Around the World

Rise of USSR As Top Imperialist Dog

(This article is a Progressive Labor Party response to the ongoing crises in the U.S.S.R. and the Letters section on the position of the U.S. as a world power today.)

The point is that this situation will shift again. U.S. zoguas are fighting to do something about their plight by robbing the completion of the Alaskan oil pipeline. Again, this line is inadvisable to the Soviets. Looking at a map, you can see that the Soviets are a short distance by pipeline from extracting our national oil. So, in every instance regarding oil, the Soviets have the strategic advantage; no matter how many the tactical situation seems to be for the U.S.

Only last year, during the energy crisis, the U.S. bosses were forced to complete a deal via Occidental Petroleum (Hammer) to ship natural gas all the way from Siberia to satisfy U.S. needs for this vital substance. Other figures concerning coal and other vital resources show parity significant leads for the U.S.S.R.

The weaken link in Soviet economic development is the production of wheat. But increased production of Soviet tractors and a rapidly developing non-chemical industry can be expected to solve this problem. By the way, as was pointed out in excellent PL magazine and CD articles, the biggest U.S. exports are foodstuffs, not machinery, etc.

 Militarily, there is not much of a contest. Even on the oceans, where the U.S. supposedly has had naval superiority, there are several ways to judge the superiority.W.Vavilov use the following:

(1) Economic development;
(2) Military development;
(3) Political influence;
(4) Internal morale.

Pointing up a significant point in the U.S. and U.S.S.R. in terms of economic and technological development has been the fact that the Soviets were the first to penetrate outer space. The launching of Sputnik was the first hard evidence of the trend towards the U.S.S.R.

This feat so shocked the U.S. ruling class that it revamped the entire education structure as well as budget priorities, to play catch-up technology. More important, and probably the actual turning point, was in 1961 when the Soviets out-produced every country in the world in steel tonnage. The Soviets produced 120 million metric tons, compared with 100 mil by the U.S. Again, steel for homes, in another cyclical step, had to play catch-up. As of 1963, they were even with their Soviet competitors. But, and it's a very big "but," steel production in the Soviet Union is used much more for military production than in the U.S. Using auto as an indicator, the U.S. outproduces the Soviets by about 10 to 1. The U.S. produced just over one million cars in 1973.

In the vital area of crude oil production, the Soviets are completely inefficient. Additionally, their oil reserves are about 50 percent larger than the U.S. (1963 figures, which are now outdated). The Soviets export 4.4 billion for the U.S. The U.S.S.R. is producing almost as much as the U.S. In 1973, it was 420 million metric tons, as compared with 454 million for the U.S. But even these figures are misleading. A much larger share of U.S. oil goes for auto, whereas the Soviets use a far larger share for the military, especially vital stockpiling for a war of defense. Most military experts acknowledge enormous Soviet reserves, while U.S. reserves are much smaller.

Even more significant are the vast Rumanian oil fields and reserves, geographically close to the Soviet Union. While the modern Soviet military machine doesn't even have to cross water. Large U.S. reserves remain, but are vulnerable Mid-East. And while the fortunes of war are there, perhaps the shippers of the future know what an advantage is. U.S. one must remember that as of twenty years ago the Soviets weren't even a factor there.

The Carter (Cont. from page 8)

would cutt unemployment be
equivalent to any jobs? Obviously it wouldn't.

We understand that the more capitalism develops, the more it tends to create unemployment. This is because the more capital intensive industry becomes, the fewer people are available relative to the growth in the labor force. (This was explained by Marx in , p. 15, that the number of people necessary to employ a given amount of capital is greater than the number of people used to employ that same amount of capital.) Therefore it must be the fault of the unemployable.

Don't blame the system, say Carter and Feldstein; blame the victims of the system, the unemployed. It is his favorite argument, that the unemployed, especially the long-term unemployed, either because he is not trained (we would say any worker has enough training to be an economics professor, if Feldstein is any example) or because he is without skills, is to blame for his unemployment. And what solutions are proposed by the system to cure unemployment—lower wages and reductions in unemployment benefits. That's Carter's "compensation for the unemployed."