P.S. to the NEWS
by PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
Phone: 618-462-5415

RELEASE: OCTOBER 17, 1980

ANTI-NUCLEAR POWER AGITATION

"Do as I say and not as I do" is the guiding maxim of Soviet nuclear energy policy. Inside the Soviet bloc, push hard for the development of nuclear power as rapidly and on as broad a scale as possible, but press the Western world to limit and close down nuclear plants as environmentally dangerous.

That's the double standard of Soviet morality, and it is unfortunate that many Americans fail to recognize its duplicity.

According to Soviet Weekly, a tabloid published in London by the Soviet embassy, "only atomic power stations are now being built in the European part of the U.S.S.R. Construction of other kinds of power stations there has been ended." Ten commercial atomic power stations are already operating in the U.S.S.R.

Anatoly Alexandrov, the president of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, wrote in June 1979 in the World Marxist Review that nuclear power plant building is a major objective of Soviet state policy. "The building of a large number of nuclear power stations has been planned in accordance with the decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU. By 1990 nuclear power stations will account for nearly one-third of the electricity generated in the European part of the U.S.S.R."

"The only way to solve the energy problem," Alexandrov continued, "is inevitably to promote the rapid development of large-scale nuclear power in engineering." He ridiculed the possibility of radioactive pollution as only a side effect of "capitalist economic management" (which, of course, is not present in the U.S.S.R.).

Soviet Weekly revealed the reason why the Soviets have embarked on a full-scale plan to double their nuclear power capacity. "It is economically less viable to transport fuel or electric energy over vast distances than to build nuclear power plants close to the consumers."

Aren't the Soviets worried about danger or disaster from nuclear plants? No.

(more)

Igor Morokhov, vice chairman of the State Committee for the Use of Atomic Energy, wrote in the Nov.-Dec. 1979 issue of New World Review, a Communist Party USA publication: "Our plans call for increasing use of atomic energy, as the cleanest and economically most profitable form of energy available."

While admitting that atomic plants are not pollution-free, he argues that "the risk of death from cancer for people living near a coal-based power station is about 30 times greater than for people living near an atomic power plant of the same capacity."

Then Morokhov puts the nuclear risk in focus. "The emergency protection system at a large nuclear station makes a major accident at it an event of very low probability as compared with other dangers which confront man during his lifetime. The death of a resident living 40 km away from a nuclear plant as a result of a disaster at it is several thousand times less probable than dying in a car crash, and hundreds of times less than death from a natural disaster, such as a lightning-stroke."

Aren't the Soviets inhibited in their nuclear plant production by anti-nuclear demonstrators? Certainly not; such demonstrations are forbidden in the U.S.S.R. At least 20 countries have nuclear power reactors, but anti-nuclear agitation exists only outside of the Communist bloc nations.

According to Communist propaganda, nuclear accidents and environmental pollution can happen only in capitalist societies. Only the socialist system has the potential to build nuclear plants free from danger or disaster.

Artyom Troitsky, deputy chief of the U.S.S.R. State Planning Committee, was asked by Moscow News, a Soviet English-language weekly, to give his opinion about the danger of atomic stations. He replied: "Mankind will never solve the fuel and energy problem without atomic stations. It is impossible to reject them, but it is possible to make them reliable and safe."

Precisely. That is what most Americans believe despite massive scaremongering propaganda to the contrary. Voters in California, Oregon and Colorado have rejected anti-nuclear referendums.

In the first referendum on nuclear energy since the accident at Three Mile Island, the voters decisively rejected the proposal to close the Maine Yankee atomic power plant. We hope that, as Maine goes, so goes the nation. (end)