

02MI15-851021-53

NEWS AND VIEWS

A totally new situation has emerged in the world, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachyov said recently in Paris. Security in Europe and elsewhere cannot be ensured by military means, through deterrence. This new historical reality calls for a rethink of many customary things in military and political spheres, writes Novosti analyst V.Kortunov.

As distinct from all previous wars, when people could not foresee all their consequences and conquerors, what with all their shortfalls, always counted on victory, the consequences of a nuclear war are known with absolute certainty beforehand. Mankind will not be able to survive it, while the very notion of victory is becoming a sheer absurdity. It has been estimated that by now 15,000 megatons of nuclear explosives has been accumulated in the world. In the last 15 years alone, the number of nuclear charges has tripled to 50,000. This nuclear arsenal is equal to one million Hiroshimas or to 6,000 world wars similar in scale to World War II. Add to this the deadly climatic, ecological and other consequences which a nuclear-missile Apocalypse would inevitably entail. Can we proceed any further? Elementary common sense suggests we cannot, since the arms race in the nuclear age has lit the red light on the road of human civilization, which only colour-blind people or suicides fail to see.

Regrettably, of late historical colour-blindness of sorts has become a fairly widespread disease in Washington. It manifests itself in the "militarisation of political consciousness", something that Mikhail Gorbachyov spoke about recently in his address on French television. Moreover,

presently, this phenomenon is growing particularly dangerous, because the world has approached a critical point when--one can say it without fear of exaggeration--its foreseeable future is being decided. The implications are whether the arms race will continue or will be stopped and, above all, whether space will be militarised or not.

x x x

The 40th session of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund ended in Seoul without producing any results, as its sponsors had to admit, writes Novosti political commentator Yuri Gvozdev. Nevertheless it was a bitter lesson for developing Asian, African and Latin American countries in the context of the present state of international economic contacts. The Third World's worst apprehensions have proved right: the United States, which sets the tone in the Western business world, has reaffirmed its tough position that developing nations must repay their debts even if they are starving and living through an economic crisis. Washington has put forward its own formula as the only way out of the financial crisis. When they promise another dollar injection, US-prompted bankers demand that developing nations substantially reduce the public sector, lift restrictions on imports and give even more freedom of action to multinationals.

No wonder that such an approach gives a political meaning to the situation. Foreign capital begins to dictate ways of development and strengthen the positions of the more conservative pro-imperialist circles.

The financial situation of developing nations continues to worsen. Their foreign debts are rapidly growing: while in 1955 the figure was 9 billion dollars, in 1980 it was 600 billion, and in 1984 almost 900 billion. Economists compare

Tuesday, October 22, 1985

9

-3-

this process to cancer which threatens the Third World's sovereignty. People are dying of starvation, poverty and diseases owing to the policy by the world financial mafia, led by the United States, which, through the IMF, demands that the debtors cut social programmes. In 1984 alone young countries had to pay Western bankers 160 billion dollars to service debts.

(APN, October 21. In full.)

THE END

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMALARI
TÜSTAV

"WE SHALL NOT REPEAT THE EVIL"

The clock of Hiroshima stopped at 8:15 a.m. on August 6, 1945, when an atomic bomb exploded in the sky over the city. In that single flash, a way of life that had been painstakingly built up over 350 years of human endeavour was utterly destroyed.

I was 29 when the bomb was dropped, and at that moment I was 3.5 kilometers from ground zero. I survived, but lost both my sisters, other relations, friends and acquaintances. I will never forget that nuclear nightmare. I have been mayor of Hiroshima for 13 years, and I have been working hard to keep the memory of that disaster alive, for the moment humankind forgets Hiroshima, the moment the evil is repeated, human history will cease.

Having overcome the pain and the sorrow, Hiroshima has risen from the rubble and become a modern urban centre. With a population of 1,050,000, we are developing into a city of international peace and culture. This was made possible by the tireless efforts and the ardent commitment to peace and justice of people in Japan and abroad. Hiroshima has been given a new life, to serve as a symbol of mankind's inalienable right to live in peace.

The moment the clock of Hiroshima stopped, the clock of history showed the onset of a new, nuclear age. With the signing of the US-USSR INF Treaty the human race took the first step towards nuclear disarmament.

The City of Hiroshima fully supports and highly values the initiatives of the Delhi Six for a freeze on nuclear testing and the results of US-USSR talks. We would welcome the conclusion of an international treaty against the use of nuclear weapons.

As / ^{the} UN forum on disarmament met in June, a "peace wave" swept the world. In Japan, it began with a drive to sign the Hiroshima and Nagasaki appeal for the complete prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. I hope to make my own modest contribution to stimulating public opinion: I reiterate my request that all national leaders visit Hiroshima. I am also working to promote the Inter-City Solidarity Project and calling for an immediate and total ban on nuclear testing and for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

On the cenotaph in Hiroshima's Peace Memorial Park are engraved the words "Let All the Souls Here Rest in Peace, for We Shall not Repeat the Evil". This is the prayer offered to the victims of the atomic bombing. It is the Spirit of Hiroshima. Hiroshima calls for the creation of a world without nuclear weapons.

Takeshi Araki

Mayor of Hiroshima

VORIO-870806DR33

THE SHADOWS OF HIROSHIMA

Yuri Zhukov

Today at 8.15 am, bells will toll once again in the centre of the Japanese city of Hiroshima and thousands of people will pay homage to the memory of the victims of the American atom bomb.

Before August 6, 1945, Hiroshima's population was 400,000. At an instant the explosion of the atom bomb, cynically called the Little Boy by Americans turned 240,000 people into ashes and mutilated 156,555. But figures are not enough. The reader's eye does not see what is hidden behind these lines. To grasp the tragedy one should walk in silence the paths of wide space crunching under one's feet. This space was once the centre of a noisy city. One should climb the steps into a lonely big house where everything what is left from Hiroshima of 1945 is collected and see a photograph placed there: the Aoi bridge, an ordinary granite bridge across the river and on it the shadows of nine people running somewhere with raised hands.

But where are the people casting their shadows? They do not exist. They evaporated under the effect of deadly beams with a tremendously high temperature, and their shadows have been left for ever imprinted into the stone.

The Pentagon likes to boast that present-day nuclear bombs are hundreds of times more powerful than the Little Boy which brought such evil that bright sunny morning in Hiroshima. But the Pentagon men stubbornly refuse to think that in the case of a nuclear war only 5 billion shadows, imprinted in burnt stones of the dead planet, would be left.

That is why today, on the day of the 42nd anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy, people of that city and people of the whole world who have not lost common sense are ever more vigorously backing the Soviet proposals for eliminating

-2-

nuclear weapons. It has just been reported from Tokyo that the international conference held there has called on mankind to collect a billion signatures to the appeal for a total and unconditional elimination of nuclear weapons.

X X X

REPORT ON VICTIMS OF BIKINI EXPLOSION

Tokyo, August 5. (TASS). Over one thousand Japanese fishing boats were affected by the radioactive fallout during the test of an American hydrogen bomb on Bikini atoll. This conclusion was drawn by the authors of a study conducted by the activists of the anti-war movement of Kochi prefecture. The new data exceed by far the official statistics of the Bikini victims in Japan. In 1954, immediately following the hydrogen-bomb explosion, the government bodies registered only two ships as affected by the blast.

The results of the many-year work done by physicians, lawyers and historians with the assistance of the local fishermen were submitted to the participants in the international conference for prohibition of nuclear weapons who assembled in Hiroshima. The fate of 187 people exposed to the radioactive rain near Bikini was accurately traced in the course of the study. Forty of them died of leukaemia and other forms of cancer.

(Pravda, August 6. Abridged.)

MEDICS SAY "NO" TO NUCLEAR THREAT

Academician Y. Chazov, Chairman,
Soviet Committee of International Physicians for
the Prevention of Nuclear War

The anti-war movement on this planet involves millions of people holding most diverse political views and coming from all walks of life. The international anti-war movement of physicians has become an important stimulating factor behind the growth of mass action against the nuclear threat. It emerged late in 1980 and came to be known as International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. There are 135,000 people active in it at present. The movement is supported by large sections of the population, political and religious leaders of various countries of the world.

Medical men have always had a special responsibility to bear for the preservation of human life and health. True to the hippocratic oath -- one of the noblest human documents -- physicians guard the health of people and save their life. We remember the ancient doctor's words : "Whatever home I may enter, I shall enter it for the good of the sick".

But we can follow the hippocratic oath only as long as we are alive ourselves, as long as our hands can work, our hospitals function, and there are medicines and instruments. In a nuclear war, however, physicians would be unable to discharge their mission. A nuclear war would not only sow death, pain and injury, but it would destroy the possibility of coming to the aid of millions of wounded, irradiated, and burnt.

A thorough understanding of the nature and scale of the biomedical consequences of the use of nuclear weapons is of

Tuesday, October 1, 1985

4

- 2 -

major significance in getting the majority of the members of the medical profession to take up a civic anti-war stance. That is why physicians are telling the peoples the hard truth about the kind of threat the nuclear arms race has in store for humanity.

The consequences of the use of atomic weapons were demonstrated to the world 40 years ago when these weapons had just appeared. The civilians of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki fell victim to that monstrous experiment. Those of their inhabitants who were affected by the radioactive fallout are still dying from leukaemia and malignant tumours. Atomic death has a long memory.

Close on 15,000 megatons of nuclear charges, an equivalent of a million Hiroshima-type bombs, are stored up in the world today. That means about six thousand "Second World Wars" in terms of explosives used. According to the estimates made by some physicians, over two billion human beings would fall victim to a nuclear war, should it break out. The immediate destructive factors of nuclear blasts would be compounded by remote consequences, including the so-called "nuclear winter" (a bitter cold because of air pollution with smoke and dust).

Research studies and conclusions made by physicians regarding nuclear war have had a strong sobering-up effect on rather large sections of public opinion in the West that underestimated the dangers of nuclear cataclysm. While in earlier days the anti-nuclear mood was common basically to progressive and liberal elements, many more from other quarters have now come to realise that a nuclear war is an identical threat to everybody. No one would escape it either in the oceans or at places far-away from military or industrial centres, or through neutrality status. It is noteworthy that many American physicians holding conservative views have come to the fore in action against the nuclear threat.

So one of the major effects the physicians' movement has achieved is breaching the psychological wall that keeps many of the Western men in the street from realising the true character of a possible nuclear war. Until quite recently they did not see well enough the real danger of its disastrous consequences. The horrors of Hiroshima slip one's memory in the daily round. The effect of the American atomic bombings of 1945 has come to mean nothing but an abstract idea to many, that is something meaningless. Indeed, it is, after all, psychologically difficult to perceive such ideas as a "million Hiroshimas" or the "death of hundreds of millions of human beings". Finally, there are fewer and fewer people with experience of the shambles of the Second World War. This is the psychological background to the underestimation of the danger of an outbreak and the scale of the consequence of another — nuclear war.

What has made for this "complacency", furthermore, is the incessant effort of many Western statesmen and politicians as well as militarist propaganda to convince the population of their countries that it is "permissible" to start a nuclear war and possible to wage it in a "limited version". This is, after all, the official military doctrine of the US and NATO.

So what had to be done was to end this indifference, to shake people, to make them see the motivation for vigorous activity and convince them that the task in hand is not to prevent just "another" war, like many that have been fought out in history, but to preserve human civilisation.

The Fifth Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which met in Budapest last summer, has been an important landmark in the medical movement. For the first time the capital of a Socialist nation played host to members of this movement -- representatives of over fifty countries. Welcoming the delegates, Janos Kadar, General

Tuesday, October 1, 1985

4

- 4 -

Secretary of the HSWP, stressed the important role of the physicians' movement in strengthening the peoples' will to peace and in mobilising international public opinion.

The physicians, assembled in Budapest, warmly welcomed the message of greetings addressed to them by Mikhail Gorbachyov who pointed out that in the Soviet Union there was full understanding of, and support for the noble activities of this movement.

Every one of more than a thousand delegates took close to heart the noble mission of physicians -- to prevent a nuclear war setting this planet ablaze. Among the delegates there were the authors of an important report of the World Health Organisation (WHO) on the consequences of nuclear war for human health and health services, and medical workers engaged in investigating the various aspects of the destructive factors of nuclear explosions as well as the economic, social and psychological implications of the arms race and a war involving weapons of wholesale annihilation.

To demonstrate the senselessness and cruelty of the arms race American physician Victor W. Sidel set up a metronome on the platform and said that with each tap of the instrument, which comes every second, one child in the world fell ill and one died. At the same time, 25,000 dollars are spent on armaments each second. The money spent on armaments in the world would be enough to provide all developing countries with food and medical assistance.

Speakers at the congress said that the world spent on arms 2,200 million dollars a day. At the same time, the WHO's budget to combat malaria in 1984 and 1985 is about 29 million dollars and the organisation's budget to tackle the problem of water supply and sanitation is 45 million dollars. Meanwhile, 2,000 million people on our planet drink polluted water, which is the cause of 80 per cent of all diseases in the developing

countries. WHO's expenditures on tackling the problems of cardio-vascular pathology, the chief cause of death in the industrialised nations, are about four million dollars in 1984-1985. How can one tolerate the situation when one out of 350 inhabitants of our planet is a soldier and only one out of 3,700 is a doctor?

These and other figures cited at the congress speak for themselves. There is no graver disease than the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race. Speakers at the congress said that a nuclear war was an epidemic for which there was no cure. Only prevention is effective here.

Participants in the congress said they were concerned over the US efforts to spread the arms race to space. They said that the implementation of Washington's plans to militarise space would undermine international stability, sharply increase the risk of a devastating global nuclear war, provoke a new, uncontrollable arms race and blow up the disarmament negotiations. Space, which has long attracted man by the possibility of expanding our knowledge about the Universe and the opportunities it opens for its peaceful exploration, should not become a source of death and destruction and an arena of Star Wars.

The congress has adopted a appeal to General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachyov and US President Ronald Reagan, which said that an arms race in space would sharply escalate the threat of a global nuclear conflict. A programme for removing the threat of nuclear war, which is spelled out in the call, envisages a verifiable freeze on the production, testing and deployment of nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles, their subsequent balanced reductions and, eventually, their elimination. It also urges other countries to follow the Soviet Union's example and make a pledge not to initiate the use of nuclear

weapons.

The motto of the Budapest congress was "Co-operation, not Confrontation." Co-operation contributes to the world's prosperity, whereas confrontation may lead to death.

The documents adopted at the congress say that the nuclear powers should, as a first step, impose a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which should be effective till the conclusion of a treaty that would ban all nuclear weapon tests everywhere. The enactment of that proposal could be a first step leading towards a complete halting of all tests, which are a catalyst for the nuclear arms race.

The unilateral moratorium which the Soviet Union imposed on all nuclear explosions on August 6 this year met with universal approval. On behalf of all the members of the international physicians' movement its leaders approved and supported the new Soviet initiative. Many national organisations followed their example. The Soviet moratorium was met with approval by physicians in the United States, a country on which it will depend whether the moratorium will be extended next year.

In his letter to the New York Times, Con Nugent, executive secretary of the international physicians' movement, answered the critics of the Soviet move by saying that the Soviet initiative created a realistic opportunity for holding back the arms race and that the United States should use this opportunity in the interest of its own security. He expressed the confidence that a ban on testing would bar the development of new generation nuclear devices, including those designed for deployment in space.

In a message to President Reagan Bernard Lown, an American cardiologist and co-chairman of the movement, called the moratorium on nuclear blasts "a medical prescription for peace" and urged the President to use the opportunity which

Tuesday, October 1, 1985

4

- 7 -

could help ensure real and lasting security for all Americans and the world as a whole. This year, thanks to the efforts of the American organisation Physicians for Social Responsibility, the problem of halting all nuclear weapon tests has become a subject of broad discussion and an active anti-war campaign by medical workers in the United States and several other Western countries.

Halting the arms race on Earth and preventing it in space and creating an atmosphere of trust and co-operation are not only problems for political debate or diplomatic negotiation today. They are the demand of our times, the demand of the nations of the world. The fact that more than 1,250,000 physicians in various countries have signed the petition to halt the nuclear arms race during the last two years bears this out.

October 1 is the International Day of Physicians against Nuclear War. On this day doctors all over the world will hold anti-war rallies and demonstrations and persuade more of their colleagues to sign the anti-nuclear petition. As ever, Soviet physicians who make their contribution to the struggle waged by the peaceloving forces to remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe will be in the front ranks of this movement.

(Pravda, October 1. In full.)

1587

THE BOOK SCENE

VOICE OF REASON, VOICE OF DECENCY

Europe on the Threshold of the Third Millennium. For Peace, Nature and Man, Issue I, The Peace Book, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura Publishers (Moscow) and Brückenverlag (Düsseldorf), 1986, 392 pp.*

If it isn't yet a rarity, it is bound to become one, for it is extraordinary in both ^{content} / and design. Soviet and West German authors worked on it for two years at the request of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and the Rhine-Westphalia Foreign Society (Dortmund, FRG) in pursuance of the recommendations of the Helsinki Final Act.

The book is not the first of its kind: its forerunners were the five-volume European Poetry and the anthology Europe: Twentieth Century, put out in the USSR in 1977 and 1980, respectively; they were acknowledged by readers as early birds of the post-Helsinki European publications project.

Now lovers of beauty have another book; I say it is a thing of beauty because it is generously illustrated with old engravings and etchings. The book offers lofty ideas and heartfelt reflections, fine aspirations and great ideals by a constellation of

* The book was put out in Russian and German simultaneously: Europa an der Schwelle des 3. Jahrtausends. Gedanken zum Frieden und zur Erhaltung der Umwelt des Menschen. Erhaltung des Friedens, Moskau, Chudozhestvennaya literatura, Brückenverlag, Dusseldorf, 1986.

notable writers, scholars, politicians, journalists and religious leaders past and present, addressing themselves to the fate of mankind and its age-old aspirations.

Out of the remote past, we hear condemnations of war, impassioned pleas for peace, and the voices of humanists, who had striven in vain to halt bloodshed.

Erasmus of Rotterdam argued in his famous treatise, The Complaints of Peace, that there was nothing glorious about war. In his view, the greatest honours should be bestowed upon those who avert war, those who restore peace with wise counsel and those who are doing their utmost to make large armies and stockpiles of arms redundant.

English philosopher Thomas Hobbes said in his day that the paramount law of Nature was for people to seek and pursue peace.

"Lay down arms and don the garb of peace," urged Johan Amos Komensky (Comenius), Czech philosopher and educationalist. His words, "We must tirelessly look for ways of supplanting humanity for inhumanity," cited in this book (p. 43), are wholly relevant today.

English natural scientist Joseph Priestley held that the succeeding generations would revise the traditional view of war; when people learn to think a little more, he wrote, they will resort to means other than the sword to settle their differences. His compatriot Jeremy Bentham urged people to banish the fear that breeds mistrust (which, incidentally, NATO strategists are now trying to perpetuate through the "nuclear deterrence" doctrine).

The fear that other nations will deceive us, and the conviction that other brains are shrewder and other hearts less noble, are signs of our weakness, he said.

Immanuel Kant called for eternal peace and conjectured as to the objective law-governed phenomena bringing about human understanding and an inevitable peaceful alliance of all peoples in the future.

Europe's principal interest is peace, said a French sixteenth-seventeenth century statesman, Maximilien de Bethune (Duc de Sully). "It is amazing that Europe with its highly civilised nations still lives by barbarian and irrational principles," he wrote. "What is the substance of its wise policy if not eternal squabbles? Wars keep breaking out, now here now there. It seems ... that we make peace only in order to start new wars!" A truly wise policy, said Victor Hugo, should bring nearer the day when "markets open to trade and minds open to ideas will be the only battlefields".

That was how the idea of world peace--an anti-militarist humanitarian idea--came into the world. The classics of Marxism-Leninism embraced and expounded it, turning a utopia into scientific theory and an elusive ideal into a realistic goal. They forcefully demonstrated the direct relationship between the struggle against war of conquest and the struggle for socialism, for the vital goals of the working class. "...The alliance of the working classes of all countries will ultimately kill war,"¹ we read in an address of the First International. Since that time the working class and communist movement has always been involved

in actions for peace.

After the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution, which Lenin characterised as the first victory in the struggle to abolish war,² he pointed to the need to draw up a foreign policy programme specially for Europe.³ The CPSU and the Soviet government have always put the emphasis on European affairs in their foreign policy. The new edition of the CPSU Programme notes, inter alia, that the Party attaches much importance to promoting peaceful good-neighbourliness and cooperation among European states. This point was also made in Mikhail Gorbachov's Statement of January 15, 1986, and in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress.

The chain of time is unbreakable. The cause of reason and humanism was carried on by Mikhail Sholokhov, Alexander Fadeyev, Konstantin Simonov, Leonid Leonov, Chinghis Aitmatov, Yuri Bondarev, Victor Astafiev, Alexander Tvardovsky, Andrei Voznesensky, Rasul Gamzatov, Yevgeny Velikhov, Yevgeny Chazov and other Soviet writers and scientists; the FRG is represented in the book by Günter Grass, Albert Schweitzer, Karl Jaspers, Heinrich Böll, Martin Niemöller, Willy Brandt, Dieter Lattmann, Herbert Wehner, Gert Bastian, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, Erich Kästner and Helmut Schmidt. The book also cites scholars and cultural figures from other European countries, the USA and Canada. Though some of the authors are represented by abstracts from their works or brief quotations (the book is very compact), the reader is given a good idea of the artistic, literary and political thought directed to finding the way to world peace, international security and to

upholding ^{the} /paramount human right to life without wars and weapons.

The book is a blend of past and present intellectual experience. The cover shows Rodin's Thinker, the artistic emblem of the publication, as it were. The reader perceives him as Europe pondering its past, present and future, the lessons of history, the bitter experiences, the chances it had, its hopes and its role in deciding the fate of the world. Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell said in their famed Manifesto, cited in the book: "We have to learn to think in a new way. We have to learn to ask ourselves, not what steps can be taken to give military victory to ~~our preferred group~~ ^{whatever group we prefer,} for there no longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: What steps can be taken to prevent a military contest of which the issue must be disastrous to all parties?" (p. 353).

The authors consider war an imperfect and criminal means of settling differences between states in the nuclear age, and offer various ways of ensuring dependably the peaceful coexistence of nations. Searching for these ways, they themselves learn to think in a new way and set an example for others. They also give the reader rich food for thought. One thought generates another, and this is another merit of the book.

The title of the first part of the book is Before It Is Too Late. The overriding idea is that Man should promptly wake up to the dangers and problems of today's world and find ways to survival. Remember the words of one of Dostoyevsky's characters: "Just five minutes! I was just five minutes late!" Humanity cannot afford being even one minute late in the effort to avert world

catastrophe. The new political thinking has to hew its way forward through a logjam of prejudice, suspicion and hostility, across barriers of hidebound pre-nuclear concepts of war and peace, of "thinking the unthinkable". Chinghiz Aitmatov, whose pertinent and impassioned article opens the book, believes that nuclear weapons have laid siege to reason. "Has insanity prevailed over reason?" the writer asks, and replies: "I think that the creative resources of reason can be compared only to the energy resources of the Sun. The old adage that beauty will save the world rings sublime, but I would like to add that reason will nevertheless have the last say. Just look: now that humanity as a whole is on the move and that the peoples are fighting for peace and against the nuclear bomb and the arms race, the collective reason of our age is being converted in the 'reactor' of struggle and in the 'accelerator' of the mass media into a public consciousness without precedent. The years of struggle for peace and against thermonuclear catastrophe are eroding the old patterns of military thinking which evolved over the ages, and are teaching people a philosophy of global survival..." (pp. 16-17).

Many ideas and projects voiced in the book epitomise the new nuclear-age political thinking. Social Democratic politician Egon Bahr, for instance, expounds provocative ideas of East-West partnership in security. The authors offer mature and well-argued criticism of the faults of militarist thinking, the pre-nuclear concepts of strength and nuclear deterrence, the plans to militarise space, etc.

Marxists-Leninists have always rejected the metaphysical predictions of the split of human civilisation into two absolutely isolated and irreconcilable currents of history. Socialism and capitalism are poles apart but this does not mean that they have no common interests or cannot work out common approaches to various problems, primarily / ^{when it comes to} safeguarding peace and protecting the environment. The nuclear age lends special force and urgency to Lenin's view that common human values have priority over the objectives of this or that class. This view, indeed, runs right through the book.

It is often said Europe should speak for itself. It is learning to do just that, to take a common approach to what is paramount, to war and peace. And it is doing so, bridging the political, military, economic, ideological and humanitarian divides. This is reflected in the present book. Although it contains a good deal of polemics and debate, that is nothing to worry about because the new political thinking does not rule out dissent and competition of ideas. It allows for differences and an honest championing of one's convictions, and offers scope for a search for common ground, approximation of views and sensible compromise. That spokesmen for nations which were locked in battle in the most gory military conflict, unleashed by Nazism, found quite a few points of contact is proof that the opportunities for understanding are boundless if there is goodwill.

The authors forcefully demonstrate that understanding and concord have a great future. The reader is bound to agree with the editors that the prose, verse and humanitarian elan of the

German and Soviet authors have torn down stereotypes and prejudices, and dampened mutual recriminations. True, it is far harder to find a common language in politics--but nothing is impossible in the quest for such a lofty goal as world peace.

Many of the ideas set forth in the book help people realise their interdependence, put aside trifling and transient differences, and come to view themselves as a close-knit human family, which alone can evade disaster.

In February 1987, when the forum For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity was taking place in Moscow, the editors presented a copy of the book to Mikhail Gorbachov. Thanking them for the gift, he said: "I do not think that differences and contradictions should be ignored or thorny issues smoothed over. But I think that one should put priorities and the hierarchy of values in the right perspective and direct one's thoughts primarily at what unites the peoples and nations, who make up the human race, in their desire for a nuclear-free and non-violent world. This is what makes your joint work so valuable."⁴ The reader will most probably agree with this view. The book is the first of a planned trilogy, with the next two volumes being devoted to Nature and Man. The useful work will be continued, helping Europeans who want to be good neighbours and crave for accord, to a better understanding of one another and to closer relations.

Vladlen Kuznetsov

Soviet writer on international
affairs

¹ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1969, p. 193.

² V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 33, p. 56.
Vol. 42.

³ Ibid.,/pp. 397-398.

⁴ Literaturnaya Gazeta, February 25, 1987.

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI
TÜSTAV

"NUCLEAR WINTER": NO ILLUSIONS

Global problems that have no national boundaries must be tackled jointly in our interdependent world. This is particularly true of the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons and prevent militarisation of outer space.

Scientists have a clear picture of the tragic aftermath of a nuclear conflict. Aside from the direct destructive effect, an exchange of nuclear strikes will cause large-scale firestorms, releasing huge amounts of soot, poisonous gases and other combustion products into the atmosphere. Tiny particles of soot will form clouds which, absorbing and blocking sunlight, will cause a "nuclear nightfall", the harbinger of "nuclear winter". As a result, the radiation balance on the Earth will be upset, and temperatures on its surface will drop by 15° to 20°C . The effects will be particularly severe in summer, with temperatures across vast areas of the hemisphere involved in the hostilities falling below freezing point. These radical upheavals in atmospheric circulation will mean that an unprecedented environmental disaster will spread throughout the world within weeks, causing massive destruction of flora and fauna. Facing agony and slow death, survivors of nuclear strikes will wish they ^{had} died in the blasts: the immediate and long-term medical and biological consequences of the catastrophe and the degradation of the environment will be lethal.

The considered and competent conclusions and explanations offered by scientists play an essential--perhaps even decisive--role in the shaping of public opinion. A mere 10 or 15 years ago the common view was that nuclear war would, at most, entail "only" the death of hundreds of millions of people and unheard-of destruction. Today, few doubt that nuclear explosions will be followed by a global environmental disaster and the destruction of civilisation itself.

Nonetheless, reason and common sense have not yet triumphed everywhere. The military strategy of the NATO countries, including the United States, stipulates "preemptive" limited nuclear strikes and local nuclear conflicts. Advocates of this doctrine assert that these are not really dangerous to the human race and that they cannot produce any catastrophic effects.

With striking placidity, US Defense Department spokesmen are saying that "nuclear winter" may produce an insignificant effect. The Office of Emergency Preparedness is also optimistic: its experts have made a "major" adjustment in the estimated US death toll in a nuclear war. Instead of the 1957 estimate of 156 million, the new figure is "only" 112 million. The public is told reassuringly that survivors will outnumber casualties.

At the Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival / WMR of Humanity" asked some of its participants--from Great Britain, Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, ^{Sweden} and the United States--to discuss the environmental consequences of a nuclear conflict. Here is a summary of their views.

Bernard Lown, professor of cardiology at the Harvard Graduate School of Public Health (US), cochairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War: People must be made to realise that mankind will not survive a new Ice Age--that is what "nuclear winter" actually is--which will inevitably come should a conflict break out. Limited nuclear war is idiocy. There is no such thing as limited nuclear war. There is absolutely no way of limiting or localising it. When two people sit down to a game of chess, they follow certain rules. It is naive to think that anyone can control the chain of unpredictable events, events that will follow the first nuclear strike.

Professor Yoyichi Fukushima of the Research Centre for the Environment (Japan), cochairman of the international movement Ecoforum for Peace: When the concept of "limited nuclear war" began to gain currency (it was advertised by the mass media close to the military-industrial complex), many people--ill-informed people, I mean--were lulled by the hope that there would be no global conflagration. But we scientists saw from the very beginning that this was an untenable and irrational concept. Fortunately, this awareness has now spread far and wide and is no longer shared by experts only. People across the world realise that in today's world, the notion of a limited nuclear conflict is unrealistic and pernicious: any nuclear strike is bound to invite retaliation and the advent of "nuclear winter", the end of all life.

Johannes Opschoor, director of the Environmental Research Institute, Free University (Netherlands), cochairman of

Ecoforum for Peace: I, too, am convinced that a "limited" nuclear strike is impossible. Nuclear conflict cannot be limited or contained. It will rapidly escalate and transcend the boundaries of this or that region. It will have devastating consequences in terms of loss of life and destruction, and its effects on the environment, on human culture will be mind-boggling.

The disaster will hardly be confined to the industrialised world, although the first nuclear strikes will indeed hit targets in developed countries.

Nikita Moiseyev, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, deputy director of its Computer Centre: The strikes will, of course, be directed against large cities in Europe, America and Asia. Let me add here that no one can hope to sit it out, no matter how far from ground zero. That is the crux of the issue. "Nuclear winter" may vary in duration in different areas, and the drop in temperatures may also vary, but eventually everything will be frozen into oblivion. Earth will continue to emit infrared radiation, but the influx of solar thermal energy will be blocked by soot and dust. The planet will begin to lose heat.

In an effort to placate the anti-nuclear movement, dealers in illusions assure the public that strikes will be aimed only at missile silos and other purely military targets.

...But the military thinks that it does not pay to target only silos. First, they are well protected and second, many of them are dummy silos. The tactic of knocking out missiles in silos does not rule out retaliation at all. Hence the

principal objective of weakening the adversary as much as possible by destroying the main resources of the country which is attacked--its people. Therefore, strikes will be "naturally" targeted at civilians in cities. I would like to stress that this is common knowledge, but the concept of a limited nuclear conflict is still current.

But you cannot limit a nuclear conflict. The very first strike will bring the world's entire stockpile of these deadly weapons into play and plunge the world into a nuclear nightmare. One cannot be sure that only the nations of the "nuclear club" possess these weapons. There are indications that several other countries have them too.

Professor Kinhide Mushakoji (Japan), Vice-Rector of the Tokyo-Based United Nations University: What worries me is that people often look at nuclear war only in terms of its scope. The number of people killed in Hiroshima was horrible enough, even though this figure is incomparable with the losses a global disaster will lead to. If we follow this logic, we may end up regarding limited nuclear war as acceptable and "nuclear winter" as survivable. This is particularly disturbing to us in Japan.

Professor Ulrich Loening, director of the Edinburgh University Centre for Human Ecology (Great Britain), cochairman of Ecoforum for Peace: I do not think that we should emphasise only atmospheric change when assessing the consequences of nuclear war. We need an integrated approach. Unlike the scientists who model "night" or "winter" scenarios for the period following

a first nuclear strike, researchers at our centre concentrate on the main global changes in the peacetime environment. But their findings are directly projected onto the situation commonly referred to as "nuclear winter". Convinced that science should be socially active, we are mobilising public opinion so that mankind would never feel the deadly cold of "nuclear winter".

Could you cite a few examples?

We publicise our findings by holding conference^s, workshops and public lectures. We are doing our utmost to promote a clear understanding of possible--and inevitable if we remain passive--consequences of environmental degradation. An informed public aware of present and future realities is a force capable of influencing the policy-makers. Obviously, we can no longer live in the old way.

Change is needed everywhere, in the East and in the West. The Soviet Union is already moving in this direction. All nations should realise that they need a new way of thinking, and not only in what concerns war and peace. We need profound conceptual changes in our entire philosophy and attitudes so as to gear them to the realities of today's world.

Gunhild Backman, president of the national organisation Physicians for Social Responsibility (Sweden): I am convinced that a great deal depends on us, that professionals can make a valuable contribution to the prevention of nuclear war. Our organisation is dealing with the medical aspects of the problem.

Great hopes will be pinned on medical assistance if "nuclear winter" sets in, with so many people wounded, disabled, poisoned and suffering from burns. But few will get the necessary treatment. The imbalance between the available medical personnel and the vast masses of people in need of assistance will be catastrophic. Millions upon millions of survivors will die, some quickly, others slowly. Besides, "nuclear winter" will produce social and psychological effects. The social structure will break down, social ties will be severed, and mental agony will compound physical suffering. Children will lose their parents, parents will not know what happened to their children, people will helplessly watch their loved ones suffer from disease or injuries, panic and fear will become endemic...

Bernard Lown: Physicians are professionally analysing the consequences of nuclear war and disseminating accurate and well-founded information about its effects from the viewpoint of human health, of human survival. Professionals can and must help others get rid of the obsolete view of war as an acceptable way of solving problems.

Nikita Moiseyev: If mankind wants to have a future, it will have to change its moral principles as radically as it did when man was becoming socially organised, when rules of conduct changed in hominid tribes, and when "thou shalt not kill" emerged as a principle. We are entering a new era, and it places new demands on us: to protect life and ensure survival is now an imperative. Awareness of this imperative is growing among the scientists, and the line we must not cross, the "point of

no return" is becoming increasingly discernible. But the emergence of new moral precepts is impossible if all passengers of our Spaceship Earth fail to grasp that this change is essential. Awareness of the dangers that threaten all of us will give rise to a feeling of global, planetary community. We all must learn to regard ourselves as members of a single family whose future depends on each and every one of us. To bring this about, we need a broad international programme of education, of enlightenment.

All this shows that scientists hold identical views on the matter in question, and these views can easily be summed up in one or two phrases: the use of nuclear weapons on any scale is a crime against humanity. The final catastrophe can be prevented, but this calls for joint efforts not only by scientists but also by all mankind.

-7-

countries, the decisions of the Non-Aligned Movement in Harare, appeals of nations of five continents and numerous UN resolutions.

The programme for building a nuclear-free world has put the cause of disarmament up to a level that seemed altogether unattainable until quite recently. The meeting at Reykjavik in October, 1986, brought with it a conceptual breakthrough and produced basic evidence to prove the possibility of big- scale nuclear disarmament accords.

The top priority today is to eliminate two classes of nuclear arms -- medium- and shorter-range missiles and to materialize the global double zero idea.

Here is a historic chance. It would be a major blunder to miss it.

The Soviet Union is as determined as ever to press for the signing of an accord for the complete elimination of the medium- and shorter-range missiles. But that must rule out the absurd counting, in defiance of all maths, that 0 plus 0 makes 72 warheads equivalent to 216 Hiroshima bombs in terms of destructive power. It is obviously high time the US displayed enough political will and responsibility to enter the door that is already open.

The Soviet Union has come to this conference firm in its determination to work for its results to be as positive and as tangible as possible. The peoples expect it to be productive. This aspiration must serve as a powerful impetus to our common effort to translate into reality the concept of "disarmament for development."

(Pravda, August 27. In full.)

SURVEYS, INFORMATION AND MAIL

TRUTH WILL OUT

Past and Present US Preparations for a
Nuclear Attack Against the Soviet Union

Declaring a "crusade" against the forces of progress, President Reagan announced his intention to "dump Communism on the ash heap of history". This phrase essentially expresses the way of thinking and the mode of action displayed, since the October Revolution, by many predecessors of the man currently installed in the White House--whether during the US armed intervention in Soviet Russia or during the Cold War which aimed to "contain" and "roll back" socialism. Let us recall a telling fact: the first scenario of a US attack against the Soviet Union involving weapons of mass destruction was drawn up as early as eight weeks after the end of World War II.

Since then, many similar plans have succeeded one another and specific steps have been taken to implement them. Invariably, their objective has been to secure nuclear military superiority, deliver a crushing blow to the USSR, suppress world socialism and smash the world's revolutionary forces. Naturally, the Soviet Union could not ignore this threat. While channelling its scientific and technological potential mostly into peaceful uses (the USSR was the world's first nation to build an atomic-fuelled electric power plant and an atomic-powered icebreaker, a civilian vessel; it also launched the first artificial satellite), it was forced to respond adequately to each new round of the race in nuclear missiles initiated by the United States.

The following reference material, based on declassified documents of Washington agencies, statements of America's leaders, papers written by experts and reports in the US press, highlights the dynamics of US imperialist war preparations for a nuclear attack against the Soviet Union dating back to 1945.

Building Up the Military Muscle

1945. Directives 329 and 329/1 approved by President Truman in November (sic), setting forth a plan of aggression against the Soviet Union and envisaging an atomic air strike against 20 Soviet cities. (Restoring the strategic balance, the USSR developed the first-generation nuclear atomic bomb, first tested experimentally in 1949.)

1946. The Strategic Air Command established, its mission to destroy the Soviet Union by delivering a "single nuclear strike" against major industrial centres. Attack against the USSR to be launched between the summer of 1946 and the summer of 1947 under the Pincher Plan.

1947. The Broiler Plan drawn up, based on the "earliest possible" use of nuclear weapons against 24 Soviet cities after the outbreak of hostilities.

1948. US National Security Council¹ Directive 30 adopted, empowering the President of the United States to authorise "immediate and effective" use of nuclear weapons without congressional approval. A surprise nuclear attack against the USSR two weeks after the outbreak of hostilities provided for in the

¹ The highest body of foreign policy and military planning under the US President.

Frolic Plan (later renamed Grabber). Destruction of 70 Soviet cities by 133 atomic bombs stipulated in the Fleetwood Plan (later renamed Halfmoon).

1949. An attack against the USSR with 300 atomic bombs scheduled for January 1, 1957 in the Dropshot Plan. Also approved: the Trojan Plan--155 atomic weapons to be used against major Soviet cities, and the Offtackle Plan--200 atomic bombs to be dropped on 104 Soviet cities, resulting in 30 million deaths.

1951. An "emergency plan" approved by the US Joint Chiefs of Staff calling for strategic bombers to drop 20 atomic bombs in the Moscow-Gorky area, 12 bombs on Leningrad, 52 bombs on industrial projects along the Volga and in the Donets basin, 15 bombs in the Caucasus and 15 bombs on Vladivostok and Irkutsk.

1952. A thermonuclear device--prototype of second-generation nuclear weapons--exploded. (The first Soviet thermonuclear weapon tested in 1953.) Contemplating the use of nuclear weapons in the Korean War,² President Truman proceeded from the possibility of destroying Moscow, Leningrad, Beijing, Shanghai and other major Soviet and Chinese cities.

1953. The idea of an unprovoked nuclear attack against the Soviet Union at the "most opportune" moment for the United States approved by President Eisenhower. The intercontinental strategic bomber and the intermediate-range missile developed. (Soviet intercontinental bombers tested in 1957; intermediate-range missiles, in 1959.)

² In the Korean War (1950-1953) US forces acted under the cover of a "United Nations force".--Ed.

1954. A report on "deliberately precipitating" war against the USSR "in the immediate future" prepared by the Policy Planning Group of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in accordance with the foreign policy concept of "rolling back" socialism. A "pre-emptive strike" against the USSR authorised by the US President.

1955. Preparations for inflicting "heavy losses" on at least half the factories in Soviet industrial centres ordered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The "advantages" of a first strike against the Soviet Union to immediately destroy all its important military targets outlined in a Pentagon paper entitled "Group for Weapon System Evaluation. Report No. 12". A list of 5,000 to 6,000 targets in the USSR to be destroyed within two hours after the outbreak of hostilities drawn up by the US intelligence community. The first intercontinental ballistic missile developed. (Similar systems of Soviet missiles tested in 1957.)

1956. Programmes for Atlas, Titan and Minuteman ICBMs, Polaris submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and Jupiter and Thor intermediate-range ballistic missiles developed.

1957. Preparation of programmes to militarise outer space, including the development of spy satellites and air and missile attack early warning systems authorised by top-level ^{US}/political and military leaders. Plans drawn up for the stationing of bombers in Europe to be used for "tactical nuclear purposes". "Limited nuclear war" concept advanced, envisaging immunity of the territory of the United States from retaliation.

1959. The concept of "optimum combination" of nuclear strikes against the USSR and other socialist countries formulated

by a National Security Council subcommittee on instructions from the President. A Comprehensive Strategic Targets List compiled, the plans envisaging the use of 1,850 strategic and medium-range bombers capable of delivering over 4,700 nuclear bombs in one sortie, as well as of hundreds of land- and carrier-based nuclear-capable fighter planes stationed in close proximity to the Soviet borders.

1960. Joint Strategic Planning Staff established. A Single Integrated Operations Plan drawn up, envisaging full-scale simultaneous strikes against all targets immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities with the USSR. The list of targets increased considerably, now covering targets both in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries. By that time the US nuclear arsenal (-----) had grown from 1,000 (in 1955) to 18,000 warheads. The Polaris missile issued to the armed forces. (In the USSR, similar missiles appeared in 1968.)

1961. A qualitative restructuring of the nuclear capability components and of plans for their use launched by the Kennedy Administration. The ^{Single} second/Integrated Operations Plan for Nuclear Attack approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff providing for five strike options against the socialist countries. The targets: the Soviet strategic forces, the air defence systems of military installations and general purpose troops, the air defence systems of large cities, the armed forces command and control system, as well as major population and industrial centres.

1962. The second Single Integrated Operations Plan fed into the computers of the armed forces. A plan for developing

the capability for a "first pre-emptive strike" against the USSR submitted to the President by the Secretary of Defence. The "optimum pattern" of a "preventive" nuclear strike against the Soviet Union run through computers.

1963. A new "limited losses" strategic concept formulated by the Pentagon, stipulating that a first nuclear strike against the USSR would considerably reduce US losses in case of Soviet retaliation for aggression.

1964. Deployment of ground-launched strategic MRVed missiles begun. (Similar Soviet missiles appeared in 1972.)

1965. Decision taken to arm Poseidon C-3 SLBMs with Mark III warheads containing 10 to 14 MIRVs.

1966. Decision taken to arm the new generation of ICBMs with MIRV warheads (on recommendation of the RAND Corporation, aerospace industry think tanks and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology which were commissioned by the Pentagon to study first-strike strategy options).

1967. The third and fourth Single Integrated Operations Plans drawn up, stipulating a strike against the USSR with 400 nuclear weapons and aiming to wipe out 25 per cent of the population and 70 per cent of the Soviet industrial capacity. The list of targets in the USSR extended to 10,000 by including more ICBM launch sites, submarine bases and long-range nuclear missile command centres.

1968. First tests of the MIRV-equipped Minuteman III missile carried out. Construction of sites and components begun for the Sentinel missile defence system designed to give protection against isolated missile strikes. Plans approved to develop a strategic missile for Trident submarines.

1969. Development of a new first-strike weapon begun-- an intermediate-range, enhanced-accuracy missile (Pershing-2).

1970. The first series of ten MIRVed Minuteman III ICBMs made operational. (Similar systems appeared in the USSR in 1975.)

1971. Decision taken to ^{re-equip} most strategic missiles with MIRV warheads. The list of targets in the socialist countries increased to 16,000. Provision adopted for covering important targets with multiple strikes.

It would be logical to ask why none of these plans of nuclear aggression against the USSR were followed up. The reason can be found among the objective factors which shaped the overall alignment of forces on the world scene--the emergence of the world socialist system, the strengthening of communist and revolutionary-democratic parties, the disintegration of the colonial system, and the world-wide movement of peace champions who opposed aggressive imperialist schemes and vigorously supported the peace policy of the socialist community.

Here, of central importance was also the alignment of strategic forces. Even in the first postwar years, when the United States held a nuclear monopoly, Washington could not ignore the growing political and economic potential of the socialist system, the technological capabilities and combat readiness of its armed forces and, finally, the combat experience accumulated by the Soviet Union in the course of the war against Nazi Germany and militarist Japan. At that time the US nuclear arsenal was clearly inadequate to ensure victory.

The development of nuclear weapons and, later, of their delivery means in the Soviet Union laid the United States open to retaliation. Without a numerical and qualitative strategic superiority, the United States could not launch a war: that would have been tantamount to suicide. The measures with which the Soviet Union responded to each new step in Washington's attempts to secure such superiority ultimately led, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, to an approximate global and regional parity between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO.

Defence Secretary Robert McNamara noted at that time that "the Soviet Union has acquired the capability to effectively destroy the United States" even after absorbing the full impact of an American first strike. President Nixon was forced to admit that strategic superiority which "guaranteed US security" was a thing of the past.

Thus a favourable situation emerged for the Soviet Union and the United States to discuss the issue of arms limitation and reduction on the basis of equality and equal security. In the Fundamentals of Soviet-US Relations signed in May 1972, Washington officially agreed for the first time that "in a nuclear age, peaceful coexistence is the only basis of relations between them".

After 1971 over 50 Soviet-American instruments were signed, among them those of extreme importance for the cause of peace, such as the Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War, the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems on a permanent basis, the Interim

Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT-1), the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War, the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests, the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes and, finally, the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT-2).³

These and other instruments became an important element of detente and exerted positive influence on the international situation. The first half of the 1970s witnessed the emergence of tangible opportunities for reinforcing political detente which had begun in the previous decade with military detente; this could have made it possible to create a reliable structure of international security.

The Impotence of Force

However, developments of this kind failed to materialise. In the mid-1970s, drawing on the latest scientific and technological advances, the more aggressive imperialist quarters undertook a new attempt to alter the qualitative strategic parity in their favour and to exert, on this basis, political and, if necessary, military pressure on the socialist community.

Washington began to methodically close major channels of negotiation on the limitation and reduction of armaments, including nuclear missiles. Violations by the United States of

³ The latter three instruments have not been ratified by the United States to this day because immediately upon their signing Washington's foreign policy exacerbated the military and political confrontation on the world scene. The US refusal to ensure these accords' entry into force was both a contributing factor in and a consequence of the new rise in international tensions.

international legal instruments it had itself signed were recorded.⁴ A painful blow was dealt to detente. And so, the imperialist forces again aggravated the international situation and sharply boosted the risks of a nuclear conflict.

Let us, once again, turn to facts.

1975. The fifth Single Integrated Operations Plan approved, providing for four types of nuclear strikes: "large-scale" (against industry), "selective" (against military targets), "limited" (against individual targets) and "regional". List of targets extended to 25,000.

1976. The fifth Single Integrated Operations Plan fed into the computers of the armed forces. Consideration of "new approaches" to the plans for a first nuclear strike against the USSR proposed by a committee set up by President Ford. Work begun to develop a new first-strike weapon--the MX three-stage missile with a liftoff weight of 80 to 90 tons and an impact weight of up to four tons, capable of destroying underground silos for ICBMs.

1977. Orders given to develop qualitatively new nuclear warheads to destroy "highly protected" Soviet targets and thus prevent the Soviet Union from launching a retaliatory strike. The list of targets in European and Asian socialist countries enlarged again.

1978. The fifth Single Integrated Operations Plan modified. The list of targets in the USSR, other Warsaw Treaty countries, Vietnam, Cuba and unnamed "allied (with the USSR--Ed.) and neutral

⁴ See "Rejecting the Language of Agreements" in WMR, No. 6, 1984.

territories" extended to 40,000.

1979. Scenarios of attack against the USSR involving a first strike against all targets considered by the Pentagon. Adoption by the North Atlantic Council (under pressure from Washington) of the decision aimed at wrecking strategic military parity in Europe and authorising deployment of US first-strike nuclear weapons--Pershing-2 and cruise missiles--in Belgium, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands and the FRG. (Development of cruise missiles begun as early as 1973. Similar Soviet missiles appeared in the mid-1980s.)

1980. Directive 59 signed by President Carter, containing guidelines for war preparations and formulating the concept of launching a first nuclear strike and concluding a nuclear war--in its different versions--on terms favourable to the United States.

1981. The thrust of Directive 59 developed by the Reagan Administration and main emphasis placed on "sustained" nuclear war. The concept of "limited" nuclear war--fought in areas remote from North America (specifically, in Europe) with the aim of deflecting the retaliatory strike from the United States--included, together with the "all-out strike" notion, in the updated Single Integrated Operations Plan. The "horizontal escalation" concept maintaining that military operations should be conducted in the areas "of US choice" (Cuba, Vietnam, Angola, Ethiopia, etc.). Allocations to the strategic forces increased sharply, with the main emphasis on their air force and naval components. Plans approved for the development of Trident II SLBMs, long-range cruise missiles and B-1B and ATB (Stealth) strategic

bombers. Decision taken to begin the deployment of some 40 MX missiles in 1985. Full-scale manufacture of the neutron bomb, the third generation of nuclear weapons, begun.

1982. A plan for "prevailing in a limited and sustained nuclear war" drawn up on the basis of NSC Directive 13. All outer space activity in the coming decade to be subordinated to aggressive military purposes according to the President's directive "On the National Space Policy".

1983. Deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles begun in Great Britain, Italy and the FRG. Presidential Directive 85 on "space defence" issued, essentially aimed at protecting the United States from retaliation for a nuclear attack. A plan involving nuclear strikes drawn up for invading Siberia from bases in Alaska, Japan, South Korea and the Philippines.

1984. Deployment of US missiles in Western Europe continued. Presidential Directive 119 adopted which follows upon Directive 85 and authorises a programme to develop an ICBM interception system. "Defense Guidance 1984-1988", a Pentagon document, formulates the strategy of "direct confrontation" between the United States and the Soviet Union, stipulating victory in a nuclear war by destroying the "Soviet structure of military and political power, nuclear and conventional forces" and the industries "shaping the military capability". The first ten space weapon contracts placed with industry by the Pentagon. Japan joins work on large-scale programmes to militarise outer space. US anti-satellite weapons tested.

True, many of the plans drawn up in the Pentagon and at the Brussels headquarters of NATO are designed for the distant future, while some of them--for example, the "Star Wars" projects, as the outer space militarisation schemes have been nicknamed in the United States--are rather dubious. Nevertheless, the beginning of the deployment of US new-generation missiles, above all of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, changed the strategic situation radically. Objectively, this increased the danger that the US ruling elite might succumb to the temptation of launching an armed conflict in the hope of attaining the overall objective formulated in President Carter's Directive 59--to destroy socialism as a socio-political system.

Faced with this critical situation, the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation as a whole were forced to adopt certain counter-measures fully commensurate with the scope and nature of the new threat. On agreement with the USSR, the governments of the GDR and Czechoslovakia stationed Soviet enhanced-range operational-tactical missile complexes on their soil. Then their number in the GDR was increased. In August 1984 the Soviet Union announced successful tests of its long-range cruise missiles and in October, that it was beginning the deployment of similar systems on strategic bombers and submarines.

The steps taken by the Warsaw Treaty Organisation began to restore the parity in nuclear missiles as early as about mid-1984. The US ruling quarters' hopes of securing military superiority collapsed, and so did attempts to create "positions of strength" for a dialogue with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

This appears to have largely contributed to the fact that in the autumn of 1984 President Reagan, taking into account the growth of anti-war sentiments in the United States itself, was forced to take some tangible steps to placate public opinion and agreed to the Soviet proposal to open new talks aimed at attaining mutually acceptable agreement on the entire range of inter-related questions concerning non-militarisation of outer space and reductions in strategic offensive armaments and medium-range nuclear weapons. As Comrade Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said in late November 1984, the Soviet Union is prepared to explore all these avenues in search of the most radical solutions which would make it possible to advance toward a complete prohibition and, ultimately, elimination of nuclear weapons.⁵ Such talks are advocated with increasing firmness by the peace movements which exert growing political pressure on imperialist governments.

X X X

To sum up, the record of the postwar years leads one to at least two conclusions:

The first is that Washington has always initiated the arms race in nuclear weapons at all its stages.⁶

The second is that the economic, scientific and technological capacity of the Soviet Union and its sister socialist

⁵ See Pravda, November 27, 1984.

⁶ Over the postwar period, the United States has initiated the development of at least 95 new weapon systems designed to upset strategic military parity in its favour.

countries rules out any US superiority in the military confrontation it has imposed on the socialist world.

The determination of the Soviet Union and all other Warsaw Treaty countries to curb the aggressor is indispensable for the success of the struggle to prevent a nuclear war the US imperialist quarters would like to unleash. Nothing they do to upset strategic military parity produces any tangible results: the socialist community countries effectively block these moves, not only ensuring their own security but also creating favourable conditions for negotiations concerning the entire range of disarmament issues on the basis of equality and equal security, the only possible basis for agreement.

The following sources were used in compiling this reference material: US Presidential Directives 329, 329/1 (1945), 18 (1977), 59 (1980), 13, 32 (1982), 85 (1983) and 119 (1984); records of the 1964 hearings on Department of Defence appropriations in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of the 1974 and 1982 hearings on strategic questions in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; the 1973, 1975, 1977-1981 and 1983 Department of Defence Annual Reports to the Congress. The monographs used include: D. Ball, Deja-Vu: The Return to Counterforce in the Nixon Administration; D. Ball, Developments in the US Strategic Nuclear Policy under the Carter Administration; J. Collins, US-Soviet Military Balance, Concepts and Capabilities, 1960-1980; T. Greenwood, Qualitative Improvements in Offensive Strategic Arms: the Case of MIRV; B. Greiner, K. Steinhaus, Auf dem Weg zum 3. Weltkrieg?; G. Herken, The Winning Weapon; Gerhardt Kade, Die Bedrohungslüge. Zur Legende von der "Gefahr aus dem Osten"; F. Kaplan, The Wizards of Armageddon; L. Korb, National Security Organization and Process in the Carter Administration; P. Pringle and W. Arkin, SIOP. The Secret US Plan for Nuclear War; P. Scheer, With Enough Shovels: Reagan, Bush and Nuclear War; R. Tammen, MIRV

and the Arms Race; The Superpowers in a Multinuclear World.

Ed. by G. Kemp, R. Pfaltzgraff Jr., and U. Raanan. Periodicals and newspapers: 1973-1984 issues of The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Chicago Tribune, Defense Monitor, Foreign Affairs, Houston Chronicle, Inquiry, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Nihon Keizai.

Compiled by the working group of the WMR
Commission on Peace and Democratic Move-
ments: Roland Bauer, Raul Valdés Vivó
and Efstratios Koracas

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA
TÜSTAV

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE IN THE FRONT RANKS
Reflections on the Place of the Communists
in the Peace Movement

Harald Neubert

Dr.Phil., Director,
International Working Class Movement Institute,
Academy of Social Sciences under the
SED Central Committee

The Communists' position concerning issues of war and peace has always been clear and unambiguous. As a principled attitude, their condemnation of wars of conquest has been tried, tested and borne out by life. Meanwhile, today defence of peace has assumed a still greater significance (-----) for the strategy and political activities of communist parties; it has become their central task.

In accordance with Marxist-Leninist theory, the revolutionary working class movement has never considered war as an indispensable means of attaining its foremost historical goal, that of eliminating capitalism and building socialism. Moreover, the communist ideals themselves dictate the need to banish international armed conflicts as an instrument of policy from the life of society. The attempts to ascribe to Lenin and to Communists the concept of war as the highest form of the class struggle of the proletariat and revolution as the highest form of war¹ are a vile falsification.

¹ See, for example, Boris Meissner, Die sowjetische Stellung zum Krieg und zur Revolution, Zurich, 1978, pp. 3-4.

Lenin has proved the class nature of imperialist wars, thus leading us to the conclusion that the working class must reject them categorically. As to socialist revolution, Frederick Engels pointed out still earlier that the working class strives to ensure the victory of socialism without armed violence and consequently, without wars. Answering the question about the possibility of eliminating private property by peaceful means, he wrote in Principles of Communism: "It is to be desired that this could happen."² At the Ninth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) in 1920 Lenin stressed that "any peace ... will open channels for our influence a hundred times wider".³

The above is true both for the countries of existing socialism and for the working class movement which is fighting for socialism in conditions of capitalism. It will never be forgotten that, having emerged on the scene of world politics, Soviet Russia began with proclaiming its Decree on Peace. In those days long gone Lenin formulated and applied in practice the principles of peaceful coexistence of socialism and capitalism, principles that form the

² Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 349.

³ V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 30, p. 453.

basis of normal international relations.

History knows no cases of the revolutionary working class movement or socialism resorting to war for the sake of attaining their political or social objectives. The Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution firmly rejects war as a means of propagation for socialism; in other words, it rejects the export of revolution. In 1918

Lenin came out against those who believed that international revolution should be furthered by war.⁴

Naturally, Communists had to take up arms many times. At the same time, they have always been in the forefront of the struggle against wars of conquest and their instigators, for peace and peaceful international relations. Communists are always ready to fight selflessly for the interests of peoples who yearn for peace. Speaking of the importance of a peaceful foreign policy, Karl Marx wrote: "The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes."⁵

When we say that today defence of peace plays an even more important role in the Communist strategy and policy, the reason for this statement lies in the historical changes which

⁴ See *ibid.*, Vol. 27, pp.71-72.

⁵ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 2, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1969, p. 18.

have occurred since the end of World War II.



First, modern weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means have produced, for the first time in history, a tangible possibility of complete annihilation of civilisation and destruction of the environment. It follows that the realisation of the social objectives the peoples set for themselves is inseparable from the imperative demand that nuclear war be prevented. That is why the Communists are saying that today none of man's tasks are more meaningful than that of defending universal peace.

Second, we are convinced that the trend towards a greater war threat is not irreversible. The catastrophe can be averted if we succeed in rallying to the defence of peace all those who hold life on earth dear, and they make up an overwhelming majority of humanity. As early as the mid-1950s the Communists arrived at the conclusion that world wars could be prevented even before the abolition of imperialism, their source. They maintain that wars are launched by people, that they cannot be considered a natural law and that they can be banished from the life of human society.

Unlike the period which preceded World War II, the gains of the peace forces and, above all, the growth of the defence

capacity of the Soviet Union and the other states of the socialist community--nations dedicated to peace--have now produced a global balance of capabilities which deprives imperialism of any chance of success. Any would-be aggressors are forced to reckon with the resistance of most of humanity to their reckless schemes, to realise that they themselves will also perish inevitably in a global nuclear holocaust.

This is a new situation. It is new for the working class movement too. For when it was still unable to prevent wars and when wars themselves did not yet threaten to extinguish life on earth, the working class movement saw its task in ending the already raging armed conflicts as soon as possible; it advocated democratic peace. Simultaneously, making use of the situation arising as a consequence of war, it sought to realise its class objectives. At that time banishment of war from the life of human society was linked, with perfectly good reason, to the imperative condition of eliminating imperialism, their source. This meant that the wars launched by aggressors were to be turned against the social system which produced them. Indeed, historical experience confirmed that both world wars accelerated revolutionary processes and considerably weakened world capitalism.

Now that a real threat to human survival has emerged, the strategic thrust of the Communists' efforts is taking on a new aspect too. We hold that the struggle for peace should now be comprehensively oriented on preventing war. The fraternal

parties maintain that even prior to the complete victory of socialism throughout the world, militarist quarters must and can be prevented from launching a nuclear conflict.

In their unswerving efforts to step up resistance to the war threat, the Communists do not see themselves as the only champions of peace nor lay exclusive claims to the peace movement. On the contrary, taking into account the threatening scope of the danger and the headstrong adventurism of the more aggressive imperialist quarters, they hold that war can be prevented only by joint action on the part of all peace forces. In the words of Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SED CC, what is needed is a broad coalition of reason, realism and peace, and the Communists are among its elements.⁶

This determines the Communists' distinctly positive, constructive stand and an attitude free from any restrictive conditions with regard to the movements which have emerged in recent years in the course of the struggle against NATO's policy of arms buildup--movements which unite members of all social strata, of different political currents and philosophies.

These are incontrovertible facts. Nevertheless--and perhaps precisely for this reason--the ideologists of the imperialist "war parties" spare no effort to sow doubt concerning the Communists' commitment to the cause of peace.

6

See Neues Deutschland, October 10, 1983.

From the outset, militarist propaganda attempted to distort the goals pursued by the peace forces. For example, Defence Minister Manfred Wörner of the FRG claimed, not so long ago, that they were the source of the war threat.⁷ However, since that position failed to produce tangible results, attempts began to fragment the movement, and above all to isolate or oust the Communists.

↓

much is
Specifically, /being done to picture the Communists of capitalist countries as "agents" of the socialist states, like say, Joseph Luns, NATO Secretary General up to mid-1984, claimed repeatedly and groundlessly.⁸ Here, one of the tricks of distorting the role of Communists in the peace movement is to allege that they want to use the peace struggle "for revolutionary purposes".

What is the actual situation? Communists are active in the peace movement alongside other forces. The movement is quite heterogeneous in terms of its social and political composition and its members' philosophies. The common denominator is the desire to prevent nuclear catastrophe. This also covers the struggle for disarmament, against the use of war as an instrument of politics, for detente. The Communists are profoundly

⁷ See Welt am Sonntag, June 5 and October 16, 1983.

⁸ See, for example, Newsweek, January 25, 1982.

convinced that no participant in the movement should make his or her cooperation with other forces conditional on their renunciation of their views and objectives.

This approach fully applies to the working class movement too. It represents the organised social strength of a definite class and pursues distinct class objectives, although, in terms of practical politics, different currents in this movement perceive, identify and solve these tasks differently. Trade unions in capitalist countries fight to defend working people, to improve their working and living conditions. Communist parties there work for the elimination of capitalism and the establishment of socialist society by revolutionary means. Social Democrats in most cases advocate reforms designed to improve the life of the popular masses within the capitalist system.

It is natural that in its action for peace, no organisation of the working class movement abandons the programme and purposes which shape its political character. But the struggle of these organisations for the interests of the working class and for social progress in no way contradicts peace activities. The reverse is true: it becomes intertwined with them even closer.

It has already been mentioned that a nuclear conflict would threaten human survival and that, consequently, universal peace is absolutely indispensable for social progress. This means that those who fight for social change should spare no effort in working to defuse the nuclear war threat.

The imperialist policy of arms buildup and war preparations adversely affects the living conditions of working people. It follows that under capitalism, defence of the vital interests of working people is impossible without resistance to militarist preparations. Incidentally, this is also the conclusion of Gert Bastian, a retired general of the Bundeswehr and a man with no connections to the working class movement. In his book Make Peace! Reflections on the Policy of Security he writes: "In our country, too, the long-proven interconnection between arms spending and cutbacks in social expenditures, between the manufacture of arms and unemployment is becoming increasingly obvious. And so in our country, too, any struggle against armament and for disarmament is not only a struggle against the growing danger of war, for durable peace; invariably, it is also a struggle against poverty, for greater social justice."⁹

As to the working class movement itself, separation of the struggle for peace from the drive to uphold the socio-economic interests of working people adversely affects both the former and the latter aspects of its activities. Nevertheless, there existed in the working class movement organisations which, for a long time, refused to share this view and hesitated a great deal before joining the struggle for peace. That is why the Communists consider it their important duty to enhance the contribution of the working class to the prevention of nuclear war, and this calls for organisational and political efforts.

⁹ Gert Bastian, Frieden schaffen! Gedanken zur Sicherheitspolitik, Munich, 1983, p. 153.

Significant shifts have been recently occurring in this road, rooted in the growing understanding by working people of the interdependence between these tasks. The direct objective of the powerful strikes in the FRG, Great Britain and other capitalist countries was to combat mass unemployment and other adverse consequences of the economic slump affecting working people. Meanwhile, the point that the runaway arms buildup aggravated the crisis and accelerated cuts in social spending was voiced with increasing vigour. It was made more obvious than ever before that action to defend socio-economic gains and the struggle(-----) for peace were inseparable.

Organisations and groups whose policy guidelines, unlike those of the working class movement, are not aimed at social progress also take part in the action against nuclear war preparations. They hold distinctive positions which are shaped by their philosophies and by religious, ethical, moral and other motives. However, this is no reason to denigrate the importance of the contribution these forces make to the joint peace-making efforts.

The Communists define their attitude to this issue in no uncertain terms. They say that while, on the one hand, today it is impossible to effectively promote social progress without fighting against imperialist war preparations, on the other hand, one can make a tangible and significant contribution to the drive to safeguard peace even if one is not a consistent champion of social change. That is why Communists never impose their socio-political, let alone revolutionary views on anyone in any form;

nor do they make cooperation in the struggle against the war threat conditional on acceptance of such views.

Expanding their involvement in the peace movement, the Communists attach priority attention to all that unites and mobilises the opponents of war and relegate to the background that which can fragment and hamper joint efforts. This approach can be put into practice only when relations among the various peace forces are shaped in the spirit of cooperation, equality and goodwill.

The Communists do not claim to lead the movement; they do not seek submission from their partners or the adoption of a common ideological platform. They even declare their readiness to act jointly in defence of peace with those whose positions in other spheres--for example, in what concerns social relations under capitalism and the need to transform them--are anti-communist.

Given the extraordinarily broad socio-political spectrum of today's peace movement, one cannot evade a dialogue between its constituent forces, a dialogue based on a striving for co-operation. This imperative is also rooted in the fact that issues of war and peace are inseparable from social inter-relations, from the alignment of forces and processes on the international scene. "The problems of war and peace as, incidentally, all global problems," Comrade Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said, "do not exist all by themselves. They are inseparable from the world social contradictions and from the development of the class struggle."¹⁰

¹⁰ Information Bulletin, No. 12, 1984, Peace and Socialism, Prague, p. 7.

only

The struggle for peace can be successful/by making a correct analysis of the international situation. Here the progressive public attaches particular attention to the identification of the true sources of the war threat.

One must, however, admit that opinions with regard to this matter differ widely. The Communists tackle it from the viewpoint of Marxist-Leninist theory. They proceed from objective realities and class positions. In accordance with this approach, issues of war and peace are inseparable from the competition between socialism and imperialism on the global scale. The Communist viewpoint is that one should look for the motives behind the aggravation of international tensions, the exacerbation of the confrontation, the intensification of the arms race and the growth of the war threat solely in the nature and policy of imperialism, in the way those who devise and apply its ideology react to the weakening of imperialist positions on the international scene.

Aggressive imperialist forces strive for military superiority over the socialist countries, for a superiority which, they hope, will enable them to win a nuclear war. US President Ronald Reagan has declared that socialism is the "focus of evil" which must be destroyed. This purpose is served by the military doctrine of the United States and of NATO as a whole. The deployment of new US medium-range missiles in several West European countries is nothing other than preparations for the implementation of the Pentagon-devised strategy of a first, "decapitating" strike.

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community pursue a fundamentally different course. They are doing their utmost to banish war as an instrument of international politics from all spheres, including the competition between socialism and imperialism; they work to firmly establish the principles of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems. They are profoundly convinced that all international conflicts and disputes can and must be solved by political means.

The first-strike concept is alien to the socialist military doctrine. The Warsaw Treaty countries do not seek strategic superiority over the North Atlantic bloc. They pursue a defensive policy. They view strategic military parity as the best possible basis for ensuring peace and enhancing detente. It is precisely for this reason that, in response to the moves by the United States and NATO to alter the alignment of military forces in their favour, the socialist countries adopted counter-measures aimed at maintaining parity.

There is another fundamental difference between socialist and imperialist foreign policy / line concerning the issue of peace. The self-seeking class interests of imperialism inevitably lead it to try and impose its will on all mankind. As for socialism, its class interests coincide with the general democratic aspirations of peace-loving peoples. That is why it does not necessarily take a Communist, an advocate of the socialist system of society, to support the peace programme of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries. Here is where the ideals of existing

socialism coincide with the imperatives of peace.

The following three aspects are of prime importance in discussing the inseparable concepts of "socialism" and "peace":

first, there are no class forces in socialist society which would profit from the arms race and war. By contrast, under imperialism monopoly capital is bent on expansion and accepts war as one of its political tools. The dominant role in the shaping of this policy is played by the powerful military-industrial monopolies which reap superprofits from the buildup of armaments;

second, the desire of socialism to prevent war coincides with the striving of peoples for peace, with the interests of all social forces who want peace. Socialism does not seek to subjugate and exploit other peoples and firmly opposes all forms of neocolonialism;

third, programme and policy, word and deed coincide in the course the socialist countries actually pursue. When they speak of disarmament, detente and cooperation, these are the goals they really want to attain. But President Reagan presents quite a different image to peace-loving public opinion. For example, proposing "elimination" of chemical weapons, he simultaneously authorised a new stage in their buildup. While resounding by condemning international terrorism, the US Administration elevated it to the level of national policy, committed aggression against Grenada, ordered the mining of Nicaraguan ports, is prepar-

ing to attack that independent country and supports Israel's policy of genocide. Swearing friendship with developing countries, the United States is undermining the non-aligned movement.

In order to uphold peace it is important for more and more members of the peace movement, including those in Asian, African and Latin American countries, to see the cause of the war threat in imperialism and to direct their struggle against its more aggressive quarters. Of course we know that there are still people in the movement who, while opposing the imperialist policy of confrontation and arms buildup, maintain that the war threat emanates to an equal degree from the socialist countries too. We are convinced that Communists cannot keep silent when such views are aired. They consider it their duty to reveal the true state of affairs and direct the struggle against those who give rise to the threat of war.

One must not ignore the occasionally expressed opinion that the socialist countries should not insist on the maintenance of strategic military parity, that they should take unilateral steps toward disarmament. Here, everything must be made crystal clear. Moves to upset this parity are detrimental not only to the security of the socialist countries but also to the cause

of universal peace. History tells us that potential aggressors unleashed war only when they believed they had a chance to succeed. Such are the facts on which preservation of world peace depends. (—————) They exert an objective influence on the course of developments.

In discussing strategic military parity, another question arises: is there no other way of ensuring durable peace? Some ask whether the socialist countries consider reliance on military means the only way of preventing a nuclear holocaust. This question calls for a clear answer since it concerns the prospects of strengthening international security and the basis of cooperation among all peace forces--from Communists to pacifists.

Given the imperialist quarters' intention of attaining military superiority and thus ensuring victory in a nuclear war, the socialist community is forced to attach priority attention to efforts to strengthen their defence capacity as a prime condition for the maintenance of peace. That is a logical conclusion based on a sober evaluation of imperialist policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union since the October Revolution. Today the situation is such that underestimation of strategic military aspects could be fatal for all mankind because it would encourage imperialism in its aggressive ventures.

At the same time it must be emphasised that central to the proposals of the socialist countries and the policy they actually pursue are political ways of ensuring durable peace. The peace programme of the Soviet Union and its allies envisages, as moves

of major importance, disarmament, renunciation of armed force in the settlement of international problems, no first use of nuclear weapons, a non-aggression treaty between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO, nuclear-free zones, a freeze on the manufacture and deployment of nuclear weapons followed by the elimination of all types of these weapons, a ban on other means of mass destruction, armed forces reductions and confidence-building measures.

All this means that, in the final analysis, the socialist countries accord greater importance to the introduction of the principles of peaceful coexistence into international practices, to the promotion of detente and the expansion of inter-governmental cooperation than to the military aspects of the strengthening of security. Such are the spirit and the specific content of the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty countries adopted in January 1983.

The socialist countries' proposals are welcomed by broad sections of the public, including those outside the communist movement, because these proposals echo their aspirations too. The military aspects of efforts to ensure peace would be even less important compared to the political aspects if the level of strategic military parity could be lowered on the basis of equality and equal security, if agreement could be reached on mutual reductions in the military ^{capabilities,} / if peace could be maintained not through mutual deterrence (the way it is stipulated).

in the NATO military doctrine) but through partnership in the field of security.

Paraphrasing the point Marx and Engels made in the Manifesto of the Communist Party, one can say that the Communists have no interests separate and apart from those of the entire peace movement. In their struggle against the war threat they single out and defend, on the one hand, those working people's interests which are common to all and have no relation to any particular national affiliation and, on the other hand, invariably represent the interests of the peace movement as a whole. The Communists are in the front ranks of the movement, without claiming hegemony in it. Their place in the movement and their relations with other champions of peace .. are shaped by their tangible and specific contribution to the struggle for everyone's right to life, against the nuclear war threat.

SURVEYS, INFORMATION AND MAIL

COMMON SENSE, REALISM, A HIGH SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

1983: Soviet Proposals on Removing the War Danger

Imperialist propaganda is striving to shift the blame for the intensification of the arms race and the continuing aggravation of international tensions onto the Soviet Union. The stake here is on the uninformed and the gullible, on those unfamiliar with the actual situation, with the tireless efforts the Soviet Union has been making to halt the accumulation of armaments and reverse it--reverse it towards arms reduction, above all nuclear arms reduction, and disarmament. The USSR advanced a series of major peace initiatives in 1983. Here is a summary of these moves, published upon requests from readers.

JANUARY

Proceeding from the principled position expressed in the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member states concerning the creation of nuclear-free zones in the North of Europe, in the Balkans and in other regions in Europe, the Soviet Union supported the Swedish proposal on the creation in Europe of a zone free from theatre nuclear weapons about 300 kilometres wide--that is, 150 kilometres on either side of the line dividing Warsaw Treaty and NATO states. Simultaneously, the Soviet Union proposed expanding the zone to 500 - 600 kilometres so as to reduce the nuclear threat.

FEBRUARY

On behalf of the socialist states directly participating in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, the Soviet Union submitted new proposals:

- reducing the strength of the NATO and Warsaw Treaty armed forces to an equal collective level of 900,000 men each, irrespective of the current strength of either side;
- withdrawing, within twelve months, 20,000 Soviet servicemen together with their armaments from the area (in addition to the same number of servicemen and the one thousand tanks withdrawn from the GDR in 1979-1980), should the United States withdraw 13,000 servicemen;
- freezing--after an initial reduction of Soviet and US troops as a joint example--the armed forces and armaments levels of all direct parties to the talks.

MARCH

At the Soviet-American Geneva talks on strategic arms limitation and reduction the Soviet delegation submitted a draft treaty stipulating a stage-by-stage reduction, by 1990, of the aggregate number of launchers for intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles and of heavy bombers down to 1,800 on either side--that is, 25 per cent lower than the initial level established in the SALT-II Treaty. Simultaneously, the aggregate number of nuclear warheads on these delivery vehicles would be reduced to an equal agreed level.

MAY

Following up on its earlier initiatives concerning nuclear arms reduction in Europe, the Soviet Union proclaimed its readiness to have no more missiles and warheads on them than possessed by NATO in each agreed period. Should the number of warheads on British and French missiles diminish, an equal reduction would be applied to Soviet medium-range missiles. This approach would also cover airborne medium-range systems deployed in Europe. Thus the USSR came out in favour of equal nuclear capabilities in Europe both in delivery vehicles and warheads on them--naturally, taking into account the relevant armaments of Britain and France. If implemented, this proposal would mean that there would be considerably fewer medium-range missiles and warheads on them in the European part of the USSR than before the appearance, in 1976, of the missiles described in the West as SS-20s.

As the first, easiest and most effective step--until agreement was reached on reducing both nuclear arms in Europe and strategic weapons--the Soviet government, in its statement of May 28, 1983, again proposed freezing the number of these armaments and restricting their qualitative modernisation as much as possible.

JUNE

On instructions from the USSR Supreme Soviet the Soviet government proposed to the governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and China that all the powers possessing nuclear weapons freeze them in quantitative and qualitative terms. In advancing this important initiative, the message stressed,

the Soviet Union did not at all view the freeze as an end in itself but as an effective first step towards reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear armaments completely--and therefore towards the removal of the nuclear threat as such.

Reiterating its support for the Finnish proposal on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe, the Soviet Union expressed its readiness to discuss with interested parties the question of making the Baltic Sea nuclear-free.

AUGUST

In his talk with a group of US senators in the Kremlin Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, put forward a series of new important proposals on preventing militarisation of outer space. The USSR, the Soviet leader said, considered it imperative to negotiate a complete ban on the testing and deployment of any space-based weapons designed to strike targets on the ground, in the atmosphere and in outer space. The Soviet Union was ready to negotiate the elimination of the already existing anti-satellite systems and the prohibition of new ones. Moreover, the USSR pledged not to be the first to deploy any type of anti-satellite weapons in outer space as long as other countries, including the United States, refrained from deploying any such weapons there.

On the eve of yet another round in the Soviet-American Geneva talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe the Soviet Union declared it was prepared to take another major step towards disarmament. In his interview to Pravda Yuri Andropov

said that should mutually acceptable agreement be reached, including the US renunciation of the deployment of new missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union would, in the course of reducing its medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR down to a level equal to the number of British and French missiles, scrap all the missiles subject to reduction. In that case a considerable number of SS-20s, the latest missiles, would be scrapped too.

SEPTEMBER

With the Soviet proposal about negotiating complete elimination of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe remaining in force, the Soviet Union expressed its readiness to achieve a far-reaching solution under which both sides would renounce the deployment in Europe of any new medium-range nuclear weapon systems and reduce the already existing such weapons by about 30 per cent, maintaining equality in both medium-range delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft) and the warheads on them at the minimum agreed level between the USSR and NATO as a whole.

OCTOBER

The Soviet Union proposed the inclusion in the agenda of the 38th UN General Assembly of an important and urgent item-- "Condemnation of Nuclear War". According to the relevant draft declaration submitted by the USSR the world community would:

- condemn nuclear war resolutely, unconditionally and forever as running counter to human conscience and reason, as the most monstrous crime against nations and as a violation of the foremost human right, the right to life;

- denounce as criminal acts the development, advancement, dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts designed to substantiate the "legitimacy" of the first use of nuclear weapons, as well as the general "acceptability" of the launching of nuclear war;

- urge all states to pool and step up their efforts to remove the nuclear war threat, to end the nuclear arms race and to reduce nuclear armaments up to and including their complete elimination.

Maintaining that the condemnation of nuclear war must be effectively supported by practical moves to curb the nuclear arms race, the Soviet Union put forward a new important initiative at the General Assembly session. The Soviet draft resolution "A Freeze on Nuclear Armaments" proposes calling on all nuclear weapon states to agree to a freeze with appropriate quantitative and qualitative verification of all their nuclear armaments. Specifically, this would mean:

- an end to the buildup of all the components of nuclear arsenals, including all types of delivery vehicles and all types of nuclear weapons;

- no deployment of new types or makes of nuclear armaments;

- a moratorium on all tests of nuclear weapons and on tests of new types and makes of their delivery vehicles;

- an end to the production of fissionable materials for the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

According to the Soviet proposal, this end could best be served if all the nuclear weapon countries simultaneously imposed a quantitative and qualitative freeze on these weapons. However, the Soviet Union also agrees to the USSR and the United States being the first to do it on a bilateral basis, to set an example to the other nuclear states.

The Soviet Union also submitted to the 38th UN General Assembly a proposal for the conclusion of a Treaty on Prohibiting the Use of Force in Outer Space and from Outer Space in Respect of the Earth.

In Yuri Andropov's interview to Pravda of October 27, 1983 the Soviet Union advanced new initiatives. -----> Essentially, they mean that should the United States renounce its plan to deploy its missiles in Europe as scheduled, thus making it possible to continue the negotiations and the search for mutually acceptable solutions, the USSR would be ready to begin reducing its SS-4 missiles. Should agreement with the other side be reached on a just basis in Geneva, a considerable part of the existing SS-20 missiles would be scrapped. Besides, the Soviet Union agrees to reduce the number of SS-20 launchers to 140--that is, a number noticeably smaller than that of British and French launchers for medium-range missiles.

NOVEMBER

Despite the breakdown of the Geneva negotiations on nuclear arms limitation in Europe through US action, after the deployment of US Pershing and cruise missiles on the continent had become a fait accompli, the Soviet Union stated firmly and unequivocally that it remained committed to its principled course of curbing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and of reducing and ultimately eliminating the nuclear war threat. Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, declared in his statement published ^{on} November 25: Should the United States and other NATO countries display their readiness to return to the situation which existed before the deployment of US medium-range missiles in Europe began, the Soviet Union will also be ready to do so. Then the proposals it made earlier on questions of nuclear arms limitation and reduction in Europe would be brought back into force. In this case, i.e., should the previous situation be restored, the unilateral pledges made by the USSR in this regard would apply again too.

* * *

The past year has shown that all those raising their voice against the insane arms race and for peace can rest assured: these are precisely the goals of the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Summary prepared by the WIR Commission
on Scientific Information and Documentation

MILITARY-STRATEGIC PARITY IN THE 1980s

Oleg Bykov, Dr.Sc. (Hist.)

Deputy Director,

Institute of World Economics and International Relations,
USSR Academy of Sciences

In the nuclear-missile age, the problem of the balance between the military potentials of states and their groupings has gone beyond arithmetical calculations and has moved into the sphere of megatons, megadeaths and "super-destruction" coefficients, so taking on a new and quite different significance. The period since Hiroshima and Nagasaki has thrown a totally different light on the traditional conception of war, as formulated in the 19th century by Clausewitz, who saw armed conflicts as an acceptable method of attaining political goals.¹ A stake on war with the use of nuclear weapons has become equivalent to a line of self-destruction, and puts civilisation itself in jeopardy.

But the essential correction in Clausewitz's postulate was not made by atomic bombs as such. When the United States had a monopoly of mass destruction weapons, its strategists continued to think and act in the spirit of the views of the German military theorist. No wonder that the then US President Harry Truman saw the testing of the first atomic bomb as a means of

¹ See, Karl Clausewitz, On War, Moscow, 1934, p. 5 (Russian edition).

pressuring the Soviet Union. The displacement of nuclear war from the life of the human society began only after the Soviet Union tested its first atomic bomb in the late 1940s, then, by building its inter-continental missiles, did away, in the 1950s, with the invulnerability of US territory to retribution for aggression, and, finally, in the 1970s, ensured strategic equilibrium with the United States.

The global military parity helped to realise Lenin's prediction that the ever more destructive power of weapons, together with the growing defensive capability of socialism, would make war altogether impossible.² The balance of forces between the socialist world and the capitalist world, a key factor in contemporary international development, has in principle ruled out the possibility of one side gaining decisive military superiority over the other. The aggressor cannot avoid a crushing retaliatory strike, whatever the scenario of a conflict with the use of mass destruction weapons.

The military-strategic equilibrium has objectively helped to improve the international situation. Under its influence the United States recognised that in the nuclear-missile age there is no rational alternative to peaceful coexistence based on the principle of equality and equal security. The USSR and the USA concluded a number of important treaties and agreements,

² See Krupskaya's Reminiscences of Lenin. A Collection of Articles and Speeches, Moscow, 1971, p. 53 (in Russian).

among them on the prevention of nuclear war, some measures in limiting strategic offensive weapons, limiting anti-missile defence systems, and so on. Soviet-US negotiations were begun on the prohibition or limitation of other types of weapons.

The equilibrium which has taken shape between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO armed forces served as an important prerequisite for advancing the positive process enshrined in the 1975 Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. This led to the first steps in strengthening confidence on our continent. The Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO got down to negotiating mutual troop and arms cuts in Central Europe.

Consequently, in the 1970s a real prospect appeared for curtailing the futile and hazardous competition in the military field. The task was to advance along the road of a mutual limitation and reduction of armaments, especially nuclear armaments, seeking scrupulous maintenance of the equilibrium on an ever lower level.

Yuri Andropov said at the June 1983 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU CC: "The military-strategic equilibrium between socialism and imperialism objectively promotes peaceful coexistence. The attainment of this equilibrium is one of the most important results of the past decades. It has required considerable efforts and resources of our people and the peoples of other socialist community countries ... If it was possible to lower the level of armaments and military expenditures on both sides, to get down to disarmament, something for which we actively strive, that would be a great boon for all the countries and peoples."³

³ Pravda, June 16, 1983.

Meanwhile, the ruling circles of the United States and the other imperialist states have taken a far from unambiguous attitude to the military-strategic parity problem. While there is recognising that the shift in the balance of forces is irreversible and that there is a need to adapt to it in the political sphere, a strongly pronounced tendency to change developments in its own favour is also making itself known in the United States.

In the past decade, the line resulting from these two contending trends in the policy of the West shaped in favour of joining the socialist states in stabilising the international situation and containing the arms race. But in the early 1980s, the most bellicose imperialist circles once again decided to try forcibly to put a brake on the social renewal of the world. They think that this can be done by upsetting the military-strategic equilibrium to the detriment of the socialist community.

The United States and NATO as a whole have started military preparations of unprecedented scope and speed. Programmes of making and deploying new land-, sea-, and air-based strategic nuclear weapons are being realised. Preparations are being made to militarise outer space. Fundamentally new types of conventional weapons are being developed.

This line reached its highest point when the Reagan Administration took office. Its first budget provided for appropriations for the Pentagon of \$211.4 billion in fiscal 1982, and \$240.5 billion in 1983. In the next five years (fiscal 1984-1988), the United States intends to spend \$1.8 trillion.⁴

⁴ Report of the Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger on the FY 1984 Budget, FY 1985 Authorization Request and FY 1984-88 Defense Programs, February 1, 1983, pp. 61, 71.

The official motivations of Washington's militaristic activity do not square with the objective state of things. First of all, the assertion that the Soviet Union has allegedly outstripped the United States in military terms, which is why there is an urgent need for additional US armaments, does not stand up in the light of the facts. That the Soviet-American strategic parity is a real one was confirmed by the previous three US administrations.

When signing SALT II in June 1979, President Jimmy Carter, for instance, said that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union were in a position to gain the upper hand over each other. In his memoirs, he writes: "Each of us would have to face the inevitability of military equivalency with the other. There would certainly not be any superiority or victory in a nuclear war."⁵

A similar stand was taken by responsible representatives of the US military-political leadership during the SALT II hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. They said that the differences between the strategic forces of the United States and the USSR were mutually balanced out, and that there was, on the whole, a rough and stable parity. The then Defence Secretary Harold Brown declared: "Overall, we are in a position of essential equivalence."⁶ He added: "With the programs the administration proposes, we will retain an adequate strategic

⁵ Jimmy Carter, Keeping Faith. Memoirs of a President, London, 1982, p. 249.

⁶ The SALT II Treaty. Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, US Senate, 96th Congress, Part 1, p. 99.

balance through 1985, and we will improve the relative balance thereafter.... The SALT II agreement will produce a more favorable balance for the United States during its duration than we would have without it."⁷ General David Jones, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also noted the "military equality".⁸

However, in Reagan's first few months at the White House, the US mass media, followed by officials, started a loud campaign over what they alleged to be "windows of vulnerability" in the US strategic system. Contrary to its earlier assertions, the Joint Chiefs of Staff began to sound the alarm, claiming that the balance of military forces was changing against the United States and its allies.⁹ Two years later, Defence Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger declared: "The Soviets have acquired a margin of nuclear superiority in most important categories, while still maintaining superiority in their conventional forces. Consequently, for the United States to have a strong and credible deterrent capability, we must strengthen both our nuclear and conventional force posture as quickly as possible."¹⁰

Can these assertions be taken at face value? It takes a decade on average to develop, produce and deploy a modern weapons system. Given the existing dynamic equilibrium, it is effectively impossible for either side to make a spurt in two years by which

⁷ Ibid., p. 302.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 368, 374.

⁹ See United States Military Posture for FY 1982, Washington, D.C., 1981, p. 53.

¹⁰ Report of the Secretary of Defense, February 1, 1983, p.34.

it could substantially outstrip the other in the military contest. The true global strategic picture will not change whatever propaganda tricks US ruling circles may resort to.

Let us take a firm footing in the facts. Concerning the strategic nuclear weapons balance between the Soviet Union and the United States, which has been thoroughly verified by experts on both sides, there is a rough equivalence in the number of delivery vehicles--the USSR has 2,500, and the United States 2,300, whereas in the number of nuclear warheads--the United States has the advantage. In hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General John Vessey, replying to a question on whether he would change places with the Chief of the Soviet General Staff, exclaimed, without giving it a second thought: "Not on your life!" Defence Secretary Weinberger was just as peremptory: "I would not for a moment exchange anything (the US nuclear arsenal for the Soviet one--O.B.), because we have an immense edge in technology."¹¹

But it would be a futile exercise to riffle through official US and NATO publications in search of even an attempt to make an objective analysis of the whole set of interacting trends determining the present state and future development of the armed forces of the opposing sides. Instead, we find these publications highlighting components of the strategic equation which are unfavourable for the United States and its allies, while

¹¹ The Defense Monitor. Center for Defense Information, Washington, D.C., 1982, Vol. XI, No. 6, p. 1.

ignoring everything that is unfavourable for the USSR and the other Warsaw Treaty countries. Thus, among the things discounted is the objectively existing difference in the types of strategic weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States, with only those of them declared to be "destabilising" which constitute the basis of the Soviet military potential.

Everyone knows that the main emphasis in the line of argument in favour of spiralling militaristic preparations by the United States and NATO is laid on the presumption of a "Soviet military threat". But any objective study of the USSR's military doctrine and the corresponding structure and line of development of its armed forces shows such charges to be completely groundless. The Soviet military doctrine is purely defensive, which is why it does not envisage the attainment of military superiority. Its goal is defence of the USSR and the other socialist countries, prevention of imperialist aggression, and maintenance of international security. The conception of a "pre-emptive strike", including a nuclear strike, is alien to that doctrine.

In consequence of the rapid development of military hardware and technology, and the further deepening of distinctions in the structure of the armaments and armed forces of the two sides, it is ever more difficult to control the process of balancing the constantly modernising opponent forces. This adds urgency to the need to accelerate the hammering out of agreements consolidating the existing equilibrium and making it possible steadily to advance to a lowering of its level.

But the fact is that disarmament has been relegated to one of the last places on the scale of priorities of the present US Administration's policy. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, bilateral and multilateral talks on many problems bearing on this sphere were either interrupted or postponed indefinitely through Washington's fault. Let us recall, for instance, its refusal to ratify SALT II and other agreements on limiting the competition in the nuclear and other military fields, or the line of eroding a number of already achieved understandings. Doubt has been cast, in particular, on the advisability of keeping in force the termless Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, and attempts are also being made to undermine the Soviet-American Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War. Last, but not least, the Reagan Administration has openly sabotaged the talks on medium-range missiles in Europe.

This obstructionist stand is clearly a natural outcome of the maniacal United States' urge to attain global strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. Whatever the slogans used to cover up these militaristic plans--be it "alignment of military potentials" or "prevention of disbalance in the future"--their aggressive substance is obvious.

The bellicose groupings in US ruling circles refuse to accept the established parity between the USSR and the United States. For several years now, there has been a purposeful build-up of US strategic armaments through an increase in the number of nuclear warheads and enhancement of accuracy for their

delivery vehicles. The yield of warheads has increased. The protection of launching-pad silos has been improved. Inter-continental ballistic missiles have been equipped with a system of retargeting, and strategic bombers, with guided missiles. Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Strategic Missile Troops Vladimir Tolubko says that the United States has effectively increased the strike potential of its systems at least five-fold, and has doubled its potentialities for delivering nuclear warheads on target without an increase in the number of delivery vehicles.¹²

The attainment of military superiority over the socialist countries is the core of Washington's "direct confrontation" strategy. Its purpose is to ensure the material prerequisites for destroying socialism as a socio-political system and for establishing global US domination.

In October 1981, less than a year after taking office, President Reagan announced a "strategic programme" for the 1980s. Its pivotal element is the creation of a nuclear-missile potential making it possible to deliver a "decapitating strike" on the Soviet Union and its allies where and when the United States should find it appropriate, and to escape retribution or, at any rate, substantially to reduce it. The programme not only incorporates and expands the earlier plans, but also provides for the development of new strategic weapons systems: MX inter-continental ballistic missiles, submarine-based Trident-1 and Trident-2 ballistic missiles, B-1B and Stealth bombers, and

¹² See Kommunist, No. 3, 1983, p. 59 (in Russian).

long-range cruise missiles. The ultimate idea is to increase, in the course of this decade, the potential of the US offensive strategic forces in deliverable number of nuclear weapons in one launch/sortie by at least 50 per cent.¹³ A radical modernisation of the US strategic defence forces, with emphasis on the use of outer space, is mooted.

Over the past several years, Washington has especially stepped up its efforts to deploy US medium-range missiles in Western Europe. NATO plans assign to these missiles the role of "first-strike" weapons targeted on the USSR and its allies. At the same time, the Pentagon expects that, in the event of a nuclear conflict, the Euromissiles will divert a retaliatory strike from the United States.¹⁴

The intention to disrupt the strategic parity is written into the directives on planning the build-up of the US Armed Forces, which say: "The United States nuclear capabilities must prevail even under the conditions of a prolonged war." The US nuclear forces "must prevail and be able to force the Soviet Union to seek earliest termination of hostilities on terms favorable to the United States".¹⁵

¹³ For details see Whence the Threat to Peace, Second Edition, Moscow, 1982, p. 39.

¹⁴ For details see "Crucial Year for the Destinies of Europe", WMR, No. 9, 1983, and also "Euromissile Shadow Over Europe. It Is Not Too Late to Ward Off the Threat", WMR, No. 10, 1983.

¹⁵ The New York Times, June 4, 1982, p. A10.

The US military-political leadership is putting out nuclear-conflict scenarios in an effort to find ways of "optimising" a nuclear war, be it limited or all-out, short or prolonged. In his report to the Congress in February 1981, Weinberger, assuming the Pentagon's capacity to "limit the scope, duration, and intensity" of a conflict, proposed "to restore peace on favorable terms" and "at the lowest possible level of damage to the United States and its allies".¹⁶

At first sight, the idea of limiting the scale of a nuclear conflict appears to be a positive one. However, the very assumption that such a conflict can be "calibrated" is unrealistic. The character of modern war categorically excludes the prospect of laying down geographical boundaries for an exchange of nuclear strikes, and this in itself nullifies any possible stabilising effect of that conception.

In critical political situations, reliance on the Pentagon's "limited intensity" scenario could in actual fact catalyse a nuclear escalation. After all, even in a "non-intensive conflict" NATO's armed forces would be operating within the framework of its officially adopted "three-stage" strategy. The first stage: operations with the use of conventional weapons; the second: the use first of tactical and then of tactico-operational nuclear weapons; and the third stage: an unlimited nuclear conflict.

¹⁶ Report of the Secretary of Defense, pp. 32, 35-36.

We find that US strategic thinking, remaining captive to notions consigned to oblivion, ignores the fundamental and irreversible fact which has brought about a radical change in the global situation: the socialist community's attainment of military-strategic equilibrium with the United States and NATO as a whole. Given the present state of monitoring systems, the degree of combat-readiness and the considerable invulnerability of strategic nuclear weapons, it is impossible to "decapitate" the Soviet Union.

Whichever scenario for unleashing a nuclear war the aggressor may opt for, under the military-strategic equilibrium it is beyond its capacity to avert a crushing retaliatory strike. And in view of the socialist community's economic, scientific and technical potentialities, it is impossible to upset that equilibrium. Yuri Andropov said that "all the attempts to attain military superiority over the USSR are futile. The Soviet Union will never allow this to happen, it will never find itself defenceless in the face of any threat."¹⁷

In its statement of May 28, 1983, the Soviet Government warned: in view of the growing threat to the security of the USSR and its allies, it will be faced with the necessity to take counter-measures in strengthening its defence capability, including the deployment of corresponding new strategic systems. The deployment of new US missiles in Western Europe, the statement said, would force the Soviet Union to abandon its unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of medium-range weapons in

¹⁷ Pravda, March 27, 1983.

the European zone. The need would also arise to effect, by agreement with other Warsaw Treaty states, other measures for deploying additional weapons for the purpose of creating the necessary counter-weight to the growing group of US forward-based nuclear weapons in Europe and the nuclear weapons of the other NATO countries. Corresponding counter-measures would also have to be taken with respect to the territory of the United States itself.¹⁸

This resolute stand has full support from the Warsaw Treaty Organisation as a whole. The joint statement adopted at a Moscow meeting in June 1983 of the top party and state leaders of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the USSR emphasises: "In the light of the interests of peace and of their own security, the states participating in the meeting declare that they will not allow military superiority over themselves under any circumstances. They take a resolute stand for ensuring an equilibrium of forces at the lowest level."¹⁹

The attempts to upset the military-strategic equilibrium are, therefore, fraught with terrible consequences which would inevitably affect the interests of the initiators of this risky and hopeless undertaking. In generating the dangers, the latter cannot but invite them upon themselves. Creating instability, they themselves will suffer from it. The unpredictable consequences of the arms race and confrontation put not only the one, but also the other side in a difficult situation.

¹⁸ Pravda, May 28, 1983.

¹⁹ Pravda, June 29, 1983.

These truths are so obvious that they have been recognised even by some of those who have the reputation of being adherents of the "tough line". Henry Kissinger, for instance, writes: "Under current conditions, no matter how we or our adversaries improve the size or quality of our strategic arsenals, one overriding fact remains: An all-out strategic nuclear exchange would risk civilised life as we know it."²⁰ Zbigniew Brzezinski has expressed the apprehension that the high level of the strategic confrontation undermines the security not only of the Soviet Union, but also of the United States.²¹

The socialist community countries are convinced of the imperative need for mutual restraint in the field of armaments. They have proposed to strengthen military-strategic stability and, by maintaining the existing equilibrium of forces, to halt the arms race and steadily advance along the road of limitation and reduction of armaments.

The Soviet Union's commitment not to use nuclear weapons first not only adds a practical aspect to the question of a complete ban on the use of nuclear weapons, but also does much to strengthen international security. USSR Minister of Defence Dimitry Ustinov has stressed that the commitment has required our country to increase its attention to measures of preventing a non-nuclear armed conflict from developing into a nuclear one. Accordingly, an even more stringent framework is being laid

²⁰ H. Kissinger, Years of Upheaval, Boston, 1982, p. 999.

²¹ See Z. Brzezinski, Power and Principle, London, 1982, p. 150.

down for determining the weapons mix, and controls designed to prevent the unauthorised launching of any class of nuclear weapons are being made more effective. At the same time, the Minister emphasised, conditions should be created for reducing the surprise factor to a minimum, and leaving the aggressor no desire to use nuclear weapons first.²²

Influential bourgeois leaders in the United States have admitted the usefulness of this approach. Thus, according to McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert S. McNamara and Gerard Smith,²³ all prominent spokesmen for the US establishment, what NATO needs most under the strategic parity "is not the refinement of its nuclear options, but a clear-cut decision to avoid them as long as others do".²⁴

Furthermore, strategic stability would undoubtedly be enhanced if, together with a mutual nuclear-first-strike repudiation, the parties undertook not to resort to armed force generally. That is precisely what has been proposed by the Warsaw Treaty states. Their January 1983 Political Declaration proposes

²² See Pravda, July 12, 1982.

²³ McGeorge Bundy was special assistant to the US President on national security matters from 1961 to 1966; George F. Kennan was US ambassador to the Soviet Union in 1952, and to Yugoslavia from 1961 to 1963; Robert S. McNamara was US Defence Secretary from 1961 to 1968, and from 1968 to mid-1981, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; from 1969 to 1972, Gerard Smith headed the US delegation at the strategic arms limitation talks, and from 1977 to 1980 was ambassador-at-large and special presidential envoy on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.--Ed.

²⁴ Foreign Affairs, Spring 1982, Vol. 60, No. 4, p. 762.

the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-resort to armed force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the states of the two military-political groupings, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO.²⁵

But the United States and its NATO allies have failed to respond to all these major initiatives which could halt the slide to the brink of war. They continue to refer to an invented "growing threat of a Soviet nuclear attack".

These assertions are so groundless that they cannot be essentially accepted even by authoritative specialists in the United States itself. For instance, the Scowcroft Commission, which includes former defence secretaries and others who were but recently high-ranking members of the foreign policy, military and intelligence departments, has admitted that "the Soviet programmes do not, in and of themselves, indicate plans to initiate nuclear attacks".²⁶

The Soviet June 1983 proposal that all the nuclear powers should put a quantitative and qualitative freeze on the nuclear weapons they have and declare a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests, and also on all new types of their delivery vehicles could provide a guarantee of strategic stability and an important prerequisite for steadily lowering the level of the existing equilibrium. The Soviet Government believes that a freeze understanding could first be reached between the USSR and the

²⁵ Pravda, January 7, 1983.

²⁶ Report of President's Commission on Strategic Forces, April 1983, Washington, D.C., p. 5.

United States, with a view to the other nuclear powers subsequently following suit.²⁷

Under the rough parity, it is relatively easy to halt the nuclear arms race. Given the good will, the solution of the problem would not require involved or protracted negotiations. But Washington has rejected out of hand the very idea of a nuclear freeze, claiming that it would be "dangerous" for the United States, because it would entrench its "lag" behind the USSR in this field. This line of argument is patently biased.

Washington's obsession with the idea of superiority has blocked every avenue for working out mutually acceptable agreements on arms limitation and reduction. All its proposals are effectively geared to the same obsessive goal of upsetting the existing parity.

The Reagan Administration has paralleled its programmes for building up US military might with efforts in the diplomatic sphere aimed to bring about the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament. Washington wants a limitation only on some of the strategic forces components which it does not like, while keeping others outside the framework of an understanding. Its scheme is a simple one: to destroy the existing structure of the Soviet nuclear potential, while leaving itself a free hand for building up its own nuclear arsenals.

That is the direction in which the United States has been pushing the strategic arms limitation and reduction talks. Washington's proposal for a cut in the number of inter-continental

²⁷ Pravda, June 17, 1983.

ballistic missiles to 850 units for each side, puts the USSR in unequal conditions. The point is that, because of the historically rooted distinctions in the structure of their strategic forces and geographical location, the Soviet Union has 70 per cent of its warheads on land-based ICBMs, while the United States has 80 per cent of its warheads on submarines and heavy bombers. If the US proposal were accepted, the USSR would have to dismantle over 90 per cent of its ICBMs, while the main US strike forces remained actually intact.

Washington has taken a similar line in the talks on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. Here again, the US side has demanded something that is absolutely unacceptable for the USSR. Acceptance of Reagan's "zero option" would mean that the Soviet Union would have a two-fold inferiority with respect to the NATO countries in the number of vehicles, and a three-fold inferiority in the number of warheads. The US President's "interim option" is also aimed to upset the equilibrium in NATO's favour.

The actual content of the US proposals testifies to their refusal to seek solutions based on the principle of equality and equal security. But once and for all this should be understood in Washington: the Soviet Union will not accept unilateral disarmament. As Yuri Andropov declared most emphatically, "if it comes to deployment (of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe.---O.B.), we shall not give up our positions, we shall not relax our defences, but shall take timely and effective counter-measures safeguarding the security of the USSR and its allies".²⁸

²⁸ Pravda, July 6, 1983.

There is still time for a fair agreement. The Soviet Union is prepared for honest and serious negotiations on all the aspects of arms limitation and reduction. Its stand on the matter was clearly set forth in June 1983, by Andrei Gromyko, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and Foreign Minister, when he said: "The Soviet Union's stand is to advance, starting from the existing parity, along the way of limiting and reducing armaments in such a way that equilibrium is maintained at every given moment, but at an ever lower level. That would mean using for the purposes of peace and not missing the truly historical opportunity offered by the existing parity."²⁹

In the dangerous international situation that has taken shape, it is the duty of all states to ensure sound and just peace. A key prerequisite for this is the assertion of the military-strategic parity and consistent limitation and reduction of armaments down to their total liquidation.

²⁹ Pravda, June 17, 1983.

Tuesday, August 3, 1982

OBPOVO-11418

1

Reflections After the Congress in CologneLITERATURE AND THE DESTINY OF PEACE

Alexander Chakovsky

Recently, at the end of June, I visited as a member of a delegation of Soviet writers the ancient West German city of Cologne where on behalf of the delegation I delivered a report at the international congress Interlit-82. The agenda offered to more than 200 participants from 48 countries of the world was formulated thus: Modern Writers and Their Contribution to the Cause of Peace: Limits and Possibilities. The very wording seemed to contain a degree of scepticism, and among the literary men who came to this congress from five continents, especially in the early stages of discussion, there were some who were quick to notice and bolster this scepticism.

Swiss scientist Jean Jacques Babel, using a computer, has estimated that in the last 6,000 years alone people went through 14,513 wars in which 3,640 million people were killed. To some present-day politicians in Europe and America it obviously does not occur that we all walk on the graves of our remote ancestors and that those of them who fell in one of the wars ask silently, but with pain and reproach: "How long?! How long you who live now will allow the barbarians thirsting for war to again kill, burn and trample down people in the earth?"

It's at this point that the problem arises which in the agenda of Interlit-82 was called "Limits and Possibilities" and which in plain language means the following: And what can artists do in order to avert a new war, a nuclear war, as a result of which mankind would have to undergo a new evolution, beginning from monkeys? If, of course, the latter survived...

Sceptics customarily answer this question by a question: Did writers, philosophers and artists ever succeed in preventing at least one war in the past?

Developing their argument, the proponents of writers' impotence in face of the impending danger of war ask further: Didn't writers

and art people on the eve of World War II, this most destructive war of all previous ones, join in the popular movements against the incipient fascist aggression?

And what, these people ask, did they succeed in averting the catastrophe? No, the war broke out. From this they conclude that writers can do nothing in solving the problem of war and peace. It isn't them who lead states or command armies. It isn't them who manufacture arms. So what is their role? The role of those who incant when a war is impending and of weepers who will mourn over its victims? These are our "limits," say such writers, and there's no way we can overstep them...

Yes, really, history, if looked at superficially, does seem to tell us that even books of a genius cannot prevent war.

And yet we, Soviet writers, subscribe to the view of those who believe that our possibilities are great, even though not infinite. To the pessimists we reply: yes, it's true that we did not succeed in preventing the Second World War; it broke out. But we, anti-fascist writers, writers who championed peace, did succeed in achieving another goal: that of instilling courage in the hearts of the defenders of civilisation, of strengthening faith in the justness of the cause in the name of which the nations and armies of the anti-Hitler coalition joined forces.

Well, what about today? Let us first of all ask ourselves: Do people want to hear us now? Undoubtedly, the answer to this question cannot be identical for different writers, as it depends both on their personal experience and on the experience of their countries. Without exaggeration, the experience of our country, the world's first country of victorious socialism, is unique in this sense, as, by the way, in many others: by thousands of examples our Party has proved its attention to literature and its concern for it. And remember the profound and respectful replies of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev to the message of Japanese writers! I have no wish to lecture foreign state leaders, but I can't help recalling that the US President and some of his allies did not even deign to pay attention to a similar message...

But the talk now is not even about whether the politicians want to listen to writers or not. It's a question of whether those for whom and in the name of whom we take up the pen--people of the Earth--want to hear us today. Has today's literature grown scarce of social and moral force? Has it lost its former power to influence the reader? Our optimism, the optimism of Soviet writers, is largely based on our sincere belief that nothing of this has happened.

I think that the struggle for peace is today inseparable from the struggle against the anti-literature which has been cynically dubbed "mass" literature in the West and that the struggle for life is inseparable from the struggle against attempts to humiliate the reader and to deceive and befool him.

Like a hundred or fifty years ago, many of my colleagues, especially in the West, continue to look upon war as an attribute of social development -- deplorable but, nonetheless, habitual and inevitable. Meanwhile, in our nuclear age war is not merely the continuation of politics by other means but a direct threat of humanity's complete extinction which grows more and more obvious every year. The present-day writer cannot but think about what we, people living in the 20th century, will leave after us -- new impressive monuments of civilization or heaps of charred bones and warheads going rusty. For if one is to believe the estimates made by scientists, a huge arsenal of weapons has been built up in the world -- about fifteen tonnes of TNT for every person on Earth. This is equivalent to about two and a half million bombs like that dropped on Hiroshima.

We, Soviet writers, see the danger of war in the thousands of bases and other military installations with which the United States and NATO Europe have encircled our country. We see it in the decision of the United States and NATO to begin next year the deployment in Western Europe of new hundreds of Eurostrategic missiles, and in the stubborn and obstinate unwilling of the present American Administration to heed the voice of reason and discuss, in real earnest, the numerous and carefully-weighed peace proposals of our country. And there are dozens, if not hundreds, of such proposals,

ranging from that on dismantling the Warsaw Treaty Organisation simultaneously with the dismantling of NATO up to Leonid Brezhnev's latest initiatives concerning a moratorium on armaments and the call upon the other nuclear powers to emulate the Soviet Union's example and solemnly renounce any first use of nuclear weapons.

I am aware that there are quite a few people in the West who, being unable to understand the true situation in the field of the arms race (but feeling, at the same time, the terrible ravages of war), say that the Soviet Union and the United States are equally responsible for the arms race. "Figures! Figures!" - shout these "equalizers". "Who can understand them? Who can bet that the Soviet Union does not belittle the data on its own armaments, while overstating those on the American and NATO ones? And vice versa." Such statements were made in Cologne, too. Meanwhile, if the man-in-the-street can, having lost his whereabouts in the labyrinth of special estimates, anathematize all and sundry without distinction, the writer -- if he pursues the task of teaching people how to live, for what to aspire, what to support and what to resist -- has no right to restrict himself to a mere paraphrasing of the famous saying: "A plague upon both your homes!" In my view, the writer should look for the way out of the labyrinth, for his Ariadne's clue of thread. For him the entire experience of world history can become such a clue.

The Soviet people and the Soviet government do not want war. This is confirmed by facts not from the political sphere alone. This is equally confirmed by our literature. The great Russian literary critic Vissarion Belinsky said in his time: "Literature is the consciousness of the people, the flower and the fruit of its cultural life." Who can refute the fact that Soviet literature is inspired with altogether peaceful objectives? Books permeated with the feeling of internationalism and the fraternal unity of people are written in many dozens^{of} languages spoken by Soviet peoples. Peace struggle and the desire to understand people of goodwill who live in other countries are a source of inspiration for our literature.

Judging by its results, the Cologne congress has demonstrated, on the whole, that fortunately, the same striving is typical not only of Soviet literature but also of all upright writers on Earth. Regardless of different social, political and aesthetic views and the initially differing approach to the facts of present-day international affairs, writers from fortyeight countries adopted the concluding document of the congress -- an address to public opinion at large -- in which they unanimously expressed themselves in favour of the complete elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, a fair satisfaction of the sides' interests without resorting to war, and the establishment of a peaceful and free atmosphere, worthy of man, in all the parts of the globe. This unanimity -- the chief result of the congress -- gives both writers and readers a sense of satisfaction and spells hope.

(Pravda, July 31. Abridged.)

TÜSTAY
TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH
ARAŞTIRMALARI

Monday, October 5, 1981

ORIOVO-25833

EXTREMELY DANGEROUS MOVE

6

Washington, October 3, (TASS). The US Administration had made yet another extremely dangerous move towards escalating the nuclear arms race. President Reagan, speaking in the White House, announced a new programme for building up the American strategic nuclear arsenals covering the whole triad of strategic forces -- land-based missiles, sea-based missiles and strategic bombers, which points to Washington's clear intention of getting military superiority over the Soviet Union.

This programme, which can only bring nearer the risk of war, provides for the development and production of a new type of strategic bomber, B-1. This project was put off by President Carter in 1977 and replaced by a programme for the deployment of cruise missiles. Now it is taken out of cold storage along with the projected deployment of cruise missiles, of which three thousand will be installed on strategic B-52 and B-1 bombers and several hundred, on submarines.

The White House decision betrays the hypocrisy of the US Administration which, while professing to accentuate the supervision of the arms control agreements, signed or yet to be signed, is planning to produce such systems of strategic weapons as would practically reduce to nought the very possibility of such control.

Under the new programme, there will be further development work on the Stels bomber, hard-to-detect, the Pentagon believes, for modern radars, and modernisation of the B-52 bombers and flying tankers -- KS-135 refuelling aircraft.

The Pentagon is planning to make at least 100 strategic inter-continental MX ballistic missiles. The mode of their installation will be finally determined in 1984. It has been decided that some of the MX missiles will be installed without delay in fortified silos now used for the deployment of Minuteman and Titan missiles. Reagan has announced the cancellation of the earlier plan for MX deployment in 4,600 underground shelters in the states of Utah and Nevada whose population has strongly protested against these sinister designs.

Monday, October 5, 1981

-2-

6

The programme for the deployment of strategic sea-based forces provides for the construction of one nuclear-powered Trident submarine a year, each to carry strategic missiles of a new type, D-5. Plans are afoot, besides, for the improvement of the system of communication and control for strategic forces involving extensive use of E-4B and ES-135 air command aircraft as well as surveillance AWACS aircraft and space satellites.

The explanatory note issued by the White House has pointed out that this programme will shape the pattern of the American strategic nuclear forces right until the turn of the century, and is to be the largest programme of their deployment for the past few decades or, as an ABC television commentator emphasized, the most considerable build-up of US strategic forces since the Eisenhower days. According to UPI estimates, it will cost the American people a tremendous total of 180,000 million dollars in the next five years.

In his speech Reagan made no secret of the fact that the new super arms race programme is directed against the Soviet Union. The President's reference to the need to redress the alleged "security balance" and close the so-called "windows of vulnerability" cannot obscure the fact that the programme he has just announced is an undisguised claim to military primacy over the Soviet Union, a move towards eroding the principle of equality and identical security and the existing parity in the military-strategic field.

Washington's contentions about the alleged violation of the balance of forces by the Soviet Union do not square in the least with the official recognition of the clear fact of the balance of forces by the previous four American administrations. None other than President Carter's Defence Secretary Harold Brown declared that there was a rough equality between the US and the Soviet Union in the field of strategic armaments. There was also a rough parity in terms of conventional armaments between us and our allies, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and its allies, on the other.

Reagan made no more than a cursory mention of the Administration's intention of negotiating "arms control". That was not casual. In point of fact, the new sweeping programme to build up the nuclear arms arsenal, as observers point out, has given rise to deep-going doubts of the good faith of the US Administration's assurances about its intention to conduct serious negotiations. Reagan himself said that the new Administration intended to conduct such negotiations from "a position of strength" which is a totally hopeless proposition since the Soviet Union will never put up with it.

The Soviet Union has never sought, nor is it seeking, any military superiority. The USSR has never gone, nor does it intend to go beyond its concern for dependable protection of the security of its own country and that of its allies. But neither will it remain indifferent to the appearance of new, still more formidable types of weapons in the US arsenals. In such an eventuality, the Soviet Armed Forces will have a proper counterweight to these new weapons. The Soviet Union will properly meet any challenge so as to preserve the balance of forces.

(Pravda, October 4. In full.)

Exptal 1982, BSS

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS. DISCUSSION

International Symposium

DETENTE: HOW TO DEFEND IT?

Towards the end of 1970s and in the early 1980s, the most reactionary and bellicose forces of imperialism once again stepped up their efforts to undermine the detente and exacerbate the international situation. These developments are a warning that the danger of a global thermonuclear clash impending over the globe in the latter half of the 20th century has not been removed but has, in fact, become more pronounced.

Is it possible to halt the slide to the brink of war? What are the chances of the detente at the present difficult and, possibly, crucial crossroads of history? How can the proponents of confrontation be forced to retreat? These questions were discussed at an international symposium sponsored by WMR together with the World Peace Council. Among those who took part in its work were:

from World Marxist Review: Girgin Girginov, CC member, Bulgarian CP; Clement Rohee, CEC member, People's Progressive Party of Guyana; Roland Bauer, CC member, Socialist Unity Party of Germany; Ibrahim Malik, CC member, CP Israel; Sarada Mitra, NC member, CP India; Jack Phillips, CEC alternate member, CP Canada; Raul Valdez Vivo, CC member, CP Cuba; James West, CC Political Bureau member, CPUSA; Ahmed Salem,

CC Economic Commission member, CP of the Sudan; Georg Kwiatowski, German CP representative on WMR Editorial Council; Raja Collure, CC member, CP Sri Lanka; Vusizwe Seme, member of the Editorial Council (South Africa).

From the World Peace Council: John Benson, Labor Party; Chairman, Australian Peace Committee; Secretary, Seamen's Union of Australia; James Lamond, Labour Party, MP; Vice-President, WPC; President, British Peace Assembly; Professor Jaime Diaz-Rozzotto, of Guatemala; Mazen Hussein, WPC Secretary (Jordan); Mahmoud Salameh, MP; Syrian Peace National Committee; trade unionist; Baathist; Tair Tairov, professor, WPC Secretary (USSR); Steve Talbot, author (USA); Iikka Vehkalahti, Editorial Board Chief, Finnish Peace Committee, member of the Centre Party; Hans J. Krysmanski, Director, Munster University Institute of Sociology (FRG).

Below is a summary of the main lines of the discussion, with the statements grouped by the topics discussed.

Peace Can Be Safeguarded

The imperialist mass media have been working hard to suggest to the peoples the idea that the international detente which began in Europe was no more than an "accidental pause" and that a military confrontation between capitalism and socialism is "inevitable". It is an effort to prove that the struggle for peace is allegedly meaningless and useless, for,

as the authors of the notorious "Santa Fe Document"¹ cynically declare, "war is inherent in mankind". The participants in the symposium exposed the man-hating substance of such conceptions, which are designed to justify the aggressive urges and plans of imperialism, and gave much attention to analysing the objective factors which help to preserve peace in present-day conditions.

Opening the discussion, Roland Bauer recalled that in the five and a half millenia of human history there have been almost 15,000 wars. But is that a good reason to say that war is a "natural state" for mankind to be in? Not at all. From his earliest beginnings, man has always had before him the vision of peace.

In the past, many writers, philosophers, scholars and statesmen advocated the exclusion of bloodshed from the life of the society. But with the exploiter societies having complete sway, this could not be done. Until the emergence of the Marxist theory there was no scientific basis for exposing the nature of predatory wars, on the one hand, and for showing the natural motivations behind the armed action against every form of oppression and enslavement, and for national freedom, on the other. The masses were defenceless in the face of the militaristic and chauvinistic propaganda catering for policies of aggrandisement. Those who wanted peace lacked the material means to avert armed conflicts.

¹ A secret report prepared by President Reagan's political advisers to define and back up the goals of current US foreign policy. For details see Rodney Arismendi's article "Global Madness Once More" in WMR, August, 1981.--Ed.

Today, in the latter half of the 20th century the situation is a totally different one. Within the six and a half decades since the victory of the October Revolution, the political map of the world has changed beyond recognition. Socialism has become a world system exerting an influence on every aspect of international development. Capitalism is being bogged down in its economic, social and political crisis. Dozens of newly independent states which emerged on the ruins of the colonial empires are making themselves heard.

As a result of these historic changes, the objective prerequisites favouring the cause of peace have emerged for the first time. Relying on these, it is possible to contain the expansionist urges of imperialism, to advance to relations of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, to ward off the threat of a world-wide conflagration, and over the long term, completely to exclude wars from the life of the nations.

The transformation of socialism into a world system has paved the way for putting an end to sanguinary global conflicts, Mahmoud Salameh declared. At the cost of great effort, socialism has succeeded in altering the balance of military-political forces in the world and in establishing a rough strategic parity with the capitalist powers. This enabled the socialist community not only to prevent another world war, to the brink of which imperialism has pushed mankind again and again over the past decades, but also to limit and in some instances to extinguish local conflicts and defend the interests of the peoples subjected to aggression.

When discussing the prospects for peaceful development, Vusizwe Seme emphasised, there is also a need to take into account the contribution which dozens of newly liberated states have made to the struggle for peace. The stand of their overwhelming majority is determined by an understanding of the connection between their urge to win complete political and economic independence and the defence of world peace. Their involvement in the non-aligned movement enables them to take joint and purposeful action to avert a world war, and resist the aggressive acts of neocolonialism.

The impact of economic factors on political relations between countries was considered in the course of the symposium. James West said that in the case of the United States economic interests had a most palpable effect on the solution of problems in international relations. This is exemplified by the reaction to "reaganomics" on the part of various monopoly centres. It is essentially aimed to recarve the Federal budget in favour of militarisation, it accelerates the growth of inflation and unemployment, and this tends to undermine the economic and financial basis of the state and to worsen US competitiveness on world markets. This produces in financial and industrial circles which are not directly connected with the arms business doubts about the wisdom of the line of military-political expansion.

It also breeds discontent among the governments of some countries which are allied with the United States, because the headlong militarisation of the economy which Washington is trying to impose on them worsens their already difficult economic

condition and increases their destabilisation in social terms. Such discontent was most manifest in connection with the White House attempts to involve the NATO countries in an economic blockade of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, a scheme that is adventurist, hopeless and unprofitable.

Participants in the symposium spoke of the objective need for extensive and mutually advantageous cooperation between countries with different social systems and emphasised that this was possible only in a climate of detente. This creates the conditions for involving those circles in the capitalist world which are interested in economic cooperation in political acts aimed to ease the international situation. In other words, the development of economic relations between capitalist and socialist countries lays the material foundations for peaceful coexistence.²

The initiators of aggression, Tair Tairov said, should remember about the law mechanism set up after the Second World War to punish those who had prepared and started it. The Statute of Nuremberg Tribunal, subsequently approved by the United Nations as the source of international law, qualifies quite unambiguously the preparation and carrying on of aggressive wars and genocide as the gravest crimes against mankind. Based on the harsh lessons of the consequences of aggression, the juridical principle becomes especially meaningful in the present conditions. It has been developing in the light of

² This is exemplified by the refusal in the summer of 1982 by the leading West European countries and Japan to submit to Washington's diktat and to scrap their contracts with the Soviet Union for delivery of equipment under the "gas-pipes" project.--
Ed.

the specific features of the present situation, notably in the Declaration on Averting a Nuclear Catastrophe, which was adopted on the Soviet Union's initiative by the 36th session of the UN General Assembly. Under it, the acts of statesmen who decide to use nuclear weapons first are qualified as military crimes.

Now the governments of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR have proposed the inclusion of this key rule into the Code of Crimes against Peace and the Security of Mankind, which is being worked out by the UN International Law Commission. The Code is to contain a definition of the concept of "crime against peace and security of mankind", to show the corpus delicti and also to reassert the principle of individual responsibility for crimes of this type.

Many participants in the symposium voiced the conviction that despite the present highly complicated and explosive international situation, the conclusion that world war is not fatally inevitable, drawn a quarter-century ago by the communist movement, continues to be fully meaningful. The main objective factors helping to avert a global armed conflict are still the following:

- the political, economic and defence potential of world socialism which is placed at the service of the cause of peace;
- the growing influence of the working class and the invigoration of its struggle against the power of the monopolies and for peace;
- consolidation of the unity of the working class and all the other working people through the development of cooperation

between Communists, Socialists and Social Democrats in the struggle against the danger of war, and in defence of the working people's interests;

- the vital concern for the preservation of peace and consolidation of the detente of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America united in the non-aligned movement, which have an ever greater part to play in world affairs;

- contradictions on the issues of war and peace within the ruling circles of the capitalist powers, between the advocates of a continuation of the "strength" policy and realistic-minded leaders mindful of the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear-missile war;

- the growing economic, scientific, technical and ecological interdependence of all the states, which requires comprehensive and equitable cooperation between them; and

- broader information of the world public concerning the consequences of war with the use of mass destructive weapons, on the one hand, and the experience of the past decade which has brought up the beneficial effects of the detente on the socio-economic condition of the masses, on the other.

Necessary Condition: Unity and Action

It was also emphasised in the discussion that the existence of objective conditions which make it possible to halt the drive by the forces of war and to safeguard and develop the detente does not in itself guarantee an improvement of international relations. The outcome of the struggle for peace largely depends

on the creation of the necessary subjective prerequisites, i.e., on the activity and purposefulness of the anti-war movements and on their cohesion on the national and international level. However, it is not easy to create such cohesion, because imperialism seeks to set the peace forces at odds with each other, and to isolate the Communists in the first place.

In the United States, said James West, much is being said about a "Vietnam syndrome" which was produced by the sanguinary experience of Washington's imperialist aggression in Indochina. Militaristic propaganda has tried to convince public opinion that the psychological impact of the defeat in Vietnam which intensified the anti-war mood is no more than a "contagious disease" which is bound to disappear soon. But the fact that such a "syndrome" originated in the first place and has continued to exist must be seen as an expression of the urge on the part of the masses to prevent fresh military gambles.

Although there are obvious elements of spontaneity in the US peace movement, it has also shown signs of a crystallising new trend: its roots now run much deeper into the working class. It has involved the public at large. The US Peace Council, which has been in existence for only a few years (it is affiliated to the World Peace Council) has already set up branches in 40 cities. More than 50 other national organisations are actively campaigning in defence of peace. Many of them are affiliated with the anti-militaristic coalition "For a New Foreign and Military Policy". The bellicose policy being pursued by the White House has come under increasing criticism from highly

authoritative politicians, diplomats and military specialists, and this has given anti-war action greater concreteness and competence.

The actions of the peace fighters have forced the Reagan Administration to manoeuvre. Its possibilities for ignoring the will of the people are shrinking. One should not rule out the emergence of conditions which will ultimately confront the White House with the need to review its foreign policy line. At any rate, historical experience testifies to the reality of such a task. Let us recall, for instance, that in the early 1970s, the rabid anti-communist Richard Nixon was forced, under the pressure of objective factors, to recognise the need to develop relations with the Soviet Union on the principles of peaceful coexistence and to sign with it a set of agreements on the most acute and complicated issues in Soviet-American relations.

Stressing this view, Georg Kwiatowski said that if the Reagan Administration was forced in 1981, after long and stubborn refusals, to enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union on medium-range missile weapons, and in 1982, on a limitation and reduction of strategic weapons, it was pressure from the peace movement that had a not unimportant role to play in this matter.

Further success in the struggle against the danger of war can be scored only if new forces are involved in it, and the attempts to split them are defeated. Here it should be borne in mind that the peace movement in the FRG is now much more checkered than it has ever been in the past. Its participants come from virtually all the social strata and are people with diverse political and ideological views.

The opponents of the detente have been trying to split the ranks of the peace fighters above all by means of anti-communist falsifications. It was asserted, for instance, that the struggle against the deployment of US medium-range missiles on the territory of the FRG is "run" by the Communists and that their purposes in doing so cut across the interests of the peace movement. When such inventions failed to take effect, reaction tried to make the peace movement prove its "independence" and "right to be trusted" by separating itself from the Communists.

We, Communists, have patiently explained to all the peace forces in our country that for us, a working class party, nothing is more important than peace. A world without weapons is one of the greatest ideals of socialism. Its realisation is in the interests of mankind as a whole. We are prepared to support any initiative which could bring on the attainment of this goal. Because the German Communist Party has organic bonds with its country's working class, it can make an important contribution to the fulfilment of the main strategic task, which is to unite the peace movement with the working-class movement.

No one has a monopoly on the struggle for peace. That is why there must be no enemies, but only partners within the peace forces' movement. Their cooperation on a basis of equality will help to overcome the remaining "barriers of mistrust" and scepticism.

Hans J. Krysmanski added that in the FRG it was not only a matter of the peace movement making a quantitative leap. One could say that the country is going through a process of "anti-war education" which has involved broad masses of people. There

is now evidence, he said, of the most remarkable swing in social consciousness since the war. The vigorous action by the anti-missile forces has brought a marked change in the political scene.

The ideas of peace have been penetrating ever more deeply into the Social Democratic Party, shaping a strong wing favouring the FRG's repudiation of Washington's nuclear-missile strategy. Up to 40 per cent of the members of the Free Democratic Party are opposed to the realisation of NATO's plans for deploying US medium-range missiles on the territory of the Republic. There are symptoms that the peace trends are also gestating both in the Christian Democratic Party and in its Bavarian branch, the even more conservative Christian Social Union. Considerable changes are also under way outside the party structures: the trade unions are actively involved in anti-war action; the churches--the Catholic and especially the Evangelical--are raising ever louder voices in defence of peace.

Turning to the situation in Finland, Iikka Vehkalahti said that, in contrast to many other countries of Western and Northern Europe, a great deal there has been done on state lines to implement the principles of peaceful coexistence between countries with different socio-economic systems. But this Paasikivi-Kekkonen line is under attack both inside and outside Finland. In these conditions, it is more important than ever before patiently to explain the substance of the danger to the cause of peace and to show its true sources and ways of elimination. This can further invigorate the anti-militarist movement which, in Finland, brings together a broad spectrum of political forces.

The Australia Peace Committee, which was set up a few years ago, said John Benson, has its branches in the capitals of the states and in some provincial cities. Its petition demanding the removal of US military bases from the country's territory was signed by thousands of people who had come to realise that if the Pentagon should start a conflict, these US outposts could turn Australia into a nuclear target. The point now is to give massive scope to our anti-war movement, and one of the ways of doing this is to go beyond actions for peace and raise other problems of concern to public opinion in the country, thereby increasing the number of its potential allies.

The specific features of the Israeli peace movement, said Ibrahim Malik, are predetermined above all by the fact that it has to come out against the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of its own country, a policy which has already caused several sanguinary conflicts. Washington's stake on converting Israel into a bastion of the US hegemonistic line in the Middle East region, the continued Israeli occupation of extensive Arab territories, and the urge on the part of the Tel Aviv rulers to destroy the Palestine resistance movement--such are the sources of the explosive situation, which for several decades now has been a source of justified alarm among the peace-loving public in every corner of the world.

Nevertheless, despite the prevalence of nationalistic and chauvinistic attitudes in the country, there has recently been a marked growth in the number of those who have begun to realise

the great harm of the government's refusal to seek ways for a just and lasting peace with the peoples of the neighbouring countries. The main question for the anti-war movement now is how to unite their forces.

The Communists believe that it is quite possible to achieve unity. But only on one condition. All the peace fighters must give up attempts to impose their views on their partners. Such attempts are instanced by the stand of the leaders of the "Peace Today" organisation, who have made joint action contingent on the adoption of the Zionist ideology by the other participants in the movement.

Progressive elements resolutely reject such claims, believing that they lead to an "excommunication" of Communists and Arabs from the anti-war movement. For their part, the Communists lay down no "ideological conditions". Their stand is clear: the historic responsibility for ridding the country and the whole of the Middle East of the danger of war requires joint action by all the peace forces despite their ideological differences and national origins.

The Communist Party of Canada, said Jack Phillips, believes that success in the struggle for peace depends on whether its adherents succeed in creating a political potential which makes it possible to prevent the militaristic circles from turning back the clock of history. Here we find encouraging the considerable support given to the petition addressed to the government by the Canadian Peace Congress. It is highly symptomatic that such

a clearly anti-militaristic document is winning more and more supporters in the New Democratic Party,⁴ among the Social Democrats and trade-unionists. Let us recall that in the early 1950s the trade-union and social-democratic leaders condemned the Stockholm Appeal and attacked all those who supported it.

Anti-war action in Great Britain has now risen to a new stage, said James Lamond. Mammoth demonstrations in defence of peace have involved the representatives of many political and social forces which had up to now remained on the sidelines of action against the threat of war.

Changes in the mood of broad public circles are so important that the last two conferences of the Labour Party called for opposition to the deployment of US medium-range missiles on British soil. The 1981 Conference came out for Great Britain's unilateral nuclear disarmament. The resolution, which condemns the government's decision to re-equip British submarines with Trident missiles and to allow the deployment of US cruise missiles in the British Isles was also adopted at a conference of the Liberal Party. The latest conference of the British Trades Union Congress (TUC) voiced its opposition to the country's involvement in Washington's missile strategy.

⁴ The New Democratic Party was set up in 1961 on the basis of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and a section of the trade unions; it is a member of the Socialist International and is represented in Parliament.--Ed.

The participants in the symposium agreed that the following positive trends in the development of the peace movement, which is becoming an ever more influential factor in averting war, could be brought out:

- the massiveness of the movement, the extension of its party, social and ideological boundaries, its transcendence beyond the framework of existing national and international organisations, and internationalisation of action on a global and regional level;

- formation of concrete demands in the light of each country's specific conditions, extension of the range of these demands to other problems of public concern, and the growing comprehension of the interconnection between the struggle against war and the potentialities for progressive socio-economic and cultural development;

- the clearer understanding of the proportions of the impending threat of war and gradual awareness of its true sources;

- the recognition of the constructive role of the socialist countries' initiatives on disarmament and the strengthening of international security;

- the sense of confidence in the effectiveness of action against militaristic plans;

- the growing readiness to overcome political and ideological barriers for the sake of cooperation in averting war.

Setting Goals, Defining Priorities

The emergence of an impressive, even if organisationally unformalised coalition of anti-war forces has made it especially

important to have a precise definition of the main lines and priorities in the activity of the peace movement. There is now a much more vigorous search for programmes which could help to unite a broad circle of organisations, groups and individuals, irrespective of the diversity of their positions. The point is, therefore, to find the most promising spheres for the application of efforts and to concentrate on these.

Much more attention should be given to the problem of correct slogans, Iikka Vehkalahti emphasised. The experience of the struggle for peace in Finland shows that it is now no longer right to confine oneself to general calls for peace and disarmament. There is a need to try to unite men and women for action in favour of concrete proposals which are acceptable for the majority, regardless of their origins. In Finland, for instance, this could be the struggle to convert Nordic Europe into a nuclear-free zone.

Among the key tasks, speakers said, is the need to indicate the sources of the current grave tension and those who are actually to blame for it. It was said that the question of those who are to blame for the difficulties arising in the way of the detente, those who seek to start a "second cold war", and those who are building up the material base for the "strength" policy is of more than academic interest. The answer to it is extremely meaningful for a correct orientation of the anti-war movement.

There is no doubt about the successes of the peace movement, James Lamond said. But then there is also no doubt that that the extent to which masses are conscious of the complexity

of international processes still falls short of the high level of anti-war activity. Thus, one will frequently find a tendency to put equal responsibility for the worsening international situation on the United States and on the Soviet Union. Not all the opponents of military preparations are able to see through the demagogic character of Washington's "peace" initiatives. Not all are aware, say, that behind the notorious "zero option" is an attempt by the White House to change the balance of strategic forces against the Warsaw Treaty countries.

An effective way to clarify the truth, Roland Bauer said, is to expose before broad public circles the essence of Washington's political conceptions in the light of its declaration to the whole world that "some things are more important than peace". With President Reagan as its mouthpiece, the US Administration has called for a "crusade" against the forces of social emancipation and national liberation and has declared its goal to be the "destruction of socialism as a world system". Those are the goals to which are geared the Pentagon doctrines of the "first nuclear strike", "warning nuclear shot", "limited nuclear war" and "protracted nuclear war". Those are the purposes served by the attempts to demonstrate that a thermonuclear conflict is "tolerable" and that "it can be won". One of the practical consequences of these militaristic doctrines is the rejection of the proposals made by the socialist community countries for ending the arms race and then going on to disarmament on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security.

The NATO countries' long-term programme for "additional armament"; the decision to get down to full-scale production of neutron bombs; the plans for deploying new "Eurostrategic" missiles in Western Europe; the chemical re-equipment of the US army--all these are interconnected stages in the adaptation of the war machine of the United States and its allies to the political needs of the ruling classes of the imperialist powers.⁵

In view of the fact that many of those involved in the anti-war movement oppose the concrete manifestations of the threat of war but have yet to discover its deep roots, it is the Communists' duty systematically to expose the sharp class edge of the current drive by reaction, said R. Valdez Vivo. Its main efforts are concentrated--by no mere chance--in the zones of the world where the peoples want resolute social change. Thus, the White House is furious over the consolidation of socialist Cuba's positions, the revolutionary changes in Nicaragua, the patriotic movement in El Salvador and other Latin American countries. Indeed, Washington has not even tried to cover up its readiness to engage in any gambles to halt the decline of imperialist influence and to keep the reactionary regimes in power.

The participants in the symposium expressed the conviction that, when analysing the causes behind the worsening of the international situation, it is not right to confine them to

⁵ On the character and scale of US military preparations, see commentary by James West in WMR, "New Facts: Who Is Preparing for War and Who Seeks Peace", April, 1982.--Ed.

the "ill will" of this or that government, of this or that bourgeois politician. There is the very existence of imperialism, for which external expansion, the drive for markets and raw-material sources, and subordination of states and peoples are a necessary condition of existence and development.

We ought to show, Jaime Diaz-Rozzotto said, that the urge for aggrandisement has always been at the root of aggressive wars. Today, in the drive for maximum profit, the stake is on boundless militarisation of the economy of the imperialist powers. Some bourgeois economists even regard it as a means for overcoming the crisis phenomena and their social consequences. But life has shown such conceptions to be totally groundless.

The stockpiling of arms is a process that has its own internal logic. The built-up war machine could tempt the most adventurous circles of imperialism to set it in motion or, at any rate, to use it to intimidate its adversaries. In such circumstances, the distance between a "cold war" and a shooting war is hairline.

While orienting the peace movements towards the need to curb the influence of the military-industrial complex as the immediate stimulator of the arms race, said Hans J. Krysmanski, one should draw attention to the fact that it has an influence not only on the production sphere. The main foreign policy and military-strategic tendencies are shaped within the entrails of this complex, which in the leading imperialist powers is increasingly coalescing with the state apparatus.

Many participants in the symposium urged the need to contrast the militaristic policy of imperialism and the socialist countries' consistent policy of bringing to international relations the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. This would help to refute the false concepts of "bloc policy", "equal responsibility" of the United States and the Soviet Union for the growing threat of war, etc.

In this context, speakers said, it is important to explain to broad public circles the fact that under socialism there is no room for classes, social strata or groups that could have a stake in the arms race, in militarising economics and politics, to say nothing of wars. For the socialist countries, it was said, peace is a necessary condition for implementing the long-term plans of socio-economic and cultural development and for extending internationalist assistance to the revolutionary, national liberation forces.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist states are working to flesh out their peace tenets with a structure of treaties and agreements, that is, to invest them with an international-law character. The socialist community is a reliable bulwark of the forces of peace, displaying firmness in matters of principle and a readiness for mutually acceptable compromise, and working to solve both global problems and particular issues paving the way towards the ultimate goals.

When describing the socialist countries' foreign policy initiatives, said Ahmed Salem, it is not enough to show their

factual aspects. There must be a theoretical analysis of their content. When speaking, say, about the Soviet Peace Programme for the 1980s, it is very useful to bring out its organic connection with the ideological and political principles of the new society. This will make even more evident the dialectical connection between communist ideals and the urge to safeguard peace, and will help broad circles of world public opinion to realise that for the socialist countries the policy of consolidating international security and disarmament is not a tactical ploy but a strategic line.

Some speakers said that it was necessary to show more deeply and clearly the danger to world peace posed by hotbeds of local tension and armed conflict. In this context, Mazen Husseini called for efforts to spread more widely the principle, which socialist democracy proclaimed a long time ago, namely, that peace was indivisible. In the context of the detente, this meant the need to regard the latter as a global process.

Exaggerating the importance of detente in one part of the world and ignoring the danger of confrontation in another, is tantamount to leading the peace forces onto the wrong road. Thus, some participants in anti-war movements in the Arab countries tend to underestimate the importance of the international detente for solving the problems of their region. But it is well known that in the period of detente common efforts were made by the USSR and the United States to find a way for settling the Middle East conflict by political means.

Elaborating on M. Hussein's idea, Sarada Mitra added that importance of the detente in Europe is not confined to the fact that it opened before the peoples of the socialist and of the capitalist parts of the continent a real way to the establishment of good-neighbourhood. Peace initiatives in Europe created the prospect for a global detente, for its extension to other regions. The detente has helped many peoples to score successes in the struggle for national liberation and social emancipation.

There is yet another argument which helps the non-European nations to gain a better understanding of the danger of "limited" conflicts, said Tair Tairov. The very fact that the main forces of the North Atlantic Bloc and the Warsaw Treaty are in confrontation in Europe makes it highly problematical that it could be possible to localise even an initially small conflict breaking out there, if it involves any parties belonging to these military-political alignments.

The symposium also dealt with the problem of combating the psychological warfare carried on by the imperialist centres. In its efforts to deceive the social forces, Clement Rohee said, bourgeois propaganda has acted along two main lines: on the one hand, it has sought to prove the "good intentions" of the imperialist powers, and on the other hand, to cultivate anti-communist and, in particular, anti-Soviet attitudes with all the means at its disposal. While this is not a new way of working on public opinion, it should be treated with all seriousness. After all, there are still many people who trust bourgeois

information. This also applies to the peoples of the Caribbean on whom torrents of refined lies have been poured for years.

While vigorously exposing the assertions about some "Soviet threat", Raja Collure emphasised, there is also a need to bear in mind that some of those who believe in the imperialist myths are our brothers by class. We must help them to escape from the propaganda snares of capital, to learn the truth about socialist foreign policy, about its ideological substance as a policy of peace and cooperation among nations.

When the bourgeoisie uses crafty methods for manipulating public opinion in the ideological struggle, backward views can temporarily prevail in a section of the working people. But it is a scientific, progressive and humanistic ideology that can alone score a lasting strategic victory in the ideological confrontation. This ideology, said Girgin Girginov, is the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. That is why the international confrontation in the ideological sphere will sooner or later result in the overcoming of the reactionary views and attitudes and in an ideological improvement of the atmosphere. This will not, of course, occur of itself, but will require further invigoration of the ideological struggle against imperialism and in defence of the detente and peace. Such a struggle helps further to unite all those who are concerned with the destinies of mankind. Its goal is to assert the only realistic and historically justified method of tackling international problems in a peaceful and constructive dialogue.

The discussion eventually brought out the following main lines in the activity of the peace forces:

- establishment of the true causes behind the aggravation of the international tension and exposure of those who are concretely to blame for the mounting threat of war;
- presentation of the objective potentialities for preserving peace and the real ways to it;
- broad efforts to explain the peace initiatives helping to halt the arms race and start disarmament, consolidate international security and extend mutually advantageous and equitable cooperation between nations;
- organisation of mass struggles for the concrete goals whose attainment helps to realise these proposals;
- frustration of attempts by the militaristic circles to dampen the peace movements, to hamper their joint action with the socialist states and the Communists; and
- exposure of the myth about some "Soviet war threat", and the "super-powers" concept, and the "equal responsibility" of socialism and imperialism for the growing international tension.

In closing the discussion, James Lamond stressed that the exchange of views at the symposium concerning the prerequisites for establishing lasting peace and the process of detente and consideration of some of the specific features of the anti-war movement at the present stage have helped to clarify its current tasks. The participants in the symposium, he said, represented not only the main regions of the globe, but also diverse political and ideological trends. It was a meeting of those who were equally committed on an issue of vital importance for all people on the globe. The sincere and good-will discussion in the

course of it has shown once again that a comparison of the views of Communists and Socialists, non-party people and members of bourgeois parties, believers and atheists, members of parliament and scientists, party and trade-union leaders--that is what we have succeeded in doing at the symposium--that such a comparison is useful in itself and could provide a stimulus to their joint efforts and active struggle for their noble goal.

* * *

The symposium was held in an international situation that was complicated and fraught with grave danger, and one whose main features in the latter half of 1982 became even more menacing. Its participants voiced this view: no task is now more important than to halt the mounting political and military confrontation which is being produced by the policy of the imperialist powers. A further heightening of tension could make it harder to return to the detente and could further complicate the relations between the capitalist and the socialist states.

Regardless of party affiliation, of ideological and political orientation among the participants in the discussion, their statements were permeated with this pivotal idea: it is possible to bring about the vitally necessary swing to a consolidation of international security. The way to defending detente lies through the utmost invigoration and joint action by all the anti-war forces and their efforts to overcome social, political, ideological and other barriers for the sake of the struggle against the threat of war. The fulfilment of this large-scale task gives especial urgency to the need for steady improvement of the

positive programme for joint action, on the basis of which the most diverse groups of peace fighters could act in serried ranks, while maintaining their complete sovereignty.

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH
TÜSTAV
ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI

SECOND EDITION OF THE SOVIET PAMPHLET "WHENCE THE
THREAT TO PEACE"

Moscow, July 30. TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachyov writes:

The leaders of the present Washington administration are the initiators of a campaign deliberately to mislead world public opinion as to the true scope of US military might. This conclusion is contained in the second enlarged edition of the Soviet pamphlet "Whence the Threat to Peace".

Soviet military experts show that as of 1981, the United States did not have the mere 1,958 strategic delivery vehicles the NATO falsifiers asserted but rather a full 2,338 nuclear weapons delivery means for strategic offensive forces, including 2,273 delivery vehicles belonging to the category of armaments of intercontinental range.

It is pointed out in the second edition of the Soviet pamphlet that the authors in the Western publication "NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Correlation of Forces" have understated the number of launchers on US nuclear-powered submarines by 160 units and that of heavy bombers by 230 units as compared with the data given during the signing of the SALT-2 treaty. At the same time the number of Soviet bombers has been stated as being more than twice as large as actually is (from 156 to 356).

The authors of the NATO pamphlet deliberately understate the number of US nuclear munitions by almost 1,500 units and overstate that of Soviet ones by including the number of munitions which, in their view, might appear in the Soviet Union in the future.

Soviet experts draw the conclusion that a balance of the armed forces of the USA and the USSR, of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization does exist and not on paper but in reality.

In the enlarged edition of the pamphlet "Whence the Threat to Peace" much attention is devoted to the course of the current negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic arms, on limiting nuclear arms in Europe and on mutual reduction of the armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

The authors analyze in detail the impact of the Soviet Union's recent peace initiatives on the improvement of the military-political situation in the world.

The pamphlet says that the Soviet Union, striving for a radical improvement of the situation and coming forward with concrete initiatives, does not deliver ultimatums. Its proposal is an invitation to a dialogue, to negotiations, during which any measures promoting a solution to topical international problems can and must be discussed.

(TASS, July 30. In full)

Translated by TASS

TRUNCHEONS AGAINST PEACE FIGHTERS

The Persecution of Participants in the Anti-War Movement in NATO Countries

The rulers of NATO countries, who had hoped that the anti-missile movement would subside with the arrival of US missiles in Western Europe, are disappointed. In the FRG alone on Resistance Day--January 30, 1984--major demonstrations against the deployment of US nuclear missiles took place in more than 500 urban communities.

To combat anti-war actions, imperialist quarters in several NATO countries have recourse to all that they believe could dilute, neutralise or discredit the peace movement. The reactionary press is raging. Slander against the movement as a whole and its individual supporters is a common occurrence today. Peace supporters are accused of lacking patriotism and even betraying national interests. This goes hand in hand with building up an atmosphere of fear of the so-called "Soviet threat".

Psychological influence is not the only means used in NATO countries against anti-war movements. There are also attempts to oppose various dummy "organisations" operating from militarist positions to peace-loving public opinion, surveillance and provocations on the part of secret services, fines imposed on participants in anti-war demonstrations, the enactment or tightening of special legislation, and outright use of force.

Here are some facts.

Pro-militarist organisations. Their aim is to undermine the anti-war movement, throw it into disarray and mislead peace supporters. One of these new organisations is the American Institute on Religion and Democracy, whose mission is, among other things, to neutralise the impact of sermons delivered by pacifist clergymen. Its financial sources are closely linked with the Pentagon and CIA. Over one-third of its board members are diehard reactionaries from the notorious Committee for the Free World. The institute backs the Reagan Administration's foreign policy and understandably has its blessing.

The National Forum headed by Senator Jeremiah Denton, a rabid anti-Communist, is a similar American organisation. It was formed during a referendum begun in 1982, when about 900 local government bodies voted for a nuclear weapons freeze. Its credo is to step up international tensions and support the arms race and moves from "positions of strength", or, in short, whatever serves imperialist policy.

In Britain reactionaries have formed numerous groups declaring for "peace from positions of security", "a free world", "peace with the aid of NATO", "defence", and so on. They approve of the militarist policy of the United States and NATO, misrepresent the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and assail participants in the anti-missile movement in Western Europe.

Total surveillance. As early as his first year in office, President Reagan lifted the ban on secret operations by the FBI

and CIA inside the country.¹ The two agencies were given his OK to infiltrate any public organisation, including anti-war ones, and proceeded to make ample use of it. They tap telephones, inspect private correspondence, invade homes and keep an eye on numerous public figures. The FBI registers every step of anti-war organisations like the June 12 Rally Committee,² Physicians for Social Responsibility, Mobilisation for Survival or the US Peace Council.

The situation is similar in Britain, where war opponents are under surveillance, telephones are tapped and private correspondence is inspected. The British police force has data on 36 million people, or virtually the whole adult population of the country, fed into computers. Blacklisting by secret services is common in the FRG, Italy, Turkey and other NATO countries.

Surveillance over peace supporters is also exercised by military secret services. Late last January the Washington Post carried a report on the Pentagon's practice of planting informers in the movement for a nuclear freeze. At a conference held that month in Böblingen, FRG, under the slogan "Stop the Dismantling of Democratic Freedoms", it was said that the Federal police, the department for the "defence of the Constitution" and military counter-intelligence had checked the record of 6.4 million citizens.

¹ See Political Affairs, October 1981, p. 22.

² A coalition of organisations which in 1982 sponsored a demonstration in New York involving one million people.--Ed.

The money whip. Fines are widely used in NATO countries as a means of counteracting movements against war. A fine totalling 900,000 Belgian francs was imposed on the sponsors of a vast demonstration against the deployment of US missiles (Brussels, October 1983). In Canada the authorities fined participants in a peace demonstration outside the premises of the Lytton Systems Company, which manufactures missile-targeting devices for the USA. In the FRG a court fined Gert Bastian, a former Bundeswehr general DM 9,000 for taking part in anti-war demonstrations. In some West German cities demonstrators were made to pay the "services" of police patrolling anti-missile marches.

Special legislation. Bonn has a draft law which provides for the punishment of demonstrators as common criminals. Under this law all participants in a peace demonstration who refuse to submit to a police order to stop "violent action" and disperse at once may be sentenced to one year in prison. (Yet violent action is mostly the work of police agents-provocateurs who join in anti-war demonstrations. During a 20,000-strong peace march in Krefeld timed to coincide with the arrival of US Vice-President Bush, a handful of such agents hurled rocks and bottles at his armoured car, thereby furnishing a pretext for a crackdown on the demonstrators.)

The draft was sharply criticised across the country. It was emphatically condemned by the FRG Peace Movement Coordinating Committee, which accused the government of violating the Constitution. A statement released by it on the occasion expressed anger at the "unprecedented campaign of persecution

which ... the Federal government is conducting against opponents of the deployment of new US nuclear weapons". Martin Hirsch, Chairman of the Association of Social Democratic Lawyers, said that he could not imagine how a large group of people can be made during a mass demonstration to clear fast the space where the action is taking place. Yet the impossibility of doing this places these people in the category of "lawbreakers".

In Britain the increasing number of lawsuits against peace supporters even prompted the authorities to adopt so-called simplified proceedings which make it impossible for participants in the anti-war movement to appeal to the jury. There is a draft law on "police and criminal evidence" which would authorise the police to make any number of stop searches and take people into custody for a long time without preferring any charges, interfere in Britons' private lives, study their private papers and even infringe medical secrecy. A further draft law would make demonstrators pay the expenses of police patrolling of demonstrations. Commenting on this, Labour ex-minister of defence Denis Healey said that it looked as if from now on none but the rich could afford to express their views.

Direct use of force. Police truncheons, tear gas and water cannons are "arguments" commonly used by the authorities against peace fighters.

In the United States there existed for many months a peace camp set up on the initiative of several public and religious organisations in Livermore, California, near a research centre designing new nuclear weapons. The campers held seminars and

rallies and handed out leaflets calling for resistance to the militarist policy of the White House. Police repeatedly attacked and beat them and destroyed their camp but it was restored again and again. On June 20, 1983, or Action Day for Disarmament, a thousand policemen were pitted against the camp. The end of the day saw over 900 people under arrest.

The British authorities are waging a regular war against women on watch at the US Greenham Common base. They threaten to use brute force. Lately these threats have been coupled with increasingly frequent incursions by hooligans and night raids by hired thugs and semi-criminal elements. Mounted and unmounted police with dogs have been repeatedly moved in and so have paratroopers.

The police action against women at the Comiso international peace camp (Italy) protesting against the delivery of US nuclear missiles to that community won sad renown. Police brutally beat demonstrators, some of whom suffered severe injuries.

During the Bundestag debate on the "missile decision of NATO" in November 1983, a mass demonstration was held outside the building. The demonstrators demanded that the new US weapons be barred from the country. The authorities moved in police with water cannons, tear gas and truncheons; 70 people were gravely wounded and over 500 were arrested.

Army units, for their part, are trained to fight demonstrators. There is a document at NATO headquarters code-named 10-1. It points out that "in an emergency" troops will suppress in member countries any disturbance or other action likely to

imperil "the strategic interests of the free world". In a special centre at Bad Ems, FRG, NATO army officers train troops for the eventuality of "internal tension". They have formed mobile squads and are drilling them. General Bernard Rogers of the USA, Supreme NATO/Commander in Europe, has issued an order to "open aimed fire" against demonstrators should they find themselves in immediate proximity to US missile sites. There have been cases of anti-war demonstrations broken up by troops. In August 1983 US troops in Federal Germany dispersed peace marchers in the area of the Ramstein air base. In March 1984, a similar operation was carried out by the US garrison of the Mutlangen military base. The result was that many anti-war demonstrators were severely wounded.

The armies of NATO countries have set up bases for the training of military units that are to suppress "civil riots". They are building up technical facilities and special arms for use against demonstrators. In Britain army manuals provide for active troop operations to "quell political unrest" and suppress "riots". In the FRG, 3,000 Bundeswehr officers are training for action against peace demonstrations.

These are only some of the numerous facts revealing traditional and new methods of putting down anti-war actions in NATO countries. Faced with an unprecedented growth of the peace movement and massive condemnation of the policy of war preparations and trying to tone down powerful anti-missile protests, the rulers of these countries resort more and more often to force, ignoring the standards of bourgeois democracy which they praise so much.

Nevertheless, the movement against war is growing and gaining in strength. In spite of refined militarist propaganda, more and more people realise that to defend peace today means fighting to preserve life on earth. It is this common concern that prompts the masses to take a stand against those whose policy directly threatens a nuclear catastrophe.

Willy Prucht

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VE YAYIN KURUMU
TÜSTAV

MALICIOUS INVENTION

Yuri Zhukov, Pravda political correspondent

The West is assiduously playing up a false thesis, circulated by swindlers specialising in deception, that the USA and the USSR bear "equal responsibility" for the arms race and for the existing threat of outbreak of a nuclear war. This malicious invention is being used by those who wish to weaken the anti-war movement, strip it of its purposefulness and, if partly, to turn it against the socialist countries.

It is already impossible to try and fully exonerate the American Administration, which not only does not conceal its intentions to achieve military superiority and exploit it for implementing its aggressive plans, but is openly publicising them. An ingenious trick is resorted to: yes, they whisper to participants in the anti-war movement, the United States does carry on the arms race, and this is to be regretted, but the Soviet Union too is stockpiling weapons. It follows then that both "superpowers" are to blame.

My occasional meetings with representatives of the West's anti-war groups have shown me that the trick acts on those who, constantly exposed to anti-Soviet propaganda, have no access to objective information. That is why it is necessary all the time to give the lie to this utterly false thesis about the "equal responsibility" of the USSR and the USA for the arms race.

Let us recall the way events developed at and after the end of the Second World War.

Even before the United States developed and tested the atom bomb, the American Administration was nurturing plans whose implementation it believed would ensure for the USA monopoly possession of this weapon of mass destruction.

- 2 -

In June 1945, in Chicago the so-called committee on social and political consequences declared over-confidently and, I would say, arrogantly that the development of atomic energy in other countries (my emphasis - Y. Zh.) must be terminated at the very beginning or, if allowed, must be put under the control of an international organisation in which the United States would have a permanent majority.

When the world learned of the horrendous tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the peoples resolutely demanded that atomic weapons be banned and abolished. As soon as the UN General Assembly convened for its 1st session early in 1946, it set up a commission on atomic energy which was to solve the problem. On April 19 of that year the Soviet Union tabled the draft of an international convention on the prohibition of manufacture and use of atomic weapons and on the destruction of stockpiles of their ready and unfinished quantities.

Who prevented that? The United States. Why? Simply because Washington decided that its monopoly on the production of the atom bomb would last for ever and that the USA would be able thus to keep the whole world in fear and subjugation. What was left for the USSR to do? Only one thing: for self-preservation purposes and in the interests of world peace it was compelled to develop its own nuclear weapons in the late 40s.

So can one speak of the equal responsibility of the USSR and the USA for the development of this weapon of mass annihilation?

Let us proceed further. In the early 50s the United States established in Western Europe a so-called forward-based system - by deploying there bombers capable of achieving our territory with nuclear weapons aboard. But that seemed too little to the American generals. Then they launched a false campaign about the USA "lagging" behind the USSR in bombers. The Pentagon gave the Congress a scare, and made it allocate money for the construction of a whole fleet of intercontinental strategic aircraft

- 3 -

capable of attacking the USSR with nuclear weapons. Later, however, it was announced cynically that the Pentagon had made an "error": the number of Soviet bombers had been overstated by three to four times. As for the Soviet intercontinental bombers, they were developed only at the end of the 50s, in response to the development of American ones. So can one speak of the equal responsibility of the USSR and the USA for the development of strategic aviation?

Early in the 60s Washington raised another hysterical ballyhoo: it announced that the USA was "lagging" behind the USSR in the deployment of ground-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles. After the brouhaha, which helped to secure means for the manufacture and deployment of more than a thousand (!) such missiles, it was calmly declared that the Pentagon had "erred" again, overstating the Soviet "missile threat" by 15 to 20 times. No less and no more! Of course, further on the USSR took the necessary measures in order to ensure its security and to achieve parity in missile armaments - there was no other way left for it.

So can one speak of the equal responsibility of the USSR and the USA for the nuclear missile arms race launched by the Pentagon as early as the late 50s?

Yet even there the Pentagon did not stop. It prepared ever new spirals of the arms race in the hope that American scientists and engineers would at last develop military equipment beyond the imagination of the Soviets and then supremacy would remain with the USA.

In the middle of the 50s, the USA built its first nuclear submarine called Nautilus and in 1960 it had three nuclear missile submarines that carried 48 nuclear warheads. The USSR at the time had no atomic submarine of that type.

Could the USSR remain indifferent to the growing threat

- 4 -

to its security? Of course, not. In 1967, it acquired its first two nuclear missile submarines carrying 32 warheads.

So can one speak of the equal responsibility of the USSR and the USA for the development of the nuclear-powered missile-carrying submarine fleet?

In the middle 70s the USSR proposed at the UN that an agreement be concluded to ban the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. In February 1976, at the 25th CPSU Congress it was proposed to prohibit new and more destructive systems, including new submarines of the Trident type in the USA and similar submarines in the USSR.

Who opposed that? Again the USA. Why? Because its generals and industrialists did not expect that our industry would be able to develop anything like Tridents. But the year 1981 arrived and the CPSU Central Committee in its report to the 26th Party Congress said: "At one time we offered to ban the development of the naval Trident missile system in the United States and of a corresponding system in our country. The proposal was not accepted. As a result, the United States has built the new Ohio submarine armed with Trident-1 missiles, while an analogous system, the Typhoon, was built in our country. So, who has stood to gain?"

At the same 26th CPSU Congress it was proposed to "come to terms on limiting the deployment of new missile submarines of the Ohio type by the USA, and similar ones by the USSR." How did the USA reply? It refused. What has been the result? The USA has five Ohio-type submarines in operation and six more under construction.

Naturally enough, in such conditions the USSR is forced to see to the maintenance of parity in nuclear armaments and although the number of nuclear warheads on the ballistic missiles installed in US submarines exceeds that on Soviet ones by two and a half times, there is rough parity between

Tuesday, October 2, 1984

3

- 5 -

the USSR and the USA in strategic nuclear weapons on the whole, taking into account other kinds of strategic weapons.

I have cited only a few examples. Their list could easily be extended but the substance of the matter would remain the same - the USA was constantly developing new kinds of armaments, and the USSR had to meet the challenge, since Washington does not wish to pause in this mad race. The same was the case with the development of multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles, the development of long-range Cruise missiles and a number of other kinds of armaments.

Now, contrary to the USSR's persistent calls to prevent the militarisation of space, the US Administration is stubbornly avoiding negotiations on this question, too, with its military research institutes and aerospace industry feverishly developing new strike weapons systems for conducting war in space and from space with respect to the Earth.

So how can one speak after all that of the "equal responsibility" of the USSR and the USA for the arms race? How can the Soviet Union be called upon to disarm, unilaterally, something which is being done by some Western leaders who tell us that in that event the men from Washington would feel ashamed and halt the arms race? How can one state that Soviet declarations about its renunciation of a first strike are not enough - let it renounce also a second strike (that is a retaliatory one - Y. Zh.)?

But imagine, there are such people, though it must be clear to everyone that in the event of an aggressor using nuclear weapons formidable retribution must await him - an all-crushing counter-strike. Renunciation of that would be tantamount to suicide.

Limitation, phased reduction and then total abolition of weapons of mass destruction are conceivable only with the strictest observance of the principle of equality and undiminished security, which was recorded in the Soviet-American agreements

- 6 -

of 1972-1973, but is now brushed aside by the American Administration. As recently as September 5, President Reagan, addressing a congress of the most reactionary organisation American Legion, declared that his object of concern was creating a margin of safety, that is, a preponderance in armaments.

The answer to the question of who bears responsibility for the arms race is absolutely clear - this responsibility devolves fully and entirely on the United States. He who genuinely wants to combat that race, must draw appropriate conclusions from this fact.

This is understood by thinking people in America who take a responsible attitude to the destinies of their country. Here is, for example, what was said in 1981 by prominent American public personality, former Ambassador to the USSR George Kennan, who, incidentally, cannot in any way be suspected of "pro-Soviet" positions: Let us not delude ourselves by putting all the blame on the USSR. It is the Americans that at every step were the first to develop nuclear weapons, to produce and test them, to raise their destructive force to a new level by creating the hydrogen bomb. It is the Americans who reject any proposal to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons and who used this weapon against tens of thousands of helpless civilians.

But the malicious invention about the "equal responsibility" of the USA and the USSR is again and again resorted to by those who would like to disorient world public opinion and the anti-war movement and to direct them against the Soviet Union.

It is all the more important therefore to tirelessly oppose this false manoeuvre with real data on the actual stand of our great socialist power which was clearly formulated by Konstantin Chernenko: "The curbing of the nuclear arms race is, of course, of key importance for peace and the security of

Tuesday, October 2, 1984

3

- 7 -

the nations. The Soviet stand here is clear. We are against rivalry in building up nuclear arsenals. We were and are in favour of banning and destruction of all kinds of these weapons."

(Pravda, October 1. In full.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI
TÜSTAV

-6-

"We do not intend to offer ultra-radical measures. For instance, we do not propose to sever historically formed economic links between the developed West and the developing South, between the United States and Latin America. But those contacts have to be reformed to find the way out of the situation neo-colonialism has created; to make it possible for all to dispose of their material and human resources in national interests," Mikhail Gorbachev said last May in his talk with Bernardo Sepulveda Amor, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico.

As the Soviet Union signed, during the 7th UNCTAD session, the multilateral agreement on a raw goods pool to be formed, it practically demonstrated the new approach to international economic affairs. World economic security would gain if all countries, the United States in the first place, joined that pool.

As the Soviet Union aids developing countries, it helps to overcome their backwardness, and tackle formidable social and economic problems. In 1986 alone, net economic Soviet aid to the Third World, computed according to UN methods, reached 15,100 million rubles, or 23 billion dollars, in the present rate of exchange.

To overcome economic backwardness, to fight poverty and solve other global problems, mammoth extra resources are needed. They can be obtained only through disarmament. There is no other major source of money.

The programme advanced in Mikhail Gorbachev's Statement of January 15, 1986, for ridding humanity of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by 2000 considers the allocation of the means for social and economic development to be a most important corollary of arms control and disarmament accords. Should those proposals be accepted, they would mean saving many billions now being spent for military ends.

The new way of thinking rejecting the worship of nuclear force has infused the initiatives of the socialist

-5-

basis.

We think we ought, whenever necessary, to create new international levers and institutions, laying stress on their possible contribution to international cooperation, disarmament and development.

The ideas of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on disarmament and development issues, as well as their specific proposals on that score, have been spelled out in greater detail in a collective memorandum of the socialist countries to be presented by the CSSR delegation tomorrow.

In the context of new political thinking we are raising the point the following way. Disarmament is not an end in itself, of course. We insist that every measure leading to arms limitation and reduction and every step towards ridding the nations of nuclear and other weapons should not only promote their security but also help earmark more money for improving the people's lives.

Likewise, we project the principle of disarmament for development on the problem of developing countries. Their troubles have acquired a global scope. Non-equivalent exchange, trade on unequal terms, bank rate machinations and their arbitrary changes and, last but not least, transnational companies' greed make some countries ever richer and impoverish others. The connection between developing countries' trillion-dollar debt and the fact that the United States has increased its military expenditures by over a trillion dollars within this decade--that connection is laid bare for all to see. Over 200 billion dollars is squeezed out of the Third World every year. The US military budget approaches 300 billion dollars. Can that be a chance coincidence?

In this situation, the Soviet Union proceeds from the principles of new thinking. It lays stress on joint search for just solutions to international economic problems: solutions based on the recognition of the existing realities and of the balance of interests.

-4-

to respond on a mutual basis with the US to regional initiatives in this direction, the understanding being, of course, that their results would take into account the legitimate interests of all the states in the respective regions.

Sixth, international agencies, the United Nations above all, ought to play a pivotal role in promoting the disarmament-for-development strategy.

We think that this conference must become a crucial landmark in the UN activities on a thorny but humane path of disarmament and development, bringing the forces of interdependence between the two processes into play.

We regret that the consensus on the need to convene the conference that existed over the past few years has not been logically translated into participation of all UN members, including a major one, in this forum. We regard the U.S. boycott of the conference first of all as an expression of a specific political line. To boycott a collective quest for ways to resolve that global issue--is it not a vivid example of an obsolete, selfish approach that indicates a profound gap between words and deeds?

Nevertheless, we believe that the states attending this conference will succeed in doing an important job by making the conference a beginning of a new attitude to disarmament and development issues.

One indication of this attitude is the Soviet proposal for pending recommendations of the conference, as well as the entire range of disarmament and development issues, to be discussed at a special meeting of leaders of the Security Council member states. Such a summit could help the idea of "disarmament for development" be interwoven in the fabric of international relations to become a guideline for practical action.

We support all proposals to create a framework whereby disarmament should pave the way for development. For our part, we propose that review conferences should be held on a regular

-3-

an end to the spiralling military budgets and limiting them to the level of reasonable sufficiency. Pressing for practical steps in this direction, the Warsaw Treaty members proposed to NATO this past April to declare a mutual moratorium on military budget increases for one or two years.

Third, even now it would be possible to set about elaborating a new economic model of the world in the context of disarmament, including conversion planning in the industrialised countries.

The role of conversion is not confined to the economic facet. It also implies the complete elimination of the negative socio-economic consequences of the arms race and a practical link between disarmament and development.

The USSR is in favour of conversion research on national and international, state and private levels. We believe the idea of conducting international expert research into the conversion problem in all its aspects to be a promising one.

Fourth, the military and political confrontation that is accompanied by the unbridled arms race must be countered by peace alternatives--a unique fusion of trust, cooperation and disarmament. Instead of competing in building up nuclear stockpiles we are proposing cooperation in peaceful and safe use of atomic energy; instead of Star Wars we are proposing interaction in a peaceful outer space and the formation of a world space organisation; instead of producing chemical weapons we are proposing joint efforts in developing a chemical industry for peaceful purposes; instead of barriers of secrecy we are proposing an exchange of the best findings of research for peace.

Fifth, the USSR believes that broad vistas for development could be opened up if the developing countries themselves cast off the burden of military expenditures. The Soviet Union is in favour of launching talks on a multilateral as well as bilateral basis on limiting the sale and delivery of conventional weapons. We are prepared

-2-

funds for development purposes is a question for collective efforts, and the USSR is prepared to take part in that job.

In our opinion, the role of the mechanism for the transfer of funds to developing countries could be played by an international "Disarmament for Development" fund that would be open for all states. Into that fund they would transfer part of the resources saved as a result of disarmament measures and cuts in defence spending. Such a fund could be set up within the framework of the UN on the basis of an international agreement stipulating the order of its activities and of the formation and distribution of its resources.

The Soviet Union has concrete proposals on that score. It is prepared to join such a fund and to take part in relevant negotiations with the participation of developed and developing countries.

Second, the military budget reduction problem requires a comprehensive approach. It cannot be divided into parts--political, economic, technological. This is also a problem of mutual trust.

The attempts taken until now to compare military budgets have failed to yield positive results as a consequence of the fundamental differences in the structure of prices for armaments, and also in the pricing mechanism. For example, the defence budget of 20.2 billion roubles we have made public reflects the expenditures of the Ministry of Defence of the USSR for the maintenance of the personnel of the Armed Forces, material and technical supply, military development, pensions and a number of other expenses. However, the financing of research and design and also of procurement of weaponry and military hardware comes under other articles of the USSR State Budget.

The conclusion of our radical pricing reform will make it possible realistically to compare overall military expenditures.

Even now the socialist countries are proposing putting

VOMI2-870827DR31

DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

New York, August 26. (TASS.) The head of the Soviet delegation at the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development which is being held here, USSR Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs V.F.Petrovski has addressed the delegates with a speech. He read out the address to the conference delegates by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev.

In our interdependent world, said the head of the Soviet delegation, the realities of the nuclear and space era are urgently dictating a choice in favour of disarmament, development and a nuclear-free, non-violent world.

We have made that choice.

Without contending for absolute truth, we would still like to share some of our ideas today.

First, without stable rates of development it is impossible today to ensure social and economic stability and durable peace. The problems of development are closely entangled with the questions of international security. To untangle that knot, it is imperative to begin, without delay, the rechanneling of resources for development purposes.

This apparently refers to the resources saved as a result of real limitation and reduction of nuclear and other weapons. This is the essence of the concept of interrelation between disarmament and development.

The Soviet Union confirms its preparedness to hand over to developing countries part of the funds actually saved by it as a result of concrete measures to curb the arms race.

Elaboration of the principles of such a handover of

VORIO-870810DR34

ZERO PLUS ZERO MAKES... 72?

V. Mikhailov

On the Global Approach and Dodging of
Washington and Bonn

The Soviet programme of stage-by-stage and complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere before the end of this century was made public a mere eighteen months ago. This made it possible for the concept of global nuclear disarmament to break through at the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik. People saw a prospect of a nuclear-weapon free world. An attempt was made to close it but it failed. The series of additional Soviet initiatives impelled the United States to switch over to joint practical preparation of an agreement on medium-range and theatre nuclear missiles. The Geneva talks have now entered the decisive phase. This explains why the new important step towards an accord made by the Soviet Union evoked an exceptionally mighty response all over the world.

What is the essence of it? The Soviet Union met the wishes of the Asian countries and expressed its preparedness to eliminate all its medium-range missiles not only in Europe but also in Asia. This removes the question of preservation of the 100 warheads on medium-range missiles which were discussed at the Geneva negotiations with the Americans, of course, provided the USA does the same. The theatre missiles would also be eliminated.

This imparts a global character to the "double zero" concept. It is proposed to destroy two classes of nuclear missiles on two continents in the areas of the most concentrated military confrontation.

In fact, this time, too, the Soviet Union expertly untied the knot tied by others. The point is that at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik it was agreed to

-2-

leave 100 nuclear warheads on medium-range missiles both in the Asian part of the USSR and the west of the USA. Later disputes flared up in Washington and, under the Pentagon's pressure, they began to voice the demand to give up this accord. To all appearances, it was supposed that the Soviet Union would not agree to this and, as a result, all approaches to an accord in Geneva would be blocked. Now these artificial obstacles have been removed.

It is not the first step towards an accord made by the Soviet Union. The USSR made quite a number of concessions in order to, at long last, get things moving in the field of nuclear disarmament and to practically start this important work. It proposed that the medium-range missile issue be singled out of the interconnected missile-space "package". It agreed not to take into account the British and French nuclear armaments. It expressed its preparedness to destroy also theatre missiles and to begin negotiations on shorter-range missiles. The European socialist countries proposed that the way to a conventional-arms war be blocked by reducing conventional weapons, to begin with, by one quarter, and that the military concepts and doctrines of both blocs be considered jointly with NATO and that the basing of them on defensive principles be ensured. Last but not least, we stated that we would proceed from the global "double zero" concept. All this was without any preconditions, the sole condition being that the United States would do the same.

It is only natural that the peoples of Europe and Asia - and it is their security that is at issue - have the right to expect that the United States and its allies will finally decide to move ahead and will cover the rest of the way, for no one can do it for them. To begin with, the US and NATO should give up once and for all attempts to put the USSR and its allies in an inequitable position and impair their security. They should also stop looking for loopholes in order to keep at least part of their

-3-

nuclear-missile potential, which is due to elimination, as is the case with the attempt to keep the American nuclear warheads on Pershing-1A missiles out of the double zero option.

In arithmetic zero plus zero never equals seventy-two. Consequently, the seventy-two American missile-based warheads cannot equal the Soviet double zero.

Washington claims that inasmuch as the Pershings-1A wholly belong to the Federal Republic of Germany it cannot negotiate a "third country's" armaments. Yet, according to all official data, when in 1963 the United States started deploying the first generation of its Pershing missiles in West German territory, it gave Bonn only 72 missile launchers as "admission fare," whereas the warheads for the missiles remained the property of the United States. The Bundeswehr was granted the right to use the missiles for training, but the United States kept key to the nuclear warheads.

In a word, it is the case of an obvious attempt to camouflage the American nuclear potential as a "third country's armaments" and to keep it in Europe. Is this a zero?

What about West Germany's position? Bonn should have been the first to welcome the possibility of a Soviet-American agreement. I am surprised at the indecisiveness of the West German ruling circles. Instead of being the first, they became the last in Europe among the NATO allies in spelling out their position on the Soviet proposal for the elimination of medium-and shorter-range missiles. And when they eventually did spell it out, it was not a clear Yes but rather something between Yes and No: On the one hand, the West German government officially stated its support for the double zero option, while on the other, it expressed the hope that the "zero-zero option will not affect the Bundeswehr's Pershing-1A missiles whose nuclear warheads are controlled

-4-

by the United States."

If so, West Germany becomes a co-owner of nuclear weapons, which is a violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. This questions West Germany's allegiance to its own obligation never to possess nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. And that commitment was a condition for West Germany's admission to NATO, the Common Market and other Western communities.

For the sake of the truth it should be noted here that the idea of keeping the American Pershings in Europe was originally conceived not in Bonn, nor even in Washington. It came to light in the American arms concern Martin Marietta, which is the main supplier of Pershing missiles. Virtually a couple of days after the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik, the concern came up with a plan of saving its progeny. It was the concern that suggested simply dismounting the first stage off the Pershing-2 missiles and thus converting them into the shorter-range class, thereby circumventing the agreement threatening with the destruction of medium-range missiles. When the USSR suggested scrapping that second class of missiles, too, Washington decided to leave the Bundeswehr missiles out of the agreement being drafted in Geneva and replace them later with shorter Pershing-2 missiles. It is clear that the plan suggested by Martin Marietta was certainly not dictated by a desire to scrap nuclear missiles in Europe and Asia.

So are the interests of Martin Marietta and other arms corporations really identical to those of the US and West Germany? It is my strong conviction that in the long term this kind of identity would be extremely dangerous both for America and for Western Europe, and not only from the military viewpoint. After all, one should not forget that in the past Western Europe had lost its international weight for a long period exactly on the battlefield, whereas the United States is losing it now in the course of a mad arms race. It is only in peaceful undertakings that

-5-

one can gain prominence in today's world.

Sure enough, the first step is the most difficult one, but it is also the most honorable of all. In the name of saving civilization we must live by the criteria of new thinking which rejects fist law and asserts the supreme forms of international communication matching the current intellectual level of mankind. It is only this logic of our nuclear-missile age rather than the outdated arithmetic of the "balance of fear" that can serve as a guiding light into the future.

(Pravda, August 10. Abridged)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMALARI
TÜSTAV

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI