

JPRS-UMA-85-021-L-CORRECTED

13 November 1985

USSR REPORT
MILITARY AFFAIRS

HISTORY TEACHES VIGILANCE

Moscow ISTORIYA UCHIT BDITELNOSTI in Russian 1985, pp 3-95

[Book "History Teaches Vigilance" by Marshal of the Soviet Union N. V. Ogarkov, Voenizdat, 30,000 copies, 93 pages, UDC: 68 0-36. Passages printed in boldface and italics in source rendered in all capital letters]

CONTENTS

	Page
Annotation.....	1
Introduction.....	2
The Exploitative System Is the Source of Wars.....	4
Two Worlds -- Two Policies.....	10
Based on the Laws of Science.....	27
Two Doctrines, Two Strategies.....	38
War Can and Must Be Prevented.....	57
Conclusion.....	64
Footnotes.....	66

- a -

[III - USSR - 4 FOUO]

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.

Annotation

The book examines the problem of war and peace as the most burning problem of our time. Based on analyzing the contemporary military-political situation, the author exposes the aggressive and reactionary nature of the military policy and military doctrines of the U. S. and its allies and shows the peace loving essence of the Soviet Union's military doctrine.

The concluding chapter is devoted to substantiating the possibility and necessity of preventing a new world war.

The book is intended for a wide readership.

INTRODUCTION

Four decades have passed since the time that Soviet soldiers hoisted the banner of our Great Victory over the Reichstag of defeated Fascist Germany and the standards of Hitler's "invincible" army were trampled under the feet of the Soviet people, the victorious people. This act has gone down in history forever. It was a worthy conclusion to the heroic feat of the Soviet people and its Armed Forces, accomplished under the leadership of the Leninist Communist Party.

Our path to victory was glorious and filled with many difficulties. The armored hordes of fascist invaders perfidiously attacked our Homeland. Tremendous efforts were required from the Soviet people and its army in order to stop and then defeat the aggressor in battles of unprecedented scale and ferocity. In great battles at Moscow and Stalingrad, at the Kursk Salient and the Dnieper, at the Vistula, in the Berlin Operation and in other battles, the glorious Soviet soldiers broke the spine of the bloodthirsty fascist beast.

Soldiers from the armies and partisans from Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia, patriots from Bulgaria, Romania, Albania and Hungary and participants in the Resistance Movement and the anti-fascist underground fought together with the Soviet Armed Forces against the hated enslavers. In their front ranks were the communists -- fervent patriots and internationalists. An important contribution to the victory over the common enemy was also made by the peoples and armies of the U. S., Great Britain, France, China and other states of the anti-Hitler coalition. In this effort the Soviet State shouldered the brunt of the battle against fascism. It was namely the Soviet people and its army which became the decisive force in achieving victory over Fascist Germany and its allies, in liberating the peoples of Europe from Fascist enslavement and in saving world civilization, and who honorably fulfilled their patriotic and internationalist duty. This is their most magnificent service to mankind.

Time and life itself demonstrate ever more convincingly the world historical importance of our victory. "The destruction of German Fascism and then Japanese militarism," it is noted in the CPSU Central Committee decree, "On the 40th Anniversary of the Soviet People in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945," "had the most profound influence on the entire course of world development. Favorable conditions were created for the struggle of the laboring masses for their social and national liberation. The positions of progressive, democratic and peace loving forces were strengthened and the influence of communist and workers' parties increased. The world socialist system arose and is successfully developing. The disintegration of the imperialist colonial system was hastened, ending in its destruction." All this led to fundamental changes in the correlation of forces on the world arena to the advantage of socialism, peace and progress.

In those victorious days of 1945, mankind hoped that with the destruction of German Fascism and Japanese militarism an era would arrive free of wars and bloodshed, an era of friendship and cooperation among countries and peoples. But the reactionary circles of the Western states, most of all the U. S.,

destroyed these hopes. Almost immediately after the end of the 2d World War they unleashed a "cold war" against the USSR and other socialist countries and aggravated the international situation. The imperialists intended, at any price, to achieve military superiority over the USSR, and to reexamine "from a position of strength" the results of the past war and regain their lost historical positions.

In the 1970s, owing to the persistent efforts of the socialist states, as well as the world's other peace loving forces, a certain detente in international relations was achieved and real prospects appeared for further improvement in cooperation among states with differing social systems. But reactionary imperialist circles, most of all the U. S. military-industrial complex, fought against detente. They desire not peace among peoples but an arms race and preparations for a new war. It is as though for them what is more important is not the interests of billions of people on Earth, but an unrestrained aspiration on the part of a small group of monopolists for unprecedented enrichment at the cost of the blood and sweat of these billions of workers.

Ever newer arms programs, irresponsible threats against the socialist states, calls for a "crusade" against them, aggressive actions by imperialism against the peoples of the liberated countries in various regions of the world, all indicate that the leaders of the capitalist world learned little from the experience of World War II. In their anticommunist blindness they are prepared to embark upon any crime, even the most monstrous, all the way to unleashing a worldwide nuclear war.

This book makes an attempt to show the influence of the Great Victory of the Soviet people over fascism on the postwar world; to expose the reactionary essence of the militarist plans of today's pretenders to world domination; and to disclose ways of preventing the new world war for which the imperialists are preparing. The book also emphasizes the importance of high vigilance by the forces which stand in defense of peace among the peoples and the gains of socialism.

THE EXPLOITATIVE SYSTEM IS THE SOURCE OF WARS

The military danger which arose recently through the fault of the imperialism of the U. S. and other countries of the aggressive NATO bloc is causing deep concern in ever wider circles of mankind. People of various ages, convictions and occupations are more and more often thinking about how and why wars arise and whether they are unavoidable and tragic companions of human progress or the ugly fruit of some social formation.

In order to answer these questions it is necessary to look at history. It makes clear that there have not always been wars. In primitive communal society, for example, they were altogether absent, since there were no reasons for them. Everything which people obtained from nature at that time was shared fairly among them.

Wars began with the appearance of private property in the means of production and the division of society into antagonistic classes, and with the emergence of exploiters and exploited.

The appearance of wars made it necessary to develop certain theoretical views on war and its weapon -- the army. These views expressed most of all the interests of the ruling classes.

In slaveholding society, which was characterized by the most brutal exploitation of the oppressed classes, war was considered a natural phenomenon, since it provided slaves, without which slaveholding society could not exist.

In the feudal era, when religion was the dominant form of ideology, war as a rule was interpreted as a "necessary evil," without which there supposedly could not be the "good of Christian peace and justice." Meanwhile, even then opinions were already being expressed that the roots of war should be sought not in heaven, but on earth.

Later, in the stage of early bourgeois society, other theories began to arise about the origin and causes of wars. There were a lot them. With the development of capitalism, many of them were seized upon by its ideologues, amplified, and exist today. These are so-called biological, racial, technical and other theories and concepts, as well as various psychological interpretations. All basically expressed the ideology of the exploiters, the ideology of capitalism and its highest stage -- imperialism.

ONLY MARXISM-LENINISM, WHICH COMBINES COMMUNIST PARTY-MINDEDNESS WITH STRICT SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIVITY, PROVIDES THE KEY TO UNDERSTANDING THE TRUE ESSENCE OF WAR AND ITS LAWS AND ROLE IN THE HISTORICAL PROCESS.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the course of world history, its most important events and the replacement of social and economic formations are objectively caused most of all by the development of productive forces and the means of production. A change in the means of production caused changes in all spheres

of social life, including the military. Therefore, Marxism-Leninism serves as the overall theoretical and methodological foundation of Soviet military science and of the cognitive and practical activity of military cadres. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism and its theories and methods, Soviet military science, along with the other sciences, studies war as a complex social and political phenomenon. Its military technical base and the methods of preparing for and waging war are studied in close connection with its social and political aspects, and appropriate recommendations are developed.

Marx and Engels thoroughly disclosed the socio-historical nature of wars and the reasons that they arise. Exposing the idealistic and anti-scientific theories of the ideologues of the exploitative classes, Engels demonstrated that it is not wars which are the cause of the inequality of classes, but, to the contrary, it is namely economic and social inequality in an antagonistic, exploitative society which led to the emergence of wars as a socio-political phenomenon. Consequently, the sources and causes of wars must be sought first of all in antagonistic socio-economic formations, where private property in the means of production divided society into opposing classes.

Thus, the need for slaves and a desire to plunder other peoples were the main causes of wars in the slaveholding world. The battle to acquire riches and secure the conditions for exploitation of the peoples became the reason for military campaigns in the feudal era. War is also inherent to capitalism and its corresponding means of production and the bourgeois type of state, the government of which, in Marx's definition, is "a committee, managing its common affairs,"² and in which the predatory military machine -- "a dirty, bloody swamp of military bureaucratic institutions, subordinating everything to itself and suppressing everything,"³ functions as the inevitable arbiter of this state. The militaristic appetite grew still more in the highest stage of capitalism, the period of imperialism, when monopolistic plunderers began to fight to forcibly redivide the world, which was already divided among the largest exploitative states.

War is an expression of the extreme exacerbation of the contradictions inherent in exploitative society, and is a specific way of solving them. Armed force is inherently necessary in this society to plunder other countries, ensure the domination of the propertied classes and maintain peoples in subjugation for the purposes of their exploitation. It is namely for this reason that the history of exploitative society, in the words of Engels, dragged "its triumphal chariot across a mountain of bodies."³ Beginning with its first pages it was written in the blood and sweat of the oppressed and the language of the fire of the oppressors.

V. I. Lenin, whose name and activity are linked to an entire era in the development of society, brilliantly continued the work and teaching of Marx and Engels. He gave answers to the most pressing questions with which mankind was faced in its new stage of development, when capitalism had attained its highest stage, that of imperialism. Lenin thoroughly developed and enriched the theory of the socialist revolution and laid the basis for a new stage in developing teaching about war and the army under new historical conditions, in the era of the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism.

A dialectical materialist understanding of history makes it possible to see clearly the close link between war and politics. "...War," noted Lenin, "is simply the continuation of politics by other," (namely forcible) "means."⁵ The nature and aims of war are fully and entirely determined by the nature and goals of "the policy of given, interested powers -- and the various classes within them -- at a given time."⁶

"War," stressed Lenin in 1915, "is a 'terrible' thing...But it is a terribly profitable thing."⁷ In the 1st World War, U. S. imperialists turned from a debtor to Europe into her creditor, and gained over \$35 billion out of the peoples' blood. In 6 years of the 2d World War, profits of American corporations reached \$116.8 billion. Considering nothing, they are intensely tearing toward this "profitable thing" today as well, all the more so because they have still not really experienced the destructive consequences of modern warfare. Ruling circles of the U. S. and its allies, expressing and defending the interests of monopoly capital and its most reactionary part -- the military-industrial complex -- are prepared in the name of their own aims to risk the vital interests of all mankind.

In Lenin's apt expression, "politics is the concentrated expression of economics."⁸ And the U. S. economy is in the hands of monopoly capital. To obtain profits, monopolies are in constant need of energy resources, oil, coal, uranium, non-ferrous metals and many other kinds of raw materials. For this reason, the regions where they are acquired and the markets for sale of manufactured goods are impudently declared areas of the "vital interests" of the leading capitalist states, where their armed forces are sent. For ever newer acts of robbery, plundering and suppressing of liberation movements, the imperialist aggressors create military bases everywhere, and dispatch marines, paratroopers and subunits of other armed forces. It is in no way for the defense of freedom and democracy, about which the U. S. so often and so shamelessly speaks of late, that it wages undeclared war against the peoples of El Salvador, Nicaragua, Afghanistan and other countries. And it was not at all for the "defense" of American students, whom no one was threatening, that the U. S. brought down a military machine of tremendous strength on tiny Grenada. Behind all of this are the material and military-political interests of the predatory and greedy U. S. military-industrial complex.

The above confirms again the objective Leninist conclusion that imperialism, "by virtue of its fundamental ECONOMIC traits, is distinguished by the least humanity and love of freedom and the greatest and most all-encompassing militarism,"⁹ and that "politically imperialism is altogether an aspiration to force and reaction."¹⁰ This assessment contains a concentrated expression of one of the most important traits of imperialism -- its aggressive essence.

But the predatory aspirations and deeds of imperialism do not pass by with no impact on it. The steadily worsening general crisis of capitalism in all of its manifestations; the exacerbation of internal and inter-imperialist contradictions; and the increasingly intense struggle for markets and sources of raw materials inexorably undermine the underpinnings of the outmoded capitalist system. Trying by any means to prolong its existence, the imperialist plunderers resort to total militarization of the economy; carry

Approved For Release 2005/06/08 : CIA-RDP93T01468R000100110005-2

out a policy of aggression, pillage and oppression of the peoples of their own and foreign countries; and unleash unjust, predatory wars.

EVERY ERA HAS CONTRADICTIONS INHERENT SPECIFICALLY TO ITSELF. Particular types and kinds of wars correspond to them. For example, characteristic of slaveholding society were wars between slaveholding states and between various groups of slaveholders, as well as uprisings of slaves against the slaveholders. In the feudal period, the main types of wars were wars between feudal states; wars for the creation of centralized feudal states; wars against foreign invaders; peasant wars -- uprisings of popular masses against their enslavers, etc. Colonial, anti-feudal, national liberation and civil wars and uprisings of the proletariat were inherent to wars in the era of pre-monopoly capitalism. In the imperialist era, acute economic and political contradictions of monopolies caused military clashes of imperialist powers, as was already stated, for the forcible redivision of the divided world. In scale these clashes are becoming universal and worldwide. At the same time, civil wars between the proletariat and bourgeoisie are becoming extensive in scale, as are national liberation wars of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries.

The modern era, which constitutes primarily the transition from capitalism to socialism, called forth a complex network of contradictions and the interweaving of various social and political relations. The main contradiction of the modern era is that between socialism and imperialism. One of its sharpest manifestations is the aggressiveness of imperialism with respect to socialism. Imperialism hopes by the force of arms to turn back the objective course of history, suffocate the workers' authority and return to its past global supremacy.

As a consequence of imperialist aggressiveness, its fanatical anticommunism and the need to defend the revolutionary gains of the peoples against the imperialist aggressors, a new type of war has arisen: WARS IN DEFENSE OF THE SOCIALIST HOMELAND. Their causes are not found in the nature and policy of the socialist states, but in the policy of imperialism and in its aspiration to retard the legitimate process of society's social development. War in defense of socialism is aimed not at seizing foreign territories and enslaving the peoples of other countries, but at defending the freedom and independence of the state of workers and peasants. Therefore, it is a just war in the highest degree, and it is consistently revolutionary in nature. The greatest modern war in defense of the socialist Homeland was the Great Patriotic War by the Soviet Union in 1941-1945. Defense of the socialist Homeland is one of the general laws of the socialist revolution and the construction of socialism, and is not only a national, but also an international cause for the peoples of the fraternal countries.

The sharp exacerbation of the contradictions between labor and capital and between the working class and the monopoly bourgeoisie; the unwillingness of the bourgeoisie voluntarily to leave the historical scene; and its aspiration to prevent by any means the victory of the new social system are causing CIVIL WARS for the liberation of the laboring masses from exploitation and oppression. This type of war represents the most acute and decisive form of class warfare, and bears for the workers a progressive and revolutionary

Approved For Release 2005/06/08 : CIA-RDP93T01468R000100110005-2

nature. The civil war which was imposed upon the people of our country by forces of foreign and domestic counterrevolution after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution was precisely such a war in its social content and nature.

The profound antagonism which divides the imperialist states and countries which have achieved national independence and are struggling for their full liberation, and attempts by the imperialist predators to prevent national and social liberation and free development of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, cause NATIONAL LIBERATION WARS. They represent the justified reaction of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to the desire of the imperialists to deprive them of state independence and impose on them neocolonial, reactionary regimes.

The contradiction between socialism and imperialism does not take away the contradictions rending the capitalist world. Sharp competition among the main capitalist powers and the emergence of new centers of capitalist competition preserve the possibility of IMPERIALIST WARS among the capitalist states or their coalitions for division of the world and establishment of a dominant position in the world. In their social nature these are extremely unjust, predatory wars from both sides, which are foreign to the fundamental interests of the peoples and are hostile to social progress.

The different types and kinds of wars are closely interrelated, and under various specific historical conditions a combination of several of them is possible. Thus, civil wars by the proletariat and all workers are often combined with wars against imperialist intervention. Examples of this were the civil war of the workers against the White Guards and military interventionists in our country (1918-1920); the war of the Spanish people against the fascist insurgents and Italian and German interventionists in 1936-1939; etc. The 2d World War of 1939-1945 also occupies a special place among modern wars from the point of view of social and political content, in view of its complex and contradictory nature. Having begun from the side of both capitalist groupings as an imperialist, predatory war, especially from the side of Fascist Germany and its satellites against the Anglo-French bloc, later, with the forced entry of the USSR in view of the perfidious attack on her by Hitler's aggressors, the war acquired a liberating, just character from the side of the peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition.

Marxist-Leninist science on war and the army teaches that certain political and strategic features are characteristic of every war, which stem from its political aims, class content, scale and means of armed conflict used. Depending on the political aims and class content, wars from one warring side may be just, and for the other, unjust. But imperialist wars are unjust for both sides.

According to scale, a war unleashed by imperialism may be a WORLD WAR, with the participation of a majority or substantial portion of the countries of the world, or it may be local, with the limited participation of two or a few states. It is not excluded that a war which began as a local war may grow into a world war, as was the case in World War II, or a war with the use of conventional weapons into one with the use of nuclear weapons.

* * *

Thus, Marxist-Leninist teaching on war convincingly, precisely and objectively discloses the reasons for the origin of wars and their essence. Under any guise the true source of wars in all times and eras in the final analysis was the exploitative class. And under modern conditions, war as a socio-political phenomenon is engendered by no one other than imperialism, led by its main power, the U. S. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are the true fighters for peace and the consistent fighters against the forces of war. The thrust of the two political policies on the world arena provides graphic evidence of this: the peace loving policy of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, aimed at preventing wars and confirming peaceful coexistence of states with opposing social and political systems, and the aggressive policy of the United States of America, aimed at whipping up the arms race, promoting military tension and preparing for a new world war.

TWO WORLDS -- TWO POLICIES

World War I and the Great October Socialist Revolution began the general crisis of capitalism. At the highest stage of capitalism -- imperialism -- due to intensified concentration and export of capital; chases after the greatest profits; competition and anarchy in production and growing inequality in the economic and political development of various states, all the antagonisms of this antagonistic society were sharpened: those between the social nature of labor and the private capitalist form of appropriating its products; between the proletariat and bourgeoisie; among the largest monopolies or their groupings; between individual imperialist states and numerous colonies and semi-colonies; and among the capitalist states themselves. Striving to solve its inherent contradictions through armed force, imperialism resorts more and more often to wars. They have become its constant and unavoidable companion.

World War II, and especially its main component, the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people, still further intensified the general crisis of the capitalist system. Victory by the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War created favorable conditions for victorious revolutions in a number of countries of Europe and Asia; for the formation of the world socialist system; the extensive spread of national liberation movements; and the struggle of the peoples for independence, social progress and peace.

In the post-war period the process of revolutionary and progressive transformations in the world continued, the scope of the antiwar, anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples grew, and the sphere of capital investment steadily diminished. In connection with this there took place a rearrangement of forces, not only in the international arena as a whole, but also within the capitalist world itself. The United States of America occupied the leading position in this. Along with its allies it directed tremendous efforts at stopping the world revolutionary process, suffocating the communist, workers and national liberation movement, wiping socialism from the face of the earth and returning to itself the role of undivided ruler of the people's fates. Ardent anti-communism and anti-Sovietism became the dominant content of their reactionary policy.

The Aggressive Policy of U. S. Imperialism

The U. S. has existed for a little longer than 200 years, but not a single capitalist state can compare with it in the number of armed interventions undertaken. The expansion and use of armed force is an age-old dark tradition in the U. S. It began with the mass annihilation of the native Indian population in North America and forcible seizing of their land in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. As a matter of fact, this was one of the most cruel colonial wars of the period.

In the early 19th Century, the colonial holdings of Britain, France, Germany and Spain in the Far East, with their huge territories, expansive markets and rich natural resources, attracted the attention of the American capitalist predator. Among the first U. S. colonial adventures were attempts to invade

Korea and the Indonesian islands. In 1853, under the threat of ships' guns, it forced Japan to conclude a treaty to open a number of her ports and grant tremendous benefits to American entrepreneurs. Through military force, beginning in the first half of the 19th Century, the U. S. secured for a long period of time its predatory interests in China. These and other acts of plunder by U. S. imperialism were usually cloaked in inventions about "defense of freedom of trade," "threats to American seafarers and traders," etc.

The U. S. also began the imperialist wars for the redivision of the world. In 1898 American ruling circles inspired the explosion and sinking of one of their own military vessels near Havana and declared war on Spain, which then ruled Cuba. In three and a half months it forced Spain to capitulate, having seized from her Puerto Rico and a number of other islands in Caribbean area. Although Cuba was declared an independent state, the U. S. established its military control over her, having created a naval base at Guantanamo Bay which, by the way, exists today. Soon afterwards it also seized the Philippines. The Spanish-American War was one of the bloody landmarks by which the start of the imperialist era was marked, and was indicative of U. S. entry into the struggle for world hegemony.

Then the U. S. annexed the Hawaiian Islands and blackmailed Panama to take away the Panama Canal.

At that time, in 1904, U. S. President T. Roosevelt formulated the well-known principle of aggressive American policy: "Speak softly and carry a big stick -- then you will achieve success." That is how the U. S. has acted, both in the past and now. The peoples of dozens of countries have experienced this American policy. In the 19th Century alone the United States unleashed more than a hundred predatory wars and its armed forces carried out thousands of military campaigns and various military actions in many areas of the world. Right after the imperialist war against Spain, in the early 20th Century the U. S. carried out extensive operations in China (1900-1905); aggressive wars against Mexico (1914), Haiti (1914-1916), the Dominican Republic (1916), Cuba (1917-1922) and other countries; suppressed the national liberation movement in Guatemala and Nicaragua; and again sent its troops to Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic (1919-1926).

As a result of the uneven, spasmodic development of the capitalist states in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the U. S., Germany and Japan began to outstrip in economic development and press Great Britain and France, soliciting redivision of their extensive colonial holdings. This, in combination with other factors, even led in the final analysis to World War I. It drew into its orbit 38 states with a combined population of 1.5 billion people, or about 2/3 the world's population at the time.

The United States of America formally declared its neutrality, but in reality participated directly in this war, making extensive military deliveries to both coalitions of warring countries. This enabled the U. S. to obtain colossal profits, to become much stronger than the enfeebled European countries which were involved in the war, and to occupy the position of the leading world power. On this subject, Lenin in his "Letter to the American Workers," noted: "The American billionaires were nearly richer than everyone

else together and were in the most secure geographical position. They gained the most. They made all countries, even the richest, their debtors. They stole hundreds of billions of dollars...On each dollar is a lump of dirt from the 'lucrative' military deliveries... On each dollar are traces of blood -- from the sea of blood which was shed by 10 million killed and 20 million crippled..."¹¹

The American monopolists believed that future wars would also become not calamities, but boons to the U. S., and in the future did everything so that such wars would serve as a source of their enrichment.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the formation in Russia of history's first workers' and peasants' state evoked the rage and malice of the imperialist predators. Their predatory and inhuman foreign policy took on most of all an anti-Soviet and anti-communist nature.

Back in November 1917 the Western governments, including the U. S., gave active, all-round assistance to counterrevolution in Russia. However, soon convinced that the White Guards armies would be unable to destroy Soviet authority, imperialist circles in the U. S., Britain, France, Japan and other states undertook armed intervention in our country. In spring and summer 1918, British and later also American troops landed in Murmansk and Arkhangel'sk. At the same time, the U. S. made incursions into the Soviet Far East, landing there along with Japanese interventionists an expeditionary corps numbering up to 12,000 men. Trying to whitewash the bloody affairs of the American militarists on the territory of Soviet Russia, the U. S. government hypocritically portrayed them as "assistance" to the Russian people "in connection with the disorders and confusion," and as an effort to "secure American stores, supplies and property located in Russia." Justifying their banditry, imperialism also resorted to a shameless lie about the "red danger," which even today is widely used in anti-Soviet propaganda. Lenin wrote in 1919: "There are foolish people who shout about red militarism; these are political swindlers who give the appearance that they believe this foolishness and throw such accusations to right and left, using their legal ability to make up false arguments and throw sand in the eyes of the masses."¹²

The direct aggression of the U. S. against the first, and at the time the only, workers' and peasants' state convincingly showed the anti-popular, reactionary policy of American ruling circles and graphically demonstrated the true nature of "American democracy." The U. S. firmly embarked upon the most merciless suppression of the workers' liberation struggle in all corners of the globe, and became the bulwark of anti-popular forces and regimes and the main designers of "crusades" against everything revolutionary and progressive. Acting in concert with other butchers against the Soviet Republic, "American billionaires, these modern slaveholders," in the words of Lenin, "opened an especially tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism..."¹³

Despite the defeat suffered in Soviet Russia, reactionary imperialist circles stubbornly did not want to reconcile themselves to the existence of a socialist state. U. S. President Hoover confirmed this with frank cynicism in 1931, stating that his goal was the destruction of the USSR.

The peoples of the world had hardly healed the bleeding wounds of World War I when, in the bowels of capitalist society, which was gripped in a severe economic crisis and torn by acute contradictions in the struggle for a new division of the world, an expansion of "living space," and world domination, the evil demon of a new World War had already awakened. Its danger sharply increased when the fascists seized power in Germany, having openly proclaimed as their main objective the struggle against communism and to assert their world domination.

Of course, direct responsibility for unleashing World War II lies mainly on Fascist Germany, Fascist Italy and militarist Japan. At the same time, the U. S., Britain, France and the other Western states were no less guilty of its preparation, either directly or indirectly. Blinded by burning hatred toward socialism, and not wanting to understand that the expansionist aspirations of Hitler's clique also represented a danger to their own countries and peoples, the ruling circles of the Western powers, carrying out the notorious policy of "appeasement" and "non-interference," tried no matter what to direct fascist aggression to the East, against the USSR. They gave Hitler's Germany generous financial and economic assistance in reviving its military-industrial capability and in deploying and equipping technically its multi-million man strong army of brigands. For example, in 1930 alone direct U. S. capital investments in German industry comprised more than \$216 million. At Washington's prompting, Zionist leaders of several other bourgeois countries also gave Hitler hundreds of millions of dollars soon after he came to power. As a result of this assistance, military production in Fascist Germany increased 22-fold from 1934-1940 and the numerical strength of her armed forces increased 35-fold by comparison with the post-war period.

But it did not turn out as the Washington, London and Paris strategists thought. The conflagration of World War II first engulfed their own houses. This forced the Western powers to enter into the anti-Hitler alliance with the USSR. However, even then they did not change their hostile attitude toward socialism, and they thirsted for only one thing -- for the Soviet Union by the end of the war to come to its last breath, at the limit of its forces and capabilities, so that they could dictate their will to it. After Fascist Germany attacked the Soviet Union, Senator and later U. S. President Truman openly expressed his hope for this: "If we see that Germany is winning," he stated, "then we should help Russia, and if Russia will win, then we should help Germany, and thus let them kill as many as possible..."¹⁴

Namely in this is found the answer to the question of why the second front in Europe was not opened in 1942 or 1943, but only in mid-1944, when the fate of Hitler's Germany had already essentially been decided as a result of the crushing blows by the Soviet Armed Forces.

The World War II cost mankind dearly. It involved in its orbit 61 states, more than 80 percent of the world's population, and resulted in the loss of more than 50 million human lives. And again U. S. monopolists profited on the suffering and blood of the peoples.

As is known, the Soviet Union lost more than 20 million people in the war, and the U. S. about 300,000. USSR losses from direct destruction and pillaging by

the fascists of its material valuables constituted 679 billion rubles. The U. S. essentially escaped material losses. They constituted only \$1.267 billion, or 0.4 percent of the total value of the losses of all countries in the years of the war.¹⁵ As a result, by autumn of 1945 the U. S. was at the zenith of its wealth. Lenin was profoundly correct when he said in 1913 that "a rain of gold flows directly into the pockets of the bourgeois politicians who comprise a close-knit international gang, instigating the peoples to competition in arms and shearing these...people like one shears a sheep!"¹⁶

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War largely determined the course of further post-war development on our planet. Whereas as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution the capitalist chain was broken, the world's first socialist state was created and a new era in human history began, the victory of the USSR in the Great Patriotic War went down in history as one of the most important social, political and military events of the 20th Century, after the Great October Socialist Revolution. As its result the positions of imperialism were seriously shaken. The correlation of forces in the world arena changed fundamentally in favor of socialism and democracy, and favorable conditions were created for an active struggle by the peoples to root out world wars, and in the future also local wars from human life.

However, the weakening of imperialist positions after the war not only did not lessen, but still further intensified its aggressiveness. The imperialists successfully restructured the forms and methods of their struggle against socialism and progress. Covering themselves with the false flag of "freedom and democracy," the American imperialists intensely spread their police order in the world, not disdaining either threats of direct military intervention or the use of military force. Frequently the question of the use of nuclear weapons was raised, including four times directly against the USSR. It was namely the Soviet State, its main ally in the anti-Hitler coalition in the past war, that the U. S. and its partners named "enemy number one."

Having a temporary monopoly on nuclear weapons, the bosses in the White House embarked upon a path of blackmail and threats against the USSR. The atomic bomb explosions over the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were, in the opinion of Western specialists, not so much the final act of World War II, as the first act in preparation for war against the Soviet Union.

At the same time, governmental figures in Washington and London such as Truman and Churchill began to re-orient their policy and public opinion in the Western countries away from the former positions of the anti-Hitler coalition to an anti-Soviet "crusade." This served as a signal for a new intensification of anti-communist hysteria and "cold war," and to the development of plans for military attack against the USSR such as "Charioteer" (1948) and later "Dropshot" (1949), according to which it was intended to drop 300 atomic and 250,000 tons of conventional bombs on the Soviet Union and knock out a large portion of the Soviet military-industrial capability.

At the same time the U. S. feverishly sought new ways of realizing its notorious policy of "from a position of strength." In practice it was manifested in the creation in 1949, at U. S. initiative and leadership, of the aggressive NATO military bloc, and in 1951-1955 of other regional military

blocs such as ANZUS, SEATO, CENTO and others.

The list of bloody adventures by American imperialism in the post-war years significantly expanded. It opened with the war in Korea (1950-1953), in which more than 1.3 million Koreans fell victim. In 1954 counterrevolutionaries trained by the CIA invaded Guatemala with American air support and overthrew the democratic Arbenz Government. In 1958, 14,000 U. S. soldiers along with British interventionists, supported by the American 6th Fleet, landed in Lebanon and helped local reactionaries to suffocate the revolutionary actions of the people. In 1961 an attempt was made to invade Cuba with an assault landing in the area of (Playa-Khiron) to overthrow its revolutionary government. This action by the reactionaries threatened to become the detonator of a new world war. In 1964-1972 the U. S. committed bloody aggression against the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea, the results of which are still felt today. Approximately 600,000 American military personnel participated there simultaneously, as well as a huge collection of aircraft and military ships. In 1966 American paratroopers and Marines fiercely suppressed a popular uprising in the Dominican Republic. In 1973 the U. S. organized and assisted a military junta in Chili to carry out a fascist coup in the country. In 1982 the United States, along with its NATO allies, committed flagrant military intervention in Lebanon. In 1983 it committed an act of international piracy and terrorism when it attacked defenseless Grenada with a total population of 100,000 people and an army of less than 1,000. The Grenadian people still are under the American boot. The list of such bloody evil deeds of U. S. imperialism could be continued. It is enough to say that, according to information of the American Brookings Institute, more than 20 million people have already perished in all these crimes and conflicts unleashed by imperialism in recent years.

The forces of imperialism and reaction headed by the U. S., trying at any cost to stop the objective course of history and turn it back, are sharply increasing the ferocity of their aggressiveness. This began to be manifested especially distinctly with the arrival of the Reagan Administration in the White House. Raising international terrorism, lying, provocations and slander to the status of state policy, U. S. ruling circles in their search for the mirage of world domination declared from the mouth of their President a new "crusade" against the USSR and socialism as a social and political system.

A wave of aggressiveness is also growing in other regions of the capitalist world. In the FRG and Western Europe, revanchists and neo-fascists have recently been raising their heads more and more in the FRG and West Berlin. High officials in Bonn are clearly shutting their eyes to them and even directly participating in their assemblages. Neo-fascists, like their predecessors on the eve of World War II, are becoming more active; are increasingly whipping up national and racial enmity among the population toward other peoples; are propagandizing slogans of a "Great Germany;" and are calling for the restoration of the German Reich to its "historical borders." It is as though reactionary imperialist forces and Hitler's remnants which were left after the war have not abandoned their hopes of altering the results of World War II. Having taken up a course of confrontation and direct conflict with the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, the U. S. and its NATO partners conducted, essentially, a full-blown offensive

against socialism, literally in all directions -- political, economic, ideological and military, all the way to balancing on the brink of war.

Under the deepening general crisis of capitalism, White House politicians are attempting, no matter what, to limit the influence of socialism on the world revolutionary process; shake loose the foundations of the socialist system where they believe they can count on success; drive a wedge between the USSR and other countries of the socialist community; weaken and split their unity; and sow dissension in the international communist and workers movement.

At the same time, Washington ruling circles are whipping up a costly arms race, applying various kinds of "sanctions" against the socialist countries; unleashing a currency war; and curtailing and even halting scientific-technical, trade, cultural and sports relations with the USSR and its allies.

In recent years, highly placed figures in the U. S. and NATO countries have unleashed an especially broad undermining campaign against the USSR in the field of ideology. Fearing honest ideological competition with socialism, reactionary imperialist forces have shifted, essentially, to direct psychological warfare against the USSR and its allies, not shying away from any methods and techniques, and are trying to instill hatred toward socialism and communism. Printed publications, films and radio and television programs in the West serve these criminal objectives.

An especially dangerous thrust in the policy of American imperialism and its followers is its direct material preparation for a new world war. This is based on the policy of achieving U. S. and NATO military superiority over the Soviet Union and Warsaw Treaty Organization countries. With this aim in mind, imperialist "hawks" are implementing large-scale military programs which provide fabulous profits to the monopolies and harm the vital interests of the peoples of their own countries. A particular threat to peace is presented by unrestrained U. S. development and stockpiling of nuclear weapons, attempt to shift the arms race into space and intensive development of weapons of mass destruction based on new physical principles. Contrary to good sense and the will of the peoples, Pentagon strategists continue to fill the territory of a number of Western European countries with first strike nuclear weapons -- the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles. Work is also being carried out on a broad front to make conventional weapons close to nuclear in terms of military characteristics and effectiveness.

In the early 1980's, the United States, with the support of the other NATO countries, proclaimed a strategy of "direct confrontation" with the USSR, and it is intensively whipping up tension in relations with the socialist countries and destabilizing the world situation. With this aim in mind, the U. S. is organizing flagrant provocations and campaigns of threats; encouraging state terrorism and committing diversions and unconcealed acts of banditry and piracy against the sovereign countries of the Middle East, Africa and Central America.

A vivid example of such flagrant provocation was the violation of the USSR state border in the Far East on the night of 1 September 1983, organized by the U. S. intelligence services, which was carried out by a Boeing 747

aircraft belonging to a South Korean airline. As has already been irrefutably proven, the incursion of this aircraft into Soviet air space was an intentional, carefully planned, provocative reconnaissance action, which for its entire duration was precisely controlled from certain centers on the territory of the U. S. and Japan.

The American rulers are striving to draw the European NATO countries, as well as Japan and South Korea, into the orbit of its adventuristic plans. At the same time, everywhere that it is possible, the U. S. is expanding its own military presence and trying to exert coarse pressure against those who oppose its will. Using its mercenaries it is essentially waging an undeclared war against the peoples of Afghanistan, Angola, Mozambique and Nicaragua, and is threatening with bloody reprisals Syria, Cuba and many other countries not wanting to live according to orders from Washington.

Thus, history irrefutably proves that the main trait of imperialism is its militant aggressiveness and desire to achieve world hegemony. Imperialism was and remains the source of wars. "World domination," noted Lenin, "is in brief the substance of imperialist policy, the continuation of which is imperialist war." 17

Anti-Sovietism, anti-communism and violent hatred toward the forces of freedom, democracy, social progress and peace, today give the policy of the most reactionary imperialist circles, most of all the American, an unprecedented evil and extremely adventuristic nature and constitute its primary thrust. The Leninist peace loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community is firmly and unshakably opposed to this policy.

The USSR -- Standard Bearer of Peace

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the main event of the 20th Century, opened up fundamentally new and unprecedented opportunities for solving the problems of war and peace. Soviet Russia in its first foreign policy document proclaimed Lenin's decree on peace, adopted by the 2d All-Russian Congress of Soviets on 8 November 1917. In this most important historical document, the Soviet government condemned imperialistic war as a most great crime against mankind and appealed to the peoples and governments of the warring countries to put an end to the world war and conclude a just, democratic peace. The Western states not only did not support these constructive, peace loving proposals by the Soviet Republic, but even fell upon her with a "crusade," which concluded in their total defeat.

Despite fierce opposition from international imperialism, the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet State persistently opened its own way. Strictly adhering to the provisions of the Decree on Peace and Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence of states, the Soviet delegation to the Genoa Conference in 1922 advanced for the first time in history a large scale program of general arms reduction. However, its proposal was not accepted.

Demonstrating its love of peace not in words, but in deeds, the Soviet Union, although in hostile capitalist encirclement, by the end of 1924 unilaterally

reduced its more than 5 million man army to 560,000 men; i.e., by almost 90 percent.

In 1927, at the fourth session of the preparatory commission of the conference on disarmament in Geneva, the USSR, true to Lenin's foreign policy, advanced a developed program of general and complete disarmament as the best guarantee of international security. The Western powers rejected this proposal as well.

In February 1932 the worldwide conference on arms reduction and limitation opened in Geneva. In it participated delegates from 60 states. The Soviet delegation, striving persistently to make war impossible, presented the conference a new and detailed plan for universal and total disarmament. But again this time the imperialist states demonstrated their manifest lack of desire to solve in a practical way the problems of preventing war, centers of which by that time had appeared in both West and East.

At the end of 1933, the Soviet Government, realistically assessing the steadily increasing threat of a new war in the Far East and in Europe, appealed to the U. S. Government to conclude a regional collective security pact in the Pacific Ocean area with the participation of the USSR, U. S., China and Japan. The ruling circles of the bourgeois states again ignored the Soviet proposals, thereby granting the aggressors freedom in preparing for their predatory actions. In 1935, Italy invaded Abyssinia (today Ethiopia); in 1936, Germany and Italy intervened in the Spanish Civil War on the side of the fascists; and in 1938 Germany seized Austria.

In those uneasy years the Communist Party and Soviet Government, persistently struggling to preserve and strengthen peace on the planet, made frequent initiatives to create a collective security system on the European Continent, capable of cooling the hot heads of Hitler's maniacs and localizing the threat of a second world war. However, ruling circles in Britain and France, encouraged by the U. S., sabotaged the Soviet proposals in every way possible and pushed the German and Japanese aggressors into war against the USSR.

A culminating point in the events on the eve of World War II was the Munich Agreement by the governments of Britain and France with Hitler and Mussolini in 1938, as a result of which Czechoslovakia was given away to be torn to pieces by the fascist barbarians. The Anglo-German and Franco-German declarations in 1938 were the logical consequence of this policy of "appeasing" the aggressor. They represented essentially an attempt to form an alliance of the Western powers with Germany and Italy and grant the latter freedom to act with impunity against the USSR.

Under a heightened threat of war, the Soviet Union was forced in August 1939 to accept the repeated German proposals and undertake to conclude a non-aggression treaty with her. In April 1941, a neutrality pact with Japan was signed. This enabled our country to gain some time to strengthen its defense and avoid a simultaneous strike by the combined forces of imperialism from West and East.

On 1 September 1939, Fascist Germany unleashed World War II with its perfidious attack against Poland. The European capitalist countries were its

first victims. Right after Poland the Hitlerites seized Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Yugoslavia and Greece, and quickly occupied France. Britain was also threatened by fascist invasion.

The Communist Party and Soviet Government foresaw the inevitability of military clashes with the forces of imperialism and prepared the country and people for defense. Owing to significant successes in socialist construction, the USSR in a historically short period of time created a powerful defense industry, which enabled it to increase substantially the output of then modern kinds of weapons and military equipment. The 3d Five-Year Plan, adopted in 1939 at the 18th Party Congress, provided for solving many important tasks of further increasing the country's economic and defense capability. The overall strength of the Soviet Armed Forces grew by 2.8 times between 1939 and June 1941. During this time 125 new divisions were formed. In spring 1941, T-34 and KV tanks, the best in the world at the time, began to enter the mechanized corps. New models of artillery and mortar weapons were developed, including the famous "katyushas." The number of air regiments in the Air Force increased more than 80 percent. The military strength of the navy increased significantly. During 1938-1940 it acquired 265 new combatant ships. Measures were taken to develop air defense, airborne, engineer and other specialized forces.

Unfortunately, history allotted us very little time. Not everything planned to strengthen further the country's defense could be accomplished. On 22 June 1941, a perfidious strike by the 5.5 million man strong aggressor army, which contained more than 4,000 tanks and assault guns, almost 5,000 aircraft and more than 47,000 guns and mortars, was made upon our Homeland.¹⁸

The Soviet people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, rose up as one man to defend the socialist Homeland. The sacred Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the fascist invaders began.

The USSR entry into armed conflict with Nazi Germany marked the turning point in the course of World War II. The peoples looked with hope to our Homeland as the only real force capable of destroying the brown plague and saving them from fascist enslavement. The governments of Britain and the U. S. were forced to declare their support and assistance to the USSR in its struggle against German Fascism back in the first days of the Great Patriotic War. Of course, they did not hurry to fulfill this commitment. Our country fought Hitler's Germany and its allies alone for three years.

The main event of the first period of the Great Patriotic War is rightly considered to be the historic Battle for Moscow. The victory of Soviet forces in the fields outside Moscow destroyed totally Hitler's plan for a "blitzkrieg," was a tremendous moral boost for the Soviet people and solidified the foundations of the anti-Hitler coalition. The defeat of the "invincible" Nazi army at Moscow strained relations within the fascist camp, prevented an attack by Japan and Turkey against the USSR and contributed to

strengthening the national liberation movement of the peoples of Europe against fascism. It was namely here at Moscow in the winter of 1941-1942 that dawn broke on our Great Victory.

A still more crushing blow was dealt to Hitler's Germany at Stalingrad. This victory of the Soviet Armed Forces made a decisive contribution to achieving a fundamental turning point in the course not only of the Great Patriotic War, but also of the entire World War II. The mass expulsion of the enemy from Soviet soil began. Soon the German Fascist troops suffered a still more serious defeat at the Kursk Salient and in the battle for the Dnieper, which shook Fascist Germany to its foundation and confronted her with catastrophe.

In 1944, brilliantly carrying out a number of major strategic operations on the Ukraine Right Bank, at Leningrad, in Kareliya, the Crimea, Belorussia, Moldavia, the Baltic and the Polar Region, the Soviet Armed Forces completely cleared their home soil of the fascist invaders and, developing a victorious offensive to the west, began to liberate the other peoples of Europe from the yoke of Hitler's occupation.

The victorious finale of the Great Patriotic War was the defeat of the German Fascist forces in the grand Berlin Operation, during which the Soviet Army destroyed almost a million man enemy grouping. Then, the thunder of artillery salvos in Moscow informed the world about the brilliant conclusion of the Prague Operation and the victorious end of the great battle against fascism.

Immediately thereafter, to eliminate the center of World War II in the Far East, ensure the security of the Soviet Union and most rapidly establish peace on the planet, the Soviet Armed Forces, honorably fulfilling their alliance commitments to the anti-Hitler coalition, routed the Kwantung Army, the main force of militarist Japan on the continent.

Victory over Fascist Germany and militarist Japan was achieved by the combined efforts of many countries and peoples. However, the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, became the main force which barred German Fascism's road to world domination. It was namely they who shouldered the main burden of the war and played the decisive role in defeating Hitler's Germany and militarist Japan and in ridding many peoples of Europe and Asia of a foreign yoke. And no one can erase this historical truth from human memory.

During four years of military operations, the Soviet-German Front was the main front of World War II. In various periods of the war, from 190 to 270 select fascist bloc divisions operated simultaneously against the Soviet Armed Forces, while Anglo-American forces, even after opening the second front in Europe, opposed only 56 to 75 divisions. During the war the USSR Armed Forces destroyed and captured the enemy's main forces -- 607 divisions, and our allies -- 176 divisions. Soviet troops destroyed and seized more than 75 percent of the enemy's weapons and military equipment.¹⁹

The results of World War II demonstrated most convincingly that there is no force in the world which could destroy socialism and subjugate the Soviet people, true to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, loyal to the socialist Homeland and closely united around the Leninist party. The war completely disclosed to the peoples of the world the true aggressor -- imperialism -- and most sharply put the question of the inadmissibility of a new, still more bloody worldwide armed conflict.

But with the end of World War II the peoples of the planet, unfortunately, did not obtain permanent peace. The United States, obsessed with a desire for world domination, immediately and for many long years plunged the peoples into the abyss of "cold war." It was based on the same naked anti-Sovietism, "atomic diplomacy," and a policy of "brinkmanship."

The Soviet Union, whose international authority and influence immeasurably increased and was strengthened as a result of its victory in the Great Patriotic War, resolutely acted against the U. S. expansionist policy and hegemonism, against those who would kindle a new world war, and in defense of peace and international security. The Communist Party and Soviet Government saw the direct path to this as, first of all, banning and destroying nuclear weapons and limiting and halting the arms race.

Back in June 1946 the USSR introduced for examination of the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy a proposal to conclude an international convention on banning the production and use of atomic weapons. It was proposed, in particular, that the governments participating in the convention undertake a commitment not to use atomic weapons under any circumstances, to ban their production and storage, and, most importantly, to destroy their reserves within a three month period. This peaceloving initiative of the USSR opened up a real possibility to curtail in its infancy the nuclear arms race, every spiral of which, as life later showed, brought the peoples not a new degree of security, but ever more threatening danger. This proposal, however, was rejected. Washington advanced its so-called "Baruch Plan," in accordance with which the U. S. alone would be in charge of the raw materials, production and scientific research base of the atomic industry in all countries.

The Soviet Union, having developed its own nuclear weapons in 1949 in response, nevertheless continued persistently to favor banning weapons of mass destruction under strict international control, and using atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. Seeking a ban on the production and use of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union at the same time carried out a purposeful struggle for the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, for universal and complete disarmament and for eliminating military danger entirely from human life. Beginning with the first session of the UN General Assembly, our country repeatedly advanced constructive proposals on these vitally important problems. The Soviet State not only called upon the Western powers to reduce their armed forces and arms, but also demonstrated its peace loving nature by practical deeds. During the post-war period the Soviet Union unilaterally carried out four major reductions in its Armed Forces; eliminated its naval bases in Porkkala Udd (Finland) and Port Arthur (China) and completely removed its troops from Romania and Austria.

How did the ruling circles of the U. S. and the other Western states respond to all this? Exaggerating in every possible way the well-worn myth about a "Soviet military threat," they began to knock together aggressive blocs, and in December 1954 agreed to equip the NATO armies with nuclear weapons.

On 4 October 1957 the Soviet Union, as is well-known, launched the world's first artificial satellite, which was indicative of the increased might of our

Homeland. But we did not plan to use this scientific and technological achievement for military purposes. This act was carried out exclusively in the interests of the peaceful mastery of space. Back in March 1958 the Soviet Government proposed a ban on the militarization of space and international cooperation in the field of space research for peaceful purposes. However, the Western powers also rejected this Soviet initiative.

Through the consistent and unwavering struggle by the Soviet Union to implement its Peace Program, advanced by the 24th CPSU Congress and developed by the 25th Congress, and the coordinated foreign policy activity of the countries of the socialist community, and owing to the USSR's achievement of approximate parity in strategic nuclear forces with the U. S., at the cost of tremendous efforts by all progressive mankind, the development of international relations in the 1970's succeeded in turning toward detente and peaceful cooperation of states with different social systems. After long years of "cold war," agreements were achieved for the first time on a number of vitally important questions, including the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (1968); banning the deployment of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction on sea and ocean beds and within their depths (1971); and banning the development, production and stockpiling of reserves of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and their destruction (1972).

The agreements on a number of questions between the USSR and U. S. were especially important steps toward reducing tension and improving the international climate. Thus, in May 1972 the Soviet-American permanent agreement on limiting anti-ballistic missile systems, and the interim agreement on certain measures in the area of limiting strategic offensive arms (SALT-1) were signed. It is true that this agreement provided for solving only the initial problem -- it established only some limitations on the development of strategic nuclear forces by the two sides, and did not yet touch the matter of their reduction, let alone their elimination. However, in this agreement the governments of the USSR and U. S. expressed their intention to continue joint efforts to limit further and reduce strategic arms. At this time one more important document was signed -- The Basic Principles of Relations Between the USSR and USA -- which stated that differences in the ideology and social systems of these countries are not an obstacle to the development of normal relations between them, based on the principles of equality, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage.

In developing this document between the USSR and the U. S., agreements were concluded on preventing nuclear war, on cooperation in the field of protecting the environment, on cooperation in the field of medical science and health, on cooperating in the exploration and use of space for peaceful purposes, on cooperation in the field of science and technology and on preventing incidents on the open seas and in the air space above them. Also developed and signed (but not ratified) were treaties on limiting underground nuclear weapons tests and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

These Soviet-American agreements, based on parity of military forces on the two sides, greatly promoted a positive advance in the strengthening of peaceful relations between the USSR and the U. S. and created a favorable

basis for the further development of broad and mutually advantageous cooperation among them in various fields.

In 1974, negotiations began between the USSR and U. S. for the purpose of further developing the SALT-1 Treaty. And five years later, in 1979, the heads of state of the USSR and U. S. signed in Vienna a new strategic arms limitation document, the SALT-2 Treaty. It contained a solution to a more complex task -- not only limiting the quantitative and qualitative development of strategic nuclear forces on the two sides, but also the start of their reduction. Moreover, the Treaty opened a direct path to new Soviet-American agreements (in SALT-3) for the purpose of more substantial and all-encompassing reduction of strategic arms. The detente process was becoming more extensive.

It goes without saying that in the West this process had many enemies in the person of the henchmen of the military-industrial complexes. To support their narrow, mercenary aims they did everything to maintain and intensify tension in the world and develop a new spiral in the arms race. The positions of these forces were particularly strengthened in the early 1980s, when circles came to power in the highest echelons of the U. S. and other NATO countries which did not want to take into account the historically mandated realities of the modern world -- the strengthened positions of socialism, successes of the national liberation movement and overall increase in democratic forces. They made up their mind, no matter what, to hold back the development of positive processes in social life, solve to their advantage by force the historical dispute between capitalism and socialism, and regain the positions lost by imperialism. As a result, there took place an abrupt turn in the policy of these Western states against detente. Thus, the U. S. Government refused to ratify the SALT-2 Treaty, underground nuclear test ban treaty (1974) and the treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (1976), which were already signed by the heads of state. It also decided not to renew the trilateral treaties with the USSR and Britain on the complete and universal banning of nuclear weapons tests. In 1982 the U. S. was the only state which voted against the UN General Assembly resolution which called upon all countries to refrain from the production and deployment of new types of chemical weapons. The U. S. unilaterally broke off negotiations on limiting and later reducing military activity in the Indian Ocean and on limiting international weapons trade and deliveries of conventional arms, and caused the breakoff of negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and weapons in Central Europe.

Persistent efforts by the USSR and powerful pressure by the peace loving forces in the countries of Western Europe and the American continent, at the end of 1981 brought the U. S. back to the negotiating table with the Soviet Union on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe (INF) and on limiting and reducing strategic weapons (START). However, from their very beginning U. S. ruling circles demonstrated that in reality they did not desire any mutually acceptable agreements, but did everything to prevent them.

At the very outset of negotiations the Soviet Union made a fundamental proposal -- to completely eliminate nuclear weapons in Europe, both intermediate range and tactical. This proposal was rejected by the U. S. Then the USSR proposed that the number of nuclear weapons launchers be reduced by approximately two-thirds (to 300). At the same time it agreed to eliminate its reduced missiles in Europe (called SS-20 in the West) and freeze their number in the eastern part of the USSR. Later the Soviet Union went still further. It agreed that not only the number of our missiles, but also the number of warheads on them be no greater than Britain and France have on their missiles; i.e., on the order of 420-430.

And what did the U. S. propose? According to its so-called "zero" option the Soviet Union was to eliminate all of its intermediate range missiles, not only in the European part, but also in the eastern part of the USSR, which had no relationship to the INF negotiations. We were "permitted" to retain only 465 bombers. In this case the NATO bloc, agreeing not to deploy missiles in Europe, would retain all of its 857 nuclear weapons and thereby gain a twofold superiority over the USSR in launchers, and almost a threefold superiority in warheads. It is true that according to the so-called "interim" American variant, the USSR, with U. S. agreement, was "permitted" to retain a certain number of its missiles, but only given the mandatory deployment of the same number of American missiles in Europe. And in this case NATO again would gain a twofold superiority. The American side had a similar unconstructive approach at the START negotiations. Moreover, contrary to good sense and the will of millions of people, in November 1983 the U. S. began deploying its first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Under these circumstances the negotiations lost all meaning.

In connection with the breaking off of the INF and START negotiations by the administration in the White House, and taking into account the heightened nuclear threat, the Soviet Government was forced, as is known, to take appropriate measures in response, with respect both to the U. S. itself and to the European states which deployed the new American missiles on their territory. The stubbornness of the U. S. and its partners in saturating Europe with nuclear missiles led to a situation in which, through the fault of imperialism, the danger of nuclear war increased and is continuing to grow worse with the appearance there of each new American missile.

As for the Soviet Union, its ideal is a permanent and stable peace. The Soviet Peace Program for the 1980's, worked out by the 26th CPSU Congress, is aimed at achieving such a peace among the peoples. The whole system of constructive measures recently advanced by the leaders of the Communist Party and Soviet State is aimed at this. This concerns, first of all, halting the quantitative and qualitative growth of all components of nuclear arsenals, including all kinds of nuclear munitions and their delivery means; a substantial limitation and radical reduction of both strategic and other types of nuclear weapons; the complete and universal banning of nuclear weapons testing; freeing Europe from nuclear weapons of all types, as well as chemical weapons; and preventing the militarization of outer space.

The Soviet Union, for whom the main aim is preventing war, favors regulating relations among the nuclear powers by a system of definite norms. In particular, it already committed itself not to use nuclear weapons first, and appealed to all nuclear states to follow its example. Moreover, our state undertook a commitment not to be first to use conventional weapons as well.

At the Stockholm Conference (1984), the USSR and its allies made specific and businesslike proposals for building trust and ensuring European and international security. The May 1984 appeal by the Warsaw Treaty Organization member states to the NATO countries about concluding a treaty on mutual nonuse of military force and maintaining peaceful relations was aimed at improving the international situation in Europe and throughout the world.

In today's difficult international environment, made worse through the fault of imperialism, the Soviet Union, along with its friends and allies, is forced to take necessary retaliatory defensive measures to ensure security and preserve peace under any circumstances. The many-sided activity of the Soviet State and its Armed Forces is so directed.

* * *

And so, even a brief excursion through history irrefutably proves that it is namely imperialism, led by the U. S. which strives for maximum enrichment at the expense of other countries and peoples, and which invariably caused and continues to cause bloody wars and armed conflicts. The chronicle of American imperialism is a chronicle of its bloody evil deeds in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. Now U. S. ruling circles are nurturing plans to unleash a new nuclear war, still more fatal for mankind, with a criminal and completely unfounded hope of winning and surviving it.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is diametrically opposite that of U. S. imperialism. In all stages of development the constant thread of its policy is protection of the socialist Homeland; peaceful coexistence of states with different social and political systems; constant struggle for peace; and conviction that with good will war as such can and must be prevented. Soviet policy is open and understandable for all peoples, expresses their innermost hopes, and therefore meets with widespread response from them. The peoples of the world, which experienced the horrors of bloody World War II, unanimously support the peace loving policy of the USSR and its foreign policy initiatives, which open a real prospect for the total elimination of military threat from the lives of this and future generations of people. The future is for the forces of peace, democracy and social progress.

At the same time, struggling for peace, the Communist Party and Soviet Government realistically assess the processes taking place in international life and are forced constantly to maintain in the center of their attention questions of providing reliable security for the USSR and its allies and friends, and maintaining the Soviet Armed Forces in a state of high combat readiness. The unity of the building of communism, love of peace and constant readiness to give a decisive rebuff to aggression was bequeathed to

us by the great Lenin and constitutes the foundation of the policy of the Soviet State. "...Our cause is firm...", stated Vladimir Il'ich, "...and there will still, no doubt, be more such attempts, but we...know that all these attempts will crumble into dust."²⁰

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

BASED ON THE LAWS OF SCIENCE

The Communist Party and Soviet people, fulfilling Lenin's behests, display constant vigilance toward the intrigues of the reactionary circles in the imperialist states, most of all the U. S., for which, judging by the blasphemous statements of its leaders, "there are things more important than peace." The Soviet people are doing everything necessary so that the defense capability of the Soviet State will always be at a high level, and that its Armed Forces will always be on guard.

Preparation of the Armed Forces to defend the socialist Homeland, and all Soviet military construction, are based on an immutable, time-tested, truly scientific world view and methodological basis -- Marxist-Leninist theory -- which makes it possible not only to understand the past and present, but also to foresee the future. V. I. Lenin noted that Marx' teaching has meaning, "not only in the sense of explaining the past, but also in the sense of confident prediction of the future and courageous practical activity, aimed at its realization..."²¹

The history of wars and military art indicates that the level of production achieved at a given moment has decisive influence in military affairs. Changes which take place in weapons and military equipment are of particular importance in its development. "...Successes in equipment," wrote Engels, "as soon as they are applied and actually used in military affairs, immediately, almost forcibly, and often against the will of the military command, cause changes and even revolutions in the method of waging war..."²² Fundamental transformations in military art occurred, as is well known, as a result of the invention of gunpowder in the 13th Century and the subsequent appearance of firearms. The creation of rifled weapons in the 19th Century, and especially the invention of automatic weapons at the start of the 20th Century, caused major changes in the military field. The mass use of strike weapons -- tanks, aircraft, submarines and other new models of combat equipment -- in the 2d World War changed the nature of conducting battles and operations, and the appearance and widespread introduction of rocket systems and nuclear missile weapons after the war even changed war as a whole.

A profound and, in the full sense of the word, revolutionary change in military affairs is continuing in our day in connection with the further development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, rapid development of electronics, and in connection with the significant qualitative improvement of conventional means and methods of armed conflict. This, in turn, has decisive influence on all other aspects of military affairs, most of all on the development and improvement of forms and methods of military operations and, consequently, on the organizational structure of troop units and naval forces and on improvement of control systems and organs. A correct and timely understanding of this makes it possible to foresee possible directions of changes in military affairs.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

It is well-known that the classics of Marxism-Leninism themselves had examples of scientific forecasting of social events, including in the area of war and military affairs. Thus, Engels, who was very knowledgeable in military matters, almost 30 years before the start of the 1st World War, based on thorough analysis of the developmental tendencies of capitalism and its root contradictions, economics and the means of armed conflict, foresaw that in Europe, "it is already now impossible to have any war other than a world war. And this would be a world war of unprecedented scale, unprecedented force. ...Only one result is absolutely assured: universal exhaustion and the creation of the conditions for the final victory of the working class."²³ The subsequent events of World War II completely confirmed these scientific forecasts of his.

V. I. Lenin, the leader of the proletarian revolution and creator of the Communist Party and Soviet State, acted on the historical arena not only as a great political and state figure, but also as a talented military leader and prominent strategist, who was brilliantly knowledgeable in questions of war and the army. Stemming from the nature and specific features of the new historical era and the objective conditions of the development of military affairs, Lenin in his works creatively developed and substantially enriched the postulates of Marxism on military questions and created the teaching about defending the socialist Homeland. Guided by the laws of materialist dialectics, he thoroughly analyzed the main laws and particularities of wars in the era of imperialism; worked out the principles of constructing the army of the socialist state and lay the foundations of Soviet military science.

Taking into account the objective conditions of the phenomena of military affairs is a most important, but not the only, requirement for its correct understanding. For this it is necessary to know and apply ably the theory of Marxism-Leninism and its logic of consciousness and dialectics, which are, according to Lenin, the soul of Marxism.

The general law of materialist dialectics is that various articles, phenomena and processes, both in nature and in society do not exist in isolation, in and of themselves. They are organically linked and constantly interact, and are in constant development. "In order truly to know a subject," wrote Lenin, "it is necessary to comprehend and study all of its aspects, all its relationships and 'instrumentalities,'"²⁴ and to approach each phenomenon from the point of view of how and under what conditions it arose in the past, what it is in the present and what it will become in the future. Military affairs are no exception. Their development convincingly confirms the action of this general law of dialectics.

The scientific nature of military theory and results of practical activity are largely determined by the degree to which the increased military capabilities of the armed forces and their individual services and branches of arms are understood and taken into account; the interaction of material and spiritual factors; and the full diversity of linkages and relationships in war. It is important to disclose internal and external relationships, as well as important and unimportant ties and relationships.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Such factors as the economic system and capabilities of a state, the level of development of science and technology, etc., are external factors, but which are, at the same time, determining with respect to war. Internal linkages and relationships in war are, most of all, the correlation of forces of the warring parties; the technical level of their equipment; the conditions and degree of interaction of the armed services and branches of arms during the course of military operations, and several other methods of conducting military operations which directly determine their success or failure.

The correct disclosure of important and unimportant linkages and relationships in war and military construction makes it possible to determine precisely the main link in a complex chain of events, which when grasped may pull the entire chain; i.e., successfully accomplish a whole aggregate of practical problems which arose. And, on the other hand, failure to understand the nature of such relationships leads to errors with very grave consequences.

Thus, analyzing the experience of World War I, Soviet military thought (S. M. Ammosov; K. I. Velichko; A. I. Yegorov; K. B. Kalinovskiy; V. K. Triandafillov; M. N. Tukhachevskiy; I. A. Khalepskiy and others) correctly foresaw the important role of tanks in a future war, as the means of developing tactical success into operational. Taking this into account, back in 1932 the Soviet Armed Forces became the first in the world to create major large units of armored forces -- the mechanized corps. By 1936 there were already four of them, which were later reorganized into tank corps. Unfortunately, later, due to incorrect conclusions about the use of tanks, made on the basis of the limited experience of combat operations in Spain, where tanks were used only as means of NPP (direct support to infantry), in 1939 these corps were dissolved and it was envisioned that, as in the Civil War, cavalry would be used as the echelon for developing success in operations. This was a consequence of the fact that partial and unimportant relationships were considered, and main, important ones were not. In 1941 this error was corrected, and in 1942 not only tank corps, but also tank armies were created in the Soviet Army.

In determining the external and internal relationships among various phenomena, and distinguishing important relationships from unimportant or secondary ones, they, naturally, cannot be considered stagnant and formed once and for all. It is always necessary to have in mind their mobility and dialectical interrelationship and interdependence. External relationships in one system may become internal in another, and vice versa; unimportant relationships under certain conditions may become primary and important under other conditions. Such is the dialectic of real life. History knows many examples when the armed forces of individual countries prepared for a future war, taking into account only the clearly manifested relationships of the past war, without examining the dialectical relationships and their dependence on changes which are taking place in the world. Such an approach usually led to major errors.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

For example, before World War II, in France, as a result of mechanical copying of the internal relationships of the 1st World War, the army's and country's preparation for a new war was based only on what had been reliably tested and confirmed by past experience. As a result, the capabilities of defense were exaggerated. The Maginot Line was built along the border, consisting of seemingly impregnable permanent fortifications. Taking this into account, the troops were also trained primarily for defense. This was caused by ignoring the opportunities which had arisen at the time for the conduct of highly maneuverable operations, based on the wide use of major tank forces and aviation, the role of which was insignificant in the 1st World War, but which by the start of World War II had become determining and primary. Namely this erroneous approach to evaluating the defense was one of the causes which led in 1940 to the rapid defeat of France and the Benelux countries: the Wehrmacht required less than 40 days for this.

Apropos of this, the absence of a dialectical approach and a certain stagnation in French military thought can be observed in our day as well. This is seen, particularly, in the extreme confidence in the "impenetrability" of the "atomic umbrella," which France is developing in every possible way in the 1980's, which is to a considerable extent similar to the French General Staff's fetish about the "all-powerfulness" of the notorious Maginot Line in the 1930's.

The development by Soviet military scholars and command cadres of the theory of the "deep operation" can serve as an example of thorough understanding by military cadres of the law of universal relationships and development, and the ability to distinguish relationships which are primary and important from those which are accidental and unimportant and finding optimal decisions.

Taking into account the experience of World War II, the armed forces of the world's main countries persistently sought ways, right up to World War II, to escape the so-called "positional blind alley." Various points of view were expressed about the possible nature of future war and methods for achieving superiority of the offense over the defense, which the armies could not overcome throughout the course of World War II. Bourgeois military theoreticians advanced at the time a number of one-sided concepts: "tank war" by J. F. C. Fuller and "air war" by Douhet, but as a result of limitations of class and the metaphysics of their theory and methodology, were unable to solve this problem.

Only Soviet military science and our military scholars and command cadres back during the pre-war years, guided by the postulates of Marxist dialectics, made a well-founded and correct forecast of the nature of World War II and of the forms and methods of its conduct. Greatly surpassing bourgeois military thinking, Soviet military science in the 1930's, based on thorough analysis of the developmental tendencies of military affairs, developed what was at the time the leading theory of "deep operations" -- a fundamentally new method of conducting active offensive operations by massive, technically equipped armies. The Great Patriotic War convincingly showed the correctness of this theory.

~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

DIALECTICS REQUIRES AN APPROACH TO EACH PHENOMENON WHICH TAKES INTO ACCOUNT ITS DEVELOPMENT AND IS HISTORICAL. The forms of conducting military operations and related changes in the organizational structure of the armed forces may serve as a confirmation of this. As is well known, before the 16th Century the highest form of military operations was the battle, and the armies of a majority of states consisted of regiments. Later, as military affairs developed, brigades began to be created (17th Century), and later also divisions (18th Century). The rapid development of weapons, equipment and routes of transportation at the end of the 18th and start of the 19th centuries, caused by the increased economic capabilities of many countries, led to a substantial increase in the size of armed forces and to the emergence of problems in the command and control of combat operations of large masses of troops. As a result of this, ground forces were organizationally divided into armies. Armies first appeared in Russia as operational formations before the Patriotic War of 1812. Later they arose in other countries: in France in 1813; Prussia in 1866; Japan in 1904-1905.

Later, with the increase in the number of armies in one theater of military operations, and the increased complexity of combat missions, and intensity and duration of military operations, the need appeared for centralized command and control of large masses of troops. Therefore, several armies began to be combined into fronts. In Russia the idea of creating fronts appeared in 1900. Its correctness was proven by the experience of the Russo-Japanese war. Fronts were further developed in World War I, and especially World War II.

In turn the increase in size of armed forces led to increasing the spatial scope of military operations [deystviy]. As a result there arose a new form of military actions -- the operation [operatsiya] as an aggregate of battles and engagements, separate in time and space, but unified by a single concept and directed toward fulfilling a partial goal of the war. War began to consist not of a number of battles and engagements, but of an aggregate of operations and campaigns. Of course, the operation as a form of military operations did not develop immediately. The rudiments or some elements existed back in the Patriotic War of 1812 and in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871. The most important encounters in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, with some stipulations, can with full justification be called operations. Finally, army and then even front scale operations were formed in the 1st World War, and were fully developed in World War II.

During the years of the Great Patriotic War the main form of military operations of our Armed Forces at the operational level was the front operation. Front troops attacked in a zone an average of 200-300 km wide or more, and with a depth of from 100 to 300-400 km. After completing a front operation there was usually a pause, and frequently an extended period of preparations for the next front operation. At the time this was justified and corresponded to the then existing means of destruction and movement.

However, during the Great Patriotic War, especially in its second and third periods, to achieve major military and political objectives the forces and resources of one front often were inadequate. The combined efforts of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

several fronts, two or more, were required. Accordingly the need arose for the simultaneous conduct of several front operations, combined by a single concept and plan, under the leadership of representatives of the Headquarters of the Supreme High Command. Thus, a new form of military operations was born, which differed substantially from the front operation. This was the operation of a group of fronts. A number of such operations were prepared and brilliantly carried out in the Great Patriotic War. They included the Stalingrad, Kursk, Belorussia, Yassk-Kishinev, Vistula-Oder, Berlin, Manchurian and other operations, which rightfully entered the treasure-house not only of Soviet, but also of worldwide military art. In the post-war years the theory of operations by a group of fronts was further developed.

At present the military capabilities of troops, aircraft and the navy, the long range of their weapons and their maneuverability have sharply increased. The periods required to concentrate strike groupings and obtain replenishments of material resources have been reduced, and the conditions and methods of accomplishing operational and strategic missions by large units [soyedineniyami] and formations [obyedineniyami] of armed services have changed. The military leadership at the highest level has obtained the capability of directly and decisively influencing the course and outcome of war. As a result, the past forms of using large units and formations of armed services have already largely ceased to correspond to modern conditions. In connection with this, it is customary to view as basic no longer the frontal operation or even the operation of a group of fronts, but a more modern, perfected and large-scale form -- the operation in a theater of military operations. During the course of such an operation, each front (fleet) can carry out, in sequence, with short pauses and even without them, two or more front (fleet) operations.

It is particularly important to understand the dialectical process of developing military affairs at the present stage, under conditions of rapid scientific and technological progress. Tardiness in restructuring views, and stagnation in working out and implementing new questions of military art and military construction are fraught with serious consequence.

THE LAW OF UNITY AND THE STRUGGLE OF OPPOSITES, WHICH COMPRISES, IN LENIN'S DEFINITION, THE CORE OF DIALECTICS, IS ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTANDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY, INCLUDING THE PHENOMENA OF WAR AND MILITARY AFFAIRS. Like the other laws and categories of dialectics, it is universal in nature and is fully applicable to military activity. The law derives from a recognition that contradictions, opposing sides and tendencies, found in a state of interrelation and mutual negation, are characteristic of all objects, phenomena and processes. The struggle of these opposites and exacerbation of the contradictions give an internal impulse to the development, which at a certain stage leads to the disappearance of the old and emergence of the new.

Armed conflict is especially complex and contradictory. It is most of all interrelations and contradictions between the opposing sides and their political and strategic objectives, and between the demands of the armed forces and the economic capabilities of the countries. It is also constant

conflict between the means of attack and defense; i.e., between various types of weapons and military equipment. For example, the appearance and development of tanks, aircraft, submarines, and radioelectronics immediately caused the emergence of correspondent antitank, antiaircraft and antisubmarine weapons and means of radioelectronic warfare, and the conduct of air and assault operations caused the development and conduct of corresponding antiair and antiassault operations; i.e., new forms and methods of carrying out military operations. In other words, an unceasing conflict between the defense and the offense goes on.

Let us refer again to history. Thus, the experience of the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) and especially the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) showed the effectiveness of the use of the automatic weapons (machineguns), and other firepower and engineer weapons of close combat support, to increasing troop stability. The advantage of using these weapons was incontestable. Their intensive development and introduction into troop units began. And it had a prompt impact on the course and outcome of combat operations. In World War I (1914-1918) the use of automatic weapons, artillery and engineer weapons in large numbers with the then existing forms and methods of carrying out combat operations led to the defense being stronger than the offense. Troop actions mainly acquired a positional, defensive nature and offensive actions were virtually conducted only episodically. The most frequent report of the Russian press buro of the Stavka of the Supreme High Commander was: "No change on the Western Front." And it is no accident that the 1st World War is sometimes called "four years in a blind alley."

In the inter-war period there was an intense search for ways to overcome the contradictions which had arisen. And they were found. In World War II there appeared in mass numbers means of breaking through and developing success (tanks, self-propelled artillery, aircraft, submarines and aircraft carriers), and from the very outset gave an active, offensive character to combat operations on land, sea and air. A tactical breakthrough immediately developed into an operational. A new contradiction arose -- offensive weapons were stronger than defensive. As a result of this, during the war and especially in the post-war period means of defense began to be developed at increased rates (antitank artillery, antitank mines, antitank guided missiles, various types of missile and air defense missile systems, fighter aviation, anti-submarine ships, etc.), the able use of which at a certain stage balanced to some extent offensive and defensive weapons.

In other words, constant conflict between means of attack and defense is an internal source of development of military affairs. The appearance of new means of attack always unavoidably led to the creation of corresponding countermeasures, and in the end to the development of new methods of conducting battles, engagements, operations and war as a whole. Therefore, under present-day conditions, when an active change from one generation of weapons to another is taking place, it is extremely important that military cadres approach the examination of all aspects of the development of military affairs not in a one-sided way but in an all-round manner, on the basis of thorough understanding of the basic law, the core of dialectics -- the law of unity and the struggle of opposites. Thorough study, inquiry and knowledge

of the optimal methods of solving the contradictions of military activity is a most important condition for successfully managing the complex and contradictory processes in the field of military construction and military art.

SOVIET MILITARY SCIENCE IS ALSO GUIDED BY THE LAW OF THE TRANSITION OF QUANTITATIVE CHANGES INTO QUALITATIVE IN UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE AND FORMS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THE METHODS OF PREPARING FOR AND CONDUCTING MILITARY OPERATIONS.

This law of dialectics teaches that the development of all subjects and phenomena of nature, society and thinking occurs by way of the gradual accumulation of quantitative changes and their transformation at a certain stage into fundamental, qualitative changes. Development, being the unity of quantitative and qualitative changes, is at the same time also the unity of continuity and discontinuity. "...Life and development in nature," noted V. I. Lenin, "include both slow evolution and rapid jumps..."²⁵

Thus, the creation of new weapons and military equipment, as was already stated, also entails corresponding transformations in the methods of conducting military operations. But this does not take place immediately upon the appearance of new means of combat, but only when they begin to be used in a quantity which inevitably causes a new qualitative state of the phenomenon. As long as the new weapons and military equipment are used in limited numbers, they are most often merely adapted to the existing methods of armed conflict or, at best, introduce in them only a few partial adjustments.

As was already stated, machineguns were used in the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902). However, their limited number (40) and poor military characteristics did not then lead to a fundamental break in the method of conducting battle, but introduced only a few changes in the structure of troop combat formations. Later the rapid development of automatic weapons and their large-scale introduction into troop units had an incomparably greater effect. During the course of World War I the use by the warring sides of automatic weapons in massive numbers, in combination with the increased power of artillery, engineer fortifications and obstacles, led, essentially, to the positional nature of fronts, to their becoming frozen; i.e., changed the qualitative aspect of the phenomenon.

Another example. Tanks and aircraft appeared and began to be used back in World War I. But in connection with their insignificant number and technical imperfection, their use could not and did not lead to qualitative changes in the nature of military operations. At the time the infantry, artillery and cavalry continued to solve the main tasks in battles, operations and war as a whole. In World War II, when mass production of tanks and aircraft had been set up, and large tank and air large units and formations were created in the armed forces, the nature of military operations changed sharply -- the qualitative aspect of the phenomenon changed.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

A more vivid manifestation of the dialectical law of the transition of gradual quantitative changes into fundamental, qualitative changes can be observed in our day based on the example of the development of views on the use of nuclear weapons. Thus, in the 1950's and 1960's, when nuclear weapons were still few, they were viewed merely as a means capable of sharply increasing the firepower of the troops. Every effort was made to adapt nuclear weapons to then existing forms and methods of conducting military operations, and in the first place to accomplishing strategic missions. Later, in the 1970's and 1980's, the rapid quantitative increase in nuclear weapons of various yields, development of numerous long range and highly accurate delivery means and their widespread introduction into the troops and naval forces led to a fundamental reexamination of the role of these weapons and to overturning former views on their place and significance in war; on the methods of waging battles and operations; and even on the overall possibility of conducting war with the use of nuclear weapons.

The dialectical law of the transition of qualitative changes into qualitative requires, in particular, increased attention to those changes which take place in arming the troops and their organizational structure; in the quantitative correlations of new types of weapons and military equipment entering the troop units and naval forces; and in the timely determination of possible qualitative prospects caused by these quantitative changes. Under modern conditions only comprehensive theoretical and practical research permits the most reliable determination of the optimal correlations between quantitative and qualitative indices of various systems of weapons and military equipment, as well as of groupings of armed forces in theaters of military operations, and can introduce timely necessary adjustments to the existing forms and methods of military operations.

THE LAW OF THE NEGATION OF NEGATION IS IMPORTANT FOR A DIALECTICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT. It reflects the progressive nature of development, its direction and the process of giving birth to the new. Characterizing the essence of this law, Lenin wrote that dialectical negation is "not naked negation...but negation as a moment of linkage, a moment of development, with retention of the positive..."²⁶

New equipment and weapons supplant and negate old equipment and weapons generation after generation. This is a graphic manifestation of the law of the negation of negation. Thus, smooth-bored weapons appeared in Europe in the 14th Century and existed for several centuries. The swift development of industry and the achievements of science and technology in the 19th Century made it possible to create rifled single-shot weapons. Having better military characteristics, they almost completely overshadowed smooth-bored weapons. The negation of one type of weapon by another took place. However, during the 2d World War, and especially in the post-war period, a new type of weapon -- non-rifled (rocket launchers, antitank guided missiles, missiles of all other types) -- began to enter the armaments of troop units and naval forces in ever-growing numbers. Distinguished by high military and maneuver qualities, they are already beginning to replace and even to some extent force out rifled weapons. In other words, the action of a law of materialist dialectics, the dialectical chain of negation, is observed

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

when one type of weapon is negated by another, although everything positive that was inherent in the old is retained and still further developed in the new.

Experience shows that the extent of negation may differ. In some cases the elimination of that which is obsolete, out-of-date and retarding further progress is accomplished while retaining some foundations of the existing. The development of military organizational structure serves as a graphic example of this. Let us take such organizational elements as the regiment, division and corps. They originated long ago; however, they exist in our day. It goes without saying that their structure and content has changed over the course of a long period of time, depending on the nature of the means of armed conflict, through the negation of out-of-date, obsolete elements of organization in the interests of more complete and effective use of the military characteristics of new weapons and military equipment, while retaining the external traits of organizational structure. In other cases the negation is more profound and fundamental. A departure from the very foundation of the existing and the formation of a new quality on a fundamentally new base takes place, since modifications no longer give the desired result.

The development of armed services and branches of arms may serve as an illustration. Thus, during the Feudal Era the knight cavalry was considered the main strike force in the armies of the European countries. The horsemen were protected by armor and the horses were covered with metal armor plates. With the invention of firearms, when in Engels' expression, the bullets from the burgher guns began to penetrate the knight's coats of mail,²⁷ this mounted cavalry lost its former importance and ceased being the main strike force. It was replaced by cavalry freed from the heavy, no longer useful, protective garb. It became more mobile and maneuverable, and the presence of firearms permitted the cavalrymen to conduct a successful battle not only mounted but also on foot. During the 1st World War and especially the Civil War in our country, mobile cavalry was widely used to develop success in the offensive, to make counterattacks in the defensive, as well as for actions in the enemy rear area and to destroy his lines of communication. A negation of the negation took place with the retention of the existing foundations.

However, with the appearance of rapid fire automatic weapons and in connection with the swift development of aviation and tanks, the importance of cavalry began to decline sharply. Under the new conditions of World War II it could no longer display its qualities with the past success or fulfill the role of a highly effective and maneuverable weapon. The cavalry had exhausted itself as a branch of arms. Therefore, it was entirely natural that it was replaced by a new branch of arms -- armored and mechanized forces -- having a qualitatively different, technical, basis and possessing incomparably greater firepower, striking force and maneuverability. As we see, a negation had taken place with the replacement of the very basis of that which had existed.

The action of the law of the negation of the negation is also clearly traced using the navy as an example. It went from oars to sails, from sails to steamships, diesel powered ships and finally to modern nuclear powered missile carrying ships.

The process of dialectical negation is continuing in military affairs. At the present time, various means of combat with tanks, aircraft, and to a large degree also ships, including aerial means, are rapidly developing. They have already reached a quantitative and qualitative state which, taking into account the action of the laws of dialectics, insistently requires careful study of these new tendencies and the possible consequences of their development. It is dangerous to ignore these tendencies.

The law of the negation of the negation -- the birth of the new and the death of the old -- is universal in nature. However, this law, like all the other laws of dialectics, is manifested in various ways. In nature it is involuntary; in society, and consequently also in military affairs, it is manifested as a tendency, and necessarily through the activity of people. Nor are the leaps from the old to the new standard in terms of time. For the barleycorn sown in the soil, the negation of the negation begins with the ear of the new harvest just a few months later, but wars, which appeared at the dawn of class society, have been blazing for millenia and are not dying away to this day. However, this in no way indicates that wars are eternal, as bourgeois historians and politicians claim. No. They are also subject to the action of the dialectical laws of development. And the law of the negation of the negation precisely underscores this thought -- one must not think in absolutes either in military theory or in practical military affairs.

The theory of military art and the practice of conducting operations in wars are entirely subordinated to the laws of materialist dialectics. This is also convincingly affirmed by the changes of military doctrines of states in accordance with their politics and with the specific historical situation.

TWO DOCTRINES, TWO STRATEGIES

The military doctrines of the states in the opposing socio-political systems attract particular attention in the present difficult and explosive international environment. Bourgeois ideologues strive in every way possible to conceal the aggressive nature of the military doctrines of imperialism and are always crudely falsifying the defensive essence and thrust of Soviet military doctrine. Unceremoniously distorting the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the essence of war, they are intensively disseminating slanderous versions to the effect that the sources of war in the modern era are supposedly not found in the aggressive nature of imperialism, but practically in the ideology of communism. Western ideologues propagandize in every way possible the malicious myth about the "Soviet military threat," and about the desire of the Soviet government to "export revolution" to other countries, and they present Soviet military doctrine in an "aggressive-offensive" light.

The truth about who is threatening whom in reality, what are the essence and thrust of the military doctrines and military strategies of the capitalist and socialist states, and where the true sources for the origin of wars may be found can be correctly understood only from the positions of dialectical materialism.

The Essence of Military Doctrine and Strategy

The history of the origin of military doctrine and military strategy goes back to the distant past, to those times when antagonistic classes appeared, exploitative states were formed and wars began. Their initial formation took place empirically, based on the direct requirements of military practice, and not as a result of revealing and thoroughly analyzing the objective laws of war. Preference was given to observing the principles for waging war which were already known from experience and seemed unchanging and immutable, and to exaggerating the factor of spontaneity and the role of the military leader.

The emergence of the rudiments of military doctrinal postulates and the bases of strategy go back to the slaveholding era. The first information about them is contained in a few works which describe the basic requirements for solving the problems of preparing for and waging wars; organizing military campaigns and training armies; determining the methods for conducting individual engagements which won the war (surprise invasion, laying siege to and storming fortresses, naval blockades), and creating powerful border fortifications such as the Great Wall of China, the Roman ramparts, etc.

Military-theoretical thinking and military practice also were not greatly developed during the feudal era, since wars were waged primarily with limited objectives, comparatively small armies (knights) and were small in scale. During the period of the formation of the centralized absolutist states (15th and 16th centuries) and the expansion of their economic

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

capabilities, standing professional armies began to emerge, firearms became widespread and artillery appeared. The methods of conducting armed conflict were developed, the theory for the use of forces and weapons in wars and battles emerged and military strategy began taking into account these fundamental changes.

Military thought and the systematization of military knowledge began to develop more fruitfully in the 18th Century, when capitalism was confirmed in a number of countries of Western Europe. The development of the political, economic and natural sciences and the generalization of the experience of the Seven Years War (1756-1763), the French Revolutionary Wars (1792-1801), etc., enlivened military theoretical thinking. In this time the fundamental works of Henry Lloyd, "History of the Seven Years War" and H. von Bulow, "The Spirit of the Latest Military System" were published, which set forth systematically the views then existing on the preparations for and methods of waging war, structuring the army, training reserves and preparing theaters of military operations. But these words were idealistic and metaphysical in nature.

The theory of bourgeois military doctrines began to take shape mainly in Western Europe in the 19th Century. During this period weapons and military equipment (especially artillery) were widely developed; military obligation was introduced in many countries; the numerical strength of armies increased and the working out of questions of conducting wars and structuring armed forces, and training and indoctrinating troops began. The works of Napoleon I; A. Jomini; K. Clausewitz; H. Moltke, Sr.; A. Schliffen and others were important contributions to the development of bourgeois military thinking. However, in their works, they usually did not go further than to systematize historical facts and bring to light individual aspects of the development of military affairs and waging of wars, which reflected primarily the political views of the ruling classes.

The establishment and development of doctrinal instructions in Russia took place independently with critical consideration for worldwide experience under conditions in which the Russian people frequently had to conduct wars for the freedom and independence of their country. Peter I was a true reformer of military affairs. He made a great contribution to the development of military thinking, strategy and tactics, carried out a number of major military reforms and developed effective methods of military training. P. A. Rumyantsev; A. V. Suvorov; M. I. Kutuzov; F. F. Ushakov; P. S. Nakhimov and other prominent military leaders and naval leaders, as well as the military scholars A. I. Astaf'yev; N. P. Mikhnevich; D. A. Milyutin; M. I. Dragomirov; F. O. Makorov and others contributed a great deal to the development of Russian military theory and practice. They courageously threw out obsolete theoretical concepts and advanced new ones, and persistently overcame the stagnation and routine which reigned in the official military views of the time.

In its present understanding, MILITARY DOCTRINE is the system of views adopted in a given state at a given (particular) time on the objectives and nature of possible future war, on the preparation of the country and armed

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

forces for it and on the methods of waging it. Military doctrine usually defines: what is the probability of future war and with what enemy will it be necessary to deal; what nature will the war take which the country and its armed forces are to wage; what are the objectives and tasks which may be assigned to the armed forces in anticipation of such a war; what armed forces are required in order to achieve the established objectives; how, stemming from this, military structuring should be achieved and the army and country prepared for war; and, finally, by what methods war is to be conducted if it breaks out.

MILITARY STRATEGY is an integral part of military art, and its highest area, encompasses the theory and practice of preparing the armed forces for war, and the planning and conduct of strategic operations and the war as a whole. In accomplishing its practical tasks it is completely guided by the fundamental directives of military doctrine. In turn, the basic postulates of military strategy, taking into account the developing views and new tendencies in military affairs, are used to refine doctrinal views and directives.

In a number of imperialist countries, including the United States, these two concepts are often equated and set forth in some cases as "military doctrine" or its partial conceptions ("naval doctrine," "tank doctrine," "nuclear doctrine," etc.) and in others as "grand strategy" or "national strategy," the substance of which essentially coincides with military doctrine. In all cases these different terms serve as veiled expressions of the military-political objectives of the state and methods of achieving them.

IN THE MILITARY DOCTRINE OF ANY STATE TWO CLOSELY LINKED AND INTERRELATED ASPECTS ARE DISTINGUISHED -- SOCIO-POLITICAL AND MILITARY-TECHNICAL. The first encompasses questions concerning the political objectives and nature of a forthcoming war, their economic, social, methodological and legal bases and the direction for structuring the armed forces and preparing the country for war. The second includes questions of military construction, technical equipping and material support for the armed forces and maintaining their combat readiness, and the methods of preparing for and conducting operations and the war as a whole.

The socio-political and military-technical aspects of doctrine are found in close dialectical interrelationship and interdependence. They are indivisible one from another and exist together only when there is a correct interrelationship. The political objectives of the war must fully correspond to the military potential of the state, the military capabilities of the armed forces and the methods of conducting military operations which they are using. The latter must reliably ensure the achievement of the established objectives.

Both aspects of military doctrine constantly influence one another, and the socio-political aspect occupies the leading and determining position. "...The main condition for the vitality of military doctrine," noted M. V. Frunze, "is its strict correspondence to the overall objectives of the state and to the material and spiritual resources which it possesses."²⁸

The views expressed in military doctrine are periodically clarified and changed and new elements appear in them. Provisions related to the socio-political aspect of doctrine are distinguished by the greatest stability. This is explained by the fact that they reflect the class essence and political objective of a given state, which remain unchanged over a long period of time. The military-technical aspect of military doctrine is more changeable, for it depends decisively on the means and methods of waging armed conflict, which are constantly changing and improving.

There are a number of features in common in the content of this aspect of doctrine between the socialist and capitalist countries, which are stipulated by the general tendencies of development of military affairs and stem from the level of scientific and technical progress achieved and the use of the experience of past wars. However, the methodology for solving the problems of military affairs and the general thrust of the military structuring of these states are contradictory in their class objectives.

The Military Doctrines of the Capitalist States

V. I. Lenin stressed that the highest and last stage of capitalism, imperialism, is distinguished by the least love of peace and the greatest aggressiveness. These imperialist traits, both in the past and the present, are clearly expressed in the military doctrines of the leading capitalist states.

TAKE, FOR EXAMPLE, WORLD WAR I. When it began in 1914 as a result of the existing sharp contradictions in the camp of the capitalist states, each country nurtured its own political objectives and had its own views on the nature of and methods of conducting the imminent war.

The desire to redivide the world by force and seize new colonies, with open pretensions to world domination, comprised the political basis of the military doctrine of the Kaiser's Germany. The German military machine was developed, militarization of the country took place and the armed forces were prepared taking this into account. However, the political objectives of German military doctrine did not correspond to the real military and economic capabilities of the country, which did not provide for fulfilling the plans of the German General Staff for conducting war simultaneously on two fronts against the Entente countries. And, as is known, as a result the Kaiser's Germany and its adventurist military doctrine suffered a crushing defeat.

France on the eve of the 1st World War also had nothing against receiving a "tidbit" at the expense of Germany and the other countries of the world. However, a lack of confidence in its strength and an absence of active and decisive plans were inherent in its military doctrine. The main thing which constituted the essence of French doctrine was to occupy an assembly area, discover the enemy's plan, and only then, taking the situation into account, to make the necessary decision. From this the approach itself to preparing for war and to structuring the army had a mark of passivity and boiled down to creating strong fortifications along the borders and stockpiling reserves of materiel for war.

Britain at the time was a huge colonial power, and therefore the basis of its political mission was a desire to strengthen its authority in every way possible over previously seized territories. In view of the great distance of the colonies from the mother state, the navy was the leading force in accomplishing this mission. This necessarily had an impact on the content of military doctrine and on the main thrust of British military strategy, which gives priority to the creation and development of the navy.

The military doctrine of Tsarist Russia on the eve of World War I also reflected in a political sense the predatory aspirations of the ruling classes of this bourgeois-landholder state and provided for accomplishing military missions by numerically large armed forces. The doctrine, however, underestimated and did not fully take into account the relatively low technical level of the Russian Army.

The United States did not participate directly in World War I, but did not remain on the sidelines. The main objective of the American imperialists was, at minimal material expenses, to enrich themselves to the maximum extent at the cost of the bloody carnage between the major European powers and at the same time to take part in the postwar redivision of the world. It is no accident that while war was underway in Europe the United States carried out a large scale expansion in Latin America, the Far East and the Pacific Ocean basin.

Therefore, a common trait of the military doctrines of the main states participating in the 1st World War was expansionism and a desire to seize foreign lands. Underestimation of the role of social and political factors, errors in assessing their own military and economic capabilities and adventurism in planning and carrying out the war were overlooked in their doctrines, which in the end also predetermined their nature and outcome -- the strategic objectives of the war were not achieved for almost any of the warring countries.

THE THUNDER OF GUNS OF WORLD WAR I HAD BARELY QUIETED, WHEN IN THE BOWELS OF IMPERIALISM THE STORM CLOUDS OF WORLD WAR II HAD ALREADY BEGUN TO GATHER. Having strengthened themselves in the years of the 1st World War, the American imperialists began to lay claim to the colonies of their competitors -- the European capitalist countries. The antagonistic contradictions among the United States, Britain, France and Germany were not eliminated, but to the contrary, took on forms still more dangerous to the world. A new and serious military conflict between Britain, France and the United States on the one hand and Germany on the other was gathering force. As was noted above, World War I and the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia caused the start of the general crisis of capitalism. The unified capitalist system split and the irreversible process of its collapse began. And although imperialism still possessed tremendous military and economic capabilities and as before imagined itself the ruler on Earth, its global positions were hopelessly undermined and could not support the realization of its pretenses to world domination.

In connection with this, there were two approaches to the Soviet Union in the ruling circles of the capitalist state. One consisted of the desire to destroy the young Soviet Republic by force of arms. The military intervention against our country was a perfect manifestation of this policy. Great hopes were also placed on restoring capitalism in Russia by way of economic blockade, political diktat, and active ideological struggle and diversions. The military doctrines and strategic concepts of the capitalist countries were determined taking this into account. Needless to say, the intensive process of developing arms and military equipment; massive equipping of the armed forces with tanks, aircraft and submarines; increasing motorization and mechanization of the troops; and application of better means of troop command and control had a definite influence on them.

Fascist Germany was distinguished by the greatest aggressiveness and desire for world domination. With the coming to power of the Hitlerites in Fascist Germany there developed a feverish preparation for war, which became the main substance of the activity of the state. Everything was subordinated to total militarization: foreign and domestic policy, the economy, science and culture, the educational system, sports and the gigantic propaganda machine. The German imperialists set as their objective crushing their capitalist competitors, destroying the Soviet Union and gaining world domination, having created a global colonial empire.

This objective also determined the views of the Nazi leaders and the Wehrmacht Command on the nature of the war, the methods of its preparation and conduct and the principles of structuring the military. The theory of total war, developed by German military theoreticians back in the 1920's and later generalized by Ludendorff in his book, "Total War," served as the nucleus of German military doctrine. Fascist theoreticians understood this war as all encompassing, in which all means and methods were permitted to defeat and destroy not only the armed forces but also the population of the enemy.

German military theoreticians viewed the war as an unavoidable and vitally necessary phenomenon. At the same time they were aware that a protracted war might end in catastrophe for them. The strategic concept of "lightning war" appeared in connection with this. Accordingly, it was considered that the active use of large groupings of tank and mechanized forces, aviation and naval forces would secure victory in the war in the shortest period of time, before the enemy could completely deploy his armed forces and military and economic potential. It should immediately be noted that these concepts were in their essence adventuristic, since they were built on underestimating the economic, military and moral capabilities of the probable enemies, most of all the USSR, and on clear overestimation of their own capabilities.

The main objective of militarist Japan, as a confederate of Fascist Germany, was to establish undivided domination in Asia, the Far East and the Pacific Ocean basin and to strengthen its role in the whole world arena. The most important objectives of its aggressive aspirations were China, the Soviet Far East, and the colonial holdings of the United States and Britain in the Pacific Ocean basin. To achieve these aims by war, surprise strong

(destructive) strikes by carrier and shore based aviation were planned against the main groupings of the opposing side, with subsequent battles on the broad water areas and territories by the main naval and ground forces. However, the plans and military policy of militarist Japan did not correspond to its economic capabilities, were not supported either in their political or military and technical respects and, like Fascist Germany, were fundamentally adventuristic.

Italian military doctrine on the eve of World War II was determined by the aggressive essence of fascism, the level of economic development of the state and the specifics of its geographical and strategic situation. The country's relative economic and military weakness prompted the Italian fascists to maneuver between the stronger imperialist states, to give preference to Hitler's concept of "lightning war" and to place great hopes on the victorious conduct of the war by Fascist Germany, which was in and of itself erroneous and unrealistic, since the Hitlerites themselves were interested in seizing the same areas to which Italy lay claim.

Just before the start of World War II another grouping of capitalist states took shape to oppose the Fascist bloc. Britain, France and the United States played a leading role in this grouping. The desire of each of these countries to stabilize and expand its influence in the world arena and a general anti-Soviet thrust to its policy had great influence on the forming of the military and political views of these countries.

Britain's military doctrine was developed under the influence of the many centuries old process of development of this colonial power and the particular nature of its geographical position. Therefore, its political content boiled down to the need to maintain and expand domination in far-flung colonial holdings and retain its leading position among the European countries. In connection with this the main tasks of its imperial strategy were to ensure the security of the country's naval lines of communication and air defenses; to suppress the liberation movement in the colonies and to fulfill limited alliance commitments in Europe.

The military and technical aspect of British military doctrine was also determined taking this into account. This involved the priority given to the development of the navy, primarily to major surface ships, as well as to aviation as a primary strategic means of waging war. Ground forces played a secondary role and were viewed merely as a means to conduct predatory colonial wars.

On the whole British military doctrine and military strategy were conservative and did not fully take into account the appearance of new means of armed conflict.

The political content of France's military doctrine reflected a desire to preserve its advantageous political and strategic position in Europe which was created as a result of the defeat of Germany and its allies in World War II. It assumed that future war, like the 1st World War, would necessarily become a positional war with two periods of military operations:

a defensive period in which the forces of the enemy would be exhausted, and an offensive period during which the allied armies would decisively defeat him. The military-technical aspect of doctrine also corresponded to this idea. It found its practical embodiment in the construction of strong, permanent fortified positions, called the Maginot Line, along the entire eastern border of the country and part of its seacoast. The ground forces were traditionally considered the main armed service. The role of aviation and tanks in future war were underestimated. The navy was used primarily for defensive purposes. By this strategy France actually gave away the initiative in waging war to Germany, which as a result led to the tragedy of 1940.

United States military doctrine on the eve of World War II stemmed from the fact that the geographical position of the country fully ensured its security, and its developed economy was creating favorable opportunities for military, economic and political influence on other countries. It provided for using its armed forces only in the concluding stage of the war, when terms of peace advantageous to the United States could easily be dictated to an exhausted enemy. Military construction was also subordinated to this.

Thus, the imperialist powers intensively prepared for a new armed clash for redivision of markets and spheres of influence. THEY ALSO ENTERED WORLD WAR II WITH WELL DEVELOPED MILITARY DOCTRINES AND STRATEGIES. The military doctrine and military strategy of Fascist Germany and its allies suffered complete defeat in conflict primarily with the USSR and its armed forces. As for the United States and Great Britain, overall World War II did not change their basic fundamental military views. The main objectives of these countries were to defeat their economic competitors, Germany and Japan, weaken the Soviet Union in every way possible, and ensure a dominant position in the world and military superiority. Accordingly, the strategic plans and actions of these states were duplicitous and contradictory over the course of the entire war. The war also again graphically and convincingly showed the clearly expressed anti-Soviet thrust of their policies.

IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE END OF WORLD WAR II, international imperialism came out against those positive changes in the world which had taken place as a result of the defeat of Fascist Germany and militarist Japan, and against the formation of the world socialist system. It was mainly at this time that the United States based its policy on the idea of undermining and eliminating the socialist system, suppressing the national liberation movement and in the end establishing world domination. U. S. President Truman expressed with particular clarity the essence of the post-war policy of the United States when he stated that victory in the 2d World War confronted the American people with the "constant and vital need for world leadership," and that "the Russians soon would be put in their place." And this statement was soon embodied in actual aggressive U. S. plans.

Thus, in September 1945 the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved the document, "Bases for the Formulation of American Military Policy," and in October approved the "Strategic Concepts and Plan for the Use of United States Armed Forces," which laid the basis for subsequent aggressive military doctrines and strategic concepts.

IN THE EARLY 1950'S, the United States, although it had lost its monopoly on nuclear weapons, still had substantial superiority in the number of warheads and to some extent still remained unaccessible for a retaliatory strike. Therefore it developed A STRATEGY OF "MASSIVE RETALIATION," which provided for conducting only general nuclear war against the USSR and other socialist countries. At the time the United States considered powerful strategic aviation, capable of making nuclear strikes deep in the rear areas of the Soviet Union, to be the main means of warfare. Therefore, the Pentagon viewed war as the unilateral use of strategic nuclear weapons, without retribution upon the United States.

BY THE BEGINNING OF THE 1960'S, in connection with the development of inter-continental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and a reliable system to combat strategic aviation in the USSR, the military and political leaders in Washington were forced to acknowledge that the United States could no longer count on attacking with impunity in a war against the USSR. In connection with this, a new strategy, that of "FLEXIBLE RESPONSE," came to light. The central place in it was again given to general nuclear war, but already with a "measured" use of nuclear weapons comparable with the "scale of military danger" and the possibility of waging a limited war by conventional means. Land based ICBM's began to be considered the main means of nuclear attack. For this purpose, 1,054 Minuteman and Titan ICBM launchers were built in the United States and a large scale program of building submarines with Polaris missiles was developed. Along with this, the deployment of powerful general purpose forces with conventional weapons was provided for. It was planned to wage war in Europe against the USSR and the other socialist countries first with conventional weapons, then with the use of tactical and in a critical situation also strategic nuclear weapons.

BY THE BEGINNING OF THE 1970'S, as is known, parity was achieved in the quantitative correlation of United States and USSR strategic weapons. This forced the White House leaders to reexamine their former views and to adopt a new strategy, that of "REALISTIC DETERRENCE," which was based on a desire to achieve qualitative superiority over the whole complex of strategic arms. For these purposes, numerous programs for further increasing the power of all types of armed forces, first of all strategic offensive forces, were intensively developed and implemented in the United States.

AT THE START OF THE 1980'S, the Reagan Administration which had come to power in the United States undertook from its very first days a still more dangerous aggressive policy and adopted a new military strategy, the so-called STRATEGY OF "DIRECT CONFRONTATION" with the Soviet Union on a global and regional scale. The United States formulated the specific purposes of this strategy in the Pentagon document, "Defense Directives for 1984-1988." It placed primary reliance on ensuring the ability of United States strategic forces to make a surprise "preemptive first strike" against the USSR and to prepare at the same time for a protracted nuclear and/or conventional war in any region of the world where the notorious "threat to the vital interests" of the United States arose.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The directives emphasized that in nuclear war "the United States must have the capability of forcing the USSR to cease military operations on U. S. conditions in a short period of time," and if it refuses, to "decapitate the structure of USSR military and political authority and nuclear and conventional forces"; destroy industrial branches which determine military capability; and at the same time to the extent possible minimize the damage inflicted against the United States and its allies. The strategic offensive forces, including intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM); nuclear missile submarines (SSBN) and strategic aviation comprise the basis of the United States nuclear capability.

Thus, United States military doctrine stems from a desire to develop to the maximum its strategic nuclear forces (SYaS) for conducting a general nuclear war and achieving the primary objectives of the war by carrying out (at least in its first stage) a so-called "limited" nuclear war in Europe, using its strategic nuclear forces as a potential threat. Taking this into account, beginning in 1983 the United States has been intensively deploying American Pershing II missiles and land based cruise missiles on the territories of a number of West European NATO countries, which, by the way, substantially enhance United States nuclear capability as a first strike weapon, since they are capable of reaching targets in the European USSR more rapidly than strategic missiles launched from the North American continent.

In the opinion of the Pentagon, the existence of powerful strategic nuclear forces in the United States, as well as the development of so-called "Eurostrategic" nuclear forces, increases the possibility of achieving U. S. political and military aims in a "limited" nuclear war in the European theater of war without its growing to a worldwide war. Of course these hopes are pure utopia. Any attempt to bring nuclear weapons into play would unavoidably lead to catastrophe, which would place in doubt the fate of life itself on the whole earth. Judging by everything, the unpredictable consequences of a nuclear conflagration in no way disturb Washington's "optimists."

In its new military strategy, the United States also envisions training its armed forces to wage a war with the use of only conventional means of destruction. In accordance with the so-called conception of "geographical escalation," it is stated that in the event conventional war arises in any theater, the United States and its allies must be prepared to expand military operations with the use of conventional means of destruction to other theaters as well, "where the enemy is more vulnerable." In other words, such a war, in Washington's view, may encompass not only Europe, but also the Near, Middle and Far East and all the naval and ocean theaters of military operations.

Taking this into account, in August 1982 the Pentagon adopted a new concept of the "air-land operation (battle)," within the framework of the strategy of "direct confrontation," which defines the foundations for the use of combined NATO armed forces in the European theaters of military operations during the conduct of wars with conventional weapons. The concept assumes the sudden unleashing of combat operations simultaneously by air, naval and ground forces with the wide use of the latest conventional, highly accurate

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

weapons and reconnaissance-strike systems to great depth to inflict maximal losses upon enemy troops, achieving an overwhelming superiority over them in a short period of time and subsequently attacking to seize their territory. For these purposes, United States and NATO ground, air and naval forces are being intensively reequipped with new, highly accurate weapons systems and their organizational structures are being improved. Joint commands in Europe, the Near and Middle East, the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean areas and Central and South America have already been deployed. Preparation by U. S. armed forces, with large scale maneuvering of groupings of their forces to different theaters of military operations has become appreciably more intense.

The number of major military exercises and maneuvers with the participation of large contingents of troops and forces has increased significantly. This is far from a complete list of direct United States military preparations.

Even a cursory examination of the evolution of United States postwar strategic concepts shows that all are based on the idea of aggressive, predatory wars against the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. They reflect as in a mirror the predatory essence of the policy of American imperialism, which thirsts for any means of achieving global superiority over the USSR, not disdaining any methods, and the lack of desire to evaluate soberly the correlation of forces existing in the world and the forecasted unprecedented consequences of general nuclear war, if the imperialist "hawks" nevertheless unleash one.

Britain acts in close alliance with the United States. Its military doctrine is linked with the military doctrines of the other NATO countries, first of all the United States, and reflects the main political conception of the British bourgeoisie -- to maintain for Great Britain the status of a great power, having its own nuclear missile capability and sufficient economic strength to consolidate its military and political positions in the world arena. In all aggressive anti-Soviet, anti-democratic acts it fully and completely supports the United States and the NATO coalition strategy. British military doctrine acknowledges both unlimited use of nuclear weapons in a general war and the possibility of conducting a "limited" war in Central Europe, although not in the British Isles.

The socio-political essence of the FRG's military doctrine stems from the class nature of this revanchist state, which is one of the main NATO partners of the United States. It consists of aggressive anti-Communism, aimed at preparing for war against the countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and striving most of all to weaken the position of socialism in the GDR and the other European states and to solve the so-called "German question" to its advantage. A characteristic of the military-technical aspect of FRG doctrine is the further militarization of the country's economy and the growth of its military capability. The aggressive reactionary traditions of German imperialism and a pro-American thrust in its foreign and military policy have a significant influence on this condition. Its main substance is determined by the NATO-approved strategy of "flexible response" and by the possible waging of either a nuclear or conventional war in Europe. Not having

its own nuclear weapons, the FRG favors strengthening the nuclear capability of the North Atlantic Bloc and is nurturing plans for its production. It has created the most powerful armed forces among the European NATO countries, numbering approximately 500,000 and after the United States, Britain and France is the next largest exporter of weapons. The removal of the last limitations on the FRG for the production of heavy non-nuclear arms creates the preconditions for turning the Bundeswehr into a NATO offensive strike force within the framework of the aggressive American strategy of "air-land battles."

A dangerous evolution has taken place in the last few years in France's military doctrine and strategy. As is known, in 1966 when de Gaulle was President of France, it left the NATO military organization and its troops were removed from subordination to the NATO command. This was a positive step in providing a certain guarantee that France would not be dragged into war. At present they prefer not to recall this in official Paris. To make up for it, at all levels, including the highest, France's allegiance to its NATO commitments and resolve to strengthen its aggressive alliance are emphasized. Claiming the role of a third power in the capitalist world, France along with England opposes having its nuclear missiles counted in the overall balance of NATO nuclear forces, and is intensively developing its own "atomic umbrella," shortsightedly relying on it as a kind of "atomic Maginot Line."

France's turn toward Atlanticism is accompanied by stronger anti-Soviet emphasis in its military policy. Its armed forces are structured based on "an expanded security zone," which was officially approved by the government in its 5 year military program for 1984-1988. For the first time in the history of the Fifth Republic, this document directly named the USSR as a potential enemy, which is entirely in keeping with the new American military strategy of "direct confrontation." France's "rapid deployment forces" are also being developed on the American model. The matter of the participation of French armed forces in NATO operations in a "crisis" is being actively worked on. This is the highly dangerous substance of French military doctrine, which is being supported by Washington in every possible way.

The socio-political and military-technical content of Japan's military doctrine is being formed under the influence of the country's growing economic might, reviving militarism and desire to strengthen its influence in Southeast Asia and the Pacific Ocean Basin. Expanding military and political cooperation with the United States, China and South Korea is heating up in Japan expansionist aspirations with respect to the USSR and its allies, and is advancing to the forefront the task of increasing the state's military might.

Thus the present military doctrines of the leading imperialist powers, especially the United States, are based on a sharply expressed anti-Soviet, anti-socialist and anti-democratic thrust, increased economic militarization and direct material preparations for a new world war for the purpose of achieving world domination. However, many centuries of historical development have already repeatedly proven the absolute bankruptcy and doom of such hegemonistic designs.

Soviet military doctrine and Soviet military strategy are completely opposite the military doctrines and military strategies of the capitalist states in their essence and thrust.

Soviet Military Doctrine -- A Doctrine for the Defense of Peace and Socialism

Soviet military doctrine is a system of guiding principles and scientifically based views of the CPSU and the Soviet Government on the essence, nature and methods of waging war, which may be unleashed by the imperialists against the Soviet Union, as well as on military construction and the preparation of the armed forces and the country to destroy the aggressor.

Marxism-Leninism is the ideological theoretical base of Soviet military doctrine. Its content derives from the objective need to defend the socialist homeland from the imperialist aggressors. Soviet military doctrine is based on the laws and postulates of historical and dialectical materialism, Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army and the conclusions of Soviet military science. The military doctrines of the USSR and other countries in the socialist community are based on progressive and just ideas of defending the socialist gains of the workers and the peace and security of the peoples. In contrast to the military doctrines of the imperialist states, their essence and nature are set forth with maximum clarity in the declaration of Warsaw Treaty Organization member states of 15 May 1980, which states clearly that "we do not have, never have had and never will have any strategic doctrine other than a defensive one."

The heroic history of our homeland and its armed forces is a convincing confirmation of the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine. From its first days the young Soviet Republic countered the imperialist policy of war with Lenin's policy of peace and peaceful coexistence. "...All of our policy and propaganda," emphasized Lenin, "are not at all directed at drawing the people into war, but at putting an end to war."²⁹

IN THE YEARS OF THE MILITARY INTERVENTION AND CIVIL WAR IN THE USSR, our main task was to defend the revolutionary gains and maintain the integrity and independence of the world's first state of workers and peasants and the conditions for the peaceful construction of socialism. These years were a period of formation of Soviet military doctrine, establishment of Soviet military art and military science as a whole and development and strengthening of an army of a new type -- the Red Army. Guided by the theoretical foundations for building the Soviet armed forces, which had been worked out by this time by Lenin and the Communist Party, our army and navy utterly defeated the combined forces of foreign and internal counterrevolution.

SOVIET MILITARY DOCTRINE WAS FURTHER DEVELOPED IN THE YEARS OF PEACEFUL CONSTRUCTION IN THE USSR (1921-1941). Already by 1921 the theoretical postulates of a unified Soviet military doctrine were developed, based on the theory of Marxism-Leninism and thorough analysis and generalization of the experience of the 1st World War and the civil war in our country. This doctrine, as M. V. Frunze noted, must be built "first, on a clear and accurate view of the nature of future war; second, on a correct and precise

calculation of those forces and those means which our possible enemies will possess; and third on the same calculation of our own resources."30

A well founded conclusion was made that future war, if the imperialists unleash one, will be protracted and will demand the maximum intensity of all the country's material and spiritual resources, and that maneuver and primarily offensive forms of battle will predominate and military operations will take place over tremendous expanses. This made it possible to clarify the socio-political aspect of Soviet military doctrine and to determine correctly the corresponding directions for the building of the armed forces and the preparation of them and the country as a whole for a possible future war.

In the 1930's, in connection with the increased danger that imperialism would unleash a new world war, the need arose to refine the military technical aspect of Soviet military doctrine, and on the basis of new tendencies in the nature of future war and the directions of development of military affairs, to work out well grounded recommendations for improving military equipment and methods of preparing for and conducting operations, and for strengthening the capability of the country to defend the gains of the Great October Revolution. The development in those days of the theory of the deep operation and battle by Soviet military thinking had great importance for this. Its essence consisted of determining the possibilities for simultaneously suppressing the enemy defense throughout its entire depth by artillery fire and air strikes, decisively breaking through the tactical zone of his defense by massing forces and weapons on selected axes, and swiftly developing tactical success into operational by way of introducing into the battle powerful mobile large units of tanks, motorized infantry, cavalry and airborne assaults. At the same time, the combat effectiveness of the Soviet Armed Forces was increased, modernization was carried out and the system for indoctrinating and training military cadres to repulse possible aggression was improved. The basic provisions of Soviet military doctrine were repeatedly subjected to practical testing in the defense of the state interests of our homeland, in battles against the Chinese militarists on the Chinese Eastern Railroad (1929); the Japanese imperialists in the Lake Khasan region (1938); on the Khalkhin-Gol (1939) and especially during the Great Patriotic War. WAR CONFIRMED THE VITALITY OF SOVIET MILITARY DOCTRINE, enriched the Soviet Armed Forces with combat experience and facilitated the development of military science and military art.

During the post-war period, Soviet military doctrine completely retained its defensive thrust. Its further development was caused by the fundamental change in the correlation of forces in the world arena to the advantage of socialism; by the achievements of the world socialist system; and by the need for collective defense of the community of socialist countries against the aggressive aspirations of the combined forces of the imperialist states and blocs.

Soviet military doctrine also thoroughly took into account the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress and the growth in the economic capabilities of the USSR and the other Warsaw Treaty Organization states.

At present our policy continues to be based on the integral unity of love of peace and constant readiness for active defense of the socialist homeland and the community of socialist countries. The defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine is clearly expressed in the decisions of CPSU congresses and is set forth legislatively in the USSR Constitution. It is based on defending socialist gains, the peaceful work of the Soviet people, and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Soviet state and its allies. The provisions of Soviet military doctrine are thoroughly developed in party and state decisions as well as in military regulations.

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTENT OF SOVIET MILITARY DOCTRINE is based on Marxist-Leninist teachings and stems from the nature of the USSR state and social system, the policies of the Communist Party and Soviet State and the fundamental interests of the Soviet people. These are also the bases for the fundamental principles of military construction in the USSR, which is implemented in strict accord with CPSU policy in the military sphere, taking into account the development of the country's economic, scientific and moral-political capabilities and the cultural level and traditions of the Soviet people.

Under present conditions the essence of Soviet military doctrine consists of blocking the path of the exceptionally dangerous policy of imperialism, halting the arms race and securing a peaceful life for the peoples. "...We do not strive to achieve unilateral advantages over the United States and the NATO countries or for military superiority over them," stated Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 11 March 1985 special CPSU Central Committee plenum, "we wish to cease and not to continue the arms race..." "But everyone must know," he emphasized, "that we will never forego the interests of our homeland and its allies."³¹

Soviet military doctrine predetermines that the USSR and its armed forces will defend equally the freedom and independence of friendly socialist states with which we are linked by appropriate treaties. In connection with this, our military doctrine fully takes into account the socio-political, economic and military capabilities of the countries of the socialist community and the need for their collective defense against possible aggressive aspirations of the forces of imperialism and reaction.

Scientifically based postulates on the moral-political and psychological preparation of the Soviet people are a most important component of the socio-political content of Soviet military doctrine. Our military doctrine views the high level of moral-political capability of the Soviet state, along with the advantages of the political and economic system of a society of developed socialism, as one of the life giving sources of our superiority over the forces of aggression.

Lenin stated that, "the construction of our army could lead to successful results only because it was created in the spirit of overall Soviet construction, on the basis of class relations which affect the area of any construction."³² It is namely this in the final analysis which has always determined and today determines the nature of the Soviet Armed Forces and their might and invincibility.

THE MILITARY TECHNICAL CONTENT OF SOVIET MILITARY DOCTRINE encompasses a wide range of matters concerning construction, training and maintaining the armed forces at a high level of combat readiness. It includes improving their technical equipment, organizational structure and command and control systems; raising the level of field, air and naval training of the troop units, aviation and naval forces, taking into account the nature and special features of modern warfare; and the further development of Soviet military art. In other words, this aspect of doctrine determines the ways, means and methods of fulfilling the tasks of reliable defense of the socialist homeland, which the country's political leadership assigns to the armed forces.

One of the fundamental provisions of the military-technical aspect of doctrine is determining the nature of forthcoming armed conflict, taking into account the development of the military-technical resources of the opposing side and the main traits and features of strategic operations and of national and joint (coalition) armed forces. Stemming from this, Soviet military doctrine presumes that modern world war, if the imperialists unleash it, will acquire unprecedented spatial scope, encompass entire continents and ocean expanses and unavoidably drag into its orbit the majority of the countries of the world. It will have an unprecedented destructive nature. Military operations will be carried out simultaneously in vast zones, will be distinguished by unprecedented ferocity, will be highly maneuverable and dynamic and will continue until total victory over the enemy.

The most important requirements of Soviet military doctrine are to maintain the USSR armed forces at a high state of combat readiness which ensures their timely deployment to repulse a surprise enemy attack; make powerful retaliatory strikes and successfully fulfill the assigned task of defending the socialist homeland. Stemming from this, Soviet military doctrine requires not merely defending ourselves, confronting the aggressor with passive means and methods of defense, but also the ability to inflict upon him crushing retaliatory strikes and to destroy him in any situation.

Soviet military doctrine has always stemmed from and continues to stem from the principle of retaliatory; i.e., defensive operations. The USSR views a nuclear attack as the gravest crime against humanity. USSR strategic nuclear forces have never been called "strategic offensive forces," as they are eloquently named in the United States. Soviet military doctrine is based on the postulate that THE SOVIET UNION WILL NOT BE FIRST TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS. This commitment was taken unilaterally and was stated to the entire world.

An important aspect of improving military readiness of the armed forces is their high level of technical equipping; i.e., providing the forces and naval forces with modern military equipment and weapons. Soviet military doctrine believes that the present level of development of the Socialist economy makes it possible to solve successfully the most technically complex defensive tasks and to develop quickly any type of weapon necessary to defend the homeland.

Great attention in the military-technical aspect of Soviet military doctrine is paid to improving the organizational structure of the armed forces and the

appropriate relationship among armed services, branches of arms and services, combat and support forces, as well as their manning, personnel training and cadres preparation, and to improving constantly the systems and organs of command, control and communications. Questions concerning the economic and mobilization preparation of the country, shifting the economy from a peacetime status to a military status and organizing and carrying out territorial and civil defense are closely linked with these provisions of military doctrine.

The military-technical content of Soviet military doctrine also includes the basic provisions of Soviet military art on the methods and forms of conducting military operations under various wartime conditions, and it provides for carrying out active and decisive combat operations, with the use of the armed might of the state and its armed forces, to the complete defeat of the aggressor if he tries to encroach on our country.

The provisions of the military-technical aspect of doctrine also determine the most fundamental bases for the organization of command and control of the armed forces in peacetime and wartime. In this regard the most fundamental provision is the principle of the unity of political and military leadership of the war and the centralized command and control of the army and navy, with the granting of broad initiative and necessary operational independence to all control organs on their own levels, in the interests of achieving the objectives of the battle, operation and war. An important role is allotted to thorough support of combat operations of troops (forces) and to reserves of various categories.

In accordance with doctrinal directives, strategic and operational tasks in wartime must be accomplished by the combined efforts of all the Soviet armed services, jointly with the armies of the fraternal socialist countries, since their views on the nature and objectives of future war and the fundamental questions of military construction and military art have the same socio-economic, political and moral bases.

SOVIET MILITARY STRATEGY, as the highest area of military art, is closely interrelated in content with Soviet military doctrine, is subordinated to it, reflects CPSU and Soviet Government policy in the area of national defense, and derives from tasks defined by the USSR Constitution for the armed defense of socialist accomplishments. "Strategy," stated Lenin, "is subordinated to policy, and they are inseparably linked."³³

Soviet military strategy derives from the objective laws of war revealed by the founders of scientific Communism, formulates on their basis the principles of preparing for and carrying out strategic operations, the construction of the armed forces and leadership of them, and is constantly improved under the influence of changing political, economic, scientific-technical, military and other factors. It is involved in working out and implementing measures for preparing the armed forces, theaters of military operations, the economy and the country's population for possible war, and for planning the war and strategic operations. It is also involved in organizing the deployment of the armed forces and command and control of them when conducting strategic

operations, as well as for solving questions related to defining under specific wartime conditions the strategic tasks of the army and navy and the forces and resources necessary for accomplishing them, taking into account the capabilities of the probable enemy for waging war and conducting operations. In military art, strategy occupies the dominant position with respect to operational art and tactics, and in turn relies upon their capabilities in accomplishing its tasks.

Thus, the content and thrust of Soviet military doctrine and Soviet military strategy in their most general aspect boil down to the fact that predatory wars are foreign to the USSR as a socialist state and to its armed forces. Our country never attacked and does not intend to attack a single state either in West, East, North or South to change their existing social system. Nor does the Soviet Union need to expand its borders. But it will defend with full resolve, actively and uncompromisingly, that which belongs to the Soviet people and was created by its labor. Therefore, the peace loving nature of the foreign policy of our state and its constant readiness to give a crushing rebuff to any aggressor, under any circumstances, are fused together in Soviet military doctrine and Soviet military strategy.

The countries of the socialist community have a single goal -- to defend their countries and the gains of socialism and to preserve peace on earth. The fraternal alliance of the peoples and the military comradeship of the armies of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization serve namely this purpose. As a result of this, the doctrinal tenets and the questions which their military strategy solve in the main coincide. Needless to say, national particularities of the corresponding countries, which are related to the level of development which they have achieved, their geographical position and possible nature of actions of the probable enemy, are taken into account.

It is an objective, vital necessity to strengthen the defense capability of the USSR and its allies in a situation of growing threat and military preparations from the United States and NATO bloc. And the more serious these threats, the higher must be our defense capability, which is a powerful factor for peace. The Soviet people, the peoples of the other countries of the socialist community, and the soldiers of their armies do not forget for a minute that the aggressive essence of imperialism has not changed, and, moreover, that its aggressiveness is increasing and that it is therefore necessary to display high political and military vigilance, to assess realistically the actions of reactionary circles in imperialist states and to keep our powder dry constantly, so that no eventuality can catch us unawares.

The peoples of the countries of the socialist community, taking into account the current situation, are doing and will do everything to make their defense still stronger and still more effective. And let the fanciers of military adventures and the new pretenders to world domination not forget about this. In the words of the great Lenin, "we will stand up for ourselves. We were not beaten, and we will not be beaten, and will not be deceived."³⁴ The Soviet armed forces and the armies of the countries of the socialist community have everything necessary to give a decisive rebuff to any aggression, no matter from where it may come.

* * *

These, then, are the essence and the thrust of the military doctrines and military strategies of the capitalist and socialist states. Comparing them, it is easy to see that the former are clearly aggressive in nature, directed toward the arms race, and embody a serious danger of unleashing a new world war. The latter are the direct opposite and have one single goal -- to defend the socialist gains of the peoples and peace on earth, and to ensure the readiness to inflict a crushing retaliatory blow to the aggressor.

WAR CAN AND MUST BE PREVENTED

The peoples of the earth have from time immemorial struggled for peace and for a life without military shocks. However, contrary to their desires, wars not only have not ceased, but have taken on ever greater scale and in the 20th century reached the apogee -- they became world wars. And today millions of people on earth are concerned by the most burning question: Is there a real possibility of preventing a new world war and can war be excluded from life of human society altogether? In striving to answer this question, they cast their gaze with hope first to the Soviet Union and the countries of socialism.

In the unforgettable May days of 1945, people believed that fascism and war had been destroyed forever and that, celebrating the great victory attained at an unbelievably high cost, they were beginning a new stage in history, a stage of peace and friendship among the peoples. Peaceloving peoples did not even dream that after the bloody 2d World War maniacs would be found who would try to push mankind into the abyss of a new, still more destructive war. In those days this seemed absurd.

The 2d World War did not eliminate the main source of military danger in our time -- imperialism. The general crisis of capitalism continued to intensify and the aggressiveness of imperialist policy continued to grow. The United States imperialists, the new pretenders to world domination, learned nothing from the experience of Fascist Germany. Having enriched themselves on the blood and suffering of millions and blackmailing the world with nuclear weapons, they considered world domination and removing from the political arena all who would oppose them to be practically their lawful right.

United States militarism grew especially sharp in the 1980's with the arrival in the White House of the Reagan Administration, he being a henchman of the most reactionary and aggressive circles of American imperialism. To please them the arms race is being whipped up without restraint in the United States, and irresponsible preparations for a worldwide nuclear war are being carried out. The U.S. President openly declared a "crusade" against socialism, and cynically "jokes" about possible atomic bombings of the USSR at his command. Militaristic circles in the United States, with the support of their European allies, are deploying nuclear first strike weapons on their territories.

One asks, how is this to be understood? Does such behavior by the representatives of the ruling circles in the United States mean that the fate of war and peace is entirely in their hands and mankind can only submissively bow their heads and await their fate without a murmur? Does this mean that there is no force in the world capable of stopping those who have raised the nuclear sword over the world? There is one answer to this: No it does not mean this! The imperial designs of the White House and reality are far from one and the same, and present day imperialism is not all powerful. The forces arrayed against it are immeasurably stronger. War can and must be

prevented. Today there exist both the socio-political and the military-technical prerequisites for this. The lessons of history also demand this.

As is known, the 1st World War began a decade after the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 -- one of the first large armed confrontations of the imperialist era. It was virtually impossible to prevent it at the time. It broke out under conditions in which capitalism was a single, all encompassing system, and when the bourgeoisie, who ruled undivided in the world arena, completely determined the political policy of the leading capitalist states. Peaceloving forces were still extremely weak and disunited, and the leaders of the Social Democratic Parties in most of the countries of Europe had betrayed the interests of their peoples and embarked on the path of chauvinism and open support to the militaristic policy of the bourgeoisie. The 1st World War continued for more than four years and took away approximately 10 million human lives.

Two decades separated the 2d World War from the 1st. And although capitalism at the time was already no longer an all encompassing system, it was still not possible to ward off its threat. The Soviet Union, the world's first and at the time only socialist state, consistently carried out a policy of peace, and in the prewar years resolutely favored curbing the fascist aggressors and creating a system of collective security. However, all the efforts of the USSR to preserve peace hit up against the shortsighted anti-Soviet policy of the United States, Britain, France and a number of other capitalist countries, which encouraged the Nazi aggressors to unleash war in Eastern Europe and to undertake a "crusade" against the USSR. The 2d World War lasted six years and took away more than 50 million human lives.

Four decades passed since the 2d World War. Profound changes took place in the world arena. The defeat of Fascist Germany and militaristic Japan in 1945; the socialist revolutions in a number of countries which led to the formation of a worldwide socialist system; the building of developed socialism in the USSR and successful construction of new societies in the other fraternal countries; and the rise of the national liberation movement and complete collapse of the colonial system fundamentally changed the worldwide picture and the correlation of class socio-political forces in the international arena to the advantage of socialism, peace and progress. The sphere of influence of capital is inexorably narrowing. Capitalism, including American capitalism, despite the substantial reserves which it still possesses, is no longer the dominant economic, political and military force in the modern world and cannot simply determine the fate of mankind.

In our day the imperialist bourgeoisie has become, as Lenin noted, a class which is "degenerating, decadent and internally dead."³⁵ That is why the unprecedented impudence of its monopolistic leaders, who threateningly brandish the "nuclear bludgeon" and loudly proclaim "crusades" against socialism, including against the Soviet Union, which only four decades ago saved mankind from the brown obscurantism, is far from a sign of strength but is a manifestation of weakness and the historical irreparability of the capitalist system. As a result of the fundamental change in the correlation

of forces in the world arena to the advantage of socialism, peace and social progress, REAL OBJECTIVE PREREQUISITES FOR ELIMINATING WAR FROM THE LIFE OF SOCIETY HAVE TAKEN SHAPE.

The theoretical and practical activity of V. I. Lenin, great leader of the worldwide proletariat, and his creative development under new historical conditions of the teaching of Marx and Engels, serve in the historical plane as a classic model of the profoundly scientific approach to solving the questions of development of society, including the vitally important problem of war and peace.

In our time, the Communist Party, guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, creatively developing and enriching it as it applies to the present situation, has concluded that wars are not fatally inevitable. The aggressive essence and class nature of imperialism, it goes without saying, remain unchanged, however the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and strengthening of the role of socialism in international life; the creation and steady development of the world socialist system; the increased defense capability of the countries of the socialist community to the level of guaranteed destruction of any aggressor; the growing communist and workers movement; as well as the stronger cohesion and activeness of the non-aligned movement and other peaceloving forces significantly limit the opportunities for imperialism to unleash aggressive wars. This conclusion is especially correct with respect to imperialist wars against the socialist countries. In other words, under modern conditions the socio-political and military-technical prerequisites are being created for the prevention of a new world war and, in the future, for the complete eradication of wars from the life of society even before the complete victory of socialism on earth, while capitalism still remains for some time in a number of countries. Of course, during this period the military threat still remains, but it will be possible to neutralize it.

THE DECISIVE FACTOR IN PREVENTING WAR AND THE MAIN SUPPORT TO THE PEOPLES OF THE EARTH IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR PEACE ARE THE COUNTRIES OF THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY, FIRST OF ALL THE SOVIET UNION, which like no other state knows the true cost of war and, therefore, is struggling for a stable peace with particular persistence. Its Leninist foreign policy is not subject to any infections of the marketplace and is directed at achieving this great goal.

The Communist Party has always opposed militarism. War is foreign to the very nature of socialism. It is well known that right up to the October Socialist Revolution the party program did not provide at all for a regular army. Voluntary formations, the Red Guards and the revolutionary units in the old army were sufficient for the Russian working people to overthrow tsarism and the bourgeois Interim Government in 1917. Only the danger of military intervention and the appearance of internal counterrevolution, supported by foreign capital, and the threat to the existence of Soviet authority forced Lenin and the Communist Party to undertake the creation of the regular Red Army with the single purpose of "safeguarding the gains of the revolution...from all the enemies of the people..."³⁶

A consistent struggle for peace and for strengthening international security constitutes the general policy of the foreign political activity of the Communist Party and Soviet state. The economic and defense might of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community and the constant high combat readiness of their armed forces are a reliable roadblock against the aspirations of the aggressor to start the fires of a new world war. This is precisely why the defense capability of the USSR is not only a guarantee of the creative labor of the Soviet people, but also guarantees universal peace on earth.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AND WORKERS MOVEMENT HAS TURNED INTO A POWERFUL AND INFLUENTIAL FORCE OF OUR TIME IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. It now numbers approximately a hundred parties in its ranks. Expressing the moods and aspirations of the broadest strata of peoples, the Communist and workers parties come out in favor of preserving the fruits of detente and advancing the cause of disarmament, and raise up the popular masses to all-round activization of the antiwar movement and to the struggle to rid mankind of the threat of a nuclear war. Participation of the organized working class in the antiwar movement is increasing. This is giving the antiwar movement a more resolute nature and is increasing its self-discipline.

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT, AS WELL AS THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT, ARE IMPORTANT FACTORS IN THE STRUGGLE TO PREVENT WAR AND FOR PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE. By the beginning of the 1980's there were already more than 110 developing states in Asia, Africa and Latin America which had achieved national independence. Of these some 20 states had selected the path of socialist orientation. Being an integral part of the peace movement, the struggle of peoples for independence and social progress invariably leads to the steady weakening of the positions of worldwide imperialism, to the narrowing of its social base and to the further deepening of its general crisis. All this contributes to preventing wars.

THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD ARE RESPONDING TO THE INTENSIFIED MILITARY DANGER WITH A POWERFUL UPSURGE OF THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE. The populations of Britain, the FRG, France, Italy and many other countries greeted with mass protest demonstrations the deployment of American Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe. They encompass literally all social strata, from workers and students to clergymen, parliamentarians and home-makers. The struggle of the peoples against United States acts of aggression in the Middle East and Central America have become widespread. The increasing size of the antiwar and anti-imperialist struggle throughout the world is a reflection of the general history of social development -- the increased role of the people as the maker of history.

As Lenin noted, under present conditions wars are conducted by the peoples. The entire burden of the war and all the human and material losses in it are placed namely on the working masses. Therefore, the peoples themselves are ever more persistently and actively becoming involved in solving the most important and burning issue of our time, the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe. There is no doubt that as the people become still more conscious of the existing danger of a thermo-nuclear conflict and its true

source -- imperialism headed by the United States -- the size of this movement will steadily grow. This already cannot be ignored. Of course, the antiwar movement can still not by itself solve the problems of war and peace in their entirety. However, it is capable of limiting significantly the freedom of action of the extremist bourgeois leaders and their monopolist masters. Lenin indicated that the force of pressure and the consciousness of the working masses has often "broken off the spear point of the militaristic policy of the imperialists."³⁷

ALONG WITH THE SOCIO-POLITICAL FACTORS WHICH HAVE BEEN ENUMERATED, TODAY THERE ALSO EXIST OTHER, PURELY MILITARY PRECONDITIONS WHICH LIMIT THE CAPABILITY OF IMPERIALISM TO UNLEASH NEW WARS. These preconditions stem from rapid scientific and technical progress which led to a dialectical jump into a true revolution in military affairs. The appearance in 1945 and the rapid subsequent improvement of nuclear weapons which have unbelievable destructive force, raised the question anew about the utility of war as a means of achieving a political objective. Only having totally taken leave of one's senses is it possible to try to find arguments and to find a goal which would justify unleashing a world nuclear war and thereby threaten total destruction of human civilization. This leads to the indisputable conclusion that it is criminal to view thermonuclear war as a rational and practically "lawful" means of the continuation of policies.

Today, through the fault of the United States which unleashed an unrestrained arms race, such stockpiles of nuclear weapons have been accumulated on earth which from a military point of view already seem truly absurd. For example, United States strategic nuclear forces in one first strike alone can use today more than 12,000 nuclear warheads, the aggregate yield of which is hundreds of times greater than the total yield of all the explosives and munitions used by all the states of the world in six years of World War II. And this, we again emphasize, is in the United States strategic nuclear arsenal alone. If the operational-tactical nuclear capability is also counted, as well as the rough parity in nuclear weapons between the United States and the USSR, one need not be a military specialist in order to understand that further stockpiling of nuclear weapons is becoming simply senseless. Ultra maximal reserves of nuclear weapons not only do not guarantee security, but rather, increase the possibility of even an accidental, unsanctioned or provocative nuclear launch or strike from imperialist "hawks" and the danger for this aggressor state of being subjected to a devastating retaliatory strike. In this regard, the solemn commitment made by the Soviet Union at the United Nations not to use nuclear weapons first, with its simultaneous appeal to the United States and the other nuclear powers to follow this example, expresses the deep concern of world society about the existing situation in the world and the insistent need finally to bring a halt to the nuclear arms race. Further delay in this is already becoming intolerable.

Thus, for the first time in history the main opposing sides have created a surplus of military and especially nuclear capabilities. And this is already changing the qualitative aspect of military affairs. As a result a paradox has arisen. On the one hand, seemingly a process is underway giving a nuclear power a steadily increasing capability for destroying the enemy, and

on the other hand the capability for an aggressor to make a so-called "preemptive" strike on his main opponent is being reduced just as steadily and, perhaps still more sharply.

The fact is that, given the quantity and variety of nuclear missile weapons which have been achieved, it is simply impossible for an aggressor to completely destroy the analogous weapons on the other side with a single strike. And an immediate crushing response even by a limited number of nuclear weapons which the defender has remaining -- a response which deprives the aggressor of the capability of waging not only the war thereafter but also any sort of serious operations -- is becoming inevitable under modern conditions.

As for the hopes of U. S. strategists for the possibility of waging a "limited" nuclear war, today these hopes are completely unjustified and are meant for simpletons. To restrain a nuclear war which has begun within some limited framework will be virtually impossible. No matter how limited the use of nuclear weapons may be, it will inevitably lead to the immediate use of the entire nuclear arsenal of both sides. This is the harsh logic of war. The dreams of the Pentagon about the possibility of a, so-called, "mild limited" nuclear strike on the main centers and control points of the enemy are even more unfounded. Such adventuristic and militarily incompetent views are entirely groundless. It is necessary to uncover those who hold such ignorant views. They are dangerous.

Everything which has been said is indicative of the fact that Lenin's conclusion, according to which the military danger "will not cease as long as world imperialism exists,"³⁸ remains relevant even today. Moreover, such danger may increase. However, the above-noted qualitatively new socio-political and military-technical preconditions and circumstances, which have taken shape in the modern world, are objectively already creating conditions and possibilities for eliminating world wars from the life of society, which contain the threat of destruction of world civilization, and subsequently, as advances are made, will even create the conditions for eliminating local wars.

However, possibilities are not yet reality. An unremitting and stubborn struggle, consolidating and further all-round strengthening of the activity of antiwar and progressive forces and increasing the economic and defense capabilities of the peace-loving states are necessary for their realization. Peace cannot be achieved without struggle. The lessons of the past war have exceptionally important and permanent significance in this regard and the "main one of these," as it is emphasized in the CPSU Central Committee decree, "On the 40th Anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet People in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945," "is that it is necessary to struggle against war before it has begun."³⁹ Historical experience teaches that in order to defend peace, cohesive, coordinated and active actions by all peace-loving forces against the aggressive, adventuristic policy of imperialism are required. It is necessary to increase the peoples' vigilance and safeguard and multiply the gains of socialism.

Forces for the struggle against war, and substantial forces capable of eliminating the threat of nuclear war, are in evidence at the present time. The aggressive imperialist circles can no longer fail to take heed of the growing weight and influence of these forces, the forces of socialism, progress and peace.

But the Soviet people are realists. They clearly understand that as long as the military threat exists from imperialism it is necessary to safeguard as the apple of one's eye the security of our homeland and our friends and allies. The Communist Party, its Central Committee and the Soviet Government take care tirelessly to ensure that the gains of socialism are always reliably protected. "In a difficult international situation," noted M. S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in a speech at the Special CPSU Central Committee plenum on 11 March 1985, "it is important as never before to maintain the defense capability of our homeland at a level at which potential aggressors know well that encroachment on the security of the Soviet Union and its allies, and on the peaceful life of the Soviet people will be met with a crushing retaliatory strike. Our glorious armed forces will continue in the future to possess everything necessary for this."⁴⁰

* * *

There is today no more important task than to prevent war and to safeguard the peoples of the planet from nuclear catastrophe. This is the key problem of our time.

The strategic policy of the Soviet Union on strengthening peace has been and remains unchanged. Our state truly desires and persistently seeks a halt to the arms race and the complete elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

Nuclear weapons were developed and used by the American imperialists in 1945. During the years following that inhuman act nuclear weapons have developed to the extent that, in the hands of the imperialists, they have created a real threat to the existence of all mankind. The need for a complete ban and destruction of this super weapon for waging war has become most critical. The Soviet people are firmly convinced that this key problem of our time can and will be solved.

CONCLUSION

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War was truly a great victory in the name of peace and life on earth and in the name of the triumph of freedom, democracy and social progress. And today, from the perspective of the 1980's, the world historical importance of this event is being revealed still more vividly and completely.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War disclosed the fundamental advantages of socialism and its tremendous economic, socio-political and spiritual capabilities. The war convincingly demonstrated the monolithic unity of party and people, the indissoluble alliance of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the working intelligentsia, as well as the friendship and brotherhood of the peoples of the USSR.

The mighty vital force of Marxist-Leninist ideology was vividly confirmed by the outcome of the most difficult solitary battle against fascism and militarism. Unshakable ideological conviction and unlimited faith in the correctness of the great Leninist cause served as inexhaustible sources of the spiritual forces of the Soviet people and its moral and political cohesion.

Victory over the fascist bloc was a most vivid indication of the superiority of Soviet military science and military art and of the high level of strategic leadership and military skill of our military cadres. Army and navy personnel, fighters in the peoples' militia, Soviet partisans and members of the underground displayed massive heroism and utter devotion to the homeland, party and people in the fierce clash with the enemy. In the rear area, workers and peasants, scientists, engineers and designers selflessly forged victory over the fascist barbarians. They accomplished a great labor feat, and won an unprecedented battle for metal, bread, fuel and raw materials, and for creating powerful Soviet weapons.

The remarkable Soviet women displayed unprecedented staunchness and labor heroism. The Leninist Komsomol accomplished a heroic feat. It was the fighting assistant of the party in solving problems at the front and in the rear. During the war, Soviet cultural figures made a worthy contribution to the overall cause of the struggle against fascism.

The Communist Party was the inspiration and organizer of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. Taking upon itself the complete responsibility for the fate of the socialist homeland, it quickly turned the country into a single military camp and brought into action all the powerful material and spiritual forces of Soviet society.

The defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism became a historic watershed in the fates of the earth's peoples. The victory of the forces of peace and progress facilitated the emergence and successful development of the worldwide socialist system, the activization of the international workers and

communist movement, and the liberation of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America from the colonial yoke.

Today, four decades following the defeat of the forces of reaction and darkness, the international environment has, unfortunately, again become sharply exacerbated. To a certain extent this recalls the years preceding World War II. Today the peoples of the planet are faced with a common deadly enemy, the threat of worldwide nuclear war from imperialism. People ever more profoundly understand the fundamental difference between the two main directions in international policy: the policy of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, directed at improving the international situation and preventing war, and the policy of the United States and other NATO states aimed at an arms race and preparations for a new world war. This is namely the reason for the growing scale of the struggle by broad strata of the popular masses for peace, freedom and social progress, and against the militarist intrigues of imperialism. The struggle to rid mankind of the costly arms race with its unprecedented danger, and to prevent a new world war, is the equivalent in today's conditions of a struggle to preserve life on earth. This is truly a task of world historical scale and importance.

At the present time, the attention of worldwide progressive society is riveted on the new negotiations with the United States, begun at the initiative of the Soviet Union, on nuclear and space weapons. Today it is impossible to limit, and even less so to reduce, nuclear weapons without taking effective measures to block reliably the paths to the militarization of space. Success in these negotiations depends primarily on the positions of the United States, and on the sincerity of its desire to achieve an agreement on the most important question of our time. Positive results in these negotiations would strengthen mankind's hope of achieving its age old dream -- to live in a world without wars and without fear for the fate of future generations.

As for our country, it has always opposed the arms race and favored disarmament. It has never desired and does not now desire to achieve unilateral advantages over the United States and the other NATO countries, or military superiority over them. World domination is not our objective. Our ideal is peace and cooperation. Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stated at the special March 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenum: "The Soviet Union always answers good will with good will and trust with trust." But he who takes our true interest in halting the arms race and strengthening peace as a sign of weakness is making a most serious mistake. We will never forego the interests of the socialist homeland and our friends and allies.

The Soviet Union believes that broad, mutually advantageous cooperation between states of opposing social systems is possible on the basis of equality, mutual respect and noninterference in the internal affairs of one another. History itself convinces us of this.

As is known, in the grave years of World War II, the USSR, the United States, Great Britain and other countries were able to combine their effort in the struggle against the most evil enemy of mankind -- Hitler's fascism and Japanese militarism. For the first time in history following the Great October Socialist Revolution, during those days large scale, fruitful alliance relations were formed between leading states of different social systems. They were based on recognition of what was most important: that for the sake of saving mankind it was necessary to unite all forces in the name of destroying fascism and establishing a lasting peace. This is truly a permanent lesson of history. It irrefutably shows that cooperation among states with different social systems in solving global, general human problems is not only desirable, not only necessary, but also possible.

In the 1970's, the Soviet Union, United States of America and other countries of the two social systems cooperated fruitfully on matters of limiting the arms race and improving the international environment. Relations among the former allies in the anti-Hitler coalition, mainly the USSR, the United States and Great Britain, seemed to have continued and developed the spirit of the Crimean Conference (February 1944), at which it was proclaimed: "Only with continuing and growing cooperation and mutual understanding among our three countries and among all peace-loving peoples can mankind's highest aspiration, a stable and lasting peace, be realized..." Comprehensive cooperation among the states of the socialist and capitalist systems is vitally important today, when through the fault of the most reactionary imperialist forces the ominous storm clouds of a new war are gathering over the planet. And, no matter what our attitude toward one another, no matter what divides us, we are obligated to be guided by the main thing -- to do everything necessary to prevent a nuclear conflagration and to preserve life itself on the planet. No matter how difficult and no matter how aggravated the present international situation, today it is still possible to preserve peace. We must not miss this chance. An end must be put to the nuclear mindlessness of the imperialist "hawks."

Struggling for peace, the Soviet Union and other states of the socialist community at the same time take into account the aggressiveness of modern imperialism and its unconcealed aspiration toward world domination. They are maintaining the vigilance and combat readiness of their armies at a level which will ensure the crushing defeat of any aggressor who is emboldened to attack the socialist countries.

History itself teaches the need for high vigilance and combat readiness.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 17 June 1984.
2. K. Marx, F. Engels, "Sochineniya" [Collected Works], 2d Edition, Vol 6, p 270.
3. V. I. Lenin, "Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy" [Complete Works], Vol 33, p 38.

4. K. Marx, F. Engels, op. cit., Vol 39, p 35.
5. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 26, p 224.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p 377.
8. Ibid., Vol 42, p 278.
9. Ibid., Vol 37, p 248.
10. Ibid., Vol 27, p 388.
11. Ibid., Vol 37, p 50.
12. Ibid., Vol 38, p 50.
13. Ibid., Vol 37, p 48.
14. Cited in "Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny" [History of World War II], Moscow, 1975, Vol 4, p 34.
15. See: Ibid., Vol 12, p 149.
16. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 23, p 175.
17. Ibid., Vol 30, p 85.
18. See: "Sovetskaya Voyennaya Entsiklpediya" [Soviet Military Encyclopedia], Moscow, 1978, Vol 2, p 412.
19. See: Ibid., Vol 2, p 66.
20. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 42, p 356.
21. Ibid., Vol 26, p 75.
22. K. Marx, F. Engels, op. cit., Vol 20, p 176.
23. Ibid., Vol 21, p 361.
24. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 42, p 290.
25. Lenin, Ibid., Vol 20, p 66.
26. Lenin, Ibid., Vol 29, p 207.
27. K. Marx, F. Engels, op. cit., 2d Edition, Vol 20, p 171.
28. M. V. Frunze, "Izbr. Proizv." [Selected Works], Moscow, 1964, p 47.

29. Lenin, Ibid., Vol 42, p 99.
30. Frunze, op. cit., Moscow, 1957, Vol 2, p 342.
31. PRAVDA, 12 March 1985.
32. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 40, pp 76-77.
33. Cited in "Vladimir Ilich Lenin: Biografiya" [Vladimir Ilich Lenin: Biography], 4th Edition, Moscow, 1970, p 505.
34. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 45, p 409.
35. Lenin, Ibid., Vol 26, p 145.
36. Lenin, Ibid., Vol 35, p 216.
37. Lenin, Ibid., Vol 42, p 134.
38. Lenin, Ibid., Vol 42, p 173.
39. PRAVDA, 17 June 1984.
40. Ibid., 12 March 1985.

COPYRIGHT: Voenizdat, 1985

9069

CSO: 8144/1712

END

JPRS-UMA-85-021-L-CORRECTED

13 November 1985

USSR Report

MILITARY AFFAIRS

HISTORY TEACHES VIGILANCE

N. V. Ogarov

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2005/06/08 : CIA-RDP93T01468R000100110005-2

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2005/06/08 : CIA-RDP93T01468R000100110005-2