

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10308

5 February 1982

USSR Report

MILITARY AFFAIRS

(FOUO 2/82)

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10308

5 February 1982

USSR REPORT
MILITARY AFFAIRS
(FOUO 2/82)

CONTENTS

MILITARY-POLITICAL ISSUES

Book Excerpts: The Military Bloc Policy of Imperialism
(VOYENNO-BLOKOVAYA POLITIKA IMPERIALIZMA -- ISTORIYA I
SOVREMENNOST', 1980)..... 1

BORDER GUARDS AND INTERNAL TROOPS

Book Excerpts: Border Guard Activities From 1929-1938
(NA STRAZHE SOVETSKIKH RUBEZHEY 1929-1938, 1981)..... 26

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

Books Excerpts: Internationalism and the Socialist Community
(OSNOVA BOYEVOGO SOYUZA, 1981)..... 40

- a -

[III - USSR - 4 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

MILITARY-POLITICAL ISSUES

BOOK EXCERPTS: THE MILITARY BLOC POLICY OF IMPERIALISM

Moscow VOYENNO-BLOKOVAYA POLITIKA IMPERIALIZMA -- ISTORIYA I SOVREMENNOST' in Russian 1980 (signed to press 18 Feb 80) pp 3-4, 452-454, 5-11, 40-42, 80-82, 122-124, 169-171, 202-204, 266-269, 322-324, 401-403, 445-451

[Annotation, table of contents, Introduction, chapter headings, introductory and concluding portions of chapters 1 through 9, and Conclusion of book by O. A. Rzheshhevskiy, A. Karizius et al]

[Excerpts] Title Page:

Title: VOYENNO-BLOKOVAYA POLITIKA IMPERIALIZMA -- ISTORIYA I SOVREMENNOST' (The Military Bloc Policy of Imperialism -- History and the Present Day)
Publisher: Voenizdat
Place and year of publication: Moscow, 1980

Signed to Press Date: 18 February 1980

Number of Copies Published: 30,000

Number of Pages: 454

Brief Description:

This volume, prepared by a team of authors at the USSR Ministry of Defense Institute of Military History and the Military Historical Institute of the GDR, examines the economic, political, and military-strategic principles of the military-bloc policy of the imperialist nations, the organizational structure of military blocs, and their reactionary role in the contemporary international situation. The authors reveal the aggressive, anti-Soviet essence of the military-bloc policy of imperialism and demonstrate its hopelessness.

This volume is intended for a broad readership spectrum.

Table of Contents	Page
Introduction	5

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Chapter One. The Reactionary Essence of the Military-Bloc Policy of the Imperialist Nations	11
1. Marxism-Leninism on the Origin and Reactionary Essence of Military Alliances and Bloc Policy of Imperialism	11
2. Principal Stages and Directions of Development of the Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	25
3. An Antisocialist Thrust -- The Main Feature of Contemporary Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	34
Chapter Two. Collapse of the Anti-Soviet Coalition Strategy of Imperialism During the Years of Foreign Military Intervention and Civil War.....	41
1. The Socialist Revolution in Russia and the Radical Shift in the Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	42
2. Forms and Methods of the Anti-Soviet Bloc Policy of Imperialism in 1917-1920	52
3. Failure of the Plans of International Imperialism to Destroy the Young Soviet Republic	71
Chapter Three. Establishment of the Imperialist Military Coalitions of World War II. Failure of Attempts by Imperialism to Create a Unified Anti-Soviet Bloc (1920's-1930's)	82
1. The Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism Between the Wars and in the First Period of World War II	83
2. Characteristic Features of the Military Doctrines of Imperialist Blocs. Establishment of Agencies of Coalition Leadership	96
3. Collapse of the Anglo-French Coalition	106
4. Struggle by the USSR to Establish a Collective Security System. Failure of Attempts to Organize a New Joint Military Campaign Against the USSR	112
Chapter Four. World War II and the Crisis of International Military-Political Relations of Imperialism	124
1. Features of the Fascist Bloc as the Shock Force of World Reaction Against Socialism	124
2. Growth of Conflicts Within the Fascist-Militarist Bloc and Its Collapse in the Course of World War II	138
3. Historical Significance of the Anti-Hitler Coalition and the Decisive Role of the USSR in the Defeat of Fascism	152
Chapter Five. The Aggressive Essence of the Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism Following World War II	171
1. Change in the World Balance of Power and Its Effect on Military-Bloc Policy	171
2. Fundamentals of the Contemporary Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	180
3. Principal Directions of Formation of a System of Aggressive Blocs ..	195

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Chapter Six. Establishment and Development of NATO -- The Principal Instrument of Aggressive Imperialist Policy (1949-1969)	204
1. NATO -- Imperialism's Largest Aggressive Military-Political Bloc	204
2. NATO Structure and Governing Agencies. Principal Features of Its Political and Military Organization	229
3. NATO Military Strategy and Counterrevolutionary Activities	244
Chapter Seven. "Peripheral" Imperialist Blocs (1945-1970)	268
1. Features of Establishment of a System of "Peripheral" Military Blocs of Imperialism	269
2. "Peripheral" Blocs -- Instrument of Struggle Against the Socialist Community and the National Liberation Movement	286
3. Attempts to Intensify the "Peripheral" Thrust of Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	316
Chapter Eight. The Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism in the 1970's. Evolution of Military-Political Doctrines	324
1. Change in the World Balance of Power in Favor of Socialism and Its Effect on the Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	325
2. Modification and Increased Aggressiveness of the Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	331
3. Evolution of Strategy and Strengthening of the Military Power of the NATO Bloc	354
4. Crisis Phenomena in the System of "Peripheral" Military Blocs and Attempts to Increase Their Activeness in the Struggle Against the Principal Revolutionary Forces of the Contemporary Era	382
Chapter Nine. The Struggle of the Soviet Union, the Nations of the Socialist Community, and All Peace-Seeking Forces Against the Aggressive Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	403
1. Peace Program of the Socialist Nations and the Campaign Against Imperialist Military-Bloc Policy	404
2. Role of the Warsaw Pact Organization in Thwarting the Aggressive Plans of Imperialism	414
3. Struggle of the Worker, Communist and General Democratic Movement in the Capitalist Countries Against the Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	428
4. The National Liberation Movement -- Important Factor in the Struggle Against Military-Bloc Policy of Imperialism	437
Conclusion	447

INTRODUCTION

Mankind's entry into the final quarter of the 20th century was marked by a further change in the correlation of forces in favor of socialism and to the detriment of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

imperialism. Two basic trends are clashing increasingly more clearly in world politics, one of which, which has been dominant throughout the last decade, leads along the road toward further détente, while the other, hindering this movement and escalating tension, is creating an increasing threat to the cause of peace, democracy, and social progress.

Imperialist military blocs occupy a leading position among those forces which embody the latter trend, which seek to hinder the consolidation of positive changes in the world arena.

The military-bloc policy of imperialism is rooted in the history of the exploiter society. Imperialist nations have united into military-political alliances for the mutual struggle for spheres of influence, for sources of raw materials and markets, and for strengthening class supremacy within the individual countries. The victory of the Great October Revolution in Russia and emergence of the world's first socialist state determined the new thrust of imperialist military-bloc policy. Beginning in October 1917, its main task was organization of joint actions against the new social system and the forces supporting it.

As early as 1915 V. I. Lenin had written of the possibility of provisional agreements between capitalists and capitalist powers in order "to crush socialism in concert...."¹ In 1917-1920 the imperialists in fact attempted to unite all forces of reaction and counterrevolution in order to strangle the young Soviet Republic. On the eve of World War II they once again undertook efforts to establish a unified anti-Soviet imperialist bloc. When this was unsuccessful, however, the bloc of fascist states went to war against the nation of socialism. Following World War II there occurred a substantial intensification of the trend toward establishment of imperialist military blocs directed against socialism, in connection with deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and weakening of its forces.

In a situation of aggravation of the struggle between the two world systems, the capitalist countries, in spite of growing conflicts which divide them, are endeavoring to unite their efforts for the purpose of preserving and strengthening the doomed exploiter system. By establishing reactionary, aggressive military-political alliances, the imperialists are attempting to strengthen their position against the world socialist system, the international worker class, and the national liberation movement, and to thwart advance of the world revolutionary process by means of forcible interference in the affairs of other countries.

U.S. ruling circles began to play a leadership role in determining the military-bloc policy of imperialism in the postwar period. At U.S. initiative the aggressive NATO bloc was established in 1949, which became transformed into the largest and most highly organized military-political grouping of capitalist nations. In addition to NATO, a number "peripheral" military blocs were established under U.S. aegis. Addressing the June 1976 Conference of European Communist and Worker Parties, L. I. Brezhnev noted that "our common class adversary -- the international bourgeoisie -- is displaying many examples of international coordination of his actions in the struggle against revolutionary forces. Wherever the exploiter system is under threat, wherever forces of national and social liberation, democratic forces are gaining the upper hand in the struggle, imperialism undertakes

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

literally feverish attempts to coordinate its counterattacks, and there are many current examples of this -- in Europe, in Africa, and elsewhere."²

Today, when the advantages of socialism over capitalism are becoming increasingly obvious, coordination of the actions of imperialism in the military-political area is being intensified. Stepping up the activities of military blocs and continuously escalating the arms race, imperialism is attempting to create insurmountable difficulties for the struggle of peoples for peace and social progress. The system of military blocs is viewed, within the framework of this class strategy of reactionary forces, as the most effective foundation for utilization of the military power of international imperialism against socialism.

It is important to find for the socialist community and for all peace-seeking forces effective ways to counter the stepped-up military-political activities of imperialism and the growing threat of war. The policy of peaceful coexistence between nations with differing social systems, a policy which is pursued by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, demands an end to military confrontation. E. Honecker emphasized in the Report to the Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany: "For us Communists peaceful coexistence means peace between socialist and capitalist nations and development of mutually beneficial cooperation on a basis of equality.... Peaceful coexistence signifies neither preservation of the socioeconomic status quo nor ideological coexistence."³

In spite of the conflictive nature of the international détente which has begun in recent years, there are realistic possibilities for success in the difficult struggle for triumph of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The military-bloc policy of imperialism, directed toward maintaining tension, is opposed by the economic and military power of the nations of the socialist community, their vigorous peace-seeking foreign policy, the revolutionary worker movement in developed capitalist countries, and the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The aggressiveness of imperialism, however, and its reactionary class nature continue to be maintained. With great persistence it seeks to attain its aggressive aims, which can lead to rapid, unexpected shifts in the international political situation and to the emergence of new focal points of war. It is primarily the military blocs of imperialism which create a foundation for this.

In spite of the great urgency of the problem of the genesis and present-day manifestations of the military-bloc policy of imperialism, it has not yet been investigated to a sufficient degree, although in recent years a number of studies have been published in the USSR, GDR, PPR and other socialist countries dealing with an analysis of new phenomena characteristic of contemporary state-monopoly imperialism, the processes of capitalist integration, international monopolies, and certain aspects of the organizational development and activities of military blocs of imperialism.

For well-known reasons synthesizing studies on aspects of this type are entirely lacking or are extremely rare in bourgeois historiography. Ruling circles in the West have no desire for the publication of studies which would shed light on the history of collective military-political actions by imperialism against the socialist community and the national liberation movement, because this would reveal the reactionary, aggressive nature of the military-bloc policy of imperialism,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

directed against social progress. Anticommunism and anti-Sovietism have comprised the ideological foundation of all bourgeois literature dealing with military-bloc policy since the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Existing military-historical literature by bourgeois authors on military blocs is for the most part of an apologia nature. Mild criticism of the military-bloc policy of the imperialist powers, which is sometimes encountered in the West, is essentially aimed at adapting this policy to changes in the international arena and thus at increasing its effectiveness.

This present volume, prepared by military historians of the USSR and GDR, investigates the military-bloc policy of imperialism, its aggressive nature and objectives, content and forms, its evolution over the course of the last 60 years, and synthesizes the results of the struggle against this policy by contemporary progressive forces.

The team of authors set for itself the task of examining as an aggregate the military-bloc policy of the imperialist nations sequentially, through the course of the contemporary era -- the era of a historic contest between socialism and capitalism and choice of the road to socialism by more and more peoples. The chronological framework and nature of the study make it possible to elucidate and show the patterns and mechanisms, specific trends, as well as development prospects of one of the most dangerous directions of foreign and military policy of the imperialist nations.

The writings of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, documents of the international Communist and worker movement and the writings of prominent figures in this movement which reveal the specific features and most significant traits in the evolution of imperialist policy, the strategy and tactics of struggle by progressive forces for peace, democracy and social progress serve as the methodological foundation for preparation of this study. These writings and documents constituted a reliable compass for investigating the patterns, mechanisms and cause-effect relationships in the bloc policy of imperialism, for producing fundamental assessments of its class thrust and role in preparation for and initiation of wars and armed conflicts at various stages of our era.

Of great methodological significance for this study were such Leninist theses as the law of nonuniformity and unevenness of the economic development of capitalism in the era of imperialism, discovered by V. I. Lenin, Lenin's determination of the possibilities and limits of unification of capitalist nations into various blocs and military coalitions in the interests of joint struggle against the world revolutionary process, V. I. Lenin's conclusion on the unifying and disuniting forces both within mutually hostile imperialist groupings and within the imperialist system as a whole.

The military-bloc policy of imperialism is examined in this volume through a prism of analysis of the aims, principles and methods of operation of various military blocs, as a phenomenon which is organically linked with changes in the international situation, the foreign and domestic policy of the leading imperialist powers, their economy, military doctrines and strategy.

Following the demand of comprehensive discussion of the military-bloc policy of imperialism and elucidation of its interrelationship with various external factors,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the authors always had the main thing in mind -- to reveal and expose the concrete content of this policy, which is directed primarily toward creating favorable external political conditions for preparation for and conduct of aggression by a given group of imperialist nations.

The book consists essentially of two parts. The first part reveals the essence of the military-bloc policy of the imperialist nations and presents an analysis of this policy from the foreign military intervention against Soviet Russia during the civil war years up to the end of World War II. In this part is revealed the reactionary role of such imperialist blocs as the Entente and the Quadripartite Alliance, in support of the struggle by the White Guardists against the first worker-peasant state in Russia, and in putting down socialist revolutions in a number of other countries; the authors analyze the process of emergence, the structure, organization, policy and strategy of the fascist-militarist bloc and the Anglo-French coalition, and reveal the reasons for the defeat of the latter in the summer of 1940; they show the struggle of the Soviet Union against reactionary attempts to establish a unified anti-Soviet bloc of imperialist nations on the eve of World War II, and the decisive role of the USSR in the defeat of the fascist-militarist bloc and in establishment of an anti-Hitler coalition.

In the second part of this study, which deals with investigation of the military-bloc policy of imperialism since 1945, the authors discuss the fundamentals of the contemporary bloc policy of imperialism, analyze such military blocs and groupings as NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, and others, and show the scope and effectiveness of the struggle of peace-seeking forces, headed by the USSR, against the danger of another world war.

The military-bloc policy of imperialism is examined in light of its role and place in the struggle between two opposing social systems -- capitalism and socialism. The authors demonstrate that the imperialist system is doomed and show the increasingly glaring discrepancy between the endeavor by the imperialist powers to hold their present position and the steadily shrinking capabilities at their disposal. In spite of attempts to gather together all the forces of imperialism within the framework of military blocs to combat genuine socialism, the military-bloc policy of imperialism is for all practical purposes unable to accomplish this task. The future belongs to socialism.

This volume is only a first step in comprehensive investigation of the multifaceted problem of the history and contemporary development of the military-bloc policy of imperialism. The authors express the hope that their modest labor will draw the attention of a broader group of specialists toward study of the historical-theoretical problems of the military-bloc policy of imperialism and exposure of its threat to peace and social progress and will promote further increase in the vigilance of peoples in the struggle against the aggressive intrigues of international reaction.

FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 26, page 354.
2. L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom. Rechi i stat'i" [Following a Leninist Course. Speeches and Articles], Vol 6, Moscow, 1978, page 63.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

3. E. Khondker, "Vozrast Tsentral'nogo Komiteta SEDG IX s"yezdu Sotsialisticheskoy yedinoy partii Germanii" [Central Committee Report to the Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany], Dresden, 1976, page 21.

Chapter One. THE REACTIONARY ESSENCE OF THE MILITARY-BLOC POLICY OF THE IMPERIALIST NATIONS

Elucidation of the sociopolitical essence of the military-bloc policy of imperialism is one of the most important prerequisites for analysis of the historical development and contemporary manifestations of this policy. A product of the era of imperialism, this policy is rooted in the military policy of the exploiter classes of preceding socioeconomic systems. At all stages of development of the military-bloc policy of imperialism its essence has remained unchanged, as has the predatory, aggressive nature of the imperialism which engenders it. Today, when imperialism has been placed by the inexorable course of historical development before the necessity of adapting to the changes in the correlation of forces which have taken place in the world, military-bloc policy is one of the means with the aid of which the leading imperialist powers are attempting to reverse the course of historical progress. Disclosure of the essence and basic content of the contemporary military-bloc policy of imperialism is of cardinal significance for success in the campaign for military détente and for radical reorganization of international military-political relations in the interests of peace and social progress of mankind.

* * *

Thus military-bloc policy is one of the most important trends in imperialist aggressive policy as a whole. Possessing a long prehistory, connected with the evolution of military alliances and coalitions of the preimperialist eras, military-bloc policy under imperialism has acquired a deeper and more elaborate socioeconomic foundation, which has placed an imprint both on the substance and on the form of military blocs. The turning point in man's history accomplished by the Great October Socialist Revolution signified a substantial change in the distribution of class forces in the international arena. The appearance of a new socioeconomic system -- socialism -- placed anti-Sovietism and anticommunism at the apex of the military-bloc policy of imperialism.

Chapter Two. COLLAPSE OF THE ANTI-SOVIET COALITION STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM DURING THE YEARS OF FOREIGN MILITARY INTERVENTION AND CIVIL WAR

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia shook capitalism to its very foundations and aggravated its general crisis. The world had split into two opposing social systems. The struggle between them now became the focal point of the class struggle on an international scale.

The imperialist powers saw in the appearance of the first socialist state in the world arena and in its foreign and domestic policy a threat to the stability of the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

foundations of capitalism and a serious obstacle to their colonial policy. Their attitude toward the new, Soviet Russia was determined by the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie and by the class hatred of the capitalists toward the proletariat. This led to radical changes in the military-bloc policy of imperialism. Imperialist military coalitions began to display first and foremost an anti-Soviet, anticommunist character, and their activities were directed against the revolutionary gains of the working people.

The reason for such a change in military-bloc policy proceeded from the very essence of imperialism, from the irreconcilable class conflict between the capitalists and the proletariat, and from an endeavor on the part of the monopoly bourgeoisie to preserve its domination and to crush its class enemy. A qualitatively new, second stage had begun in the military-bloc policy of imperialism.

The imperialist powers attempted with all means at hand to impede the emergence of this new societal system. Immediately following the October Revolution they adopted a policy aimed at destroying the Soviet State. This task was complicated by the state of war between the two imperialist coalitions. Both military groupings of imperialists employed diversified forms and methods of struggle against the Soviet Republic. Main emphasis was placed on snuffing out the young Soviet Republic by means of armed violence. Military intervention, in which both imperialist blocs actively participated, was supplemented by vigorous support of domestic counterrevolution. Such forms of military-bloc policy of imperialism as economic blockades, subversive propaganda, diplomatic isolation, and others were also employed.

Substantial efforts were undertaken by influential circles of the opposing military blocs to establish a united imperialist front against the world's first socialist state. Acute imperialist conflicts between the powers of the Entente and the Quadripartite Alliance, however, which in addition were skillfully exploited by the young Soviet Republic in its foreign policy, impeded the establishment of such a front on a world scale. During the first years of existence of the Soviet Republic the military-bloc policy of imperialism went through a number of stages. At first both blocs independently undertook armed aggression against the Soviet Republic, while subsequently one of the blocs placed its money on domestic counterrevolutionary forces; after this an attempt was made to establish an anti-Soviet bloc of neighboring bourgeois states. Resolute resistance to the interventionists and internal counterrevolution, organized under the leadership of the Communist Party, led to total failure of the military campaign by imperialism against the Soviet Republic.

* * *

The imperialists sought to prevent the existence of the new, socialist system. Immediately following the Great October Socialist Revolution they embarked upon a course of policy aimed at destroying the Soviet State. An important role in carrying out this plan was assigned to an aggressive military-bloc policy. Both imperialist groupings -- the Quadripartite Alliance and the Entente -- employed the most diversified forms and methods of anti-Soviet actions. Main emphasis was placed on defeating the young Soviet Republic with the aid of military force. The armed intervention, in which both blocs actively participated, constituted open,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

gross intervention by the imperialist powers in the internal affairs of the Soviet State. Aggressively utilizing military-bloc policy, they offered collective assistance to the domestic counterrevolutionaries, supplying the White Guardist armies with combat equipment, arms and gear. Subversive propaganda, economic blockade and diplomatic isolation of the Soviet Republic became important component parts of bloc policy.

Influential circles in the opposing imperialist coalitions sought to establish a united front to gain military defeat of the world's first socialist state. The existence of major conflicts between the blocs, however, which were skillfully exploited by the foreign policy of the Soviet Republic, prevented the establishment of a formal alliance between these coalitions.

The new system, engendered by the Great October Revolution, withstood the onslaught of the united forces of imperialism. Socialism proved to have more sources of strength than capitalism. These sources included the dedication of the workers and peasants of Russia to the Soviet Government, their solidarity behind the Communist Party, and their heroic, self-sacrificing struggle against the foreign interventionists and White Guardists. Russia's working people, together with the proletariat of other countries, dealt a first crushing blow against anti-Soviet bloc policy.

Chapter Three. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE IMPERIALIST MILITARY COALITIONS OF
WORLD WAR II. FAILURE OF ATTEMPTS BY IMPERIALISM TO CREATE A UNIFIED
ANTI-SOVIET BLOC (1920's-1930's)

The military-bloc policy of imperialism after World War I and the failure of military intervention in Soviet Russia evolved under conditions of further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Under the influence of the fundamental conflict of the era -- the conflict between capitalism and socialism -- the interimperialist struggle became increasingly more closely interwoven with the intensifying struggle by world reaction against the first worker and peasant state and with attempts to destroy mankind's greatest achievements, which were embodied by the Soviet Union.

Up to the mid-1930's the victors in World War I -- the United States, Great Britain, and France -- succeeded in securing for themselves an advantageous balance of power in the capitalist world. The activities of the governments of these countries reflected a trend of the bloc policy of imperialism which was predominant in that period, expressed in an aspiration to unite in a "crusade" against the USSR.

As a consequence of the nonuniformity of capitalist development, which became intensified as a result of the 1929-1933 crisis, as well as the move by countries with fascist-militarist regimes to aggressive actions in Europe, Asia and Africa, beginning in the mid-1930's there was a sharp increase in the trend toward establishment of mutually hostile imperialist groupings, and the Western powers stepped up attempts to resolve aggravated imperialist conflicts at the expense of the USSR, at the cost of betrayal of other countries and peoples, which in the final analysis led to World War II.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

* * *

One of the important features of development of imperialist military-bloc policy in the prewar period was the fact that the forming of mutually antagonistic imperialist groupings took place in conditions of an acute struggle between unifying and disuniting tendencies. This created the preconditions for the abrupt development of bloc policy -- for swift changes in the composition of imperialist groupings, their strength and immediate objectives. This process was manifested in concentrated form at the stage of the prewar crisis, when a sharp aggravation of interimperialist conflicts led to a clash between two imperialist blocs -- the beginning of World War II.

Considerable influence on the forming and development of military-bloc policy was also exerted by the subjective factor, that is, the character of political, diplomatic and military decisions made by various nations and groupings.

The campaign being conducted by the Soviet Union and other progressive forces to establish a system of collective security and organization of joint resistance to fascist aggression was the only possibility of averting World War II. "During those years when the threat of fascist aggression hung over the world," stated L. I. Brezhnev, "the Soviet Union was persistently campaigning for establishment of a system of collective security which could restrain the aggressors and prevent World War II."¹

The possibility of establishing a system of collective security and of preventing World War II proceeded from objective premises: fascist aggression threatened not only the USSR but also Great Britain, France, the United States, and a number of other capitalist countries. The anti-Soviet thrust in their policy, however, prevented them from joining in a common front of struggle against the fascist invaders and placed the Soviet Union in a position of political isolation and direct threat of aggression from West and East.

In the prevailing conditions of the international situation, the Communist Party and Soviet Government, exploiting the conflicts between the imperialist groupings, were able temporarily to divert the military threat from the USSR and to gain almost 2 years to strengthen this country's defense capability and to lay the groundwork for subsequent establishment of an anti-Hitler coalition and future victory over fascism and militarism. The failure of the imperialist plans for a united anti-Soviet campaign, which threatened the existence of the USSR and the fate of world socialism and progress, was an outstanding achievement of the Communist Party and Soviet Government, a brilliant example of elaboration and execution of military-political decisions on the basis of a Marxist analysis of the distribution of class forces and trends in the bloc policy of imperialism.

FOOTNOTE

1. L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom. Rechi i stat'i" [Following a Leninist Course. Speeches and Articles], Vol 2, Moscow, 1973, page 123.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Chapter Four. WORLD WAR II AND THE CRISIS OF INTERNATIONAL MILITARY-POLITICAL RELATIONS OF IMPERIALISM

The sharp, irreconcilable conflicts caused by the increasingly more uneven political and economic development of the main capitalist countries in the 1920's and 1930's led to the formation of two mutually opposing imperialist groupings. They were united by anticommunism. Both groupings sought to inflict military defeat on the Soviet Union and on this basis to resolve the conflicts within the capitalist system.

The military-political calculations of the ruling circles of Great Britain, France, and the United States consisted in channeling the aggressive aspirations of Germany against the USSR and thus putting an end to the socialist state. But nevertheless World War II began as a conflict between the opposing imperialist alliances. In the summer of 1940 the Anglo-French coalition suffered a number of serious defeats in the struggle against the fascist-militarist bloc, which led to its collapse.

Strengthened by seizure of the countries of Western, Central and Southern Europe, fascist Germany proceeded with execution of its main plan -- aggression against the USSR. As the Hitlerite leadership conceived it, defeat of the Soviet State and enslavement of the Soviet people would not only lead to achievement by fascism of its class aspirations, but also to removal of the main obstacle in the path of establishment of world domination by the Third Reich. Preparing for war against the USSR, Hitlerite Germany and the fascist-militarist bloc it had created opposed socialism as the main shock force of world reaction.

* * *

The process of formation of mutually opposing military coalitions on the eve of and during World War II expressed on the whole the development of the principal conflict of the era between the world of capitalism and the world of socialism. Therefore final polarization of forces and the hammering together of military coalitions took place in the final analysis around two countries: the shock force of imperialism and reaction -- fascist Germany -- and the most consistent adversary of imperialism, fighter for democracy and social progress -- the Soviet Union.

The main feature of the fascist bloc was the fact that it began to be formed even prior to the outbreak of war -- on the basis of anticommunist, antidemocratic and aggressive aims, on the basis of the dictate of a single, mightiest power, which prior to the attack on the Soviet Union, in view of the fact that the opposing forces were splintered, achieved substantial military-political success.

In contrast to the fascist bloc, the anti-Hitler coalition began to be formed following the collapse of the Anglo-French military alliance, during the period of defeats of the capitalist countries which were forced, in order to save themselves, to join forces with the principal adversary of the fascist bloc -- the Soviet Union -- which became the main force in the military defeat of the aggressors and saving mankind from fascist enslavement. The outstanding victories of the Soviet Armed Forces and the consistent policy of the socialist state aimed at strengthening relations between allies, became the cementing force of the anti-Hitler

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

coalition and served as the basis for the crushing defeat of the fascist-militarist bloc.

Nevertheless the social conflictiveness of the coalition was in evidence throughout the war. Two policy lines were constantly in struggle during the war. The USSR was consistently and unswervingly seeking the adoption of decisions aimed at achieving the earliest possible victory and elaboration of democratic principles of postwar arrangement of the world. The Western powers sought to subordinate conduct of the war and resolution of postwar problems to imperialist interests.

Definition of war aims, coordination of war plans and hammering out the basic principles of the postwar peace settlement were the most complex area in attainment of mutually acceptable political solutions. The policy of the Soviet Union won out, which enabled the anti-Hitler coalition successfully to accomplish its principal tasks. The policy pursued by the Western powers was leading to prolonging the war and shifting its main burden onto the shoulders of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces. In addition, temporary alliance with the USSR did not signify a change in the anticommunist and antisocialist aims of the imperialist powers. This was particularly clearly evidenced following the defeat of the fascist-militarist bloc.

As a result of a radical change in the world balance of power following World War II in favor of socialism, the conflicts between the imperialist powers receded to the background. Development of the third, postwar stage of the military-bloc policy of imperialism was characterized by a dominant tendency toward worldwide unification of all forces of imperialism against social progress, and particularly against socialism, which had become a worldwide system.

Chapter Five. THE AGGRESSIVE ESSENCE OF THE MILITARY-BLOC POLICY OF
IMPERIALISM FOLLOWING WORLD WAR II

After World War II a new, third stage began in implementation of the military-bloc policy of imperialism, which is still continuing today. A radical change in the world balance of power in favor of socialism as well as redistribution of forces within the imperialist system have become characteristic of the international situation. Consolidation of the three main revolutionary forces of the present day was a distinctive feature of this situation; this consolidation was expressed in establishment of a world socialist system, growth of the worker and Communist movement, and development of the national liberation movement. Deepening of the general crisis of capitalism was occurring in an inseparable link with development of the world revolutionary process. As the struggle of revolutionary forces developed following World War II, there also was occurring an intensification of the subversive activities of the imperialist powers and their allies, aimed at shifting from defense to offense and weakening, and paralyzing if possible, the growing influence of the forces of socialism and peace. In these conditions the imperialist powers resorted to employment of diversified means and methods in the global struggle against democratic and revolutionary forces, primarily against socialism. The military-bloc policy of imperialism assumed qualitatively new features. The growing

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Influence of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism narrowed the possibilities of imperialist policy. At the same time the reactionary, aggressive essence of imperialism and its antisocialist aims remained unchanged.

* * *

The principal factor which determined development of the military-bloc policy of imperialism following World War II was the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Establishment of a world socialist system, collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and the emergence of a large number of young independent states, as well as growth of the worker movement in the capitalist countries narrowed the possibilities of actions by imperialism but did not change its aggressive, adventurist nature.

Reaction by imperialism to the progressing development of the world revolutionary process in conditions of a radical change in the world balance of power in favor of socialism was expressed in concentration of the efforts of all capitalist countries and a trend toward establishment of an international antisocialist military alliance under the sponsorship of the major imperialist power -- the United States. The aggregate of imperialist military blocs, around which are also grouped other countries linked to the leading imperialist powers by bilateral agreements, comprise the military-political foundation of this coalition. Creation of a system of imperialist military blocs signified concentration in the hands of imperialism of enormous military power directed primarily against the USSR, the other countries of the socialist community, and the international worker and national liberation movement, and constituted a dangerous source of imperialist aggression and threat of war.

Analysis of the foundations of imperialist military-bloc policy attests to its aggressive nature, dictated by the essence of contemporary state-monopoly capitalism and constituting an expression of the interests of the most reactionary monopoly bourgeois circles. Military-bloc policy reflects the principal stages of development of the global imperialist strategy of war and aggression. The activities of the imperialist blocs is of a clearly marked class character and serves as affirmation of the domination of an exploiter elite in the countries of the world capitalist system.

The realm of military-bloc policy is subjected to the action of two trends -- centripetal and centrifugal, the development and struggle of which is influenced by the correlation of forces in the world arena and within the capitalist system. In recent years there has been clear evidence of the fact that the military-bloc policy of imperialism is being subjected to serious crisis phenomena, which is confirmed by the collapse of certain blocs. The establishment and activities of imperialist military-political blocs in the postwar period, however, indicates that one should not underestimate or ignore to the slightest degree the aggregate economic power and integrated military strength of imperialism, its aggressive aims, programs and plans, and its striving toward unification on an anti-Communist basis. This would signify loss of a realistic approach to reality, and forgetting Lenin's statement on the necessity of revolutionary vigilance in regard to the class enemy -- the bourgeoisie -- which "is prepared to perpetrate any barbarous acts, atrocities and criminal actions in order to defend the moribund system of capitalist enslavement."¹

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOOTNOTE

1. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 23, page 166.

Chapter Six. ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATO -- THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUMENT OF AGGRESSIVE IMPERIALIST POLICY (1949-1969)

After World War II the military-bloc policy of imperialism found its most consistent expression in the activities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

This bloc, established at U.S. initiative, became the nucleus of the entire postwar system of aggressive military-political blocs, the main instrument of the global strategy of U.S. imperialism, which aims at world domination. This aggressive bloc has pushed the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe time and again through its activities, which are directed against the socialist community and the world revolutionary movement.

The United States and the other imperialist powers, however, uniting in NATO their vast military and economic potential, were unable to achieve their aims of "containing," "pushing back" and destroying genuine socialism. The reverse happened. The growing might of the socialist community and the attractive force of its peace-seeking foreign policy not only successfully withstood the bloc policy of the NATO powers but also promoted an increase in the crisis within this aggressive military-political grouping. The capitalist countries within the bloc were forced to adapt to the new conditions of the international situation.

* * *

By the beginning of the 1970's the more than 20-year history of NATO clearly attested to the fact that the military-bloc policy being conducted by reactionary monopoly capital groups in the United States, the FRG, Great Britain and the other NATO countries against the Soviet Union and the socialist community presented a serious military danger to the forces of peace, socialism, and social progress. Since World War II reactionary forces had succeeded in unifying the military potential of almost all highly-developed capitalist countries in a volume and scope unprecedented in history, in gathering these countries into a single military bloc, and in accomplishing moral and material preparations for war by armed forces and nations according to uniform principles, which led to aggravation of the international situation and especially to intensification of the danger of war. In spite of all this, they failed to achieve their stated objective of driving back and destroying the socialist countries. NATO, as an instrument of a predatory foreign policy, was unable to help either the U.S. monopolies implement their global strategy in Europe, Southeast Asia and the Near East, nor the FRG imperialists to carry out their revanchist plans in regard to the GDR and the other socialist nations.

In the 1950's and 1960's the world balance of power was shifting increasingly more obviously in favor of the nations of the socialist community. The general crisis of capitalism entered its third stage. It became considerably aggravated at the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

end of the 1960's in all its manifestations. The fiasco of the military-bloc policy of monopoly capital was obvious not only in the example of NATO but also in that of the "peripheral" imperialist military blocs.

The forced adaptation by imperialism to the changed world balance of power at the end of the 1960's also affected military-bloc policy. Militant NATO leaders, however, refused to give up their aggressive plans of struggle, fraught with the threat of war, against the nations of the socialist community and the other principal revolutionary forces of the contemporary era.

Chapter Seven. "PERIPHERAL" IMPERIALIST BLOCS (1945-1970)

The military-bloc policy of imperialism in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other parts of the world pursued the principal mission of struggle against the socialist system. Aggressive military-political alliances and exclusive groupings which "supplemented" NATO, enveloping the socialist countries with a chain of military-strategic bridgeheads intended for initiating new wars, became the main instrument of this policy on the "periphery" of the capitalist world. Another aim of military-bloc policy was suppression of the liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries. The imperialist powers, relying on "peripheral" blocs, sought to prevent disintegration of the colonial system, to hinder oppressed peoples from gaining independence, and to prevent liberated countries from choosing socialism or a road of noncapitalist development.

Diversified forms of bloc policy were employed to attain these two basic goals: establishment of military-political blocs headed by imperialist powers, into which liberated countries were drawn; formation of military coalitions headed by imperialist nations for the purpose of waging wars against socialist or liberated countries; transformation of disintegrating colonial empires into military-political neocolonial confederations, as well as organization of military groupings within them. In addition, bilateral military agreements were reached within the framework of military-bloc policy, a system of military strongpoints was established which encompassed the entire world, the main imperialist powers forced military assistance on young national states, and attempts were made to utilize regional associations of liberated nations for the military purposes of monopoly capital.

The military-bloc policy of imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America was developing in a situation of profound imperialist conflicts. The struggle between the old colonial powers and the United States, which was playing the role of hegemonic power of the capitalist world, assumed a particularly acute character.

* * *

Establishment of a system of "peripheral" blocs in Asia, Africa and Latin America, closely linked with NATO and with each other, aimed at strengthening the "rear" and "flanks" of the imperialist camp in the world war which was being planned against the USSR and the entire socialist community, as well as crushing of the worker and national liberation movement. In the 1950's and 1960's the imperialist powers, headed by the United States, extensively employed a system of "peripheral" blocs for

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

material preparations for another world war, suppression of the revolutionary and national liberation movement, and local wars. The "peripheral" military blocs promoted to a significant degree the maintenance of focal points of political tension and armed conflicts in the zone of national liberation. The "peripheral" blocs, however, were less cohesive than NATO; deep conflicts and centrifugal trends developed within them, undermining the unity of policy of the leading imperialist powers and the leadership role of the United States. The bloc system created by imperialism contained very substantial "flaws" from the standpoint of imperialism. In the first place, plans to establish an all-encompassing system of these blocs proved unsound. Dozens of liberated nations not only did not affiliate with blocs but established close relations with the socialist countries, in many instances relying on their military systems. The movement of the masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America, vigorously opposing imperialist military-bloc policy, took on an extensive international character. Secondly, the blocs themselves were internally unstable, and participation in them evoked dissatisfaction both on the part of the developing and certain capitalist countries, especially in matters of forms and methods of general policy, and resistance to Washington's dictate. Third, the created blocs, especially the Baghdad Pact and SEATO, proved little effective in the face of major international political crises, wars and military conflicts. In order to wage local wars the imperialist powers were compelled to create special military coalitions, in the formation of which bilateral military agreements "operated" most reliably, while puppet regimes which were not bloc members were the most vigorous assistants of U.S. imperialism. There was no success in creating joint military forces in any of the "peripheral" blocs.

Membership in blocs had a pernicious effect on developing countries, since it resulted in rule by reactionary regimes, for the most part military dictatorships, excessive expenditures on maintaining constantly growing armed forces, and enormous material and human sacrifices in connection with involvement in local imperialist wars. This evoked dissatisfaction on the part of the worker masses and led to complication of the internal situation in these countries.

The activities of the "peripheral" blocs were fraught with enormous danger for the national liberation and revolutionary movement. They continued to remain a serious military threat for the socialist countries and independent national states in both hemispheres and a source of military and political pressure and subversive activities in countries sharing a common border with them. The "peripheral" blocs frustrated détente in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The bloc member countries were virtually isolating themselves from the forces of peace and progress and were doomed to follow the neocolonialist policy of imperialism.

By the end of the 1960's, however, progressive mankind, headed by the USSR and the nations of the socialist community, had achieved major success in the struggle against imperialist war and aggression. This had the most direct and immediate influence on the effectiveness of the military-bloc policy of imperialism in the "Third World" countries. The forces of reaction and militarism began seeking new ways to maintain their influence in existing blocs, attempting to alter the world balance of power in favor of capitalism by means of regrouping. Therefore ruling circles of the imperialist powers directed particular attention to regional groupings, which constituted nominally independent alliances of liberated nations. Liberated countries, endeavoring to achieve economic independence and liberation

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

from the domination of foreign capital, sought in regional associations compensation for their economic weakness. At the same time the imperialist powers, particularly the United States, stepped up attempts to transform these regional associations into military blocs subordinate to their dictate. The NATO military bloc, nucleus of the military-bloc system, was the point of departure for these actions.

Chapter Eight. THE MILITARY-BLOC POLICY OF IMPERIALISM IN THE 1970'S. EVOLUTION OF MILITARY-POLITICAL DOCTRINES

At the end of the 1960's failure of the postwar antisocialist strategy of imperialism became an obvious fact. The determining causes of the failure were, on the one hand, further upsurge in the world revolutionary movement, and particularly the successes of world socialism, and on the other hand, deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. In the prevailing conditions the military-bloc policy of imperialism was undergoing significant changes. Reflected in it to a greater degree than in other policy areas of the main imperialist powers was the endeavor to adapt to the new correlation of forces in the international arena and to overcome further development of the deep crisis phenomena which are organically characteristic of this policy.

As is indicated in the Program of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, however, the process of adaptation to new conditions "does not alter the substance of imperialism, its adventuristic and predatory nature. It craves maximum profits, intensifies exploitation, oppression and expansion, and seeks ways and means to arrest and prevent the further development of antiimperialist, democratic forces. It utilizes all the potential capabilities at its disposal to carry out its dangerous, aggressive plans. Preservation and expansion of its position, undermining and destruction of the socialist system remain the primary objective of imperialism."¹ The leading imperialist powers perceive in modification of military-bloc policy a convenient method of uniting and utilizing in a more concentrated manner all the political, economic and military resources of world imperialism in the struggle against socialism and other forces of the world revolutionary process.

* * *

In the 1970's ruling circles in the United States and the leading NATO member nations and other capitalist countries proceeded to increase their efforts further to activate the military-bloc policy of imperialism, expand its area of action and increase the military potential of imperialism. These efforts correspond to the principal direction of imperialist policy at the contemporary stage: attempts by the international monopoly bourgeoisie to find in unification of its efforts, on the basis of a common political and military strategy and in alliance with the Chinese leaders, ways of combating the main forces of the world revolutionary process which promise success. L. I. Brezhnev noted at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Worker Parties that ruling circles of the monopoly bourgeoisie are attempting to stop the general crisis of capitalism "by invigorating the imperialists' military-political blocs...."²

Created as an instrument of the global strategy of imperialism during the "cold war" years, military blocs are today more than at any time in the past an anachronism in

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

international relations. They represent the principal obstacle in the path of further advance of political détente and concrete measures aimed at ending the arms race, at arms limitations and disarmament. U.S. ruling circles as well as other centers of imperialist rivalry continue to reject all proposals by the socialist nations on putting an end to military confrontation and on the simultaneous, gradual dissolving of military groupings. Military force continues to be viewed by these circles as a means of attaining their foreign policy objectives. Only the forms and methods of its application change, in relation to the current correlation of forces.

Military blocs, and particularly NATO, continue to remain the principal centers of preparation for war. Proof of this is the fact that the imperialists are seeking new variations of aggressive foreign policy doctrine and military strategy, the escalating arms race, efforts aimed at expanding political and military cooperation among the imperialist countries which are members of military blocs, and acting in concert in the conduct of disarmament talks. Preparations by the armed forces of military blocs for aggressive actions on any scale are continuously escalating, and concentration of NATO troops on the European continent is continuing to increase. Increasingly larger stockpiles of arms are being built up, including mass destruction weapons, and the military infrastructure is steadily improving. These extensive military preparations in peacetime are taking the form of attempts by imperialist nations to use military force to exert pressure and threats directed primarily against the socialist countries.

Military blocs are used to maintain existing focal points of war and to create new military conflicts. It is characteristic that new military blocs or military-political groupings are usually established in such regions. Wherever an upsurge in the revolutionary liberation struggle threatens the position and interests of imperialism, new methods of military-bloc policy are usually born.

The contemporary military-bloc policy of imperialism most vividly expresses the aggressive essence of the domination of the monopolies. In spite of conflicts and competition, the monopoly bourgeoisie seeks to unite into military-political alliances in order to forestall the inevitable collapse of world imperialism. Being the last exploiter class of human society, it is attempting to utilize all the means and methods of class struggle at its disposal, including armed violence, in hopes of preserving its class rule.

Aggressive imperialist circles have not ceased and are not ceasing for a single day their preparations for war. Military budgets are continuously growing and the arms race escalating in the United States and the other NATO countries.

Leading the military preparations of the West is the United States, which in the last 10 years has doubled expenditures for these purposes. Washington is planning further escalation of the arms race, however: in the 1981 fiscal year it is planned to allocate 160 billion dollars for militarist purposes, which comprises more than 25 percent of the national budget. In 1985 plans call for spending a quarter of a trillion dollars on military needs.

The socialist community and its growing might are limiting the aggressive military aspirations of imperialism. Those patterns and mechanisms which are characteristic

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of monopoly capitalism, however, invariably engender and intensify a military threat. Persuasive evidence of this is the military-bloc policy of imperialism in the 1970's, the principal directions of which continue to be dictated by the military-industrial complex. It is precisely these forces of imperialism which constantly seek to incline their governments toward pursuit of an adventurist, expansionist course in foreign and military policy. Dominant in military-bloc policy is an aggressive orientation, an endeavor to employ military forces and means in the struggle against the world revolutionary process.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Programma Sotsialisticheskoy yedinoy partii Germanii" [Program of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany], page 17.
2. "Konferentsiya kommunisticheskikh i rabochikh partiy Yevropy" [Conference of European Communist and Worker Parties], page 69.

Chapter Nine. THE STRUGGLE OF THE SOVIET UNION, THE NATIONS OF THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY, AND ALL PEACE-SEEKING FORCES AGAINST THE AGGRESSIVE MILITARY-BLOC POLICY OF IMPERIALISM

V. I. Lenin, pointing to the inalterably predatory, aggressive nature of imperialism and its internally inherent tendency toward wars, at the same time emphasized that the first socialist state, in alliance with the world revolutionary movement, represents a force which in the future will be capable of guiding international development "to the deliverance of mankind from the yoke of capital and from imperialist wars."¹

V. I. Lenin's prophetic thoughts have been confirmed by the entire course of the world revolutionary process. After World War II a number of European and Asian countries detached from the capitalist system, a world socialist system was formed, the international Communist and worker movement gained strength, and the colonial system of imperialism collapsed. Today militant imperialist circles are opposed in the international arena by a powerful community of socialist nations, which enjoy the broad support of progressive forces in Europe and the entire world.

The world of socialism places in opposition to the imperialist policy of war and aggression, enslavement of other countries and peoples a Leninist policy of peace and friendship among peoples and active involvement of the masses in the struggle for the victory of just, democratic principles in international relations.

"Today it is more clearly apparent than ever before," stated L. I. Brezhnev at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Worker Parties, "that imperialism can no longer dictate the fate of Europe. Today the socialist nations as well as the worker and democratic movement in the capitalist countries have a great deal to say in determining these fates. And these forces deserve the principal credit for the fact that for more than 30 years now Europe has been living in conditions of peace."²

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

* * *

International events following World War II once again graphically confirmed the hopelessness and reactionary nature of the military-bloc policy of imperialism and the invincibility of the main revolutionary forces of the present day -- the world socialist system, the revolutionary worker and Communist movement, and the national liberation movement, which constitute a powerful and steadily growing force of the contemporary era. The forces of peace, democracy and socialism are today playing a leading role in the world and are exerting increasingly more determining influence on the destiny of mankind. Their success in the struggle against the aggressive forces of imperialism is inseparably linked with strengthening of the world socialist system, intensification of the class struggle of the proletariat of the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement, and with their unity of actions.

With their actions, genuine socialism and the other forces of the world revolutionary movement are thwarting many aggressor plans and are forcing the leaders of the reactionary imperialist blocs to reckon with the present balance of political and military power in the world. Today imperialism is being forced to accept the fact of disintegration of some of its blocs, the necessity of their reorganization, the withdrawal of certain countries from blocs or their military organizations, and the elimination of military bases and "military presence" in a number of countries, especially in Asia.

Further success on the part of peace-seeking forces in the struggle against the bloc policy of imperialism, which holds a danger for all mankind, depends to a decisive degree on development and strengthening of the world socialist system. The nations of the socialist community, relying on increasing defensive strength and fully supported by the working people of the entire world, succeeded in the 1970's in achieving a shift from "cold war" to international détente. Winning new victories on their journey toward communism, they are creating new, more favorable preconditions for further development of the class struggle of the working people of the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement against imperialism, including against the military blocs created by imperialism.

Affirming the principles of a policy of peaceful coexistence and applying all energies and resources toward further deepening and development of international détente, the USSR and the brother socialist countries, as well as all progressive forces bear in mind that imperialism cannot change its reactionary nature. "Détente," stated L. I. Brezhnev, "does not and cannot abrogate or alter the laws of class struggle. Nobody can count on the Communists, in conditions of détente, becoming reconciled with capitalist exploitation or the monopolists becoming champions of revolution."³

Imperialism has lost its monopoly on settling the questions of war and peace. Supported by the world socialist system, all the revolutionary detachments of the international proletariat are uniting and becoming more aggressive. V. I. Lenin's prophetic words ring out today with new force: "The worker movement will gain ascendancy and build the road to peace and socialism."⁴ As the position of socialism becomes stronger, the crisis phenomena in the military-bloc policy of imperialism will inevitably intensify.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 44, page 148.
2. L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom. Rechi i stat'i" [Following a Leninist Course. Speeches and Articles], Vol 6, page 50.
3. "Materialy XXV s"yezda KPSS" [Proceedings of the 25th CPSU Congress], page 33.
4. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 35, page 18.

CONCLUSION

An analysis of the origin, development and main features of the military-bloc policy of imperialism in the contemporary era, an era of transition from capitalism to socialism, reveals one of the most important aspects of military-political activity of the international monopoly bourgeoisie. This analysis shows that military-bloc policy constitutes one of the forms of the class struggle of capitalism against socialism, an organic part of the foreign-policy doctrines and military strategy of the leading imperialist powers, and is focused on the struggle against the world revolutionary process and all progressive forces, and in particular against genuine socialism. Following World War II and emergence of a world socialist system, the role of military-bloc policy as a means of global unification of the forces of international reaction into a united anticommunist front increased sharply. The bloc policy of imperialism is encompassing an increasingly broader realm of world external political and military relations and is serving as a source of constant military threat for all mankind, a serious obstacle on the road to successful resolution of such problems as the campaign for peaceful coexistence of nations with differing social systems, disarmament, a lasting peace, and social progress.

Acting in opposition to intensification of trends directed toward uniting anticommunist forces are disuniting tendencies caused by the struggle for hegemony by certain groups within the monopoly bourgeoisie. Interimperialist conflicts have fostered the collapse of a number of military coalitions of imperialism and the failure of many variations of imperialist military-bloc policy. At the same time the monopoly bourgeoisie, which defines the course of policy of contemporary centers of imperialist rivalry, continues to count on military-bloc policy as a means of struggle against the main currents of the world revolutionary process and is modifying this policy, adapting the system of military blocs to the new world balance of power. This is fraught with a serious military danger.

A real force opposing the military-bloc policy of imperialism emerged with the appearance of the first socialist state and its peace policy. The campaign of the Soviet Union, and subsequently the other socialist nations as well, for peaceful coexistence and détente and their implementation of the principles of peaceful cooperation with countries of a different social system are helping ensure the most favorable conditions for building socialism and communism and intensified development of the world revolutionary process. The fruitful peace policy of the USSR and the entire socialist community, the principal points of which are formally stated

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

in the Peace Program and the Program of Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation, points out the way toward a world without military blocs, in which the security of every country is guaranteed.

The Moscow meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member nations presented in its November 1978 Declaration a realistic and at the same time highly optimistic answer to the vitally important problem of strengthening peace and guaranteeing security. The Warsaw Pact member nations solemnly declared that "they shall do everything in their power to ensure that this great task is accomplished and that mankind enters the 21st century in conditions of a lasting peace and extensive international cooperation."¹ They also reaffirmed their willingness to dissolve the Warsaw Pact Organization simultaneously with dissolution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and, as a first step, to disband their military organizations, beginning with a mutual reduction of military activities.

In contrast to the initiatives of the socialist nations, ruling circles in the United States and its allies concentrated their efforts on the threshold of the 1980's on achieving greater aggressiveness and effectiveness of military-bloc policy. In conditions of deepening interimperialist conflicts, when the capabilities of individual capitalist countries had become considerably reduced in the area of controlling international relations in a favorable direction, imperialist ruling circles are stubbornly endeavoring to find ways to achieve a "collective" solution to problems which arise in the realm of economics and politics.

First of all there is a long-standing and persistent tendency toward strengthening with various means the NATO pact, the main instrument of the military-bloc policy of imperialism. The crisis of the "peripheral" blocs, which deepened with the collapse of SEATO and CENTO, resulted in acceleration of the process of transformation of NATO into an instrument of imperialist policy on a global scale. One assumes that the NATO foreign policy thrust for the period up to the 1990's, adopted in 1978, as well as this bloc's long-range program of further acceleration of the arms race pursue this objective.

The deal between the ruling circles of the leading imperialist powers and the Beijing successors of Mao Zedong constitutes a new, highly dangerous and insidious trend in the military-bloc policy of imperialism. "A qualitative change of a counterrevolutionary nature has taken place in the international activities of the Chinese leadership. Increasingly going beyond the framework of a national matter, the Chinese problem now directly affects the root interests of the peace and security of peoples and carries a threat to all."²

On the threshold of the 1980's the military blocs of imperialism once again constituted an active force impeding détente and disarmament. In addition, their leaders stepped up their attempts to effect a return to "cold war" times. The arms race, initiated and carried out to a considerable degree with the assistance of military blocs, began to increase in pace and reached a dangerous level both qualitatively and quantitatively. This applies not only to strategic, operational-tactical and tactical nuclear weapons but conventional arms as well. The main objective toward which ruling circles in the NATO member nations are striving is an end to the existing approximate balance of military forces of the opposing sides and gaining of military superiority over the socialist nations and the other nations of the world. Restricted in an uncontrolled arms race by the coordinated decisions

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of the governments of the USSR and the United States, the imperialist countries are counting on increasing the lethality and improving the quality of arms. Attempts are continuing once again to transform military strength into a widely used means of aggressive imperialist policy.

Another trend in the development of military-bloc policy is manifested in efforts to give greater flexibility and diversity to its forms and methods. This applies not only to the military area but also to diplomacy, economics, and ideology.

Pursuing a policy of broadening the realm of military-strategic expansion, U.S. ruling circles are using military blocs and centers of comprehensive imperialist policy and strategy and are endeavoring to bind their allies in a network of bilateral and multilateral pledges and to utilize for this purpose not only their military presence but also military organizations and alliances of the most diversified character. In spite of the failures of this policy, the monopoly bourgeoisie intends to build a flexible military-police system exercising control over the entire world, with NATO and other imperialist blocs comprising strong-points of this system.

Attempting to counter the successes of the peace offensive of the USSR and other socialist nations, as well as the liberation struggle against imperialism which is being waged by liberated nations, U.S. propaganda and that of the other NATO nations is intensifying its apologia of the military-bloc policy. A broad range of arguments are being advanced in favor of continuing the military-bloc policy "by more effective means." An important place among these arguments is occupied by fantasies about a "military threat" which allegedly emanates from socialism, as well as other anticommunist, anti-Soviet slander, which is accompanied by claims about an imaginary commonality of destinies of the "free world" nations and the "necessity" proceeding therefrom for them to give one another mutual military assistance.

Serious defeats and failures have befallen the military-bloc policy of imperialism on the threshold of the 1980's. In spite of the complexity of the present world situation, there exists a real possibility, through persistent effort on the part of all peace-seeking forces, to build a solid obstacle in the path of that danger carried by the military-bloc policy of imperialism. Conflicts and rivalry within the camp of the monopoly bourgeoisie limit possibilities of achieving the objectives of the military-bloc policy. But the main obstacle in its path is the strength and might, the vigorous peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist nations, and the antiimperialist struggle of the working people of the capitalist countries, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are demanding détente in international relations and averting of the threat of a world war.

Nevertheless the reality of the military threat engendered by imperialism and its military-bloc policy is obvious. The endeavor by imperialism to unite all forces at its disposal for the struggle against the world revolutionary process is a continuously operating factor which heightens the threat. With the aid of military blocs, the United States and its allies seek to shift the overall world balance of power in their favor and to obtain favorable conditions for conducting "big stick" tactics toward the socialist countries although, as the experience of history has shown, it never brought imperialism the desired results and inalterably ended in the failure of counterrevolutionary plans and actions. As Mar SU D. F. Ustinov,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

USSR minister of defense, noted, "forces of reaction and aggression exist and are actively operating in the capitalist world, which oppose détente and disarmament. They are attempting to revive in intergovernmental relations an atmosphere of distrust and brinkmanship, seek to expand existing and create new aggressive military blocs, and to achieve military superiority over the socialist countries. These forces are supporting focal points of tension, are provoking military conflicts, and are escalating the arms race, which is becoming increasingly more dangerous."³

Persistent efforts on the part of the Carter Administration to destabilize the international situation and to plunge the world once again into a state of "cold war" constitute evidence of the unceasing endeavor on the part of reactionary military and political circles in the West, particularly U.S. imperialism, to thwart the policy of peace, détente and disarmament which is being pursued by the nations of the socialist community. This policy, hostile to the cause of détente, a policy of escalation of the arms race, leading to an increased danger of war, was adopted by ruling circles in the United States and other NATO countries at the May 1978 meeting of the NATO Council. In 1980, in the traditional "State of the Union" New Year's Message to Congress, reflecting the spirit of "cold war," President Carter openly declared U.S. claims to a "leadership role in the world." This was followed by Presidential Directive 59, which essentially "legitimized" nuclear war as a means of achieving the global anticommunist aims of U.S. imperialism and launched a new round of militarist preparations.

As L. I. Brezhnev stated in his replies to questions put by a PRAVDA correspondent on 13 January 1980, "militaristic trends in U.S. policy have recently also been expressed in acceleration of new long-range arms programs, in establishment of new military bases far from the borders of the United States, including in the Near East and the Indian Ocean, and in establishment of a so-called 'rapid deployment force' -- this instrument of a policy of military intervention."⁴ In his replies L. I. Brezhnev also exposes attempts by the U.S. administration to utilize the events in Afghanistan in December 1979 to block international efforts to strengthen peace. A considerable role in the activities of the U.S. Government is played by new attempts to expand and strengthen the bloc system of imperialism, particularly the NATO bloc and the alliance of anti-Soviet forces in Asia with the participation of China.

In these conditions, in order successfully to counter the aggressive military-bloc policy of imperialism, it is essential to continue in the future strengthening the economic, political and military might of the nations of the socialist community and the Warsaw Pact Joint Forces. Close cohesion and coordinated actions by the socialist countries with all peace-seeking forces are capable of averting the danger presented by the military-bloc policy of imperialism and of securing world peace.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 24 November 1978.
2. KOMMUNIST, No 4, 1979, page 72.
3. "60 let Vooruzhennykh Sil SSSR. Dokumenty i materialy" [60th Anniversary of the USSR Armed Forces. Documents and Materials], Moscow, 1978, pp 27-28.
4. PRAVDA, 13 January 1980.

COPYRIGHT: Voenizdat, 1980

BORDER GUARDS AND INTERNAL TROOPS

BOOK EXCERPTS: BORDER GUARD ACTIVITIES FROM 1929-1938

Moscow NA STRAZHE SOVETSKIKH RUBEZHEY 1929-1938 in Russian 1981 (signed to press 1 Apr 81) pp 1-15, 264-271

[Annotation, table of contents, introduction and conclusion from book "On Guard over the Soviet Borders 1929-1938", by A. I. Chugunov, Order of Labor Red Banner Voennoye Izdatel'stvo Ministerstva oborony SSSR, 35,000 copies, 271 pages]

[Excerpts] The monograph covers the operational and service activities and combat activities of the Soviet Border Guard Troops and generalizes the historic experience of guarding the USSR state border in the period from 1929 through 1938.

The book is intended for a wide range of readers.

Contents

Introduction..... 3

On Guard over the Northwestern and Western Sectors of the Border..... 15

Security of the Transcaucasus Sector of the Border..... 39

Conclusion of the Struggle Against the Basmach. Security of the Southern Borders..... 52

 Security of the Eastern Sector of the Border..... 127

Rebuffing the Provocatory Sallies by Chinese Militarists on the Far Eastern Border (1929-1931)..... 133

 Thwarting Provocations by Japanese Militarists in the Far East by Border Guard Troops (1929-1938)..... 168

 Fighting Provocations by Japanese Militarists on the Border with Manchuria.. 189

Border Guard Troops in Fighting at Lake Khasan..... 236

Conclusion..... 264

FOR OFFI

Introduction

With the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution the Communist Party and V. I. Lenin personally resolved the task of organizing security of the borders of the first socialist state in the world along with other urgent and immediate tasks.

The SNK [Council of People's Commissars] Decree signed by V. I. Lenin on 28 May 1918 set up the Border Guard Troops, which are a component of the USSR Armed Forces. The first Red Guard detachment became part of them, as did later the best Red Army units from the legendary combined units of Shchors, Kotovskiy and Parkhomenko, the Samara-Simbirsk Iron Division and others.

An orderly structure of the Border Guard Troops had taken shape by the mid-1920's. The Main Administration of Border Guard Troops was in charge of the troops and organization of security for the USSR borders. In outlying areas these tasks were made the responsibility of administrations of districts of the Border Guard Troops, Border Guard detachments were subordinate to them, border commandants' offices were subordinate to the detachments, and the Border Guard posts directly guarding the state border were subordinate to the commandants' offices. Border Guard ships placed together into groups and divisions and subordinated to district administrations of the Border Guard Troops were assigned for protection of maritime borders.

From the first day of their existence the Border Guard Troops vigilantly guarded the state border of the homeland of the Great October. Independently and together with Red Army units, they fought steadfastly and courageously against foreign military interventionists and the White Guard hordes, and defeated numerous armed bands of the Basmatch and Khunkhuz, of Ungern and Semenov, of Makhno and Petlyura, of Grigor'yev and Zelenyy, and many other sworn enemies of Soviet power.

By 1929 Border Guard personnel had gained abundant experience in fighting large and small armed enemy formations and had acquired high Chekist expertise in guarding the Soviet borders.

The years 1929-1938 were years of intensive peaceful labor for our country. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Soviet people successfully implemented a program of socialist construction.

Socialism was advancing in all sectors along an extensive front. Complete collectivization had been carried out in agriculture. There was a fundamental change in the social, economic and political make-up of the village with the victory of the kolkhoz system. The many millions of peasants shifted to a socialist form of work, which changed the way of life and labor activities of the toiler of the soil.

The national economy was modernized technically in the 1930's, giants of heavy industry were erected, methods of economic management were improved and the country's defensive capabilities strengthened. There was a significant increase in the material and cultural standard of living of the workers. Socialism was completely victorious in the USSR by 1936, which was secured in the Constitution adopted in December 1936.

The colossal successes in various areas of the national economy and in the country's material and cultural life became possible thanks to the wise politics of the Communist Party, the peaceloving course of the socialist state, and the close unity

of party and people. The results of elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet on 12 December 1937 attested to the solidarity of workers, kolkhoz peasantry and labor intelligentsia about the party. Participating in the voting were 96.8 percent of electors, and of these 98.6 percent voted for candidates of the bloc of communists and nonparty persons to the Council of the Union, and 97.8 percent to the Council of Nationalities.¹

In the period 1929-1933 an economic crisis shook the world system of capitalism, which sharply aggravated contradictions between labor and capital and among the imperialist countries. Reactionary forces tried to resolve the heightened contradictions in the capitalist world by means of war. This began to be seen especially clearly with the arrival of fascism to power in Germany and with the beginning of Japanese military actions in the Far East, resulting in the occupation of Northeast China.

The Party Central Committee took all steps to prevent war and guard the Soviet Union against provocations and aggression on the part of imperialist states. An important role was given to assuring the security of the state borders in the general plan of struggle for preservation of peace.

In the period 1929-1938 the imperialists were preparing bases of operation for a war against the USSR in the northern and western parts of the country and in the Far East, and from year to year the sending of spies and saboteurs across the border stepped up. In the early 1930's an end was put to the Basmatch bands in the south, but the fight continued against smugglers and against agents of the imperialist states.

The remigration movement into the USSR created great difficulties on the border of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. The populace which had fled abroad in the 1920's began to return to the Motherland. This change occurred as a result of a strengthening of Soviet power and a rise in the workers' material welfare.

The situation on the far eastern border was most difficult. Here the Japanese militarists, who had occupied Korea and North China, systematically provoked incidents and unleashed armed conflicts.

At the same time the western border also demanded unremitting attention. Here bourgeois governments of contiguous countries were conducting hostile, subversive actions against the USSR on a rather broad scale. They stepped up especially with the arrival to power in Germany of the fascists, who began preparing for World War II.

In the peaceful 1930's an acute class struggle continued on the USSR's borders, demanding exceptional attention, vigilance, steadfastness, courage and endurance of the Border Guard Troops against the endless provocative border violations.

The reports then coming from the Border Guard posts, detachments and districts told of the systematic erection of various installations for military purposes (especially on the far eastern border) and about armed clashes with violators of Soviet borders. The Japanese militarists concentrated troops on the Soviet-Manchurian border, conducted shows of military force, moved weapons around and stockpiled ammunition.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Exchanges of fire and transient fighting on the southern and far eastern borders occurred almost daily. In four months of 1929 (January-April), Border Guard Troops entered into armed clashes 537 times. In December 1930 and January 1931 alone there were 45 clashes with armed groups in these sectors² and 113 exchanges of fire with lone violators and groups invading Soviet territory for various purposes.³ In January 1931 some 2,200 violators were detained in the southern sector of the border alone,⁴ among whom were a large number of smugglers. Fire often came from contiguous territories against peaceful Soviet citizens and Border Guard Troops: There were 18 such cases in April 1931.⁵

It often was necessary to conduct combat actions against armed bands invading USSR territory from abroad, especially on the Central Asian border. In just four months of 1929 (January-April), 90 bands violated Soviet borders. It should be noted, however, that the number of such provocations gradually dropped: While 449 bands intruded into our country from abroad in 1928, there were only 120 in 1929.

Although the number of bandit raids dropped, there was an increase in the number of attacks on Border Guard details by various armed groups from contiguous countries. In the period January-April 1928 there were 17 attacks on Border Guard Troops, and for this same time in 1929 there were 21 attacks. There was an increase in the number of shellings of Soviet territory. During January-September 1928 there were 153 shellings, and there were 266 for that same time in 1929. The majority of shellings were conducted from Manchurian territory. The number of such provocations almost tripled in 1929 in comparison with 1928 in this sector of the border.

During the period 1929-1931, when the country was carrying out mass collectivization, demolishing the last hopes of enemies of Soviet power for a rebirth of capitalism in the USSR, chiefly among the well-to-do peasants, rich landowners in Central Asia, reactionary clergy and bourgeois nationalists, there was a reactivation of antisoviet activities and of actions by internal kulak and Basmatch bands and those beyond the Border Guard outposts. In those years Soviet Border Guard personnel successfully eliminated major kulak-bai bands in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia and White Guard bands in the Far East and other border regions in bloody armed clashes. The last major Basmatch gang, of Durda Murt, was eliminated in May 1933.

An intense struggle against smugglers continued on the Soviet border in the 1930's. As a result the size of the smuggling trade became considerably below that of the 1920's, and dropped each year. At the same time, smuggling trade was still significant, especially in the first half of the 1930's, and to some extent damaged the economy of the Soviet state. In developing the economy under conditions of a difficult class struggle against the capitalist world, the USSR was forced to mobilize its export resources to a maximum for acquiring from abroad the industrial articles extremely necessary to the national economy.

The policy of an economic blockade of the Soviet Union carried out by a number of bourgeois states placed USSR foreign trade organizations under difficult conditions in carrying out export-import plans. In this connection the struggle for maximum accumulation, economy and proper expenditure of every ruble of currency played an important role for our country. A significant place was set aside for the Border Guard Troops in the struggle against currency smuggling. The fact is that the rigid currency regime established in the USSR, which restricted to a maximum the speculative opportunities of foreigners trading with us encountered opposition on

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the part of foreign trade partners, expressed in the form of a massive evasion of Soviet laws and extensive illegal smuggling of ten-ruble banknotes from abroad.

In addition, smugglers would move various deficit goods, valuables and currency across the border. Bands which were pursuing not only economic but also political goals participated in these criminal transactions on the eastern and southern borders.

Losing their last hopes for a rebirth of capitalism, the kulaks and other representatives of the overthrown exploiting classes tried to flee abroad illegally, taking with them cattle, property and various valuables which were the people's property. Soviet Border Guard Troops were faced with the task of stopping the illegal export of property and valuables and the driving of cattle outside the country.

The fight against export contraband on the European border bore a somewhat different character than on the Asiatic and far eastern borders. There were practically no bands here in the 1930's and the contraband shipments prepared by the "nepmen" and kulaks often were stopped at the moment they were being carried out. The Chekists usually promptly exposed the "moneybox" funds of the "nepmen" and kulaks, which did not find use with the petty private traders being actively crowded out of trade and production. The number of detentions and amount of contraband detained under these conditions sharply increased in connection with the reinforcement of border security. The flow of smuggled goods on the western border constantly dropped. While contraband amounting to over R2,350,000 was detained on the western border during 1928 and the first half of 1929, more than R6,268,000 was detained in the latter half of 1929 and in 1930. But the unpunished flow of goods on the far eastern and southern borders was still considerable.

The serious economic depression and low trade in Northern Manchuria created favorable conditions for smuggling activities. The rugged mountainous terrain hindered actions of the Border Guard Troops. The border guard of contiguous countries aided the criminals in an attempt to use them for espionage purposes.

Concrete figures indicate the impressive scope of smuggling. In 1930 contraband amounting to a total of R12.7 million was detained on all borders of the USSR, of which 62 percent consisted of export contraband (i.e., being taken illegally abroad). The majority of smugglers on the western border were "nepmen" and kulaks, and on the borders of the Transcaucasus, Central Asia and Kazakhstan they were the bai⁶ and bai-manap,⁷ who in the majority of cases were armed. The struggle against them was accompanied by armed clashes.

Cattle held a prominent place among the export contraband on the Central Asian border. The bai and bai-manap tried to drive cattle over the border in large herds. In 1930 Border Guard troops detained some 48,000 head of cattle and, in 1931, over 81,000 head.

Smuggling increased sharply during the period of mass collectivization and elimination of the kulaks as a class. Kulaks tried to move accumulated riches over the border. In 1933 contraband amounting to almost R26.5 million was detained.

The movement of smuggled goods, valuables and currency began to drop sharply beginning in 1933. In 1934 contraband amounting to a total of some R20 million was detained, and amounting to some R6.7 million in the first half of 1935.

Smugglers were inventing more and more new methods for transporting goods and especially valuables and currency. In taking out currency at anchorages on the Caspian Sea, for example, they would hide it in floats secured to boat anchors by long lines and to old pilings near piers. During the departure the anchor would be hoisted and contraband collected. Valuables and opium would be sewn into belts, hidden in specially made hollow objects, between double walls of cans, suitcases and so on.

The fight against smuggling was no simple matter. With a good knowledge of the terrain, acting under the protection of foreign intelligence agencies and having a far-flung network of mutual ties, persons engaged in smuggling disguised themselves and the contraband skillfully. At the same time they often went to extremes on being detained and made use of weapons.

The thirst for profit spurred the smugglers to take the most extreme measures and the most daring actions. In March 1937 a group of Border Guard personnel discovered smugglers with four pounds (64 kg) of opium. The criminals were set up in several bases, one of which was in a mountain gorge from which smuggled goods were disseminated to nearby auls [villages] over camouflaged trails difficult of access. The Border Guard Troops uncovered and closed all routes of approach to the base. As a result of a skillfully conducted operation all ten smugglers were arrested despite their furious armed resistance.

Two days later a new base with seven persons was discovered in this same region. The smugglers opened up rifle fire on the border guards. Three smugglers were killed and one wounded and captured in the exchange of fire which ensued, while three took advantage of the nearby border and fled abroad. Some of the contraband was thrown into an inaccessible canyon, while part of it, including several dozen kilograms of opium, was seized by the border guards.

The instances where smugglers did not offer armed resistance to the Border Guards, especially on the southern and far eastern borders, were rare. In 1936 alone there were 54 armed clashes with smugglers in the Turkmen sector.

The Communist Party devoted much attention to extensive political work among the border populace and to an increase in the workers' welfare. While goods amounting to R8,382,000 was brought in for the populace of the border zone in the latter half of 1928 and the first half of 1929, this sum amounted to some R40 million in 1929 and the first half of 1930.

Steps taken by the Communist Party and Soviet government to combat smuggling constantly reduced its import and export. In 1929 alone in comparison with 1928 the number of smugglers dropped 20.9 percent on all USSR borders. The volume of imported contraband dropped 3.5 percent.

Soviet ten-ruble notes were the chief kind of imported contraband. Smart foreign dealers who had Soviet money tried to send as much as possible of it into the USSR in exchange for foreign currency and valuables with their subsequent shipment abroad. Opium held a prominent place in imported contraband on the Central Asian border.

The amount of unpunished smuggling dropped even more in subsequent years in connection with stepped-up security of the state border and other measures taken to stop smuggling activities.

The year 1935 was a turning point in the content and forms of state border violations. There was a sharp reduction in the number of Soviet border violators, but at the same time the importance of each violation rose. In 1935 the number of border violators in various sectors dropped 2-3 times. The largest amount of border violations in this period was in the Turkmen sector with 33 percent and the Kazakh sector with 24 percent, with 6-10 percent each in the remaining sectors, although even in the first two sectors the number of violations also had become much fewer (for example, by fourfold in the Kazakh sector).

The massive drop in the number of violators occurred as a result of a reduction in emigration, a drop in remigration and the elimination of bands. The main contingent of those detained on the border in 1935 consisted of smugglers (21 percent), remigrants (18 percent) and emigrants (3.6 percent), with the remaining violators (2-3 percent) performing assignments for intelligence agencies of imperialist states and various foreign antisoviet centers. The number of such violators began to grow constantly. In comparison with 1934 the proportion of persons connected with foreign intelligence agencies in the overall mass of those detained on the border in 1935 rose from 1.3 to 5.5 percent (4.2 times) and the proportion of smugglers rose from 12 to 22 percent (almost double).

Meanwhile there was a growing frequency of provocative sallies leading to incidents and conflicts on the border. Consequently the reduction in number of detentions on the border did not reduce the tense situation. The proportion of violations pursuing clearly antistate goals rose, especially in the Far East, which had become a center of conflicts and incidents, as well as on the border with Finland and, to a certain extent, with Poland and Romania. With consideration of this, the party took steps to beef up security of the state border in these very regions.

Armed forces were concentrated, additional border outposts were set up and new commandants' offices and detachments were activated on the operationally most important sectors of the state border, where the situation was especially tense and where governments of contiguous countries were conniving with provocations. In the period from 1932 through 1937 alone 28 newly activated Border Guard detachments and three separate Border Guard commandants' offices were set up in the most important operational sectors. Border Guard aviation was set up in 1932. Soviet-made vehicles were received by Border Guard units in the 1930's. The formation of Border Guard aviation regiments and squadrons and the motorization of outposts, commandants' offices and detachments was of great importance for increasing troop mobility and maneuverability and for raising their combat effectiveness.

By decision of the Communist Party and Soviet government, the Border Guard Troops received the best small arms in the period 1929-1939, which considerably improved the fire capabilities of Border Guard personnel in fighting violators.

A strengthening of USSR state borders in the 1930's was carried out in all directions. During this period the Communist Party and Soviet government did much to train highly qualified cadres for the Border Guard Troops. The Border Guard education institutions were set up to train company grade commanders and political officers. In the period 1930-1932 the Novo-Petergof, Khar'kov and Moscow military border guard schools were opened for training command and political personnel.

In 1929-1939 the Communist Party devoted great attention to reinforcing party-political work in the Border Guard Troops. Political departments were set up in

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

border guard detachments, and districts, detachments and outposts were reinforced with ideologically conditioned, well trained political workers. Party members were sent from industrial enterprises to outposts and commandants' offices. Full-fledged party organizations were formed at border guard outposts and in commandants' offices with their arrival and with the increased acceptance of Komsomol activists as candidate members of the VKP(b) [All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik)].

The publication of large circulation newspapers which began to be put out in the 1930's by decision of the Communist Party was of great importance in political indoctrination work of the Border Guard Troops. For example, the following newspapers began to be published in 1929: NA BOYEVOM POSTU [At the Combat Post] in the Timkovichi, KRASNYY POGRANICHNIK [Red Border Guard] in the Nakhichevan, NACHEKU [On Guard] in the Dauriskoye and AMURSKIY POGRANICHNIK [Amur Border Guard] in the Blagoveshchensk border guard detachments.⁸

Steps taken by the party and government to strengthen the state border in the 1930's were of exceptionally great importance in providing reliable security of the Soviet borders.

From the first day of victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution the Communist Party and Soviet government firmly conducted a peaceloving Leninist course of foreign policy and respect for the sovereignty and independence of other states, came out for prevention of conflicts and against the seizure of foreign territories.

In securing the sacred borders of the Motherland, the Soviet Border Guard Troops steadfastly and courageously rebuffed those who tried to encroach on the peaceful life of the Soviet people. M. I. Kalinin, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR TsIK [Central Executive Committee], gave high praise to the selfless actions of Border Guard personnel in a speech during presentation of governmental awards to Border Guard personnel and sailors of the Navy on 17 March 1936: "In the 15 years of its existence it can be said boldly that the border security has earned the award with which our party and government have recognized the Border Guard Troops. There is probably not a single state where service is so difficult and so complex as that in our Border Guard Troops.

"Let's take just the eastern borders. Were we to list just the open attacks reported in our press and which are set down in official documents, there would be a very considerable number of them in one year.

"These are only those attacks which have deep repercussions throughout the Soviet Union, but the fact is that all kinds of minor incidents take place daily about which nothing is reported in our press. Why is this? Why against our state, against its borders, against one of the most powerful states, the strength of which is recognized by all capitalist countries, why do these countries permit themselves to take such a defiant, provocative policy with respect to our state? We know that the capitalist states do not permit themselves such impudent provocative conduct in relations among themselves. Then why do these capitalist states permit themselves this provocative conduct toward the Soviet Union?

"It is only because our state is a state of workers and peasants and the armies opposing us or, more precisely, the leaders of these armies, hate us, experience literally a bestial hatred toward our state and are ready to destroy us or, if this is impossible, then at least to inflict some damage on our state...

33

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

"And when you think this out in your minds, the provocative policy of our enemies as carried out by them on our borders will become understandable to you. As you see, our Border Guard fighting men are performing the most responsible, the most important and the most difficult work."⁹

In his greeting to fighting men, commanders and political workers on the day of the 15th anniversary of Border Guard Troops, USSR People's Commissar of Defense Mar SU K. Ye. Voroshilov wrote: "Your steadfastness and valor and your utter dedication to the cause of Lenin evoke admiration of your brothers in arms in the Red Army and peoples of the Soviet Union. Standing on guard over the Soviet borders, the glorious Border Guard personnel invariably set heroic examples of genuinely Red Army courage and selflessness, together with the necessary self-control and iron discipline, in the cause of defending our socialist borders."¹⁰

The Border Guard Troops of OGPU [United State Political Administration] of the Belorussian Front were awarded the Order of Labor Red Banner of the Belorussian SSR by decree of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR TsIK dated 15 January 1932 for services in protecting the Soviet borders and for extensive work in reinforcing the economic and political status of border regions. On 14 February 1936 the USSR TsIK presented the Order of Lenin to the Kamchatka and Tajik Red Banner border guard detachments and the Order of Red Banner to the Blagoveshchensk, Grodekovo, Sestroretsk, Kamenets-Podol'skiy, Slavuta, Timkovichi, Ashkhabad, Kerki, Baku and Daur-skoye border guard detachments for outstanding services in securing the state border and heroic exploits. This same decree, as well as decrees of the USSR TsIK dated 26 August and 22 November 1936 and 2 March 1937, and ukases of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated 22 and 25 October 1938 presented USSR orders and medals to large groups of Border Guard personnel and local residents for courage and valor displayed in securing and protecting the state borders.

The situation on the border and combat activities of Border Guard Troops in the 1930's reveal a number of important points in the USSR's foreign policy relations with contiguous states, demonstrate the uniqueness and change in methods of hostile acts by imperialist states applied on the border with respect to the USSR, and provide an opportunity to understand the grounds for measures taken by the Communist Party to strengthen the Soviet borders, to prevent and rebuff provocative sallies on the Soviet Union, and to instill patriotism, a feeling of high obligation to the Motherland, and moral-combat qualities in border personnel and the young people who come to replace the veterans.

Meanwhile, the difficult and tense struggle on the border in 1929-1938 is of great importance in developing vigilance. The enemies of socialism never let up in their schemes against the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, but merely change forms and methods of struggle. They are trying to undermine our might through joint efforts.

The 1930's were filled with significant events in activities of the Border Guard Troops which still have been insufficiently covered in literature. Generalized works of this period also are lacking.

Without laying claim to a comprehensive and detailed study of the problem, the author makes an attempt to examine the situation in different sectors of the border in those years; measures taken by the Communist Party and Soviet government to strengthen the Soviet borders and prevent and disrupt provocations and conflicts on

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the Soviet border; basic forms and methods of struggle against border violators; and to show the heroics and selfless service to the Motherland by Border Guard personnel.

Conclusion

The 1930's were years of peaceful construction of socialism for the Soviet Union. The rapid development of industry, agriculture, science and culture and the growth in workers' material welfare gladdened not only Soviet citizens, but all progressive mankind. The Soviet people's successes convincingly demonstrated the enormous advantages of the socialist system and the peaceloving foreign policy of the Communist Party and Soviet government.

The strengthening of socialism generated anger and hatred in its enemies. Fearing the revolutionizing influence of the USSR's example on the layers of the populace being exploited, imperialists of all countries of the world joined in efforts to fight the first socialist state in the world.

In beginning preparations for World War II, militant circles of capitalist states stepped up intelligence activities against the Soviet Union and took advantage of all means to retard socialist construction and weaken the USSR.

Aggressive forces attempted to use the territories of countries contiguous with the Soviet Union, reactionary emigres and the counterrevolutionary elements remaining in the USSR for antisoviet purposes.

The fight against forces hostile to the socialist system was felt most keenly on the state border separating the two worlds of socialism and capitalism. Remnants of the surviving counterrevolution were seated in border regions. Smuggling was carried out to undermine the socialist economy, agents of imperialist intelligence agencies were sent onto USSR territory for various purposes, and raids were carried out by armed bands. The border was the line where imperialists felt the firmness of the Soviet system and its ability to defend the achievements of the Great October reliably.

The situation was tense in all sectors of the state border in the 1930's and required Border Guard personnel, local party and soviet entities and the workers of border regions to have constant vigilance and take decisive actions to stop border violations.

The situation was most difficult on the southern part of the border in the early 1930's. A fierce struggle was going on against bandit raids by the Basmatch, chiefly from abroad, from the territory of Iran and Afghanistan.

The Basmatch appeared in separate centers in border regions of Central Asia at this time and did not present great danger. Small Basmatch bands operated for a brief time in border regions of Tajikistan and Kirghizia. The main centers of the Basmatch bands formed in the sands of the Karakum, where the cattle-rearing bai of Turkmenia and Kazakhstan sought cover, as did Basmatch bands intruding from the territory of Iran.

Up to the middle of 1931 Basmatch bands consisting of the reactionary Tajik and in part Uzbek portion of the emigration were operating actively in regions of Afghanistan bordering on the USSR.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

*

The foreign Basmatch did not become widespread in regions of Afghanistan bordering on the USSR, since the Afghan powers, fearing that the Basmatch would seize the northern border regions, took effective steps against them, including even the use of armed forces for neutralizing, disarming and dissolution of the Basmatch formations. The ringleaders of the Basmatch and their foreign protectors were not able to concentrate forces for an invasion of Tajikistan for a long while in connection with steps taken by the Afghan government and major defeats of the bands inflicted by Soviet Border Guard personnel. Losing the last hope for success, Ibragim-Bek burst onto the territory of Soviet Tajikistan with the remaining bands on 30 March, but this adventure by the henchman of the overthrown emir of Bukhara and British intelligence failed. Ibragim-Bek was seized with the active assistance of the populace and received his just desserts from Soviet justice. This basically put an end to the Basmatch in Tajikistan.

The Basmatch bands which had come in from abroad and which were formed from the remaining counterrevolutionary forces existed enormously longer in the vast Karakum Desert. Soviet power was established here and measures taken to strengthen it later than in the other parts of Turkmenia in connection with the difficult geographic conditions.

The reactionary foreign Turkmen emigres in Iran were not as limited in antisoviet activities as in Afghanistan, although Iranian authorities took some measures to restrict the formation and actions of Basmatch bands.

The Turkmen foreign bands joined under the leadership of Dzhunaid-khan in early 1929.

Soviet authority was firm in Central Asia, including in Turkmenistan in the 1930's, but many social, political and economic problems still had not been fully resolved in Soviet Turkmenia by 1929. Individual cattle raisers in the Karakum Desert still had not gone over to a socialist collective basis.

All activities carried out by Soviet authorities in the sands of Turkmenia in the early 1930's had the purpose of creating maximum favorable conditions for the working populace and putting an end to the bai once and for all as a class of exploiters.

The bai did not wish to surrender their positions and, with the active support of reactionary emigres from abroad, did everything to hinder the strengthening of Soviet power and, when they became convinced of the futility of their efforts, they tried to send large flocks of sheep and property plundered from the working people illegally across the border in the accompaniment of armed bands. But the reactionary forces were not able to carry out a single one of the plans. Time and the socialist transformations accomplished in Turkmenia were working against the enemies of Soviet power. The working people of socialist Turkmenistan stood firmly on the side of Soviet power. In close coordination with local party and soviet entities and with the active support of the broad working masses, the Red Army, Border Guard personnel and NKVD [People's Commissariat of the Interior] entities successfully defeated the foreign and internal bands of Basmatch.

Major operations were conducted successfully against Basmatch bands on the territory of Turkmenia in the fall of 1930 and in 1931. A deciding blow was delivered against the last groupings of the Basmatch in the Karakum Desert by Red Army units,

OGPU troops, Border Guard personnel and volunteer detachments in September-November 1931. All major bands closely linked with foreign intelligence agencies were eliminated as a result of this operation. The struggle continued against the remaining internal and foreign Basmatch bands violating the USSR border in the Turkmen sector until the end of 1933. By the fall of 1933 the territory of Soviet Turkmenia had been cleared completely of the Basmatch. Scattered bands remaining in the border regions of Iran did not represent serious danger. They were awaited by inevitable retribution on Soviet territory. During 1934 some foreign bandit formations still were trying to penetrate to Soviet territory, but in the majority of cases the Border Guard personnel eliminated them on the border. Reactionary forces took steps to revive the Basmatch in the latter half of the 1930's, but failed.

The high mountain sectors of the state border of Kirghizia and Kazakhstan were quieter in the 1930's than the southern sectors of the USSR border, although here too Border Guard personnel had to carry on a heroic fight against various bands along some axes, passes, canyons and smugglers' trails. The size of bands in the eastern sector of the border was small, but the fight against them was difficult under the high mountain conditions. Here the Basmatch, who knew their way around well, tried to violate the border undetected, but in the majority of cases they failed in this.

The number of raids dropped sharply as a result of the defeat of internal and foreign bands in the border regions of this area, and by the late 1930's the bands practically ceased their sallies onto Soviet territory.

The situation on the Soviet far eastern border was the most difficult in the 1930's. Until the occupation of Manchuria by Japan, the Chinese government in Nanking conducted a policy hostile to the USSR. And relying on their military-economic assistance, the Nanking politicians systematically provoked incidents on the Sino-Soviet border, using White Guard and local Khunkhuz bands for this purpose.

In the spring of 1929 wide-scale preparations unfolded at Nanking's direction for unleashing a conflict on the KVZhD [Chinese Eastern Railway].

The Communist Party and Soviet government took all steps to localize the conflict artificially whipped up by the Chinese side.

From spring until late autumn 1929 the Soviet government refrained from vigorous actions to stop the provocations, trying not to give cause for unleashing major military actions on the far eastern border. The great steadfastness, courage and self-control of Border Guard personnel and Red Army personnel disrupted the schemes of the White Chinese provocateurs and imperialists of the United States, England, France, Japan and Germany standing behind them.

After concentrating major forces by mid-September, Chinese authorities began extensive preparations for an invasion of Soviet territory, but the armed conflict on the KVZhD ended with a crushing defeat of the aggressor in the fall of 1929. The enemy's main body was defeated on the vast border territory of Manchuria. Chinese authorities were forced to sign a protocol on 22 December about restoration of the situation on the KVZhD in accordance with the Sino-Soviet agreement dated 31 May 1924. But many thorny issues still had not been resolved right up to the invasion of Manchuria by Japanese forces, and the Nanking government did not cease to provoke incidents on the border.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The provocative actions of the White Chinese authorities created a difficult situation on the far eastern border, but of greatest danger to the USSR was imperialist Japan, which possessed major economic and military potentials. Aggressive forces of Japan were conducting a policy hostile to the USSR, developing a plan for occupation of the Soviet Far East, and committing provocations systematically and on a broad scale in all vast sectors of the far eastern border.

Japanese provocations at sea assumed special scope in the first half of the 1930's. Under protection of the Navy, Japanese vessels plundered the maritime riches belonging to the Soviet people, tried in every way to provoke conflicts, hindered the normal activities of fishermen and interfered with navigation.

Up until September 1931 the Japanese restricted provocative antisoviet actions chiefly to the maritime borders. In the early 1930's the land borders between Japan and the USSR were limited to a narrow strip between North and South Sakhalin. The danger of provocations increased considerably in September 1931 with the Japanese occupation of Korea and Manchuria.

Having set up the puppet state of Manchoukuo on occupied territory, the Japanese immediately began preparing a base of operations on its territory for an attack on the USSR. Construction of various military installations, highways and access routes to the border began in the border areas. Troops of the elite Kwantung Army concentrated on the territory of Manchuria, especially in areas bordering on the USSR. Japanese intelligence began the wide-scale collection of espionage information in the vast territory of the Far East. The Japanese regularly provoked armed conflicts on the border. Each year the scale of provocations rose and in the summer of 1938 a major armed conflict broke out.

The Communist Party and Soviet government took various steps to prevent provocations and conflicts and to strengthen security and defense of the Soviet far eastern borders, and they constantly tried to lessen tension on the border and resolve thorny issues by peaceful means. At the same time, considering the growing aggressiveness of Japan, the party and government strengthened the Red Army, Pacific Fleet and Border Guard Troops in the Far East.

Measures taken by the Communist Party and Soviet government to reinforce the far eastern borders permitted a successful repulse of armed sallies by various bands and regular units of the Japanese-Manchurian army and defeat of a significant grouping of Japanese forces in fighting near Lake Khasan. This demonstrated the strength of defense of Soviet far eastern borders and the moral and military superiority of the Red Army and Border Guard personnel over aggressor troops.

Security of the state border under the peaceful conditions of the first two five-year plans was a vivid example of the acute class struggle which continued against forces of international reaction. In this many-sided, difficult struggle the Border Guard personnel, Red Army units which came to their assistance and the local populace of border regions demonstrated vigilance, high military and special schooling, bravery, steadfastness, courage and heroism. Solidarity of the Border Guard personnel and Red Army personnel about the Communist Party, their utter dedication to the socialist homeland, allegiance to the military oath, deep faith in the ideals of communism, indestructible friendship of all nations and nationalities of the Land of Soviets, and the close ties of the Army and people were clearly manifested during the struggle against state border violators and the provocative sallies by bands and regular troops of the aggressor who invaded USSR territory.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL

The reliable security and defense of Soviet borders in the 1930's demonstrated to all the world the strength of the dictatorship of the proletariat and persuasively proved that the borders of the socialist state are sacred and inviolable.

"...Today the situation is quite different than before on our borders," said CPSU CC Politburo Member, Chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security Yu. V. Andropov in a report at the 20 December 1967 ceremonial meeting dedicated to the 50th anniversary of state security organs. "We now neighbor with fraternal countries of socialism and other friendly states over enormous distances, but there still are many sectors of our border where we must be especially vigilant. The border still remains the channel through which our enemies try to send their agents and carry out provocations and other subversive actions. If they fail in this, if the majority of extraordinary occurrences on our country's borders go no further than attempts to violate the Soviet border, it is only thanks to the enormous, persistent work, heroism and high vigilance of our Motherland's sentries, the Border Guard personnel. They perform their difficult service well."¹¹

FOOTNOTES

1. See "Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], Moscow, 1971, Vol. 4, Book 2, pp 520-521.
2. Central Archives of Border Guard Troops (henceforth TsAPV), stack 14, list 224, file 864, sheet 10.
3. Ibid., sheet 16.
4. Ibid., sheet 12.
5. Ibid., sheet 76.
6. The bai in Central Asia, Kazakhstan and in the Altay, and partly in the Caucasus, is a wealthy, major landowner and rich cattle-raiser.
7. The bai-manap are the feudal aristocracy in Kirghizia. They were recognized as having the right of exercising justice and of leadership in wartime among members of their kind. The bai-manap possessed large herds of cattle and vast pastures and took advantage of the cheap labor force of poor people in their bondage.
8. See "Boyevoy put' sovetskikh pograničnykh voysk" [Combat Path of the Soviet Border Guard Troops], Moscow, 1967, p 89.
9. "Pograničnyye voyska SSSR. 1929--1938 gg.: Sbornik dokumentov i materialov" [USSR Border Guard Troops 1929-1938: Collection of Documents and Materials], Moscow, 1972, pp 713-714.
10. Museum of Border Guard Troops, folder 3, file 2, sheet 26.
11. Yu. V. Andropov, "Izbrannyye rechi i stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1979, p 116.

COPYRIGHT: Voenizdat, 1981

39

6904
CSO: 1801/064

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

BOOKS EXCERPTS: INTERNATIONALISM AND THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY

Moscow OSNOVA BOYEVOGO SOYUZA in Russian 1981 (signed to press 4 Sep 80) pp 1-2, 271, 3-12, 263-270

[Annotation, Table of Contents, Introduction, and Conclusion of book by V. F. Samoylenko]

[Excerpts] Title Page:

Title: OSNOVA BOYEVOGO SOYUZA (Basis of the Fighting Alliance)
Publisher: Voenizdat
Place and year of publication: Moscow, 1981

Signed to Press Date: 4 September 1980

Number of Copies Published: 30,000

Number of pages: 271

Brief Description:

This book reveals the content and principles of proletarian internationalism. The author shows socialist internationalism as one of the fundamentals of successful economic development and ideological-political unity of the socialist community, and discusses the essence of and practical military cooperation among the Warsaw Pact member nations.

This volume is intended for army and navy officers, personnel enrolled at higher military educational institutions, as well as all persons interested in matters pertaining to the international character of defense of the achievements of socialism.

	Page
Table of Contents	
Introduction	3
Chapter I. Proletarian Internationalism	13
Essence, Content, and Criterion of Proletarian Internationalism	13

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Stages of Development of Proletarian Internationalism	25
Dialectics of the Objective and Subjective	45
Chapter II. Principles of Proletarian, Socialist Internationalism	87
Equality and Equality Before the Law of National Detachments of the Worker Class and Their Parties	89
Combination of National and International Interests of the Worker Class	98
Combination of Proletarian Internationalism and Patriotism	107
Subordination of the Interests of the Struggle of the Worker Class in One Country to the Interests of Its Struggle on a World Scale	113
Struggle Against Bourgeois Nationalism and Chauvinism	120
Chapter III. Socialist Internationalism -- One of the Foundations of Development and Strengthening of Economic Potential	131
Advantages of the Nations of the Socialist Community in Strengthening Economic Potential	132
Equalization of the Levels of Economic Development and Defense Capability of the Socialist Nations	145
Economic Integration of the CEMA Member Nations -- A New Stage in Strengthening Economic and Defense Might	159
Chapter IV. The Role of Socialist Internationalism in Forming and Strengthening the Moral-Political Factor	180
Socialist Internationalism in the Structure of the Moral Factor	181
Significance of Sociopolitical and Ideological Unity for Strengthening the Internationalist Foundation of the Moral Factor	210
Chapter V. Military Alliance of the Socialist Nations and Its Functions	236
Objective Necessity of Military Unity	236
The Warsaw Pact -- Embodiment of the Social and Internationalist Nature of Socialism	243
Functions of the Warsaw Pact Organization	256
Conclusion	263

INTRODUCTION

Never before in history has proletarian internationalism exerted such a powerful and direct influence on societal development. Such great and determining processes of the present day as strengthening of the world socialist system, cohesion of the international Communist movement, the struggle of the working people of the capitalist countries, the national liberation movement, the struggle of peoples against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, and defense of revolutionary gains are taking place under the banner of proletarian solidarity.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

"The principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism and peaceful coexistence, advanced and scientifically substantiated by Lenin," states the CPSU Central Committee decree entitled "On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin," "are being implemented in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The CPSU and Soviet State have done and are doing everything possible to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the socialist nations, to assist and support peoples fighting imperialism, neocolonialism and racism, to strengthen peace and international security, to end the arms race, and to achieve disarmament."¹

Our party is constantly enriching Marxist-Leninist teaching on internationalism and is exposing various attempts to refute or distort it. "We Soviet Communists," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "consider defense of proletarian internationalism to be the sacred obligation of every Marxist-Leninist."²

The problem of international relations always has been and remains one of the most complex problems of development of human society. There are more than 2000 different nationalities and ethnic groups on our planet. They speak different languages, differ in level of economic, political and intellectual development, in religious beliefs, traditions and customs, and are partitioned off by national borders. The main complexity of relations between nations and nationalities lies in the fact that they have never existed in pure form. Ethnic communities are forms of existence of people at a specific stage of historical development, the content of which is the socioeconomic, class relations characteristic of the given socioeconomic system. Division of people on the basis of color of skin and ethnic attribute is ethnic division. But the centuries-long domination of a class-antagonistic system based on private ownership established relationships of domination and subordination, hostility and hatred between nationalities and ethnic groups.

The ruling exploiter classes have always sought to foist off their selfish aims as national aims, to disunite peoples, to kindle distrust, and to set peoples against one another. War, a product and constant companion of a class-antagonistic society, has always been portrayed by the ruling classes as a necessary struggle against aliens, against "infidels," dictated by "higher national interests." The experience of history attests to the fact that entire peoples and nations have been subjected to the poison of chauvinism and nationalism because, as is correctly noted, nationalism is a venom which can poison the most enlightened mind.

Under the camouflage of national interests, exploiters pursue their narrow, selfish class aims and perpetrate unseemly, antihuman actions and the vilest crimes against mankind. Presently quite widespread in the capitalist world are concepts the advocates of which declare nationalism and mutual hostility of nations to be one of the primary causes of wars.

In the contemporary era preparations for, execution or further consolidation and development of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism, common to all mankind, constitutes the essence and content of progress by every nation and nationality. The relative historical stability of national-ethnic structures, however, gives specific features to the processes of social development and places on them the imprint of considerable uniqueness. Interweaving of the general socioeconomic laws and patterns of development of nations with their specific features,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

which have a long history and unique experience, advances the problem of interethnic relations to the ranks of the most important problems in a theoretical and practical respect. The complexity of this problem is increasing in connection with the fact that the transition of peoples from capitalism to socialism is taking place in a situation of increasingly aggravated historical rivalry between the forces of progress and reaction, socialism and imperialism. The aggressive policies of imperialism are aimed at weakening the position of world socialism by any and all means, at crushing the national liberation movement of peoples, at preventing the development of the class struggle of the worker class, of working people in capitalist countries, and at impeding the irreversible process of the disintegration and collapse of capitalism. Just as V. I. Lenin foresaw, in connection with expansion of the liberation struggle front and choice of the socialist road by more and more peoples, the resistance of the bourgeoisie has become international from national. In spite of the growing conflicts which separate the capitalist nations and aggravate relations between them, the imperialists are endeavoring to unite their efforts, in order to preserve and strengthen the exploiter system and to regain lost ground.

The imperialists realize that the aggressive wars they are scheming against the world socialist community cannot be waged without uniting into military coalitions. This is attested by the foreign policy concepts and military doctrines of the imperialist nations.

U.S. military doctrine, which forms the basis of the military-strategic concepts of NATO and other aggressive imperialist military blocs, has changed several times in the postwar years. But one thing has remained unchanged: the U.S. aspiration to unite under its leadership all the countries of the capitalist world and to use their territories and armed forces to wage wars against the socialist countries and peoples which are fighting for freedom and national independence.

The U.S. military doctrine of "flexible response" was adopted in the 1960's as official doctrine of the aggressive NATO military bloc. As we know, its component parts include the strategic concepts of "guaranteed destruction" (annihilation of the enemy by nuclear strikes), "counterforce" (destruction of nuclear weapons and other military targets) and "escalation" (gradual broadening and sharpening of the military conflict). At the same time the doctrine of "flexible response" was augmented, at the insistence of the FRG, by the doctrine of "forward positions," which specifies advancing NATO forces right up to the borders of the socialist countries for invasion of their territory and for swift escalation of a conventional war into a nuclear war.

The present stage of aggravation of the international situation also proceeds from a disinclination on the part of the most diehard imperialist circles soberly to appraise the present world balance of power and their totally unrealistic calculations, which are dangerous to peace, of achieving military superiority over the socialist countries and dictating their will to these countries. Engaging in a noisy campaign claiming an alleged "military threat" to the West by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, the Washington meeting of the NATO Council (1978) proclaimed a course of policy of renewed escalation of the arms race, to extend for decades, with the objective of "obtaining a longer and sharper sword" and endeavoring to return to a policy "from a position of strength."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Imperialism is making desperate efforts on the one hand to strengthen its aggressive military coalitions and to draw additional countries into the dangerous game of aggravating the international situation, and on the other hand to weaken the defensive organization of the socialist nations -- the Warsaw Pact. Western military-political theorist T. Stanley stated in his book "NATO in a Period of Transition. The future of the Atlantic Alliance" that the best of all possible worlds would be a world in which a united and cohesive West faced a Communist camp which was split up into factions.

In their acts of ideological sabotage against the unity and solidarity of the peoples of the USSR and the world socialist system, against the world Communist national liberation movement, the ideologues of imperialism are using nationalism practically as their main weapon. Z. Brzezinski, for example, openly appeals to the West "to encourage pluralism through nationalism and separatism in the Soviet Union." They are employing the most sophisticated techniques to disunite the peoples of the world, to provoke quarrels between the peoples of the socialist countries and the Soviet Union, to poison them with the venom of nationalism and chauvinism, to kindle national enmity and distrust, with the aim of weakening the antiimperialist front. Attempts by the ideologues of imperialism to poison the peoples of our country and the other socialist countries with the venom of bourgeois nationalism constitutes a particular danger in connection with the fact that rightist and "leftist" revisionists have added their voices to the chorus. "The struggle against rightist and 'leftist' revisionism and against nationalism continues to be of vital importance. Bourgeois ideologues and bourgeois propaganda are today counting most heavily on nationalistic tendencies and in particular on those which assume the form of anti-Sovietism, in the struggle against socialism and the Communist movement."³ This conclusion articulated at the 24th CPSU Congress continues to be valid today.

The great-power, chauvinistic, militaristic policy of the present Beijing leadership presents a great threat to the cause of peace and socialism. As has been correctly emphasized in CPSU documents, this policy is aligned with the position of the world's most extreme reactionaries and is openly directed against the majority of the socialist nations. China's aggression against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam reaffirmed the treacherous policy of the Beijing leaders.

"China's attack on Vietnam," stated a Soviet Government declaration, "once more shows the irresponsibility of Beijing's attitude toward the fate of peace and the criminal easy willingness with which the Chinese leaders resort to arms.

The incursion by Chinese troops into Vietnam, which only recently had fought off external aggression, cannot be a matter of indifference to any honest, upright person or any sovereign nation. These aggressive actions, which are contrary to the principles of the United Nations, which grossly violate international law, reveal to the entire world the genuine essence of Beijing's hegemonist policy in Southeast Asia. Any connivance with such a policy is connivance with violence and diktat, connivance with attempts by China's leaders to plunge the world into war."⁴

The political and ideological aspects of internationalism in the military realm are in a close dialectical interrelationship with the scientific and technological revolution. Today it is becoming more obvious than ever before that not all socialist

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

countries are capable of resisting alone the united front of imperialism, which possesses the very latest weapons, including nuclear missiles. The socialist nations can reliably ensure their security only under the condition of relying on the unified military might of the entire community, and particularly the defense might of the Soviet Union.

The coalition nature of another world war, if the enemies of peace and socialism start one, urgently advances the demand of continuous improvement and strengthening of the economic, political and military unity of the socialist countries in peacetime, and the joint combat training of their armed forces.

Consequently, in present-day conditions it has become more essential than ever before to achieve the closest cooperation among the socialist nations. It is essential both for effectively accomplishing the tasks of building socialism and communism and, to quote Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "to defend and strengthen peace as successfully as possible, which is so needed by all peoples, to strengthen international détente, and to offer an effective rebuff to any and all aggressive actions by imperialism and to all attempts to do detriment to the interests of socialism."⁵

Precisely for this reason the problem of international relations merits serious and profound study. Another important substantiation for this is the necessity of elaborating scientifically validated ways of strengthening the might of the socialist community and its defense organization -- the Warsaw Pact -- on the basis of principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism. The problems of the future are the concerns of the present. "At the present stage of this country's development," stated Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "the need for further innovative elaboration of theory is not diminishing but on the contrary is becoming even greater. New possibilities for fruitful investigations both of a general theoretical, basic and applied nature are opening up at the juncture of various sciences, especially the natural and social sciences. They should be utilized in full measure."⁶

It is no exaggeration to state that in recent years the problem of relations between nations is one of the central problems in investigations both of foreign and Soviet philosophers, historians, and economists. These investigations have extensively elaborated the theoretical and methodological problems of proletarian, socialist internationalism. This research area is extremely important, since it creates a broad theoretical front on the basis of which concrete problems are elaborated pertaining to development of the socialist community, including problems pertaining to its defense capability.

Many research projects have been devoted to investigation of the activities of the CPSU and other brother Communist and worker parties of the socialist countries in the area of strengthening proletarian internationalism at various stages of historical development. Of course interest in the past has always been connected with people's need better to understand the future, to comprehend the causes of contemporary phenomena in international relations and to predict in what direction they will develop in the future. Especially valuable in this regard are studies devoted to investigation of the problems of proletarian internationalism during World War II. One must bear in mind, however, that this experience is separated from us by a considerable time interval. In subsequent years many new elements have

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

appeared both in the development of international relations and in the problem of defense capability of the socialist community. There arises the necessity of re-interpreting a number of points, of penetrating anew and more deeply into the essence of the increasingly more complex dialectical interrelationships between genuine internationalism and the defense capability of the brother socialist countries. "Cognition is a perpetual, endless approaching of thought to object," wrote V. I. Lenin. "One must define the reflection of nature in man's thoughts not in a 'dead' or 'abstract' manner, not without movement, not without conflicts, but in a perpetual process of movement, the emergence and resolving of conflicts."⁷

In the Soviet and foreign literature there are many studies dealing with the problems of internationalism and strengthening the defense capability of the socialist nations and their community as a whole. A number of these studies, however, insufficiently reveal the dialectics of the relationship between proletarian, socialist internationalism and the defense capability of the socialist community. These problems are examined in an isolated manner, as independent of one another.

In the 1960's and 1970's there were published a great many collective-authorship studies, monographs, candidate and doctoral dissertations dealing with the problem of the correlation between internationalism and defense capability of the socialist community. These studies usually discuss, sometimes deeply and in detail, individual aspects and facets of this extensive and multiple-level problem. Acknowledging the correctness of and need for a differentiated approach to study of the dialectical link between international relations and the defense capability of the socialist community, the author considers it extremely important to examine this problem as a whole. On the one hand we have the requisite experience in functioning of the socialist community and its defense organization for such an investigation, while on the other hand the requisite theoretical foundation has been created for studying this experience.

The aim of this study is to investigate the dialectical relations between the actually developing international relations and defense capability of the brother socialist countries and examination of internationalism as a factor in strengthening all components of their collective military might in present-day conditions.

The main and determining thesis which permeates the entire study is the organic unity of scientific objectivity and a high-principled evaluation of the phenomena being studied, from the position of the worker class and the sociopolitical requirements of the socialist society and its army.

Alongside analysis of the objective conditions of the military unity of the peoples of the socialist countries, this study also investigates the subjective factor -- the practical activities of Communist and worker parties and government agencies pertaining to conscious establishment of the unity of the international and national, the general and specific, the long-term and the temporary, the root and the transient elements in the development and strengthening of this unity.

The socialist community is a model of new relations between countries, unprecedented in history, relations of full equality, mutual assistance, and collective cooperation for the sake of common goals. Standing shoulder to shoulder in the world arena, the socialist nations assist social progress; their actions are in conformity

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

with the root interests of the worker class, working people, all the world's peoples. We must state that if the imperialists have not unleashed another world war, this is primarily to the historical credit of the socialist community. Without it the entire countenance of our planet would be different. The Warsaw Pact member nations have supported and continue to support development and deepening of the process of détente and radical improvement of the international political climate. This is strongly reaffirmed by the Declaration adopted at the jubilee conference of the Political Consultative Committee held on 15 May 1980 in the capital of the Polish People's Republic. "In the struggle for peace, security and détente," states the Declaration, "the members of the Warsaw Pact always have displayed and continue to display consistency and high principledness, a constructive approach and good will, boldness in advancing initiatives and realism in negotiations, and willingness to consider the legitimate rights and interests of others."⁸

It is to the great credit of V. I. Lenin, the CPSU and the other brother parties that they have demonstrated the essential, legitimate nature of the military unity of peoples which have taken the road of socialism and have defined the principles and form of this unity. The logical process of their drawing closer together "depends on the policy of the ruling parties, on their ability to preserve unity, to combat exclusivity and national isolation, to consider common international tasks, and to act in concert for the sake of accomplishing these tasks."⁹

Theory of internationalism and the fundamentals of scientific policy in the military area are elaborated on the basis of synthesis of practical activities and innovative resolution of the problems formulated by practical realities. The author was guided by the Lenin thesis that "the viewpoint of practical realities should be the first and principal viewpoint of theory of knowledge."¹⁰ Wherever possible and expedient, the author has sought to refine theoretical syntheses and conclusions into practical conclusions and recommendations.

The basic problems discussed in this volume are revealed in a close link with critique of the gnosologic and theoretical principles of bourgeois nationalism, revisionism and Maoism, with exposure of the distortions by bourgeois, revisionist and Maoist ideologues of the theory and practice of the CPSU and the other brother Communist and worker parties in questions pertaining to unity of the nations of the socialist community and its defense organization -- the Warsaw Pact.

FOOTNOTES

1. "O 110-y godovshchine so dnya rozhdeniya Vladimira Il'icha Lenina" [The 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin], Moscow, 1980, page 11.
2. "KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh s"yezdov, konferentsiy i plenumov TsK" [The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums], Vol 12, page 114.
3. "Materialy XXIV s"yezda KPSS" [Proceedings of the 24th CPSU Congress], Moscow, 1971, page 21.
4. PRAVDA, 19 February 1979.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

5. L. I. Brezhnev, "O pyatidesyatiletii Soyuzu Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik" [On the 50th Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics], Moscow, 1972, page 30.
6. "KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh...", op. cit., Vol 12, page 156.
7. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 29, page 177.
8. PRAVDA, 16 May 1980.
9. "KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh...", op. cit., Vol 12, page 91.
10. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 18, page 145.

CONCLUSION

World history attests to the fact that the problem of relations between nations cannot be resolved in conditions of a class-antagonistic society. Aggravation of the nationalities question in the contemporary capitalist world is a logical consequence of development of the essence of imperialism. "Imperialism is progressive oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of great powers...." emphasized V. I. Lenin.¹ National movements take place throughout the capitalist system in two aspects: intrastate -- in countries with a variegated ethnic composition, and inter-state -- between imperialist powers and politically and economically dependent countries standing at different levels of development.

Constituting a part of the struggle for democracy, national movements in the era of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism are linked historically with the prospects of the struggle for socialism, for only socialism brings an end to man's exploitation by man, to all forms of national and ethnic oppression, ensures genuine equality of peoples, and creates realistic conditions for fraternal cooperation among nations.

The experience of the USSR convincingly shows that only a socialist revolution ensures close unification of all popular forces, headed by the worker class, with the goal of putting an end to the capitalist system of exploitation and, together with it, the system of national and ethnic oppression.

The Soviet experience of establishment of a multinational socialist state as well as resolution of the highly complex nationalities question have gained worldwide recognition and are of invaluable assistance to all those fighting for social and national liberation. History has never before seen in the mutual relations between dozens of nations and nationalities such a firm unity of interests and goals, will and actions, such a spiritual kinship, trust and mutual concern as are constantly manifested within the fraternal alliance of Soviet peoples.

"Consistent implementation of Leninist principles of nationalities policy," states the CPSU Central Committee Decree entitled "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," "is leading to further comprehensive drawing together

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of all the peoples of our multinational socialist homeland. The Soviet Union offers an attractive example of successful resolution of one of the most complex problems of development of human society."²

Resolution of the nationalities question on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism has triumphed not only in the Soviet multinational state but also on an international scale. The system of capitalism, social and ethnic oppression and racial discrimination is opposed by a world socialist system, in which mutual relations between countries are characterized by constantly growing political, economic and cultural ties, by development of integration processes, vigorous exchange of knowledge and know-how, and close cooperation in the area of foreign policy and military defense.

International events of recent years have developed under the determining influence of the socialist system. Precisely this system constitutes the principal driving force in man's movement along the road of progress; man's ideals are increasingly more fully embodied in this system. It is situated on the front line of the struggle against imperialism. The entire development of the contemporary revolutionary movement is inseparable from the growing influence of the socialist countries on the course of world affairs. Strengthening of the unity of the socialist countries and deepening of the fraternal friendship between their Marxist-Leninist parties are substantially increasing the unified might and influence of socialism on the course of international events.

Proletarian internationalism is the ideological-political foundation which unites and cements these factors. Constituting a reflection of social reality, proletarian internationalism is evolving and improving in the process of historical development. In an era of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, in the course of building a developed socialist society in the USSR, establishment and consolidation of a world socialist system, the range of influence of internationalism on societal progress is greatly expanding.

Today proletarian internationalism reflects the relations among the worker class of all countries; among the world's Communist and worker parties; between the worker class as a whole and forces fighting for national liberation in the former colonial world; among the socialist countries. One specific feature of the present situation is the fact that the ideas of internationalism are being increasingly more actively perceived not only by the worker class but also by progressive revolutionary democrats in the developing countries. In the last decades proletarian internationalism has become a more powerful and effective weapon of the worker class of all countries. Its basic principles have to a significant degree been adopted by representatives of other antiimperialist, primarily revolutionary-democratic forces. Today to speak of proletarian internationalism means to speak of the solidarity of the worker class and Communists of all countries in the struggle for common goals, and their solidarity with the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress.

In the socialist countries proletarian internationalism is developing into socialist internationalism. Together with deepening of the objective process of internationalization of all aspects of societal affairs, the science of proletarian,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

socialist internationalism is being improved and perfected. Brother Communist and worker parties view it as a unity of the objective and subjective, a unity of the objective laws and patterns of building socialism and the activities of Marxist-Leninist parties in conformity with these laws and patterns.

The mandatory character of the general laws and patterns of socialist revolution and socialist development, discovered by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and confirmed by the experience of socialist reforms, has been comprehensively reflected in the documents of conferences of Communist and worker parties. These mechanisms were formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. He emphasized that the path taken by various countries toward socialism has been marked by such important mechanisms, landmarks common to all of them, as socialist revolution in one form or another, including the scrapping and replacement of the governmental machinery of the exploiters; establishment of a given form of dictatorship of the proletariat, which entered into alliance with other toiler strata, and liquidation of exploiter classes; socialization of the means of production and establishment of socialist production and other societal relations in urban and rural areas; bringing cultural assets within the reach of the broad worker masses, that is, a cultural revolution in the Leninist meaning of the term. Power in the hands of the working people, with the worker class playing a vanguard role, guidance of societal development by the Marxist-Leninist party, public ownership of the means of production and, on this basis, planned development of the entire national economy at the highest technological level in the interests of prosperity of the entire people; implementation of the principle "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor"; indoctrination of the entire people in a spirit of the ideology of scientific communism, in a spirit of friendship with the peoples of the brother socialist countries and working people of the entire world; and a foreign policy based on the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism are integral features of the socialist society.³

Military unity and joint strengthening of the defense capability of the socialist community constitute a most important mechanism. The defense of socialism is a common international duty of the brother countries. Elucidation of general laws and patterns is a result of synthesis of the enormous historical experience of peoples and one of the outstanding achievements of Marxist-Leninist theoretical thought.

A strong imprint, however, is made both on the process of internal development of the socialist countries and on the character of their relations with one another by objectively existing differences in level of development of productive resources, structure of production, social-class composition of population, and in historical conditions. In connection with this it is essential, guided by the general patterns and mechanisms of development of the nations of the socialist community, to take their specific national features into account. Without considering both these factors it is impossible correctly to develop relations between socialist nations.

The CPSU and the brother Communist and worker parties of the socialist community consider the principle of combination of the general and specific-national to be a central aspect of internationalist policy. All the outstanding accomplishments of the Soviet Union and the remarkable achievements of the brother socialist nations

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

constitute genuine embodiment of innovative application of general patterns and mechanisms of building socialism in each country.

The process of development of the world socialist system has shown that the problem of combining international and national interests applies to both major areas of establishment of the new system, the internal processes of building socialism and the external relations of the brother nations.

The last quarter of a century attests to the fact that in spite of certain difficulties, the major trend in development of the world socialist system is the process of drawing together of socialist nations and states, which is leading to their economic, political and military unity and to growth and strengthening of all forms of cooperation and interrelations.

A correct combination of international and national interests in the mutual relations of the socialist countries presupposes not only proletarian solidarity and equality. Practical internationalism requires of each socialist country subordination of national to international interests and an implacable struggle against all manifestations of nationalism. The entire course of development of socialism has demonstrated that policy which runs counter to these principles, policy in which nationalist aspirations are paramount, in the final analysis does detriment primarily to the interests of that country which pursues such a policy.

Consistent implementation of the principles of socialist internationalism, which are an expression of objective patterns and mechanisms, is a powerful factor in strengthening the economic, sociopolitical and military might of each socialist nation and the world socialist system as a whole.

Today one is hard put to name a problem in which the basic interests of the socialist countries do not coincide. But this commonality is perhaps not so obvious in any other realm of societal affairs as in the military area. In order to withstand the threat of imperialism and the aggressive blocs it has fashioned, in order to defend the cause of socialism and peace, the peoples of the socialist community have established a defensive organization -- the Warsaw Pact. This has raised the defense capability of each member nation to a qualitatively higher level. Thanks to unity, solidarity, and mutual support, the socialist countries have succeeded in successfully resolving many major problems and accomplishing that for which they have struggled for a long period of time.

The slightest departure by any nation from the principle of collective defense weakens the entire socialist system and threatens the sovereignty of the brother countries. This is why the Marxist-Leninist parties, governments and peoples of these countries are making every effort to strengthen their unity, are increasing their revolutionary vigilance, and are constantly concerned with improving collective defense.

The Comprehensive Program is a qualitatively new stage in the development of economic cooperation in the socialist community. It specifies concrete ways to achieve intensification of cooperation in coming years and at the same time lays the foundation for new, more effective directions and forms of interrelationships

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

extending far into the future. The Comprehensive Program opens up the way for fullest utilization of the possibilities of cooperation among the brother countries in the interests of rapid utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution and planned development of economically effective production in each country and in the community as a whole. Developing the economic foundation of the socialist community and boosting its economic potential, economic integration is raising its economic power to a new and higher level.

The moral-political potential of the socialist community is increasing year by year; a social structure of a single type has been established in this community, comprised of the worker class, a peasantry unified into cooperatives and the toiling intelligentsia. An ideology of Marxism-Leninism, socialist internationalism and friendship of peoples has been established, processes of exchange of material and spiritual goods and cadres are taking place intensively, and the mutual influence and internationalization of the entire way of life of the peoples of this community is becoming strengthened. There is taking place an intensive process of realization by the masses of the correctness, justice and vital necessity of joint defense of the socialist community, an awareness which, to quote V. I. Lenin, "is of enormous significance and guarantees victory."⁴

Guided by the principles of socialist internationalism, which have been tested and proven in a practical manner, and carrying out the military-patriotic and internationalist indoctrination of the masses, the brother Communist and worker parties are successfully accomplishing the tasks of collective defense of the socialist community. The brother countries are pursuing a unified, coordinated policy on fundamental points of international affairs. Virtually all important problems which are of common interest are discussed collectively. Meetings of the leaders of the ruling parties have assumed particular significance; at these get-togethers leaders formulate and solve important, long-range problems and elaborate methods and means of a unified strategy of the socialist community. The Warsaw Pact organization is the main center for coordination of foreign policy activity.

Strengthening of the moral-political potential, unity and cohesiveness of the socialist countries is also proceeding in the direction of ideological cooperation. The brother parties are formulating and accomplishing tasks of joint theoretical elaboration of the most important problems in the area of building socialism and communism; the strategy of defense of this process, as well as problems pertaining to the struggle against anti-Communist, bourgeois ideology, against rightist and "leftist" opportunism and bourgeois nationalism, and matters pertaining to indoctrinating the peoples of the countries of this community in a spirit of socialist internationalism and patriotism.

The socialist people's armies and the Warsaw Pact Joint Forces are the object of special concern on the part of the Communist and worker parties of the Warsaw Pact nations. With the objective of increasing the defense might of the Warsaw Pact Organization, considerable work has been recently accomplished on improving the military command and control agencies of this defensive organization, on furnishing the brother armies with the latest combat equipment and weapons, on exchanging experience and know-how on military organizational development, training and internationalist indoctrination of the fighting men of the brother armies.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Proletarian, socialist internationalism is a most important factor in strengthening all components of the defense capability of the world socialist system and constitutes a sure guarantee of the sovereignty and prosperity of all nations of the community. The CPSU has time and again stressed the importance of unified actions by the brother countries in the international arena and the importance of combining in a coordinated foreign policy firm resistance to aggression with a constructive policy of peaceful political settlement of critical international problems.

The jubilee meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member nations is new and persuasive evidence of the fact that the nations of this community are unswervingly following their high-principled course of foreign policy. "The strength of our policy," stated Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his address in Warsaw, "lies in the fraternal unity of our countries, our parties, our peoples, in our faithfulness to the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of socialist internationalism. The strength of our policy lies in the fact that it is in conformity with the vital interests of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world, everybody who wants peace and not war...."⁵

The great principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism are exerting increasing influence on international affairs. They express an objective trend toward unity of the socialist countries, a trend which is a logical pattern of their development and is invincibly moving forward, for it is backed by the profound international and national interests of the entire community.

The Warsaw Pact member nations are doing everything in their power to ensure that their alliance is strong and invincible and continues in the future to be a reliable shield protecting the revolutionary achievements of socialism.

FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 27, page 63.
2. "O 60-y godovshchine Velikoy Oktyabr'skoy sotsialisticheskoy revolyutsii. Postanovleniye TsK KPSS" [On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. CPSU Central Committee Decree], Moscow, 1977, page 12.
3. See L. I. Brezhnev, "Delo Lenina zhivet i pobezhdayet" [The Cause of Lenin Lives on and Conquers], Moscow, 1970, page 47.
4. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 41, page 121.
5. PRAVDA, 16 May 1980.

COPYRIGHT: Voenizdat, 1981

3024
CSO: 1801/061

END

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY