

# Soviet war mobilization was proposed by Ogarkov in 1981

by Rachel Douglas

The missile-crisis escalation marked by Soviet submarine and short-range missile deployments is part of the picture of a Soviet Union totally mobilized for war. A reorganization of economic management and allocations in the U.S.S.R. in the last months fits a blueprint published in 1981 by Chief of Staff Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, to militarize the entire Soviet economy on the model of the "centralized leadership of the country and the armed forces" provided during World War II by the State Defense Committee. Thus, while high-level officials in the Reagan administration are still hesitating about, or opposing outright, a 1939-44-style economic mobilization behind the President's beam weapons program, the Soviets have declared themselves to be following the wartime example.

As for military programs proper, Moscow is forging ahead with development of beam weapons for anti-missile defense, the very capability the Soviets have been doing everything conceivable to stop the United States from acquiring.

On Nov. 28, the Communist Party daily *Pravda* carried a glowing prospectus for the next phase of the Soviet space program, including the placement of large mirrors in orbit for the purpose of reflecting sunlight onto winter-darkened cities in the Soviet north. Nobody who has been following the blow-by-blow Soviet media descriptions of U.S. beam weapons programs, current and planned, could miss the allusion to orbiting mirrors to be used to bounce back ground-based laser beams onto their targets, even if the technology for sunlight reflection is not identical.

Both the Moscow think tank publication *USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology* and the Communist Party journal *Kommunist* published long denunciations of the U.S. beam program this month. *Kommunist's* article was written in fact-sheet style, listing U.S. breakthroughs on x-ray lasers, mirror-reflected lasers, and so forth—all the technologies the U.S.S.R. had planned to get first and exclusively.

According to Fusion Energy Foundation staff analysts, there is evidence the Soviets will be able to deploy first-generation directed energy anti-ballistic missile weapons as early as 1984. Rand Corporation studies in the 1970s reported

a Soviet claim to have developed a compact x-ray beam generation device in 1975. Already then, they were close to developing an x-ray laser device pumped by relativistic electron beams.

Soviet sources have boasted that their government is about to launch weapons production and deployment, evidently on a scale to dwarf even earlier Soviet arms build-up programs, which have been running at 15 or 16 percent of the USSR's Gross National Product.

A recent CIA report on Soviet military production (see *EIR's* critique, page 36) shows that, after two years of stagnation in the machine-building sector, the first eight months of 1983 witnessed a dramatic increase in usable floor space in those industries. It is also reported that the Soviets currently have more weapons systems in the stage of "Research, Development, Testing, and Evaluations" (RDT&E) than they did during the decades of the 1960s and 1970s combined and that consumer-related investments are collapsing for the sake of defense.

That this is a pre-war mobilization is evident not only from the reported investment parameters, but from organizational measures taken since Leonid Brezhnev died last year. The administrative restructuring of the economy outlined in the economic "experiments" unveiled by the Andropov regime this past summer have little to do with decentralization à la the "Hungarian model" (although the Soviets are quick to exploit publicity about their alleged economic liberalization, as a selling point for West European businessmen they want to get involved in U.S.S.R. economic plans). Flexibility granted to local managers is being combined with tighter control from the top, in a streamlining maneuver aimed to wipe out a fat middle layer of the bureaucracy. Several military-allied or military-selected technocrats have been promoted to run key sectors.

For example, there has been a reorganization of the Soviet nuclear industry. A government decree in July, published in November, named Gennadii Sharashin as first deputy minister of electric power in charge of the nuclear power program. Deputy Prime Minister Ignatii Novikov, an old Brezh-

nev ally and head of the national construction authority, and his deputy were scapegoated for problems at the Atommash complex for mass production of nuclear reactors, and forced to retire.

On Aug. 1, Moscow announced creation of a new State Committee for the Safe Conduct of Work in the Atomic Power Industry, headed by Yevgenii Kulov, formerly of the Ministry of Medium Machine Building—the defense industry department believed to build nuclear missiles. That appointment suggests the question: Has the Soviet high command militarized the country's nuclear energy power grid for the purpose of powering ground-based relativistic particle beam weapons in the near future?

### Ogarkov's directive

In a July 1981 issue of *Kommunist*, Ogarkov outlined his ideas on military-economic integration in the manner of the last world war: "The element of surprise played a determining role already during the Second World War. Today it has become a factor of exceeding strategic importance. The question of the prompt shift of the Armed Forces and the entire national economy onto war status, their mobilization in a short time, is posed substantially more acutely. Therefore supplying the troops with trained personnel resources and technology defines the necessity of measures that are precisely planned already in peacetime and coordinated actions by party, *soviet*, and military organs in the localities.

"Now as never before, it is necessary to have coordination of the mobilization deployment of the armed forces and the national economy as a whole, especially in the utilization of manpower, transport, communications, and power, and in ensuring the stability and vitality of the economic mechanism of the country. In this connection it is necessary to have a constant search for how to improve the system of production links of the enterprises producing the basic types of weapons, in raising the autonomy in the event of war of production enterprises and associations involved in energy and water supply—their full provision with necessary reserves and the creation of a reserve of equipment and materials. It is necessary for there to be further improvement of the system of mobilization readiness of the national economy itself, proceeding from the fact that a close interconnection of the mobilization readiness of the armed forces, the national economy and civil defense is a very important condition for maintaining the defense capability of the country as a whole at the necessary level."

None of this, continued Ogarkov, will be possible "without a stable system of centralized leadership of the country and armed forces. We have a certain experience in this regard. The State Defense Committee and the defense committees in the cities on the front, created in the years of the Great Patriotic War, fully proved themselves. It is quite natural that we must take this experience into account. In a future war, should the imperialists force it upon us, the role and importance of the appropriate local party, *soviet* and economic organs in carrying out defense tasks will rise significantly."

## U.S.A.: a 1939-43 buildup is urgent

*Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. analyzed the Soviet strategic threat to the U.S.A. and reiterated his recommendation for a World War II-modeled economic mobilization of the U.S.A. in a statement issued Nov. 26 through his presidential campaign committee. Excerpts of the statement follow:*

During mid-April of this year, I estimated and reported that the Soviet government was committed to a global thermonuclear confrontation with the United States during the early period ahead. I reported my estimate that the count-down toward this confrontation would probably begin during August of this year, and build-up to placing the mainland United States under threat of Soviet thermonuclear attack by as early as December 1983.

Now, precisely the scenario against which I warned during April and May of this year has unfolded. This past week, a new escalation of Soviet-coordinated violence exploded, and Moscow issued the anticipated public threat of placing the mainland United States under immediate threat of thermonuclear attack from submarines and other new emplacements of missiles. . . .

The significance of this is not to remind you how right I was in the estimate of the Soviet government I issued this past spring. The practical purpose is to warn you that my estimate of the character and intentions of the Soviet government is now fully proven by events, and to urge you to support my strong recommendation to President Reagan that he immediately implement a war-emergency powers order, not to launch war, but to build the defenses of the United States up rapidly to the level the Soviet leadership will pull back from its present decision to risk thermonuclear showdown. . . .

### Present Soviet intentions

The Soviet government is committed to an early thermonuclear confrontation with the United States, with the purpose of risking war in the expectation that the United States will back down, and in backing down will provide Moscow such extensive concessions that Soviet military superiority will be unchallengeable for the decades ahead. What