

RECORD COPY



FOREIGN DOCUMENTS DIVISION

TRANSLATION

Number 967

29 August 1966

SELECTED TRANSLATIONS FROM "VOYENNAJA MYSL",

Issue No 3, March 1966

OFFICE OF CENTRAL REFERENCE
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

SELECTED TRANSLATIONS FROM "VOYENNAYA MYSL",

Issue No 3, March 1966

Voyennaya Mysl' (Military Thought) is a monthly organ of the USSR Ministry of Defense, printed by the ministry's Military Publishing House, Moscow. The articles translated below are from Issue No 3, March 1966 which was signed for the press 16 February 1966.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Let's Raise Military-Scientific Work to the Level of Party Demands, unsigned lead article	1
The Most Important Leninist Principles of Management and Methods of Working With Military Cadres, by Maj Gen V. Domnikov	13
Criticism of the Philosophical Foundations of the Imperialist Military Ideology, by Col K. Spirov	28
Consolidating a Gain in an Offensive Operation, by Maj Gen V. Reznichevko and Col Ye. Bob	45
Radioelectronics and Intelligence, by Maj Gen Engr-Tech Serv A. Matveyev	52
Protection of the Population and Installations of the Zone of the Interior From Radioactive Contamination, by Col B. Timofeyev	64
The War in South Vietnam, by Col I. Moskvina	73
Counterintelligence Activities in the US Army, by Maj Gen R. Simonyan and Col N. Nikolayev	86
A New Book on the Period Preceding the Second Front in Europe, by Col A. Stokov and Lt Col V. Sekistov	98

CRITICISM OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS
OF THE IMPERIALIST MILITARY IDEOLOGY

Colonel K. Spirov

CPYRGHT

The essence, content, and nature of the philosophical, political, and military ideas, and theories of every class are determined by that position which the particular class occupies in social life.

The working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties, which have an interest in a truly scientific explanation of phenomena of nature and society, make consistent use of the scientific philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism. Life convincingly confirms that scientific dialectical-materialist methodology is an inseparable prerequisite for the correct and successful decision by the Communist Party and by the Soviet state of the tasks of the policy, theory, and practice of construction and development of the armed forces of the socialist state.

Imperialist military ideology and science also have their philosophical and methodological base but, with a rare exception, modern imperialist military ideologists and theoreticians prefer not to acknowledge openly the existence of a definite philosophical basis of their views, ideas, and theories. Moreover, many bourgeois military ideologists and theoreticians deny the link between philosophy, on the one hand, and their military ideology and science, on the other. Not infrequently this manifests itself in the statement that military ideology and science, in and of themselves, are a "philosophy of war" or a "military philosophy."

Engels stated that in the bourgeois society "naturalists imagine that they are free from philosophy when they ignore or berate it" (K. Marks, F. Engel's Marx, Engels, Soch., Vol 20, page 524). Without a doubt this also pertains to certain bourgeois military theoreticians who are convinced that military theory does not have anything in common with those varieties of idealistic philosophy which are studied in educational institutions in almost all the capitalist countries. But, as Engels said, "... as a result, they still prove to be subordinated to philosophy..., which is unfortunately for the greater part the most unpleasant, and those who abuse philosophy most of all are the slaves precisely of the worst vulgarized remnants of the worst philosophical teachings" (Ibid., pages 524-525).

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85-00875R000300090024-0
subjectivist methods in work, characterizing them as voluntarism having nothing in common with Leninism.

Wherein, then, lie the most important peculiarities of the Leninist principles of administration and work with cadres? They lie:

-- in high adherence to ideology and party principles on the part of our cadres, in the critical analysis of the results of their work, all of which are necessary conditions for correct administration;

-- in the ability to combine revolutionary scope with Bolshevik efficiency, to be guided always and in everything by the theory of Marxism-Leninism as the scientific basis of military construction, the ability not to disregard small matters, not to lose sight of the higher goal, and always to coordinate and to compare all decisions and actions with that goal;

-- in the ability to isolate the main trends, tasks, and the basic links in the chain for the attainment of the goal, in the support and dissemination of advanced initiative, in the sense of the new, as necessary conditions for success;

-- in the skillful selection, education, and placement of cadres, the constant checking of their activity, the checking of the execution of decisions, as the absolutely fundamental principle of Leninist administration, in the unity of decision and execution, word and deed;

-- in the inseparable bond with the masses, as a most important condition for the correctness and party-mindedness of administration;

-- in the ability to rely upon the masses, political agencies, and party organizations, to consult with them for the making of the most correct decision;

-- in the manifestation of genuine concern for subordinates, attention and sensitivity to comrades in the service, in simplicity and modesty, precision and justice, and demandingness on the part of administrators to their subordinates;

-- in the efficiency, concreteness, directedness, and the positive personal example of administrative cadres in their work with subordinates.

In work with cadres, all officers, generals, and admirals must always rely on Leninist principles of administration and work methods, must persistently develop them, and use them not only in practice in ideological educational activity, but also when training cadres in modern military affairs.

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85-00875R000300090024-0

PYRGHT

As an example illustrating the justness of this remark of Engels, one may cite the views of the same General Decker and Lieutenant Colonel Ferguson. In their statement that "military doctrine is, in and of itself a philosophy," one can see the reflection of the rehash of one of the idealistic philosophical schools, so-called positivism. The latter denies the existence of over-all natural laws in the development of nature, society, and thought, and rejects philosophy as an independent science and its methodological importance for the concrete sciences. The basic conclusion of positivism consists in that each concrete science supposedly has "its own philosophy." Thus, the opinions of those military theoreticians who at first glance completely reject philosophy as a world outlook and methodology, express a definite antiscientific philosophical trend.

The military ideologists of imperialism attempt to theoretically "substantiate" the necessity and possibility of the elaboration of concrete methods of destroying by military means the world-wide system of socialism, of restoring the dominance of capitalism throughout the world, and of suppressing revolutionary movements. Not only in politics, but also in the ideology, "the commanding bourgeoisie, out of fear of the growing and the strengthened proletariat, supports everything that is backward, obsolescent, and medieval" (V. I. Lenin, Poln. sobr. soch., Vol 23, page 166). Their reliance upon the most reactionary antiscientific philosophical teachings has, consequently, social roots.

The profound crisis which the entire bourgeois ideology and its component part, philosophy, are now undergoing manifests itself primarily in the fact, as mentioned in the Program of the CPSU, that bourgeois teachings and schools "could not and cannot provide a scientific answer to questions being advanced by life." Their conclusions do not withstand the checking of practical life.

The reactionary, anticommunist direction of the imperialistic military ideology and science are inseparable from eclecticism, idealism, metaphysics, and irrationalism as a world-outlook and methodological basis. The peculiarity here consists in the fact that the military ideology and science of imperialism as a whole, and each theoretician individually, express not a separate philosophical direction, but an eclectic mishmash of various philosophical schools and directions -- from subjective and objective idealism to elemental materialism, from the purest metaphysics to elements of Hegelian dialectics, from agnosticism to elements of the materialistic theory of reflection.

At the same time it would be an error to equate the philosophical fundamentals of imperialistic military ideology and military science. They do have something in common in their world-outlook and methodological foundations, about which mention was made earlier, but they also

PYRGHT

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0

RIGHT

have substantial differences which are linked with the immediate social functions, on the one hand, of military ideology, and on the other hand, of military science, although they serve one and the same class purpose. The military ideology of imperialism has its cutting edge directed at the justification of exploitation, the stupefying of the broad masses of the workers, and the apologetics of imperialist wars. But military theory, which is intended to contribute to the attainment of imperialist goals by military means, is called upon to generalize the practice of the preparation and conducting of armed combat, the construction of the armed forces, to analyze their own and the enemy's actual military capabilities, and to search for means of attaining victory in warfare.

The need for the correct cognition of military affairs pushes bourgeois military theoreticians onto the path of recognizing and explaining the military-technical aspect of war from the positions of elemental materialism and inconsistent dialectics. When a particular theoretician is studying the technical aspect of military affairs, he is interested in the correct cognition of the objective reality and is capable, to a definite extent, of doing this. But unlike nature, in military affairs everything manifests itself through the actions of peoples; in the struggle between classes, states, and social systems, definite political tasks are solved. In military theory, the military-technical aspect is also linked with the social-political, that is, with the world outlook and class interests of the military theoretician himself and, as a whole, the interests of the reactionary monopolistic oligarchy which is served by bourgeois military science. The definition provided by V. I. Lenin for bourgeois scientists is applicable in full measure to bourgeois military theoreticians: "Not a single one of these professors, who are capable of providing the most valuable works in special fields of chemistry, history, and physics, can be believed, not even for a single word, once the discussion comes around to philosophy. Why? For the very same reason that not a single professor of political economics, capable of providing the most valuable works in the field of factual, specialized research, can be believed, not even for a single word, once the discussion comes around to the general theory of political economics. Because that latter is the same kind of party science in modern society that gnosiology is. In general and as a whole, the professor economists are nothing else but learned henchmen of the capitalist class, and the professors of philosophy are learned henchmen of the theologians" (Poln. sobr. soch., Vol 18, pages 363-364).

Let us consider in more detail certain questions of the philosophical content of the military ideology and military theories of imperialism.

Modern imperialist military ideology represents the sum total of the views and ideas of the monopoly bourgeoisie, which substantiate and justify the preparation and the conducting of an aggressive war against

CPYRGHT

the USSR, wars against revolutionary forces -- the working class and the masses of the workers -- in the capitalist countries, predatory wars against states which have attained their independence, colonial wars against the national-liberation movement, as well as wars against imperialist competitors. At the same time that ideology poses as its task the justification of the militarization of the state apparatus and the policy of the arms race and the aggravation of the international tension.

Until the over-all crisis of capitalism, a narrow circle of ideologists engaged in problems of military ideology, and there was no special apparatus for propagandizing its ideas among the masses of the people. At the present time, military ideology occupies a very important place in the political system of working over the masses of the people. Special ministries of propaganda, information, and education, and bourgeois parties, political figures, and publicists are constantly engaged in elaborating and propagandizing that ideology. The persistent inculcation of military ideology is carried out via the radio, television, motion pictures, the church, schools, universities, the periodical press, and literature. In many capitalist states after the Second World War, within the military departments there was created a large-scale and well-ramified apparatus of ideological pressure upon the personnel in the armed forces, an apparatus which also constantly propagandizes the military ideology among the civilian population of these countries.

During the present-day era, when the world-wide capitalist system as a whole is ripe for the social revolution of the proletariat, anticommunism has become the basic content of the imperialist military ideology. With the aim of guaranteeing the active participation of the masses in imperialistic wars, of drawing them away from the revolutionary struggle, the ideologists of imperialism are using all methods to inculcate in the consciousness of the people hatred for communism.

Relying on modern bourgeois philosophy and sociology, the military ideologists of imperialism widely propagandize the views concerning the "eternity" and the fatal inevitability of wars, "the wiping out of differences" between the concepts "war" and "peace" under present-day conditions, and attempt to prove the allegedly existing natural law governing the increase in the role of military management in state administration and the "inevitability" of the militarization of modern bourgeois states, as well as the necessity of the establishment of dictator regimes in all the countries of the world.

In order to "substantiate" these views they utilized modern bourgeois philosophical and sociological trends from objective idealism and subjective sociology to vulgar social Darwinism. These philosophical and sociological trends are premeditatively supported and disseminated by imperialism because imperialism has an interest in substantiating

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
its views of the development and in concealing its reactionary essence from the masses of the people. Of the numerous idealistic and vulgar materialistic sociological conceptions one should note the ones which are widely utilized by the imperialistic military ideologists.

The principal place in modern military ideology of imperialism is occupied by the basically idealistic, so-called conception of defense of the "free world," the conception of the "spiritual freedom of personality." The essence of this conception is that the primary factor, the determining one in social life, should not be considered to be social existence, not the material aspect of the life of society, but the so-called "spiritual freedom" which allegedly exists only under conditions of capitalism.

RIGHT
The under the guise of "protection against communism," the militant wing of the idealistic philosophy openly proposes an ideological, political, and economic struggle carried on against the world-wide system of socialism, and proposes that that struggle should be culminated by a new world war. Thus, the religious-political organization "Moral Rearmament," which has branches in many capitalist and young independent states in Asia and Africa, circulated millions of copies of the pamphlet Ideology and Coexistence. This reactionary libel begins with the statement that the "Third World War has already begun. As long ago as 1918 ... the Soviets worked out their plans for the destruction and enslavement of the Western world with the aid of a war of ideas.... Communism has a plan for the seizure of every country" [retranslated from Russian]. The conclusion of this slanderous pamphlet is that, in the struggle against communism, "it is necessary to have the unification of ideological and military factors" [retranslated].

The most brilliant manifestation of the reactionary nature of militant idealism is provided by the slogans of the imperialistic military ideology: "Better to atomize than communize," or "Better dead than Red." The former slogan took on a semi-official nature in the United States during the crisis in the Caribbean, and the latter is the official slogan of the ruling party in West Germany, the CDU-CSU [Christian Democratic Union -- Christian Socialist Union]. The latter slogan is utilized, in particular, to justify the nuclear armament of the Bundeswehr and the affirmation of the so-called "strategy of front lines." The slogan "protection of the free world from communist infiltration" is used by the United States Government to justify its aggressive actions against the peoples of Vietnam, Latin America, and the preparation for a world-wide nuclear war.

3015 Lines at EC
In the ideological processing of the broad masses of the workers, especially the personnel of the imperialist armies, in recent times more attention than formerly has been devoted to the idealistic religious substantiation of wars as a means of combatting "communist
Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0

atheism." Extremely telling in this regard is the fact that the text
Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
of the data taken by American soldiers, as approved in 1962 by the United
States Congress, contains a reference to God's help in protecting the
United States from foreign and domestic enemies. The entire militaristic
ideology in West Germany is completely saturated with religious
justifications. The leading political and military figures in the CDU-
CSU and in the West German Government constantly cite the fact that the
only person worthy of eternal bliss is the one who "in this world" re-
mains a Christian and a militant enemy of socialism. "If, for example,"
the head of the Protestant Church in Germany and the chief bishop of
NATO, Dibelius, stated, "one hydrogen bomb kills a million people, its
victims will attain eternal life all the sooner." "Justifying" the re-
quirement for granting the Bundeswehr atomic weapons and a leading role
in NATO, Adenauer, as far back as 1960, when speaking to the Germans,
said, "God has bestowed on the German nation a special role in the pres-
ent troubled times, by making the Germans the protectors of the West...."

Precisely in this direction at the present time a large amount
of attention has been devoted to the religious working over of the sol-
diers in the imperialist armies. Even articles concerning space flights,
architecture, and the history of wars, which are printed, for example,
in the magazine Die Bundeswehr, are adapted to prove the "existence and
omnipotence" of God. A vast apparatus of churchmen in all the capital-
ist armies are responsible for the religious processing of the personnel.

The religious-idealistic substantiation of wars and of militarism
is constructed with reliance on the fact that millions of the working
masses, including a considerable number of soldiers in the capitalist
countries, still believe in God, and believe in churchmen as the preach-
ers of the "word of God" on earth. In an atmosphere of military hys-
teria and military psychosis, religion is assigned the immediate task
of drawing the masses of the people away from the active struggle for
peace, the task of forcing them to reconcile themselves to the inevita-
bility of war, of believing that the source of wars is not imperialism,
but socialism.

The increase in atheism, especially among the working class, the
social awakening of the broad masses of the people, their recognition
of the necessity of carrying on the struggle for social reforms and for
peace, and against warmongers -- all these factors have forced certain
churchmen to take a realistic path of acknowledging the necessity of
lessening the international tension, and of banning nuclear weapons.
Such, in particular, was the position of the late Pope John XXIII, a
number of the participants at the Vatican Assembly, and Pope Paul VI.
However, in the speech made by Paul VI at the session of the United Na-
tions General Assembly on 4 October 1965, in addition to a summons for
disarmament, the prevention, and censuring of all wars in general (and,
consequently, even just wars), he said, "people cannot be brothers if

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
they are not humble, the striving for a higher position, colonialism, and egoism...."

There is no necessity to attempt to prove that such an idealistic explanation diverts people from a correct understanding of the source of wars, the arms race, and international tension, and diverts them from ascertaining the causes of colonialism.

YRGHT

In addition to the religious "substantiations" of the military ideology of imperialism, its apologists also spread widely other, just as idealistic, "psychological" and racist theories of the eternity and inevitability of wars. Their essence consists in the fact that people and entire races have, since time immemorial, allegedly been inclined to bellicosity, to the use of arms to assert their domination over other people and races. The social demagoguery of the "psychological" theories is directly aimed at undermining the confidence of peoples in the peace-loving policy of the socialist states. It attempts to "refute" the principle of Marxism-Leninism that socialism and peace are inseparable and that even now it is possible to prevent a world war. The imperialist ideologists make wide use of anti-Leninist statements made by schismatics and adventurists in the ranks of certain communist parties on problems of war and peace in order to convince the masses of the people in the national tension, and of banning nuclear weapons. Such, in particular, was the position of the late Pope John XXIII, a number of the participants at the Vatican Assembly, and Pope Paul VI. However, in the speech made by Paul VI at the session of the United Nations General Assembly on 4 October 1965, in addition to a summons for disarmament, the prevention, and censuring of all wars in general (and, consequently, even just wars), he said, "people cannot be brothers if they are not humble. It is pride ... which gives rise to tension and the struggle for prestige, the striving for a higher position, colonialism, and egosim...."

There is no necessity to attempt to prove that such an idealistic explanation diverts people from a correct understanding of the source of wars, the arms race, and international tension, and diverts them from ascertaining the causes of colonialism.

In addition to the religious "substantiations" of the military ideology of imperialism, its apologists also spread widely other, just as idealistic, "psychological" and racist theories of the eternity and inevitability of wars. Their essence consists in the fact that people and entire races have, since time immemorial, allegedly been inclined to bellicosity, to the use of arms to assert their domination over other people and races. The social demagoguery of the "psychological" theories is directly aimed at undermining the confidence of peoples in the peace-loving policy of the socialist states. It attempts to "refute"

the principle of Marxism-Leninism that socialism and peace are inseparable and that even now it is possible to prevent a world war. The imperialist ideologists make wide use of anti-Leninist statements made by schismatics and adventurists in the ranks of certain communist parties on problems of war and peace in order to convince the masses of the people in the capitalist countries that the source of military danger under present-day conditions is the "traditional aggressiveness" of the representatives of the yellow and black races, the allegedly age-old hatred between the "East" and the "West," and that these "eternal sources of war" continue to be present under conditions of socialist society.

CPYRGHT

An especially large amount of attention is devoted to the psychological and racist conceptions of the explanation of the causes of wars by the present-day adherents of subjective idealism -- pragmatists and existentialists. The West German existentialist and "military philosopher" Karl Jaspers unambiguously entitled one of his works "The Atom Bomb." The chief idea of that book and Jaspers' philosophy is expressed in the statement that "there is no other way than the intensification of armament until such time that the world will be blown into small pieces and turned into cosmic dust." This "philosophical conception" is a component part of a revanchist ideology. It is not difficult to understand the great danger to the German people and mankind as a whole that would be posed by the followers of Jaspers' philosophy if they were to receive nuclear weapons.

One of the widespread theories in the ideological processing of the personnel of the imperialist armies is the pragmatic theory of "survival." The basic thesis of pragmatism consists in the fact that there is no objective truth, and the only true thing is that which is beneficial for the particular individual.

The theory of "survival" is the ideological justification of preventive warfare and sudden nuclear attack upon the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. It also serves as a justification of the perfidy and treachery of the United States policy with respect to their European NATO partners, and places a "theoretical" basis under the bestialities of the American soldiers in Vietnam, and Latin America, and in the event of war, against the peoples of the socialist countries.

It would be a serious error to underevaluate the pernicious influence of this "theory" upon the members of the American Armed Forces and, in general, upon a certain number of Americans. Millions of Americans, at the 1964 presidential election, voted for one of the zealous champions of the "philosophy of survival" -- Goldwater. The United States Government attempts to justify from pragmatic positions even the predatory bombings by American aviation of the peaceful population of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, calling its actions "retribution" and "strategic conviction" in favor of negotiations.

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
The cynical egoism, not by accident, become very widespread in the ideological and psychological processing of the personnel of the imperialist armies: the armed forces of Great Britain have been completely, and those of the United States have been nine-tenths manned with mercenaries, for whom service in the army and participation in predatory wars are a kind of "business." And the very philosophy of pragmatism is, by its social essence, a world outlook of a businessman, who denies the concepts of justice, duty, honor, patriotism, and service to the people, but is ready to commit any crime, so long as it promises a corresponding material advantage.

RIGHT

Among the widespread theories of imperialist military ideology one should note the previously mentioned neomalthusianism. The views of Malthus, who explained social relations from the biological positions of the "struggle for existence," were "developed" after the Second World War by bourgeois sociologists for purposes of slandering socialism and the peoples who had achieved national independence, and to justify wars using means of mass destruction. From day to day the bourgeois press publishes accounts of the allegedly increasing gap between the increase in population in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the lagging production of consumer goods. Attempts are made from positions of neomalthusianism to "prove" that the "aggressiveness" of the Asiatic countries is explained by the large population and by the geographical conditions of their life. The most militant neomalthusians openly state that a future atomic war will only reduce the sufferings of hundreds of millions of people who would only die of hunger and deprivations anyway, since there allegedly are not enough food resources for the normal existence of the earth's population. In 1965, in the American magazine Saturday Evening Post, the former president of the American Chemical Society and Pentagon adviser Rossweller proposed the bold and decisive utilization of chemical and biological weapons "for the more humane and even charitable" annihilation of millions of people in a future war.

Certain other bourgeois theories also attempt to solve the tasks of justifying capitalism and of substantiating the inevitability of wars. Those theories differ only in their argumentation, but their philosophical content is one and the same: idealism, metaphysics, irrationalism, and not infrequently unabashed sophistry. For example, well-known British military ideologist and publicist B. Lidden Hart, in his book Deterrent or Defense, gives the following evaluation of the history of wars: "The study of the history of wars has led me to the conclusion that almost all wars could have been avoided and that in most instances war was begun by peace-loving state figures who lost their patience and who placed their opponents in a position from which they could not escape without serious damage to their prestige" /retranslated from Russian/ [See Note/.

U. Liddell Hart / B. Liddell Hart / Ustrashniye ili oborona? / translation of Deterrent or Defense /, Voenizdat, 1962, page 188.

In this statement everything is topsy-turvy: wars are viewed as an accidental phenomenon, rather than the continuation of the aggressive predatory policy of the exploiter classes; the causes of wars, according to Hart, are the subjective qualities of the peace-loving figures, while the military criminals are only the victims of unfavorable conditions.

There is no necessity to consider other, less widespread directions and varieties of the theories of the imperialist military ideology. They are all united by the attempt to remove the blame from imperialism in the preparation and unleashing of wars, the striving to evoke hatred toward communism, and to make the masses of the people in the capitalist countries an obedient tool of militarism and aggression. Therefore, as a philosophical base the imperialist military ideology consciously chooses the "theories" of the most reactionary and militant obscurantists in the camp of the imperialist philosophers of the past and present.

The reactionary, antiscientific nature of the philosophical foundations of the imperialist military ideology does not mean, in any way, that it is incapable of exerting an influence upon definite segments of the working masses in the capitalist countries. Therefore it must be consistently and decisively opposed by all the progressive, anti-imperialist forces.

* * *

Prior to the First World War, the formation of the socialist state, and the creation of its armed forces, bourgeois military science viewed armed combat almost exclusively from the aspect of military technology. In the methodology of military sciences, elements of elemental materialism and dialectics during the analysis of the development of means and methods of conducting armed combat coexisted eclectically with an idealistic treatment of the decisive role of intuition and the will of the military leaders, with a metaphysical interpretation of the "eternal principles" of military art and the denial of the objective natural laws government war and armed combat.

The rapid development of military technology during the course of and after the First World War and of methods of conducting armed combat, and the revolution in military affairs after the Second World War effected a break in the metaphysical conceptions in military science. Certain military theoreticians, including D. Smith, M. Taylor, B. Brody, and others, in recent times have emphasized that they rely

COPYRIGHT

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
on the dialectical method developed by Hegel and utilized in the research on military theory which was conducted by Clausewitz. The West German military theoretician Wilhelm von Schramm, in the magazine Wehrkunde, writes of the necessity, under present-day conditions, of restoring to its former rights the military philosophy of Clausewitz, including the dialectical approach to the analysis of the forms of the manifestation of war.

Of course, none of the bourgeois military theoreticians who are now raising dialectics onto the shield raises the question of materialistic dialectics, or the reflection, in subjective dialectics, of the dialectical development of objective reality. It is not by accident that they emphasize that they are concerned with Hegelian dialectics, viewed only as a method of thought which is subordinate to certain a priori rules and laws. This type of "dialectical method" is easily converted into sophistry, when it is applied subjectivistically. And sophistry, presented under the guise of dialectics, is frequently employed to "substantiate" subjectivistic and adventuristic theories and conclusions. For example, General Pablo Supino, citing Hegelian dialectics, attempted to prove in the magazine Revue Militaire Generale that by the policy of the arms race and the constant threat of military aggression without war it is possible to achieve the morale-and-political capitulation of a probable enemy (Supino has in mind the world-wide system of socialism). M. Taylor revealed a critical attitude to the so-called strategy of "massive nuclear effect," but it turned out that his conceptions also were just as adventuristic and lacking in conformity to the objective reality -- the conceptions of "flexible reaction" and "special troops" which he recommended as an effective means in the combat against the world-wide system of socialism and the widespread revolutionary movement on the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Bourgeois military theoreticians who call themselves adherents of dialectics do not understand and ignore the essence, the nucleus of dialectics: the teaching of the unity and the struggle of opposites as a source of self-propulsion and development in nature and society, including military affairs. Refusal to acknowledge that the struggle of internal opposites is the source of development is linked primarily with their fear of acknowledging the role of class antagonisms in capitalist society and in the bourgeois armies. A dialectic from which, on the basis of class reasons, its essence has been discarded is an idealistic dialectic and it cannot be a scientific methodology although bourgeois military theoreticians do rely in their research and conclusions upon individual elements of that dialectic.

A few bourgeois theoreticians acknowledge that the decisive influence upon changing the methods of armed combat is exerted not by the "free will" of the military commanders, but by the development of the material means of conducting the war. Undoubtedly this is an

element of the materialism of armed combat. But this materialism of theirs is inconsistent and limited, metaphysical and not infrequently vulgar, and incapable of rising to a materialistic explanation of the socio-political aspect of armed combat.

CPYRGHT

From positions of elemental materialism and inconsistent dialectics, bourgeois military theoreticians view such phenomena as the influence of the development of weapons and combat technology upon the means of their application, many questions of tactics, maintenance, and the methodology of combat training for personnel, the organization of troop control, combined operations of combat arms and of branches of the armed forces, and other questions of a military-technical nature. The more or less correct solution of these questions is based upon the publicizing of the past experience of wars, as a rule, between homogeneous bourgeois states and armies. When the new situation does not correspond to that which was encountered in past experience, bourgeois military theory either attempts metaphysically to adapt to the new conditions the laws, conclusions, and principles formulated on the basis of past experience, or rolls over to the side of subjectivism, voluntarism, and agnosticism.

In wars against the Soviet state there was an especially brilliant manifestation of the limitation of bourgeois military science, its inability to reveal the dependence of armed combat upon the nature of warfare, the political goals and tasks, social structure, interrelations between the people and the army, etc. Bourgeois military theoreticians evaluate the socialist social system and its army from metaphysical positions, that is, from positions of those natural laws, qualities, and internal antagonisms which are inherent in the capitalist social system. They cannot understand the specific natural laws governing armed combat between states and armies of different social systems.

It is well known that absolutely all the bourgeois military theoreticians predicted the defeat of the Soviet state and its armed forces in a combat against the imperialistic interventionists and the domestic counterrevolution. Moreover, even after our victory in those wars, bourgeois military science still was unable to understand correctly the decisive reasons for the victory of the Soviet nation and its armed forces. British, French, and other bourgeois military historians explain the reasons for the defeat of Hitlerite Germany in terms of the rainy autumn and freezing winter of 1941-1942, Lend-Lease Aid to the Soviet Union, British and American bombings of German territory, etc. This pluralism is characteristic of the metaphysical method of thinking, when there is no understanding of the dialectics of the necessary and the accidental, the essential and nonessential links, essence and phenomenon, cause and effect. The incorrect evaluation of the reasons for our victory is also explained by the fact that the correct treatment

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
and truly scientific substantiation of the reasons for the victory of the Soviet state and its armed forces over the strong bourgeois armies unmasks the very system of capitalism, which is incapable of opposing the new progressive social system that socialism and communism is.

PYRGHT
The famous British theoretician General Fuller, as far back as 1962, stated in the article "Berlin Problem" that the partisan movement against the German-fascist usurpers could have been avoided if Hitler had raised, instead of the swastika, the flags of the bourgeois Ukrainian, Belorussian, and other nationalists. Without desiring to understand the essence and nature of socialist patriotism and the proletarian internationalism of Soviet citizens as one of the sources of the victory of the Soviet nation in the Great Patriotic War, Fuller advanced his own new victory plan to be used by the NATO countries against the Soviet Union, using "subversive warfare," inasmuch as, he admits, it is impossible to be victorious over the Soviet Union in atomic warfare.

The bourgeois theoreticians are also extremely far from a scientific understanding of the matter when they analyze the economic conditions of the victory of the Soviet Union. In a book written by former Hitlerite generals and several leaders of the wartime economy and entitled Results of the Second World War there are several articles with an analysis of the wartime economy during the Second World War. But none of them contains even a hint of the most important thing: the opposite nature of the production relations in the Soviet Union and in Hitlerite Germany, the decisive advantage that the socialist wartime economy had over the capitalist. American Professor Klaus Knorr analyzes the wartime economy and the outcome of the Second World War from the same metaphysical and vulgar-materialistic positions. In his book, War Potential of Nations, the class position of the imperialist theoretician has taken the upper hand over common sense. It is difficult to believe that K. Knorr actually failed to understand the tremendous supremacy in combat spirit that the Soviet troops had over the soldiers of the Hitlerite Wehrmacht, and the supremacy of Soviet military art over Hitlerite. Or to believe that this eminent expert on military economics "did not notice" the obvious advantages that the socialist production relations have over the capitalist production relations in the achieving of the economic and military victory of the USSR over Hitlerite Germany. Knorr states that "the outcome of the war was decided not by supremacy in combat spirit, military art, or the qualities of old or new weapons, but by the advantage in military production which proved to be on the side of the United Nations" /retranslated from Russian/ and that, in warfare, "the deciding role of the quantity of human and material resources was the consequence of the development of industrial production and machine technology" /See Note/. And that is not all: Knorr openly rejects all that manifests the tremendous advantages

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
of the socialist social system and its successes, and consciously states that the sole factor of military might and victory in warfare is supremacy "in industrial production," only because it is profitable to him from the class point of view, since capitalism, according to the level of industrial production, still has advantages over the world-wide system of socialism.

CPYRGHT

Note: Klaus Knorr, Voyenny potentsial gosudarstv [translation of: War Potential of Nations], Voenizdat, 1960, page 68.

Social development during the present-day era is proceeding, in accordance with natural laws, along the path of the victory of socialism over capitalism. The ideologists and theoreticians of imperialism simply cannot recognize this objective, natural phenomenon. The doom of the bourgeois system is inevitably leading to the intensification of mysticism, irrationalism, and agnosticism in bourgeois philosophy and sociology, and bourgeois military theoreticians are proving incapable of understanding the sources of the military might of the socialist state and its armed forces. The lack of understanding of objective natural laws governing social development, and the lack of desire to admit the lack of scientific substantiation for their military ideology are leading bourgeois theoreticians to scepticism, irrationalism, and agnosticism in military theory.

Of course, in military science irrationalism and agnosticism cannot be expressed in the same open form as in bourgeois philosophy and sociology. No one will attempt to take into consideration a theoretician who denies the possibility of the cognition of military affairs. Therefore it is possible and necessary to speak only about elements of irrationalism and agnosticism in bourgeois military science. For example, one of the ideologists and participants in the development of the "Blitzkrieg" plan -- former chief of the Hitler General Staff Heinz Guderian -- justified himself, by the use of hindsight, by saying, "The outcome of any combat actions, as a rule, and in Russia in particular, cannot be planned in advance" [See Note].

Note: Itogi vtoroy mirovoy voyny [Results of the Second World War], Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1957, page 133.

But wherever laws are ignored and wherever, consequently, it is impossible to rely on theoretical thought, that is when a possible way out is allegedly provided by intuition, which is understood by bourgeois military theoreticians idealistically, as a supernatural "inspiration" inherent only in special people who are granted this ability from "higher revelation," that is, from God. The intuitivistic trend in military theory is one of the sharply expressed forms of idealism. It is well known that the German-fascist military theory was officially and consistently constructed on the acknowledgment of the supernatural intuition

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0

of military and political leaders. The reverse side of the same kind of idealism is the tenet, which currently is very widespread in bourgeois military theory, that the sole reason for the defeat of fascist Germany lay in Hitler's incompetency and miscalculations in military and political management. Certain military theoreticians attempt even to "legalize" intuition as one of the fundamentals of military science. For example, General-Colonel (Retired) L. Rendulich states that "even in the past war a large role in the acquisition of the correct views concerning the basic paths of the further evolution of the war was played by intuition" [See Note].

YRGHT

[Note]: O sovremennykh operatsiyakh [Modern Operations]. Collection of translated articles, Voenizdat, 1962, page 47.

The idealistic essence of "intuitivism" consists in the acknowledgment of the "divine revelation," and the "mystical aura" which are allegedly bestowed on individual personalities at birth.

The bourgeois military theoreticians who are adherents of "intuitivism" feel that war and armed struggle do not have any objective natural laws governing them, and therefore the management of combat actions of the troops cannot, in their opinion, be constructed on a scientific basis and does not lend itself to scientific explanation. Only person who presumably are imbued with that supernatural "aura" are capable of finding the decision which leads to victory and which is inaccessible for "ordinary" people.

The voluntaristic idealistic theory of intuitivism has its social basis. In the intuition of the military leaders, dictators, and presidents the imperialists attempt to find a force capable of turning back social development and of saving the capitalism which is doomed by history [See Note].

[Note]: The mystical explanation of intuition is directly antithetical to the scientific, dialectical-materialistic understanding of intuition as the ability of people, under definite conditions, without any well-founded substantiation or reasoning, to evaluate a situation and to make the correct decision on the basis of a large amount of practical experience, knowledge of the objective natural laws governing armed combat, and a thorough study of the enemy.

By failing to acknowledge the dialectical-materialistic theory of cognition and by ignoring it, bourgeois military science accepted pragmatic gnosiology as standard equipment. This theory of cognition justifies eclecticism and sophistry in the theory of cognition, and justifies treachery and deceit in practical activity. An example of the pragmatic approach to the solution of problems of military theories is an article written by British Air Marshal D. Slessor and published

CPYRGHT

late in 1964. The article begins with the statement, "Personally I have always felt that direct military aggression is incompatible with the basic political line of the Soviet Union. The Soviet regime obviously has at its disposal other means permitting it to inflict defeat upon us without, by so doing, threatening those tremendous successes which were achieved by the Soviet nation" /retranslated from Russian/. But this statement does not correspond to the military policy of imperialism or the interests of the military monopolies and the military men. Therefore Marshal Slessor, completely without proof, advances the thesis that the present-day size of the imperialist "armed forces in Europe does not correspond to our actual needs."

This sophistic method was also used by the former commander in chief of the United States Strategic Air Command, General Thomas S. Power, in an interview published in the magazine U. S. News and World Report on 25 January 1965. He is strongly in favor of the development of nuclear weapons and the carrying out of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, despite his very own statement that "attempting to resolve the differences of opinion or to achieve any goals by means of a war with nuclear rockets means the greatest stupidity that one could imagine" /retranslated/.

The pragmatic, subjective-idealistic interpretation of the laws which are allegedly the product of the human consciousness and exist in the consciousness of people also finds its reflection in bourgeois military theories. D. O. Smith, for example, confuses objective laws and principles, metaphysically views the "eternal nature" of principles. "... The law of concentration of superior forces and means at the necessary time in the decisive sector is just as invariable as Newton's law of action and counteraction" /retranslated/ /See Note/. Hence the correctness of the principles and conceptions are determined by Smith not by checking to see whether they conform to objective laws, but on the basis of the feature of "general acceptance," "general validity," and the conformity to the interests and ideas of people.

/Note/: D. O. Smit /Smith/, Voyennaya doctrina SSHA /United States Military Doctrine/, Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1956, page 13.

Inasmuch as bourgeois military science is not and cannot be a consistent scientific theory, there frequently occurs in the military affairs of imperialist states a break between theory and practice, between the views of military theoreticians and the official views.

Of course, even in bourgeois military science there are many principles which reflect the objective natural laws governing modern armed combat. It is necessary to conduct a thorough, critical analysis of the imperialist military theories, to know how to differentiate between the efficient in them and the antiscientific and one-sided.

Approved For Release 2000/08/09 : CIA-RDP85T00875R000300090024-0
"Everyone will agree," V. I. Lenin wrote, "that it is unintelligent and even criminal if an army does not prepare to master all the types of weapons, all the means and methods of combat which the enemy has or might have" (Poln. sobr. soch., Vol 41, page 81).

RGHT
An absolute necessity for the successful unmasking of the reactionary features of bourgeois military theory and a critical analysis of that which is efficient in it is the dialectical-materialistic analysis of its philosophical and methodological foundations. The solution of this task is also necessary in order to achieve a better understanding of the scientific nature, the tremendous importance, and the advantages of Soviet military science.