

OCT 24 1964

## SOVIET SEEN FIRM IN MILITARY FIELD

But Specialists Predict No  
Adventurist Moves

By ARTHUR J. OLSEN

Special to The New York Times

MUNICH, Germany, Oct. 23—Soviet military policy is likely to harden in the wake of Nikita S. Khrushchev's dismissal, according to the consensus of a group of Western specialists on Soviet military affairs and strategy.

The international group, meeting in a three-day symposium here, agreed, however, that the new Soviet regime was not likely to undertake adventurist military moves.

Most of the 33 specialists predicted that the Soviet Union would remain committed to the nuclear-deterrent strategy initiated by Mr. Khrushchev. They concluded that the basic lines of Soviet foreign policy—and the military establishment created to support it—would be reaffirmed by the new regime.

The leadership upheaval in Moscow dominated the discussions of the experts, who met to exchange views on the impact on Soviet foreign policy of Mr. Khrushchev's 1960 decision to base the Soviet military position on a massive nuclear deterrent.

### Million-Man Reduction

That policy decision was implemented with a million-man reduction in Soviet uniformed personnel and a cutback in conventional combat forces.

Scholars and government experts from the United States, Britain, France, West Germany and other European countries took part in the symposium which was organized by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., a private research organization.

In several papers the experts cited resistance by Soviet military men to full execution of Mr. Khrushchev's nuclear-defense strategy. Some of the specialists expected the armed forces to take advantage of Mr. Khrushchev fall from power to resume the argument for a rounded military establishment as well as an attempt to achieve nuclear superiority over the West.

Dr. Robert L. Garthoff of the United States, a State Department official, said:

"There is simply no way now foreseeable for the Soviet Union to neutralize the United States' strategic capability. This is the underpinning of mutual deterrence. Soviet military men now realize this, though they are compulsively inclined to keep trying. Mr. Khrushchev was not."

### Build-up Held Uncertain

Dr. Garthoff said it was uncertain whether the new Soviet leaders would look favorably on appeals for a renewed military build-up.

"I very much doubt that in the short run they will press the military to follow Mr. Khrushchev's 'new look' course," he said, "but in the long run they will probably pursue much the same policy as he did."

He predicted that the "impulsive swings" of military policy that characterized the Khrushchev era would cease.

"In this sense the new regime will be more conservative," he said. "Whether this will be for the better or worse I do not know."

### The Anti-Missile Missile

Another American specialist, John R. Thomas of the Analysis Research Service, ventured a cautious prediction that the Soviet Union would attempt the huge task of perfecting and replacing a nuclear-defense system based on the anti-missile missile.

He said that Soviet scientists seemed to be mastering the technical problems of the anti-missile missile but that the vast

investment needed to put in a complete system still lay ahead. "The anti-missile missile will impose a severe strain on the Soviet economy with resultant internal political consequences," Mr. Thomas said. "Their experience and subjective attitude suggest that the Soviets are likely to pay the price."

In a much-praised paper on Chinese-Soviet relations, J. M. Mackintosh of the Institute of Strategic Studies in London concluded that "there is little hope of a major reconciliation" between the two leading Communist powers.

The British scholar said the possibility that China might resort to the type of limited border warfare practiced by Chinese warlords in the nineteen-twenties could move Soviet leaders to strengthen their already considerable conventional forces in the Far East.

"In general the military situation is not likely to change substantially and both sides are likely to continue to fear that the other will attempt military solutions," Mr. Mackintosh said.

He declared that the Chinese-Soviet conflict was likely to continue "in less crude form" without prospect of fundamental solutions.

### Ideology Said to Suffer

By HANSON W. BALDWIN

The military revolution, epitomized by nuclear weapons and long-range missiles, has been "undermining the ideological foundations of the Soviet regime," according to Nikolai Y. Galay of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. He expressed this opinion this week at the Munich symposium.

Mr. Galay, one of a number of anti-Communist Russians associated with the institute, has specialized in Soviet military developments and the relationship between the Soviet armed forces and the Communist party.

In Mr. Galay's view, the revolutionary impact of military technology, which was officially recognized and encouraged under Mr. Khrushchev

beginning in the 1960-62 period, has shaken not only the armed forces but also the social and ideological structure of Soviet Communism.

Radical changes, Mr. Galay said in his symposium paper, have already taken place in the Marxist doctrine on war, and the "loss of political primacy over military strategy is automatically undermining the ideological foundations of the Soviet regime."

### 'Withering of Ideology'

Thus "withering of ideology," according to Mr. Galay, is emancipating the mass of the population and the ruling group itself from Communist dogma, but at the same time it has encouraged to some extent "naked militarism, born of the pressure exerted by aggressive military policy and strategy."

"The Soviet leaders," Mr. Galay declared, "may find themselves driven by this factor to resort to open war if their cold war campaign against the West should go against them."

"Under these circumstances, a versatile, flexible, dispersed but at the same time unified and automatically operative nuclear deterrent in the hands of the West, ready to deal with any major world crisis, is the sole guarantee of future freedom."

Mr. Galay made no attempt to analyze the role of the Soviet military in the recent overthrow of Mr. Khrushchev. He said, however, that he thought it was "likely" that Mr. Khrushchev's successors would "conduct a more cautious foreign policy." He added that the "Soviet Army hierarchy cannot currently muster any challenge to the party technocrats who have taken power."