

## Reader Comment

The question of Super-Power rivalry is a complex one, and Robert Orr (25 March) simplifies the issue by relating it solely to Soviet aggression. His views are echoed by Nicholas Dimic, who exhibits a similar inability to take a dispassionate look at the question.

The Soviet Union, for all its faults and weaknesses — and it is certainly a crumbling empire — does adhere to an ideological system, namely to Stalin's interpretation of Marxism-Leninism, which has been followed, with a brief interlude during Khurshchev's ascendancy, from 1928 to the present day. Its foreign policy has two notable characteristics:

1) a fear, bordering on paranoia, of capitalist aggression against the USSR and its satellites. To some extent, this is justifiable. The Soviet state was almost destroyed by Nazi Germany, a country with far inferior resources and manpower. Further, with the realignment of forces after 1945, the USSR faced a nation that had already shown that it would not shirk from using atomic weapons in modern warfare. For a brief period, the USSR

was as defenceless as imperial Japan against such an onslaught.

Allied to this fear is a pathological suspicion of capitalist intrigues. Again, this is a direct offshoot from Stalin, a leader who purged members of one in every three Soviet families to assuage his doubts about their loyalty. In the eighties the suspicion has moved from Soviet citizens to satellite and nationality problems. Poland is seen as the latest locale of Anglo-American intrigue; Afghanistan is a sensitive area since it borders on the USSR's Central Asian republics, which have been deprived of any real power within the soviet system.

2) the Soviet leaders believe that they have a moral obligation to aid liberation movements, and, at the same time, indoctrinate them in Stalinist ideology. The roots of this policy lie in the Spanish Civil War of 1936-9, when Stalin made a half-hearted attempt to aid the Spanish republicans against Franco's falangist troops. Soviet ideologues see a right and a wrong side in every conflict taking place in the world today. The view is simplistic, but it originates from

the premise that the Communist Party is infallible, and that a single interpretation can be applied to every event.

The underlying assumption of Soviet policy is that eventually capitalism is bound to collapse. Thus it does not hurt to give the decaying structure a push here and there to catalyse the process. This is a far cry from the wanton aggression seen by Messieurs Orr and Dimic. But the problem with the Soviet outlook is that it is outdated. The Politburo leaders are aging men who look at world events from the perspective of the 1950s. Yet capitalism has proved stronger than expected. The USSR, in turn, has not evolved into a communist state, as Stalin predicted, but rather into an edifice of state capitalism, with a small elite clinging to power. The analyses of Marx, Lenin and Stalin are not always relevant today. Still the belief remains: ultimate victory over capitalism (or rather Western-style capitalism) is inevitable. A nuclear holocaust, although possible and even surmountable, is not the most preferable course. Instead the Soviet leaders keep a firm hand on their own spheres of power whilst

waging a war of attrition in other areas of the world.

The USA, on the other hand, has returned to the confrontation of the fifties with renewed vigour. The Reagan administration has no overriding ideals, no humanitarian motives befitting the world's largest democracy. If the USSR supports, with arms, an insurgent movement, then Haig and Co. will naturally support the ruling government of that country, *even if that government has a proven record of tyranny and oppression*. The failure of the American and Canadian media to discern this is nothing short of incredible. The regime in El Salvador, for example, which would not survive for a week without U.S. support, is more brutal than was Hitler's Germany in the thirties or for that matter, Mussolini's archetypal fascist state of 1922-44 in Italy. Similarly, the Pinochet regime in Chile has carried out similar atrocities and again is upheld by the U.S. American support for South Africa and the militaristic Begin government in Israel can only help lend credence to the Third World view, so clearly revealed in

by David Marples

the United Nations, of the USSK as a liberating and the USA as a repressive force.

In Europe, which strategists agree is the most likely point of confrontation between the two powers, the most probable consequence of U.S. policies will be disavowal of U.S. protection, at least by France and West Germany. As continental Europe succumbs to Soviet hegemony (unfortunately there is no third alternative), the U.S. government may be prepared to use the nuclear deterrent. Of course, other factors might intervene: the Soviet government may fall; the Americans may weary of such "unfaithful" allies; or (my personal hope), the Reagan administration will be replaced by a more liberal team in 1984. One should note, however, that the Europeans, on the periphery of the confrontation, do not share the illusions of people like Orr and Dimic. There are no good guys and bad guys anymore; even life under a Soviet bureaucracy is preferable to the oblivion of a nuclear holocaust. U.S. policy is leading more quickly to the latter than many of us realise.

## Student politics sink to a new low in slimy mud-slinging

I, along with many other students, am disgusted at the low level to which student politics seems to have sunk. Unfortunately Amanda LeRougetel, having polished her slimy mud-slinging skills during her campaign for the position of VP External, has now found herself compelled to practice these childish tactics on the faculty election level.

I am referring to Miss LeRougetel's letter of March 25 entitled "Participation demands sacrifice." This letter implies that "two people (Susan Field and myself) running on 'The Arts Slate' in the upcoming Arts Faculty elections" have no right to claim membership to the Anti-Cutbacks Team! It is the intention of this letter to point out that any such innuendos are outright lies, and to question LeRougetel's motives for such unfounded slander.

To begin with, both Susan and myself have been actively involved with ACT! since May of 1981. Susan is the sole person responsible for both the organization and execution of a Faculty Association social held by ACT! in early 1982 for the purpose of encouraging faculty associations to get involved in the fight against cutbacks.

I am Treasurer of ACT! and

have been involved in every ACT! campaign, including the National Week of Action. Susan's and my own involvement in ACT! is indisputable to anybody who has been involved in this organization.

Because this is the case, it is peculiar, to say the least, that this letter was ever written. However, when certain events are brought to light, Miss LeRougetel's purpose becomes unmistakable.

In order to see LeRougetel's motives one need only to look back to the period of time before the first Executive elections. At this time LeRougetel wanted ACT! to run an educational campaign about Cutbacks which sounded suspiciously like "The Walker Executive's" campaign platform.

I expressed my reservations over the content and timing of the campaign and subsequently worked to get it declared invalid. Further, it should be noted that Susan Field was campaign manager for the Cottle Slate. It is therefore clear that Miss LeRougetel seems to hold both Susan and myself partly responsible for her defeat.

However, this is not the only motive LeRougetel has in seeing us discredited. Three of the five candidates running on the other slate in the Arts Faculty elections

worked on the Walker Slate campaign. Further, the other slate's campaign manager is none other than Mark Hoye, the ratified VP Academic from the Walker Slate.

LeRougetel also has other motives, mostly arising from Susan's and my choice in friends, which are altogether too trivial to

## Support campus El Salvador committee

On March 28 of 1982 a so-called "democratic election" will be held in El Salvador; Duarte's trying to show the world that El Salvador is a free democratic country. But how can it be democratic and free when thousands of people are dying every year? What democracy are they talking about? When 50 percent of the population are illiterate and 75 percent of the children suffer from malnutrition; the junta and its American friends must be referring to the American child when they talked about the year of the child, because for the Salvadorean child there is nothing.

Now let's look at the background of El Salvador. Since 1932 the Salvadorean people have been subjected to the rule of brutally repressive military regimes. In January '32 when the

your mud slinging skill is not in doubt, Amanda. The timing of the letter was perfect. This refutation of your lies will appear in the Gateway too late to repair the damage that might have been done.

In conclusion, it is evident that LeRougetel felt compelled to slander Susan Field and myself on grounds of personal dislike, rather than anything which could possibly affect our ability and commitment to represent Arts students in Students' Council.

One final note: the quality of

able to sustain itself in a reign of terror over the Salvadorean people. In the past few years the U.S. has sent advisors and millions of dollars of military equipment to the junta, as well as participating in the training of Salvadorean troops.

For all of the above and more, some students on campus decided to organize a committee to support the struggle of the Salvadorean people; the purpose of this committee is to denounce the abuses of human rights which take place everyday in El Salvador at the hands of the military junta and support the Franco-Mexican resolution which recognizes the FDR-FMLN as the legitimate political representative of the Salvadorean people. The most important of all is to pressure the Canadian government to reaffirm its condemnation of the junta in El Salvador, and to follow the Franco-Mexican lead in recognizing the FDR-FMLN as a viable political force.

We need your support.  
Christina Fernandez  
Ag. 2

## Nuclear parity exceeded by Reagan's massive spending

Gary Desgrood (Mar. 25th) implies that three Soviet strategic missiles have no parallel in NATO; this is incorrect. The missiles to which he refers (SS 18, 17 and 19) were the first strategic MIRV's deployed by the U.S.S.R. In other words, they are long range missiles having, respectively, 8 (or 1), 4 and 6 independently-targetable warheads.

However, they were introduced in 1976 and 1977 in response to the first two U.S. strategic MIRV's which were deployed in 1970 (ie. the Minuteman III and the Poseidon C-3 with 3 and 10 warheads respectively).

To stop this gap from closing, the U.S. is already producing its 3rd generation of nuclear submarines with a choice of two new strategic MIRV's and will shortly introduce the MX MIRV and B-1 bomber.

Incidentally, the 1980 Yearbook of the independent

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute shows that the U.S. normally maintains a 2:1 superiority in independent strategic warheads over the U.S.S.R. Furthermore, because the Soviet missiles are always one generation behind in design, they use a larger warhead which compensates for a lack of accuracy but not numbers, according to SIPRI's "lethality" index. However new weapons are usually introduced by the U.S. whenever the gap begins to close. Understandably, the closest estimates for independent strategic warheads are those of the U.S. Department of Defense which now puts the U.S. in the lead by 9000 to 7000, a situation which their last Annual Report interestingly describes as follows:

"While the era of U.S. superiority is long past, parity — not U.S. inferiority — has replaced it, and the United States and the Soviet Union are roughly

equal in strategic nuclear power."

It is clear therefore, that President Reagan's massive increase in arms spending is an attempt to avoid the parity which would allow negotiations for meaningful arms reductions, and to restore the superiority which will not only lead to another Soviet buildup, but also to increased tension, hostility and danger from accidental war. Because of its geographical position, Canada is literally playing with fire if it maintains military links with any military alliance of nuclear powers.

S.P. Goff  
Grad Studies Geology

P.S. As a useful, detailed primer on this subject, I recommend "Overkill" by John Cox, a new Penguin paperback which serves as a reference for much of the above.

With an overwhelming amount of aid from the US, the military government has been

## Art gallery petition

The following petition is being circulated until 5 April 1982. In the Fall of '81, Students' Union Council decided to phase out the Students' Union subsidy of SUB Art Gallery by 31 March 1984.

We, as students, are aware of the benefits of having SUB Art Gallery on campus and feel that Students' Union budget deficits should not be detrimental to the quality of exhibitions and services offered.

Accordingly, the undersigned support the allocation of \$1.00 (One Dollar) from each student's fees directly to SUB Art Gallery in addition to the SU's present com-

mitment.  
For more information, please contact the SUB Art Gallery Office at 432-4547.

What can you do?  
— Phone or write a SU Executive  
— Find a petition and sign it!  
Copies are available at SUB Art Gallery and the General Office, Department of Art & Design.

Dana Shukster  
Canadian Studies  
Rita Lilley  
Canadian Studies