

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10412

25 March 1982

Translation

ALWAYS IN READINESS TO DEFEND THE HOMELAND

By

Nikolay Vasil'yevich Ogarkov



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

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

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

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

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

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

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10412

25 March 1982

ALWAYS IN READINESS TO DEFEND THE HOMETLAND

Moscow VSEGDA V GOTOVNOSTI K ZASHCHITE OTECHESTVA [Always in Readiness to Defend the Homeland] in Russian 1982 (signed to press 26 Jan 82) pp 1-71

[Book by Mar SU Nikolay Vasil'yevich Ogarkov, Voenizdat, 100,000 copies]

CONTENTS

Annotation	1
Introduction	2
Chapter One. Imperialism -- the Source of Military Danger	4
Chapter Two. Development of the Art of Warfare and the Organizational Development of the Soviet Armed Forces	19
Chapter Three. Defense of the Socialist Homeland -- the Concern of All the People	39
Conclusion	51

- a -

[II - USSR - 4 FOUO]
[II - USSR - 35 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

ALWAYS IN READINESS TO DEFEND THE HOMELAND

Moscow VSEGDA V GOTOVNOSTI K ZASHCHITE OTECHESTVA in Russian 1982 (signed to press 26 Jan 82) pp 1-71

[Translation of book "Always in Readiness to Defend the Homeland", by Mar SU Nikolay Vasil'yevich Ogarkov, Voenizdat, 100,000 copies, 71 pages; published in the series: "Implementing the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress"; passages enclosed in slantlines printed in boldface or italics (if in italics, [it.] will precede closing slantline)]

[Annotation]

[Text] On the basis of the theses of Marxism-Leninism and the conclusions of the 26th CPSU Congress, this book presents an analysis of the world military-political situation and demonstrates the growing aggressiveness of imperialism, the sources and causes of intensification of the military danger. The author examines the character of Soviet military doctrine and its root differences from the military doctrines of the capitalist nations. The author reveals the objective necessity of further strengthening the defense might of the Soviet State, the principal directions of organizational development of the USSR Armed Forces, ways to increase their combat readiness to offer an immediate rebuff to any aggressor, and discusses several important problems of development of Soviet art of warfare. This book is intended for a wide audience.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTRODUCTION

The 26th CPSU Congress was a most important and historic event in the life of our party and the entire people. It summarized the results of the productive labor of Soviet citizens during the last decade and specified a clear and precise general line of further building of communism in this country.

The congress profoundly formulated and examined in a Leninist manner the vital and urgent economic and sociopolitical problems of developed socialism at the present logical stage on the road to communism. In doing so, it has made a substantial contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory and the practical building of communism and has furnished reliable guidelines for many years into the future.

The congress stressed that an inalterable program demand--everything in the name of man, everything for the good of man--has served and continues to serve as the point of departure for a party-minded, political approach to the economy. Hence the party's economic policy is focused on decisively turning the nation's economy toward the diversified tasks connected with increasing the prosperity of the people and emphasizes a decisive shift toward primarily intensive factors of economic growth and improving the efficiency and quality of all work performed.

The 26th CPSU Congress reaffirmed the steadfastness of the peace-seeking Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet State which is aimed at ending the threat of war, deepening detente, holding the arms race in check, and opposing the forces of aggression. /"The defense of peace,"/ stated CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Comrade L.I. Brezhnev at the Congress, /"is the most important task of the world."/1

At the same time, as was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, the state of affairs in the world demands today new, additional efforts to preserve world peace. Therefore in the interests of further deepening international detente, the highest forum of Soviet Communists adopted a Peace Program for the 1980's. The proposals by the USSR contained in it encompass a broad range of problems. These proposals pertain to strengthening measures of confidence not only of a political but of a military character as well. The new Soviet initiatives address the most urgent problems of international affairs and constitute a continuation and further development of the peace-seeking foreign policy of the USSR.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The Soviet Union's devotion to peace, that great ideal of mankind, has been convincingly demonstrated time and again by the Appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the Parliaments and Peoples of the World (June 1981), by the new Soviet proposals presented at the 36th Session of the UN General Assembly, and in speeches made by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev during his trip to the FRG in November 1981. These new peace initiatives by the USSR, permeated by an ardent desire to preserve and strengthen the security of all mankind and to prevent the catastrophe of a nuclear war, have won the extensive approval and active support of the peoples of all countries.

In the struggle for peace, the Communist Party and Soviet Government realistically assess the processes which are taking place in international affairs and are forced constantly to keep at the center of their attention matters pertaining to guaranteeing the reliable security of our country, its allies and friends. A unity of communist creation, love of peace and readiness to offer a resolute rebuff to aggression was bequeathed to us by the great Lenin and comprises the foundation of the policy of the Soviet State.

FOOTNOTE

1. "Materialy XXVI s"yezda KPSS" [Proceedings of the 26th CPSU Congress], Moscow, 1981, page 31.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Chapter One. IMPERIALISM -- THE SOURCE OF MILITARY DANGER

The 26th CPSU Congress, analyzing the international situation, noted that in recent years "the sphere of imperialist domination in the world has narrowed, and internal conflicts in the capitalist countries and rivalry between them have become aggravated. There has been a sharp increase in the aggressiveness of the policies of imperialism -- and particularly U.S. imperialism."¹

V. I. Lenin emphasized that the highest and final stage of capitalism -- imperialism -- "is distinguished in its root /economic [it.]/ properties by the least love of peace and freedom, and by the greatest and ubiquitous development of the military."² "...Politically," he stated, "imperialism is basically a striving toward violence and reaction."³ Concentrated in these words spoken by Lenin is one of the most important characteristics of imperialism -- its aggressive nature.

The principal goal and content of the policy of imperialist circles, especially the United States, is the achievement of world supremacy, and their main aspiration is to halt the world revolutionary process, to strangle the revolutionary worker and national liberation movement, to wipe socialism off the face of the earth, and to regain for themselves the role of arbiter of the destiny of peoples. In other words, a striving to attain the unattainable.

World War I and the Great October Socialist Revolution signaled the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism, which encompassed its economic and governmental system, politics and ideology. Under imperialism, as a result of an intensified concentration and export of capital, the pursuit of maximum profit, competition and production anarchy, as well as the ever increasing irregularity of economic and political development, all the conflicts of an antagonistic society became sharply aggravated: between the societal character of labor and the private-ownership, capitalist form of appropriation of its results, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the great monopolies, between individual imperialist nations or groups of nations, and between imperialist nations and numerous colonies and semicolonies. The principal conflict of the contemporary era -- the conflict between socialism and capitalism -- not only does not eliminate but deepens to an even greater extent the conflicts within the capitalist society.

Engaged in a struggle for division of the world with the aim of establishing world hegemony and endeavoring to resolve its inherent contradictions by means of armed violence, imperialism resorts to wars. They have become its constant and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

inevitable companion. It is precisely for these reasons that in the first half of the 20th century imperialism imposed two world wars on the peoples of the earth, wars which claimed 60 million lives. Just since 1945 more than a hundred times local wars and military conflicts have erupted in various parts of the world through the fault of imperialism, and today imperialism threatens to unleash a third world war, with the employment of nuclear missile weapons.

'Contemporary militarism,' stressed V. I. Lenin, "is a result of capitalism. In both its forms it is a 'vital manifestation' of capitalism: as military force employed by capitalist nations in their foreign clashes... and as a weapon serving in the hands of the ruling classes to crush any and all (economic and political) movements of the proletariat..."⁴

Anticommunism and anti-Sovietism is the main, dominant trait and feature of militarism in present-day conditions. "Today all the enemies of social progress," notes the CPSU Program, "have united under this black banner: the financial oligarchy and the military, fascists and reactionary clericalists, colonialists and landowners, all the ideological and political accomplices of imperialist reaction."⁵

And all this is being done behind a cloak of struggle against an allegedly constantly growing "Soviet military threat." We shall state quite frankly that attempts to utilize lies of this kind have been undertaken time and again, since the first days of existence of the young Soviet Republic. But the entire world knows full well that the Soviet Union never threatened anybody and never attacked anybody. This is convincingly attested by the more than 60-year history of the world's first Land of Soviets. Its first legislative enactment was the famous Lenin Peace Decree. And speaking of military threat, it is precisely our homeland which has been constantly threatened and continues to be threatened by reactionary imperialist circles.

Literally immediately following the victory of the Great October Revolution, international imperialism, working hand in glove with domestic counterrevolution, attempted to strangle the young Soviet State while it was still in its cradle. Intervention by Germany, Great Britain, France, the United States, Japan and other imperialist nations, and attacks by the White Guard hordes merged with counter-revolutionary insurrections and conspiracies by the Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, and remnants of the bourgeois parties. The overthrown exploiter classes and international imperialism fought furiously against the new societal system and brought incalculable calamities and suffering to our people. It was precisely "world imperialism..." noted V. I. Lenin, "as a matter of fact, which caused our civil war and which was responsible for its prolongation..."⁶

The hopes and schemes of international imperialism, however, were not fated to come to pass. In a fierce struggle in defense of the young Soviet Republic, our people, led and inspired by the Great Lenin and the Communist Party, totally defeated the united forces of external and domestic foes and expelled them from our country. Socialism had won the first decisive battle against the forces of the capitalist world.

Proceeding with peaceful, constructive labor, by the end of 1924 the Soviet Union had reduced the size of its army, which had numbered more than 5 million men, to

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

560,000. And this decision was made by the Communist Party and Soviet Government in conditions of encirclement of the USSR by hostile capitalist nations. Is this not evidence of the Soviet Land's genuine love of peace?

Reactionary imperialist circles, however, were stubbornly loath to accept the fact of existence of the young Soviet Republic. Fabricating the myth of "Soviet threat," they attempted time and again during that period to test our nation's strength by force of arms. We well remember the acts of provocation perpetrated by the Chinese militarists on the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1929 and the Japanese samurai at Lake Khasan in 1938 and on the Khalkhin-Gol River in 1939. Although receiving a crushing rebuff on each occasion, imperialist reaction nevertheless continued nurturing even more perfidious schemes against the Soviet Union.

In the 1930's the black clouds of another world war began to gather over our planet, a war which was born and went through a protracted period of maturation within the bosom of the capitalist world, which was caught in the clutches of a severe economic crisis and was being rent by acute political and social conflicts. The danger of war sharply intensified when power in Germany was seized by fascism -- a shameless terroristic and chauvinistic dictatorship of the most reactionary and aggressive forces of imperialism, which proclaimed its main goal to be the struggle against communism, for world supremacy.

Ruling circles and monopolies in the United States, Great Britain and other capitalist countries placed high hopes on fascist Germany as a shock force in the struggle against the world's first socialist state. They offered it generous financial and economic assistance in rebuilding Germany's military-industrial potential and in establishing, training and equipping a multimillion-man army.

The Soviet Union, true to its Leninist foreign policy, during the prewar years firmly and unswervingly championed the cause of peace in Europe and throughout the world. It advanced a number of constructive proposals aimed at holding the Hitlerite aggressors in check and at eliminating the threat of a second world war. All its efforts, however, were met by stubborn, calculating opposition on the part of the ruling circles of the Western powers, which were seeking to achieve international isolation of the USSR and were pursuing the notorious policy of "appeasement" of claimants to world domination and a policy of "channeling" fascist aggression eastward.

Thus ruling circles of the Western powers played an important role in the rebirth of German militarism and the strengthening of fascism. Blinded by hatred of socialism and refusing to acknowledge that the expansionist aspirations of fascist Germany also presented a deadly threat to their own countries and peoples, they not only calmly sat by watching while the Hitlerite clique fanned the flames of war but also offered it every possible assistance.

As we know, the Munich deal (1938), as a result of which the British and French governments in fact betrayed Czechoslovakia and handed it over to be torn to pieces by the fascist barbarians, was the culminating event on the eve of World War II. The Anglo-German and Franco-German declarations of 1938, which essentially were nonaggression pacts and an attempt to form an alliance between the Western powers, fascist Germany and Italy and to give them total freedom of action against the USSR, constituted a logical continuation of their policy of "appeasement" of the aggressor.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

World War II began, however, and proceeded to develop according to a scenario quite different from that envisaged by the strategists in London, Paris and Washington. It was the capitalist countries of Europe, not the Soviet Union, which became its first victim. Between September 1939 and June 1941 the Hitlerites seized Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Yugoslavia, and Greece. They were soon occupying France. England too was faced with the threat of fascist invasion.

Our party foresaw the inevitability of a military clash with the forces of imperialism and was readying the country and people for defense. Thanks to gigantic achievements in building socialism in the USSR, a powerful Soviet defense industry was created in short order. Production of modern arms and combat equipment increased substantially. The Third Five-Year Plan, adopted in 1939 at the 18th Party Congress, ensured accomplishment of many important tasks pertaining to further boosting the nation's economic and defense potential. Total numerical strength of the Soviet Armed Forces increased by 180 percent between 1939 and June 1941, with 125 new divisions formed during this time. The mechanized corps which were being deployed began taking delivery on the T-34 and KV tanks, the world's finest at that time. New models of artillery and mortar weapons were developed, including the famed multi-round rocket launchers ("katyushi"). The number of aviation regiments in the Air Forces increased by more than 80 percent. The combat power of the Navy grew substantially; a total of 265 new warships were added in 1938-1940. Requisite measures were taken to develop air defense forces and airborne troops.

Unfortunately history gave us very little time. Not everything which had been planned for strengthening national defense was accomplished. On 22 June 1941, treacherously violating the nonaggression pact, Hitlerite Germany launched a massive sneak attack on our homeland. The Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, rose as one man to the defense of their socialist homeland. The sacred Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the fascist invaders had begun.

Imperialism's schemes of destroying the socialist nation in the flames of World War II were a total failure. The outcome of the war was not at all determined by the combat operations of Anglo-American troops in North Africa and Italy, as bourgeois falsifiers of history today attempt to argue. Its outcome was determined on the Soviet-German front by the selfless, courageous struggle of the Soviet people, who displayed mass heroism and the power of Soviet arms. The Battle of Moscow in 1941 buried Hitler's plan of blitzkrieg and signaled the beginning of a turning point in the war, the Battle of Stalingrad in 1942-1943 made a decisive contribution toward reaching a radical turning point in the course not only of the Great Patriotic War but of World War II as whole, while the Battle of Kursk in 1943 placed fascist Germany at the brink of catastrophe.

In 1944, brilliantly executing a number of large-scale strategic operations at Leningrad, in the Crimea, in the Right-Bank Ukraine, in Belorussia, Moldavia, in the Baltic and the Arctic, the Soviet Armed Forces swept Soviet soil clean of fascist invaders and, pushing the victorious offensive westward, proceeded to liberate the peoples of Europe from the yoke of Hitlerite occupation.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The grandiose Berlin Operation, in the course of which Soviet troops crushed almost a million-man enemy force, was the victorious finale in the ultimate defeat of the German-fascist forces in the Great Patriotic War. Our Victory Banner flew proudly over defeated Berlin, while the standards of the "invincible" Hitlerite army ended up at the feet of the victorious Soviet people.

After this, with the objective of bringing World War II to an end in the Far East, ensuring the security of the Soviet Union and achieving the earliest possible establishment of peace throughout the world, our Armed Forces, carrying out their pledge as an ally in the anti-Hitler coalition, routed the Kwantung Army, the main striking force of militarist Japan.

The results of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union demonstrated in a most convincing fashion that there are no forces in the world capable of crushing socialism and bringing to their knees the Soviet people, loyal to the ideas of Marxism-Leninist, dedicated to the socialist homeland, and united behind the Leninist party. These results constitute a stern warning to the imperialist aggressors, a harsh and unforgettable lesson of history.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War predetermined in large measure the entire course of postwar development in the world. Favorable conditions were created for victorious revolutions in a number of countries in Europe and Asia, establishment of a world socialist system, and a powerful upsurge in the national liberation struggle of peoples. The position of imperialism proved to be seriously undermined, and the correlation of forces in the world arena had changed radically in favor of socialism.

Weakening of the position of imperialism in the postwar period, however, not only did not diminish but on the contrary increased its aggressiveness to an even greater degree. Imperialism began urgently regrouping its forces. The United States of America assumed a leadership position within the capitalist camp.

In the interests of consolidating its political and military-strategic positions, the United States, possessing a temporary monopoly in nuclear arms, pursued a policy of blackmail and threats directed against the USSR, its recent ally in the anti-Hitler coalition. The imperialist countries, headed by the United States, began openly pursuing a policy from a "position of strength" vis-à-vis the socialist nations. Virtually as soon as World War II ended, when the Soviet people were totally absorbed in rebuilding their war-demolished economy, U.S. and British ruling circles, once again loudly proclaiming to the world a "Soviet military threat," began preparing the most monstrous and perfidious plans against the USSR. In 1948 Churchill proposed initiating an atomic war against the USSR, while in 1949 the United States even drew up a plan of war against the Soviet Union code-named "Dropshot," the authors of which proposed dropping no less than 300 atomic bombs and 20,000 tons of "conventional" bombs on the USSR.

That same year an aggressive military bloc was formed at the initiative of and with a leading role played by the United States, a bloc which was named the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Six years later the FRG was accepted as a full-fledged member of NATO. At the same time international imperialism began establishing around the Soviet Union and the other

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

socialist countries a network of military bases, and proceeded to hammer together new regional military blocs in various regions of the world, such as CENTO, SEATO, ANZUS, and others.

And all this was being done under the cover of slogans about the need to eliminate the "Communist threat," slogans which were intended for the purpose of continuing the arms race which had been initiated by imperialism while casting the blame for the arms race on the USSR. But reality totally refuted these fantasies.

The domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union always has been, is now and will remain directed toward strengthening peace, cooperation and international security. The entire world knows for a fact that it is not our country which was initiator of the arms race and the establishment of military-political blocs. Our country was forced to take merely requisite response measures to every new challenge by the West. And these are not simply words, but facts, which neither the United States nor its NATO allies can refute, no matter how much they would like to do so.

The military-political alliance of Warsaw Pact member nations was established in 1955, that is, 6 years after creation of the aggressive NATO bloc. The situation is similar as regards the arms race. We know, for example, that the United States built the world's first atomic bomb, in 1945, and proceeded to use it to threaten the Soviet Union, which did not develop a similar weapon until 4 years later. What is more, the United States was the first to test an even more powerful hydrogen bomb, in 1952, while the USSR followed suit in 1953. The Americans were also the first to build nuclear-powered submarines armed with ballistic missiles, in 1960, while the USSR followed suit in 1967. The United States was the first to develop MIRVed warheads for land-based and sea-launched ballistic missiles, at the end of the 1960's, while the USSR did not build such warheads until 1975-1977. This list of strategic weapons could go on and on.

Or take, for example, space intelligence-gathering hardware, the multipurpose "Shuttle" space system, and the AWACS long-range radar detection system. All these items first appeared in the arsenal of the Pentagon, not of the Soviet Armed Forces.

And if we consider the development of the so-called conventional weapons, here too the palm of precedence has been solidly retained by the United States, with the aim of achieving superiority over the USSR. This applies to the building of aircraft carriers, to the development of antitank guided missiles (ATGMs), surface-to-air missile systems (SAMs), tanks with stabilizers and laser gunsights, hypersonic aircraft and other modern weapons and combat equipment.

Thus even a brief historical digression persuasively attests to the fact that it is precisely the United States which always has been and continues to be the "designer" of more and more new weaponry and the initiator of each new round of the unchecked arms race.

As for the Soviet nation, it is quite understandable that it could not waive the interests and security of its people and that in response to the military preparations of the United States and the other NATO countries it has been forced to take the necessary measures to strengthen its defense.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

All of postwar history also incontrovertibly reveals a picture of how U.S. imperialism, endeavoring to assert its dictate in international relations, elaborated various strategic ideas and nurtured insidious plans against the USSR.

/At the beginning of the 1950's, for example, the United States, although it had lost its nuclear weapons monopoly, still enjoyed superiority in total number of warheads and means of delivery, and remaining to some degree safely out of range of a response attack, elaborated the /strategy of "massive retaliation,"/ [strategiyu "massirovannogo vozmezdiya"], which specified waging only an all-out nuclear war against the USSR and the other socialist countries. The Americans considered that the main weapons at that time were the powerful strategic aircraft, capable of delivering nuclear strikes deep in the Soviet heartland. For this reason the Pentagon viewed a war as the unilateral employment of strategic nuclear weapons, which the United States could prosecute with impunity.

/By the beginning of the 1960's, in connection with the fact that the USSR had developed intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and had built a reliable national air defense system, military-political leaders in Washington were forced to acknowledge that in a war against the USSR the United States could no longer go unpunished but would receive an appreciable response attack. Therefore the U.S. strategy of "massive retaliation" was replaced in the 1960's by the /strategy of "flexible response"/ [strategiya "gipkogo reagirovaniya"]. A central place in this strategy was once again assigned to all-out nuclear war, but in which "dosed" ["dozirovannoye"] employment of nuclear weapons was specified, commensurate with the "scale of military danger" and the possibility of waging limited war with conventional weapons. Land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles began to be considered the principal offensive nuclear weapon. With this aim the United States built 1054 Minuteman and Titan ICBM launchers and initiated a program to build submarines armed with Polaris missiles.

In addition to modern strategic nuclear weapons -- land-based (ICBM) and sea-launched (SLBM) intercontinental ballistic missiles and strategic bombers, powerful general-purpose forces armed with conventional weapons were to be maintained. Plans called for fighting a war against the USSR and the European socialist countries initially with conventional weapons, with subsequent employment of tactical nuclear weapons and, in a critical situation, strategic nuclear weapons as well.

/At the beginning of the 1970's, as we know, a quantitative parity was reached between the United States and the USSR in strategic arms. This forced White House officials to revise their previous views and adopt a new strategy -- /the strategy of "realistic deterrence"/ [strategiyu "realisticheskogo ustrasheniya"] ("realistic restraint"), which was based on ensuring a qualitative superiority of the entire strategic arms complex. Toward this end the United States began elaboration and implementation of numerous programs for further building up the power of all branches of its armed forces, particularly in the area of improving strategic offensive forces -- nuclear submarines armed with ballistic missiles, and equipping land-based and sea-launched strategic missiles with MIRVed warheads, and in addition development began on a new strategic nuclear weapon -- air-launched, sea-launched, and land-based long-range cruise missiles.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The strategy of "realistic deterrence" was expressed in its most concentrated form in 1980 in the Carter Administration's Directive No 59 as well as other directives which supplemented it, which presented the concept of employing U.S. strategic nuclear forces in war against the Soviet Union.

/At the beginning of the 1980's/ the new Reagan Administration proceeded at the very outset to adopt an even more dangerous reactionary policy and, in connection with this, began development of a /"new military strategy" -- a strategy of "direct confrontation"/ [strategii "pryamogo protivoborstva"] between the United States and the Soviet Union on a global and regional scale. According to a statement by U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger, the main goal of this strategy is to achieve "complete and indisputable" military superiority, reestablishment of the "U.S. leadership role in the world," active countermeasures against the Soviet Union in "defense of vital U.S. interests" in various regions of the world, and the "disintegration" [razrykhleniye] of the socialist community. This strategy places emphasis on preparations for a protracted nuclear war.

Two concepts are being elaborated in developing the "new military strategy" -- "active countermeasures" ["aktivnogo protivodeystviya"] and "geographic escalation" ["geograficheskoy eskalatsii"]. The concept of "active countermeasures" envisages multivariant employment of strategic nuclear weapons -- from so-called limited nuclear strikes to massive nuclear strikes against the entire aggregate of targets [kompleksu ob'yektov] on the territory of the Soviet Union and the other nations of the socialist community. In the opinion of the Pentagon, the fact that the United States possesses powerful strategic nuclear forces, as well as the creation of large, so-called "Eurostrategic" nuclear forces allegedly enhances U.S. capabilities to achieve political and military objectives in a "limited" nuclear war in the European theater without such a war escalating into a world war.

Of course one can reason theoretically in this manner. But any sober-minded person can understand without any particular difficulty that in practice it is impossible to achieve this, that is, to hold nuclear war within a certain restricted framework. "If nuclear war breaks out, be it in Europe or elsewhere," stressed Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his replies to questions put by the editors of the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, "it would inevitably and inescapably assume a worldwide character."⁷ And military experts and political leaders in the United States and the other leading NATO countries unquestionably are well aware of this fact. Their true aim, however, is to dull the vigilance of the peoples of the world, to teach them to accept the idea that "limited" nuclear war is realistic and "acceptable," and to suppress in them any resistance to an unchecked arms race and the military preparations being conducted by the forces of imperialism.

The U.S. "new military strategy" also calls for preparing the armed forces to wage a war with the employment of solely conventional weaponry. It is asserted thereby, in conformity with the so-called "geographic escalation" concept, that in case a conventional war begins in any theater, the United States and its allies should be prepared for the spread of military operations with the employment of conventional weapons also to other theaters "where the adversary is most vulnerable." In other words, in their view such a war may embrace not only Europe, which continues to be viewed as the principal theater of war, but the Near, Middle and Far East, all sea and ocean theaters as well.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

What can be said about this "new" U.S. strategy? If one examines it as a whole, peeling off the verbal shell, one can easily see that essentially it further develops that same notorious "nuclear strategy" which the previous U.S. administration was attempting to proclaim, but at the same time it is of an even more openly aggressive character and essentially constitutes a return to the initial U.S. strategy of "massive retaliation." In other words, strategic thinking has come full circle, but it has now risen to a significantly more dangerous level -- dangerous for all mankind.

Even a cursory analysis of the evolution of U.S. strategic concepts indicates that all of them essentially contain the idea of nuclear war against the USSR and are of a clearly-marked aggressive character. Reflected in them, just as in a mirror, is the predatory essence of the policy of U.S. imperialism, which seeks to achieve global superiority using any means, while refusing soberly to assess the present world correlation of forces.

The 26th CPSU Congress noted that in recent years the aggressiveness of imperialism, and particularly U.S. imperialism, has increased sharply. "Adventurism, willingness to gamble the vital interests of mankind for the sake of their own narrow selfish aims," stated Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the congress, "are particularly glaringly manifested in the policy of the most aggressive imperialist circles."⁸

Imperialism is increasingly losing ground in the world, and the sphere of its domination is inexorably narrowing.

At the same time the might and authority [avtoritet] of the nations of the socialist community are steadily increasing, national liberation movements are broadening (since World War II colonial rule by imperialism has been ended in more than 100 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America), the class struggle is gaining momentum within the capitalist countries themselves, and the forces of peoples in the struggle for democracy and social progress are growing stronger.

Imperialism is no longer capable, as it was in the past, of controlling and, particularly, of directing the course of world events as it sees fit. In conditions of further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, reactionary forces are seeking at all costs to impede the process of progressive changes in the world, to turn back the wheel of history, and to regain their past world domination, utilizing any and all means and methods to achieve this end. This so-called "global offensive" against socialism and the forces of progress is also presently taking place on command from Washington, for the sake of these frankly illusory goals. U.S. subversive actions in regard to Poland are graphic confirmation of this.

U.S. ruling circles do not conceal the fact that in calling for a new round in the nuclear and conventional arms race they are essentially taking the path of militarization of the entire country and utilization of U.S. military power in a broad range of military conflicts. In a military-political regard, one can see several trends with a sufficient degree of definiteness.

/First of all,/ present U.S. leaders are stubbornly bringing things toward a breakdown of treaties previously signed with the Soviet Union, as well as of arms

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

limitations and reduction talks. In 1973 the USSR and the United States signed an agreement on preventing nuclear war, pursuant to which the two parties pledged to act in such a manner as to prevent the occurrence of situations capable of causing military confrontation. At the present time, however, Washington officials through their practical actions are pushing the peoples of the world toward the abyss of thermonuclear war.

Existing agreements and understandings in the area of strategic arms limitations (SALT I) are not to the liking of the U.S. administration. In particular, opinions are being expressed which urge repudiation of the provisional agreement on certain measures in the area of limiting strategic offensive arms. Attempts are also being made to undermine the permanent treaty between the USSR and the United States on limiting antimissile defense systems, which was signed in 1972. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, for example, openly stated that the United States may demand revision of this treaty, depending on the results of research being conducted by the Americans in the area of antimissile systems.

Many top White House officials, including the President, openly state that the SALT II Treaty is allegedly disadvantageous to the United States and therefore should be radically revised or even scrapped.

The United States broke off talks on limiting and subsequent reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean, on limiting international trade in weapons and deliveries of conventional arms, and is making every effort to hinder the work of the UN Conference on Law of the Sea. The United States is stubbornly blocking the reaching of agreements in talks on total and universal banning of nuclear weapons testing, on banning the development, manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons and destroying existing stockpiles, on mutual reduction of forces and arms in Central Europe, as well as on a number of other problems.

The United States and its NATO partners, disregarding the interests of their peoples, are ignoring new foreign policy initiatives on the part of the USSR in the area of arms limitations. They are also stubbornly ignoring the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on deployment in Europe of new medium-range [sredney dal'nosti -- also translates as intermediate-range] nuclear missile weapons by the NATO countries and the USSR.

The United States has long been dragging its feet on the matter of resumption of talks on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. Finally, under pressure by the world community, including in the Western European countries, the United States was forced to agree to the talks. It is now becoming increasingly more clear, however, that the United States is interested least of all in reducing nuclear weapons on the European continent. Advancing proposals which it knows are unacceptable to the USSR, such as President Reagan's "zero option" ["nulevogo varianta"], the United States in actuality is not seeking a constructive solution to the problem of reducing nuclear arms in Europe on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security for both parties, but is merely attempting to gain time for the deployment of additional new U.S. nuclear missiles in the countries of Western Europe. At the same time, coming up with various fraudulent documents, such as the pamphlet entitled "Soviet Military Power," published in September 1981, official circles in Washington are clearly pursuing the aim of convincing the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Western Europeans of an alleged Soviet military superiority and of camouflaging their efforts at an unchecked buildup of nuclear arms, both strategic and medium-range, and thus to guarantee in advance an impasse in Soviet-American talks. "They need a breakoff of the talks," stated Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in reply to questions put by the editors of the magazine DER SPIEGEL, "as a kind of alibi for continuing a deliberate arms race, intended to transform Western Europe into a launch pad for new U.S. missiles targeted against the USSR."⁹

/Secondly,/ the United States is pursuing an avowed policy of gaining military superiority over the USSR and the other nations of the socialist community. This is becoming increasingly an obsession with U.S. ruling circles. They are seeking to shift the present approximate military balance in their favor, a balance, the fact of which, we might note, U.S. officials have repeatedly acknowledged and continue to acknowledge. It is a well-known fact that military superiority has always been required not for defense. Superiority has always been and continues to be today a symbol of aggressive aspirations.

This policy has become particularly dangerous in connection with actions by the Reagan Administration aimed at direct and comprehensive preparations for war. Confirmation of this is the substantial increase in U.S. budget appropriations for the development and execution of new weapons programs, the forming of new military contingents, rapid deployment forces in particular, and plans calling for "additional arming" ["dovooruzheniya"] of NATO with nuclear missiles and stepped-up military preparations in various regions of the world.

Direct U.S. military appropriations have reached staggering figures in peacetime conditions: more than 180 billion dollars for the 1981 fiscal year, and more than 220 billion for 1982. And in the next five years, up to 1986, U.S. military expenditures planned just for the Department of Defense total 1.5 trillion dollars, that is, an average of 300 billion dollars a year. Just what are these billions going to be spent on?

First of all, plans call for further buildup of strategic nuclear forces at a priority pace. These include new "Ohio" class missile-carrying nuclear submarines, MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, the new B-1 and "Stealth" strategic bombers, the multirole Space Shuttle, long-range air-launched, sea-launched, and land-based cruise missiles, plus other weapons. Planning to begin the mass production and deployment of cruise missiles, the United States intends to create for itself considerable additional nuclear potential for accomplishing strategic missions, and thus to tip the present strategic balance in its own favor, both in individual regions and throughout the world. A buildup of military power is being carried out not only by the United States but also by the NATO bloc as a whole. One should note thereby that the NATO countries have serious differences of opinion with their leader, the United States, on certain questions of economic and sociopolitical development. On the main thing, however -- in their anti-Sovietism and anticommunism, in the struggle against socialism, democracy and social progress, they basically adhere to a common policy. Under heavy pressure by Washington, the Western European countries ratified at the Rome meeting of the NATO Council (in May 1981) the NATO decision on "additional nuclear arming" ["yadernom dovooruzhenii"] of Western Europe adopted in December 1979, calling for deploying in Western Europe an additional approximately 600 Pershing II missile launchers and cruise missiles in order to achieve military superiority over the Warsaw Pact

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

countries. The FRG displayed particular zeal in adopting this decision. And for some reason France also is working intensively to build its own nuclear "umbrella," something akin to a new "nuclear Maginot," which increases the overall nuclear potential of the Western European nations and NATO as a whole.

Substantial appropriations are being designated for maintaining the U.S. military presence in various parts of the world. Hundreds of large U.S. naval and air bases are deployed around the Soviet Union and the other socialist nations. U.S. regular troops totaling approximately 500,000 men are stationed in more than 15 different countries.

Permanent forces are being established in the Near and Middle East for purposes of aggression. Under the pretext of monitoring the "truce" between Egypt and Israel, the United States is planning to station American troops on the Sinai Peninsula. The network of supply depots at which additional stocks of heavy weapons and equipment are stored for dual-based U.S. troops in the FRG, Luxembourg, Great Britain, Norway, and other countries in Western Europe is being expanded at an accelerated pace.

Quite recently the United States, by its reckless decision to commence full-scale production of neutron weapons, threw a direct challenge to the peoples of the world with undisguised cynicism. This decision, together with implementation of plans to build and deploy other types of nuclear missile weapons, is a component part of the U.S. strategic policy of preparing for war with employment of the entire arsenal of weapons and clearly attests to Washington's far-reaching aggressive schemes.

Once again, and for the umpteenth time, U.S. ruling circles have assumed their customary role of inventor of barbaric means of waging war, of instigator of another round of the arms race. The world community is particularly alarmed by the fact that in this case we are dealing not simply with an increase in the quantity of already existing weapons but rather a qualitative leap forward in this area, for neutron weapons, even tactical weapons, can play the role of detonator of a thermonuclear world war.

Thirdly, the United States has elevated to the status of national policy brazen interference in the internal affairs of sovereign nations and aggressive struggle against national liberation movements.

The United States is undertaking enormous efforts to crush such movements in the countries of Central America. They are engaged in outright intervention in the internal affairs of El Salvador. The threads of conspiracy are constantly being woven, and all kinds of subversive actions are being undertaken against Nicaragua, including from the territory of neighboring countries. Intensive arms deliveries are being made to the military junta ruling Guatemala. To achieve its aggressive aims in Latin America, Washington is attempting to establish so-called inter-American forces, consisting of subunits and units of regular troops of the United States and countries with antipopular, police regimes -- Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, Uruguay and Chile.

Outright acts of provocation, sabotage and threats directed against socialist Cuba are continuing. Mexico and a number of other countries in this region which do not

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

desire to follow submissively in the wake of U.S. aggressive policy have also become the targets of blackmail and threats.

The next most important region of U.S. hegemonist aspirations -- incidentally, the U.S. assessment agrees with this -- is Africa. White House officials have openly stated that they will offer support and supply arms to the UNITA terrorist grouping in Angola. Giving every encouragement to bandit-like military incursions by South African troops, they seek to undermine the revolutionary achievements of the people of Angola, to destabilize the situation in Mozambique, and to crush the national liberation movement in Namibia. The United States devotes special attention to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, seeking to establish bases in these countries and to arrange for permanent stationing of U.S. regular military units on their territory.

Arming Israel at an accelerated pace and encouraging its aggressive piratical actions, the United States is making every effort to escalate tension in the Near East. In the 1970's the Americans supplied Tel Aviv with more than 8.5 billion dollars worth of weapons and military equipment. It was recently announced in Washington that U.S. military aid to Israel will reach an annual figure in excess of 2 billion dollars.

The Middle East is also now the center of heightened attention on the part of U.S. imperialism. The President himself announced that the United States will continue arming counterrevolutionary bands in Afghanistan, for the most part via Pakistan, which is viewed as a bridgehead for carrying out hegemonistic schemes in the Middle East and Persian Gulf area. Toward these ends the Americans intend to give Islamabad more than 3 billion dollars in military-economic aid.

The situation developing in the Far East is also cause for concern. China's present leaders are continuing to pursue a malicious anti-Soviet course of policy. We must state that the Chinese leaders were the only ones in the world to voice strong approval of the decision by the U.S. administration to commence the production of neutron weapons. The partnership between imperialism, and particularly the United States, and Beijing hegemonism is a new and dangerous phenomenon in world politics, presenting a threat to all mankind.

In their nearsighted policy of escalating military tension, reactionary circles in the United States and other Western powers have found a "worthy" partner -- the Chinese hegemonists. By giving them various assistance, including military, the U.S. imperialists seek to play the "China card" -- to turn China into an anti-Soviet shock force, into a gendarme and the main support of reaction in Asia.

Apparently the strategists across the ocean as well as certain Western European strategists have forgotten those fatal consequences to which the actions of their countries' ruling circles led on the eve of World War II. Such a policy can boomerang in present-day conditions as well, striking precisely and primarily those who have undertaken and are playing this dangerous game.

Expansion of military-political ties between the United States, China, and Japan, which is increasingly proceeding in the direction of militarization, is creating a long-term military threat to peace in the Far East. China, with U.S. approval,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

is artificially maintaining a focal point of tension in Kampuchea and along China's border with Vietnam and Laos.

Thus world imperialism, and particularly U.S. imperialism, is seeking to extend its tentacles into every part of the world. Militant U.S. circles have openly adopted a course of policy aimed at undermining détente, engagement in a massive arms race, and vigorous [aktivnuyu] preparations for nuclear war. The various actions and acts of sabotage against the USSR and the other nations of the socialist community and against progressive forces throughout the world which they are presently conducting are of a coordinated nature and are joined together by a common scheme. The main goal which the U.S. imperialists have set for themselves is gradually and sequentially to weaken and undermine socialism as a system, using any and all methods and means, and ultimately to establish their world domination.

This is not a new phenomenon. History has seen many claimants to world domination. Napoleon persistently sought to achieve world domination, as did Hitler at a later time. The outcome of their ambitions is well known. An even harsher outcome may await these latter-day claimants.

The White House administration's most sinister schemes against peace, against very life on earth, and especially its decision to build neutron weapons have unleashed a huge storm of public anger on all continents.

Public outcry against Washington's plans is assuming a particularly large scale in Europe, which the Pentagon's strategists intend to turn into an arena of nuclear war, leaving U.S. soil untouched. Millions of people, broad segments of the public, many statesmen and political leaders are more and more clearly realizing that the root interests of the countries and peoples of Western Europe are totally at variance with the militarist aspirations of the United States.

Differences between the United States and its NATO allies on many military-political problems, including the production of neutron weapons and deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, are becoming increasingly deeper and assuming an undisguised character.

In the present-day situation caution, weighing of actions and, at the same time, vigorous efforts toward achieving a radical improvement in the world political climate are more needed than ever before. The Soviet State and its allies are displaying precisely such a high-principled and flexible approach to resolving international problems.

Vivid evidence of this are the new peace initiatives advanced by the Soviet Union at the 36th Session of the UN General Assembly, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's replies to questions put by the editors of the magazine DER SPIEGEL, and his statements made during his visit to the FRG. They are aimed at preserving and further strengthening world peace and placing a barrier in the path of the dangerous militaristic plans of the imperialist forces.

At the same time, realistically assessing the international situation and the danger of military preparations on the part of imperialism, the Communist Party and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Soviet Government are taking necessary steps in order reliably to protect the vital interests of our people. "In the period under review," stated Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress, "the party and government have not failed to bear in mind every single day matters pertaining to /strengthening the defense might of this country and its Armed Forces."/10

FOOTNOTES

1. "Materialy XXVI s"yezda KPSS" [Proceedings of the 26th CPSU Congress], page 4.
2. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 37, page 248.
3. Ibid., Vol 27, page 388.
4. Ibid., Vol 17, page 187.
5. "Programma Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], Moscow, 1976, page 52.
6. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 39, page 343.
7. PRAVDA, 3 November 1981.
8. "Materialy...", op. cit., page 20.
9. PRAVDA, 3 November 1981.
10. "Materialy...", op. cit., page 66.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Chapter Two. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ART OF WARFARE AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET ARMED FORCES

The question of war and peace is one of the most acute questions in the affairs of man. In addition, it is becoming especially important in present-day conditions as a consequence of the enormous qualitative leap forward which has occurred in the last decades in development of weaponry. Employment of this weaponry can wreak incalculable calamity on the peoples of the entire world. "...The very nature of modern weapons has become such," stressed CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at the 5th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 10th Convocation, "that if they were unleashed, the future of all mankind would hang in the balance."¹

The Leninist Communist Party, on the basis of a profound scientific analysis of the disposition of class forces in the world arena and developmental trends in international relations, has reached the well-substantiated conclusion that it is possible to prevent a world war in present-day conditions. Today the nations of the socialist community, other peace-seeking nations, the international worker class, and all those who champion the cause of peace have great forces and resources at their disposal.

But the objective possibility of preventing war cannot simply become a reality. For the sake of peace it is necessary, as practical experience demonstrates, to wage a persistent and vigorous struggle against warmongers of various ilk. The CPSU, the brother Communist and worker parties, and all progressive mankind view precisely this as their most important and urgent task.

Our party teaches that the Soviet people and their Armed Forces should not forget for a single minute that the aggressive nature of imperialism has remained unchanged, and therefore it is necessary to display constant vigilance and to appraise in a realistic manner the actions of reactionary circles in the capitalist countries, for whom, according to the blasphemous statements of their leaders, there are things more important than peace.

The effectiveness of scientific cognition of a potential war and theoretical substantiation of optimal modes of conducting such a war and preparing this country and its Armed Forces for such a war is determined first and foremost by the nature of the methodological principles applied by Soviet military science, which are based on the firm foundation of Marxist-Leninist theory.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Unity of scientific objectivity and Communist party-mindedness is a most important principle of Marxism-Leninism, which military cadres of the socialist state take as their guide. "The main thing in a Leninist approach to societal phenomena and processes," stated the CPSU Central Committee Theses on the V. I. Lenin Birth Centennial, "is an organic unity of scientific objectivity and a high-principled assessment of these phenomena and processes from the position of the worker class. For Marxist-Leninists and for all genuine revolutionaries Leninism is a methodology of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action."²

Scientific objectivity presupposes cognition of the military-political situation and occurring military processes such as they exist in reality, revealing the conflictive trends in their development, without allowing any elements of one-sidedness and subjectivism. Communist party-mindedness demands disclosure of the class content of occurring phenomena, an appraisal of these phenomena from the position of strengthening socialism and defending revolutionary achievements, and elaboration of modes of military activity which would make it possible to accomplish these tasks with the greatest degree of effectiveness.

At the same time Marxism-Leninism constitutes a general methodological foundation of scientific foresight, which makes it possible not only to understand the past and present but also to predict the future.

V. I. Lenin noted that the teaching of K. Marx possesses significance "not in the sense of mere explanation of the past but also in the sense of fearless prediction of the future and bold practical activities directed toward bringing it to pass..."³

We know that the founders of Marxism-Leninism themselves displayed model examples of scientific forecasting of societal events, including in the area of military affairs. That great connoisseur of military affairs F. Engels, for example, foresaw almost 30 years before the outbreak of World War I, basing his conclusions on a profound analysis of trends in the development of capitalism and its root conflicts, economics and weaponry, that in Europe "today no other war is possible but a world war. And it would be a world war of unprecedented magnitude and unprecedented force... only one result is absolutely indisputable: general exhaustion and the creation of conditions for the final victory of the worker class."⁴ The subsequent events of World War I fully confirmed his scientific predictions.

V. I. Lenin, leader of the proletarian revolution and founder of our party and the Soviet State, trod the arena of history not only as the greatest political leader and statesman but also as a gifted military leader, an outstanding strategist, with a brilliant understanding of matters pertaining to war and the army. Proceeding from the character and features of the new historical era, V. I. Lenin innovatively developed and substantially enriched the theses of Marxism on military questions and created a teaching on defense of the socialist homeland. In his works he made a most profound analysis of the fundamental laws, patterns and features of wars of the era of imperialism, elaborated the principles of organizational development of the army of a socialist state, and laid down the foundations of Soviet military science.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The practical military activities of V. I. Lenin and his strategic leadership during the period of the civil war and military intervention (1918-1920) still remain today an inexhaustible source of experience in the area of the art of warfare.

Lenin's guidance of defense of the Soviet Republic constitutes an example of a skillful combination of revolutionary theory and practice and innovative solving of complex problems raised by history for the first time. V. I. Lenin demonstrated model examples of deep penetration into the essence of the developing situation at the fronts and scientific prediction of the enemy's plans and the development of events.

In October 1918, for example, V. I. Lenin exposed the plans of military intervention on the part of the Anglo-French imperialists. Vladimir Il'ich commented in one of his speeches that the British and French imperialists, following their defeats in Siberia and at Arkhangel'sk, "are now directing their efforts toward attacking Russia from the south, either from the Dardanelles or from the Black Sea, or by land across Bulgaria and Romania."⁵ This was indeed the case. A month later a memorandum of the general staff of the high command of allied armies of the Entente specified the necessity of intervention in Southern Russia (the Ukraine-Donets) simultaneously via Romania and the Black Sea.⁶

A special place in the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism is occupied by materialist dialectics, which V. I. Lenin called "the soul of Marxism."

/Materialist dialectics teaches that different objects, phenomena and processes, both in nature and in society, do not exist isolated, by themselves. They are organically linked and are continuously interacting with one another and are in a continuous process of development./ "In order truly to know a subject," wrote V. I. Lenin, "it is necessary to encompass and thoroughly study all its aspects, all its relationships and 'indirect elements' ['oposredstvovaniya']. We shall never completely achieve this, but the demand of comprehensiveness will caution us against errors and against loss of sensitivity [omertveniya]."⁷ Military affairs are no exception.

The scientific character of military theory and the results of practical activity are determined first and foremost by the degree to which are cognized and taken into consideration the entire diversity of links and relationships of war, the combat capabilities of the branches and arms of service, the interaction of material and spiritual factors, etc. It is essential thereby to elucidate first and foremost external and internal important and unimportant linkages and relationships.

Such factors as a country's economic system, level of development of science and technology, etc. are external in relation to war. The relative strengths of the belligerents, interactions of the branches and arms of service, plus other elements are internal linkages and relationships of war.

An understanding of the external factors which influence the character of a war, its course and outcome is a most important prerequisite for a scientific analysis of the internal linkages and relationships of war, which determine victory and defeat as well as the modes of conduct of military operations.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Elucidation of the important linkages and relationships of war and military organizational development enables one to determine the main element in the complex chain of events, by seizing which one can pull out the entire chain, that is, successfully resolve the entire aggregate of practical problems which arise. Pointing to the importance of accomplishing this task, V. I. Lenin stated: "We must firmly keep in mind that the fact that we always concentrated on the main, principal thing was the source of the successes and miracles which we have achieved in military affairs... "8

At the same time Marxist-Leninist methodology proceeds from the position that the future always follows from the present, which has its roots in the past. "Whatever societal phenomena we examine in the process of its development," commented V. I. Lenin, "it will always prove to contain vestiges of the past, foundations of the present, and rudiments of the future... "9

The dialectical principle of development requires that one approach each phenomenon from the standpoint of how and under what conditions it arose in the past, what it is at the present time, and what it will become in the future.

The history of wars and the art of warfare persuasively attests to the fact that changes in military affairs are dictated by changes which take place first and foremost in weapons and military equipment. "...Advances in technology," wrote F. Engels, "if they became applicable and in fact were applied in military affairs, immediately -- almost forcibly, and often against the will of military command authorities -- they have produced changes and even revolutionary changes in the mode of waging combat..."10 As we know, radical transformations took place in the art of warfare as a result of the appearance of gunpowder and firearms in the 13th century. Large-scale changes in the military realm were produced by the development of rifled-barrel weapons in the 19th century, and especially by the invention of automatic weapons at the beginning of the 20th century, and subsequently by the development of weapons of offensive exploitation--tanks, airplanes, submarines and other new military hardware.

A profound revolution in the full meaning of the word is taking place in military affairs in our time in connection with the development of thermonuclear weapons, rapid advances in electronics, development of weapons based on new physical principles, as well as in connection with extensive qualitative improvement of conventional weapons. This in turn is influencing all other aspects of military affairs, particularly the development and improvement of forms and modes of military operations, and consequently the organizational structure of the troops (forces) and of the navy, and the improvement of weapons systems and control agencies.

Awareness of this dialectical process is especially important at the contemporary stage when, on the basis of advances in science and technology, principal weapons systems are virtually renewed every 10-12 years. In these conditions belated updating of views and stagnation in development and implementation of new matters pertaining to military organizational development are fraught with serious consequences. The following example can be cited as confirmation of the fact that any

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

particular problem, taken separately, should be examined in a linkage with other questions pertaining to military affairs.

In the period between World Wars I and II various viewpoints on the potential character of a future war were expressed, and a persistent search was in progress for ways to escape from the so-called "impasse of static warfare" ["pozitsionnogo tupika"] which had developed during World War I as a consequence of superiority of defensive over offensive weapons. We must state that bourgeois military theory, which at the time advanced a number of one-sided concepts -- J. Fuller's "tank warfare" and Douhet's "air war" -- was unable due to its inertia correctly to solve this problem.

It was only Soviet military science, our scientists and military command cadres who in the prewar years, guided by Lenin's statement that "one must have the ability to change the methods of combat against the adversary when the circumstances change," predicted in a well-substantiated manner the character of World War II, the forms and modes of its conduct. With a great lead over bourgeois military thinking, our military science elaborated, on the basis of a profound analysis of development trends in military affairs, a theory which was advanced for the times, the theory of the operation in depth -- a fundamentally new mode of conduct of aggressive offensive actions by technically-equipped mass armies.

In conformity with this, in 1932 the world's first large combined units [soyedineniya] of armored troops -- mechanized corps -- began to be formed in the Soviet Armed Forces. By 1936 there were four of these, which later were reorganized into tank corps. Subsequently, however, for a number of reasons incorrect conclusions were reached on the employment of tanks, conclusions grounded only on the limited experience of combat operations in Spain. As a result, by 1939 the tank corps were disbanded, and once again cavalry was specified as the exploitation echelon in operations. This situation was subsequently corrected, and in 1942 not only tank corps were established in the Soviet Army but tank armies as well, although it would have been better to have had them before the war began.

Or take, for example, the question of development of the organizational structure of armed forces. As we know, the armies of the majority of states up to the 16th century consisted primarily of regiments. Subsequently, as military affairs evolved, brigades began to be formed (17th century), and subsequently divisions as well (18th century). The rapid development of weapons, military equipment and lines of communication at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century, caused by the increased economic capabilities of many countries, inevitably led to a substantial growth in the numerical strength of armed forces. And this in turn had an immediate effect on the problem of control of large masses of troops in a theater of military operations. For this reason ground forces were organizationally divided into armies, with the objective of increasing efficiency of control and achieving full utilization of increased combat and maneuver capabilities. Armies as ground troops operational formations [operativnyye ob'yedineniya] first appeared in Russia just before the Patriotic War of 1812, and subsequently in other countries as well: in France (1813), Prussia (1866), and Japan (1904-1905).

Subsequently, with an increase in the number of armies in a single theater of military operations, increase in the scale of combat tasks, and further increase in the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

scope, intensity and duration of military operations, there arose the necessity of centralizing control of the even larger masses of troops participating in military operations. Therefore several armies began to be combined into fronts [fronty]. The idea of forming fronts appeared in Russia in 1900 and was confirmed by the experience of the Russo-Japanese War. Fronts experienced development during World War I and particularly during World War II.

Increase in the numerical strength of countries' armed forces led in turn to an increase in the spatial scope of military operations. As a result there arose a new form of military actions -- the operation [operatsiya] as an aggregate of battles [boyev] and engagements [srazheniy], separated in time and space but unified by a common concept and directed toward accomplishing a particular war objective. A war now began to consist not of a series of battles and engagements but of an aggregate of operations and campaigns [kampaniy]. Of course the operation as a form of military actions did not develop instantaneously. Its rudiments or certain elements were present as early as the Patriotic War of 1812 and in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871. The most important engagements in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 can, with certain reservations, quite definitely be called operations. Operations on the scale of the army, and subsequently the front as well, however, did not take shape until World War I, and experienced their full development in World War II.

We know that during the Great Patriotic War the front operation was the principal form of military actions by our armed forces on an operational scale. The front would advance in a zone averaging 200-300 kilometers in width and ranging from 100 to 300-400 kilometers in depth. Upon completion of a front operation a pause would usually occur, and frequently a protracted period of preparations for the next front operation. At the time this was justified and was in conformity with the weapons and means of locomotion then available.

In the course of the Great Patriotic War, however, especially in the second and third periods of the war, the manpower and weapons of a single front frequently proved insufficient to achieve large-scale military-political objectives. In connection with this it was necessary to combine the efforts of several -- two or more -- fronts. There correspondingly arose the necessity of planning several front operations executed simultaneously, unified by a common concept and under the unified control of the Supreme High Command [Verkhovnogo Glavnokomandovaniya]. Thus a new form of military operations was born, which differed significantly from the front operation -- the operation of a group of fronts. A number of such operations were prepared for and brilliantly executed during the Great Patriotic War. They include the Stalingrad, Kursk, Belorussian, Iasi-Kishinev, Vistula-Oder, Berlin, Manchurian and other operations, which have taken their rightful place in the treasure house not only of Soviet but of world art of warfare. Operations of a group of fronts experienced further development in the postwar period.

The dialectical-materialist principle of development has been graphically manifested in evolution of the forms of military operations in present-day conditions. Today the command authorities of fronts can have at their disposal weapons (missiles, missile-armed aircraft, aircraft with a considerable combat radius, etc) the combat capabilities of which substantially exceed the framework of front operations. Troop mobility and maneuverability have sharply increased, the time

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

required to concentrate battle groups has decreased, and the conditions and modes of accomplishment of operational and strategic missions by combined units and formations of the various uniformed services have changed. And with the establishment of strategic nuclear forces, the top-echelon military leadership has acquired the capability significantly to influence the achievement of strategic and military-political war aims and objectives. As a result, the previous forms of employment of combined units and formations of the different armed services have in large measure ceased to correspond to present-day conditions.

In connection with this one should evidently consider as the principal operation in the war of today not the front but rather a larger-scale form of military operations -- the theater strategic operation [strategicheskuyu operatsiyu]. In the course of such an operation each front (fleet) can conduct two or more front operations in succession, with brief pauses and even without pauses.

All this convincingly reconfirms how important it is that all scientific investigations of the processes and phenomena of military affairs be performed on a solid Marxist-Leninist methodological foundation. Only under these conditions will they produce an effective result. The party teaches us to free ourselves more boldly from the prison of inertia and narrow parochial interests, more resolutely to overcome sluggishness in our views, to note the emerging shoots of the new and progressive in a timely manner, and at the same time not to become detached from reality, to reach conclusions in a thoughtful manner, without undue haste, on the basis of thorough, practical verification, for practical application is a criterion of truth.

Profound knowledge and skilled, innovative application of the dialectic method enabled Soviet military cadres to reveal in each concrete phenomenon of military affairs the source of its development, to gain knowledge of the mechanism of birth of the new in the bosom of the old, evolutionary and revolutionary changes, as well as to elucidate trends and foresee the direction of development.

/The basic idea of a dialectical interpretation of the development of society and, consequently, the development of military affairs is expressed by the law of unity and struggle of opposites./ It is the struggle of opposites, of contradictions which constitutes the source, the motive force of development of the entire diversity of phenomena of armed combat and war as a whole. V. I. Lenin emphasized that "in the true sense dialectics is the study of contradiction /in the very essence of objects [it.]...."1

It is a well-known fact how complex and contradictory armed combat is in its essence. We are dealing here first and foremost with interrelationships and conflicts between the opposing sides, their political and strategic aims; between offense and defense; between concentration of men and weapons in limited areas in order to establish the requisite superiority on the axes of advance and the capability to destroy them with fires, and today nuclear fires as well; between armed forces need of modern weapons and combat equipment and the economic capabilities of nations to produce them, etc.

The experience of past wars persuasively attests to the fact that the development of new offensive weapons has always inevitably led to the development of corresponding

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

countermeasures, and ultimately to the development of new modes of fighting battles, engagements, operations, and a war a whole. With the rapid development of tanks, aircraft, and submarines, for example, antitank, antiaircraft and anti-submarine weapons appeared and experienced equally rapid development, along with corresponding methods of protection against these weapons and combat equipment, and consequently forms and modes of military operations.

This also applies in full measure to nuclear missile weapons, the development and rapid growth of which compelled military-scientific theory and practice to work vigorously to develop means and methods of countering these weapons. The development of means of protection against weapons of mass destruction in turn prompted the improvement of offensive nuclear missile weapons. All this confirms the conclusion that the constant and continuous contest between means of attack and means of defense and protection, that is, weapons and combat equipment, is one of the leading sources of development of military affairs as a whole.

A dialectical contradiction is manifested particularly vividly today in such a complex process as troop control [upravleniye voyskami]. At one time preparations for military campaigns took years, while in World War II it took months to prepare for front operations. In present-day conditions, where the potential adversary possesses weapons which make it possible to launch surprise attacks and execute swift maneuver and redeployment of troops, only a few weeks or even a few days can be allocated for preparation. Therefore in conditions of increasingly more highly-dynamic combat operations and nontypicalness [netipichnost'] of combat situation, greater flexibility and efficiency [operativnost'] of leadership are demanded of commanders and staffs than ever before.

Flexibility and efficiency, stability and continuity of control in turn depend in large measure on the degree of preparedness of commanders and staffs to exercise skilled leadership of subordinate troops and forces, on the validity [obosnovannosti] of their operational-tactical calculations, the practicability [real'nosti] of concepts and plans, and on their ability to respond flexibly to situation changes. Combat readiness at all echelons of command and of the entire command, control and communications system, which should be greater and more mobile than the overall readiness of the troops (forces) [voysk (sil)] is today assuming exceptional importance.

Speaking of troop (forces) control, we must direct attention to the steadily increasing role of staffs. Today staff functions have become more responsible and multifaceted than ever before. It is quite understandable that the one-man commander [komandir-yedinonachal'nik] makes the decision and bears responsibility for accomplishment of missions, but his staff is the principal organizing and linking element in the entire great aggregate of command and control activities. All this demands of the staff a high degree of teamwork, efficiency and knowledge.

In recent years automation of troop (forces) control has been increasingly more extensively applied to the activities of command cadres and staffs. The principal purpose of automation is to improve efficiency of command and control of subordinate troops (forces), efficiency and effectiveness [effektivnost'] of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

employment of weapons and military equipment, and troop (forces) combat readiness as a whole, as well as sharply to reduce expenditure of the time and resources of commanders and staff officers on technical tasks. Successful employment of new management and control hardware in turn predetermines the necessity of raising the level of military-technical training of commanders and staff officers, scientific organization of work, precise and reliable communications at all echelons of troop control. Even at the very highest level of automation, however, the commander remains the central figure, and his staff remains the principal agency in troop (forces) control.

Thus investigation, discovery and resolution of contradictions and conflicts [protivorechiy] in military realities are a most important condition for advances in military theory, the task of which consists precisely in promptly spotting imminent contradictions, seeking the most effective measures to resolve them, and thus influencing the development of military affairs.

Materialist dialectics helps our military cadres reveal not only the source but also the corresponding forms of development of a given phenomenon in the military domain. /Soviet military science determines the character and forms of development of the Armed Forces, their modes of conduct of military operations and ways of resolving other problems taking into account operation of the dialectical law of transition from quantitative to qualitative changes./

This law states that development of all objects and phenomena of nature, society and intellectual process [myshleniya] takes place by means of gradual accumulation of quantitative changes and their transformation at a certain stage into radical, qualitative changes.

For example, development of new weapons and military equipment, as already noted, leads to corresponding transformation in the modes of conduct of military operations. But this by no means takes place immediately upon the appearance of new weapons, but only when they begin to be employed in a quantity which inevitably induces a new qualitative state of the phenomenon. As long as new weapons and combat equipment are employed in limited quantity, most frequently they are merely adapted to existing modes of combat or at best introduce only certain partial amendments [korrektivy].

We know, for example, that tanks and airplanes appeared and began to be employed during World War I. However, in connection with the fact that they were few in number and lacked technical perfection, this could not and in fact did not lead to qualitative changes in the character of combat operations. Infantry, artillery and cavalry continued at that time performing the principal missions in battles, operations, and in the war as a whole. Subsequently, however, when mass production of tanks and airplanes was started up and large tank and aviation combined units and formations began to be established in the armed forces, the character of military operations changed qualitatively.

And this was reflected in the theory of the operation in depth, which consisted essentially in simultaneous suppression and neutralization [podavlenii] of the adversary's defense to its entire depth by means of artillery fire and airstrikes,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

in a determined attack and penetration of the tactical zone of defense by massing personnel and weapons on selected axes [napravleniyakh] and in swift development of tactical into operational success by committing to action powerful mobile combined units of tanks, motorized infantry, cavalry, and delivery of airborne assault forces.

In the course of the Great Patriotic War theory and practice of the operation in depth, both as a whole and individual elements, were being continuously improved and developed. In particular, quantitative growth of air forces made it possible substantially to expand the missions of aviation in offensive operations. Aviation, just as artillery, transitioned from sporadic support to continuous support of ground troops in the offense. Employment of aviation acquired the form of the air offensive [aviatsionnogo nastupleniya], which included preliminary and immediate preparation for the assault phase [predvaritel'nyu i neposredstvennyu podgotovku ataki] and close support of infantry and tanks during combat deep in the enemy's defensive positions.

In the postwar period the material-technological foundation of Soviet aviation made a large advance in its qualitative development. Piston-engine airplanes were replaced by jet aircraft. Aviation units began to receive supersonic all-weather aircraft equipped with diversified artillery, rocket-missile [raketno-] and bomb armament, and capable of reliably hitting and destroying [porazhat'] various ground and air targets at considerably greater depth than had been the case in the past. In addition, helicopters have experienced rapid development in recent decades, and are capable of performing a wide range of missions in the battle and operation: destroying various exposed and sheltered enemy ground targets, including tanks, delivering airborne assault forces, transporting troops, military equipment and various supplies, performing radiological and engineer reconnaissance, laying minefields, providing control and communications, plus others.

The gradual accumulation of quantitative changes in these new and improved existing weapons logically led to further development of existing and development of qualitatively new forms and modes of conduct of combat operations.

Operation of the dialectical law of transition from quantitative to qualitative changes was also manifested in full measure in the evolution of views on the employment of nuclear weapons. In the mid-1950's, for example, when nuclear weapons existed in limited quantity, and aircraft were the principal means of delivering them to the target, they were viewed only as a weapon capable of sharply increasing the firepower of combat troops. An effort was made to adapt these weapons to existing forms and modes of military operations, primarily strategic. In connection with this, the principal role in accomplishing combat missions continued to be played by the troops engaged in combat directly on the battlefield.

Subsequently the rapid quantitative growth of nuclear weapons of various yield and their extensive adoption in all branches [vidy] of the USSR Armed Forces and the development of rockets, including intercontinental, as a means of delivering nuclear weapons to the target, led to a radical revision of the role of these weapons and an abrupt change in former views on the place and significance of each

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

military service in war and on modes of conduct of the battle, operation, and a war as a whole.

Substantial quantitative changes on the basis of scientific and technological advances also took place in the postwar period in the Ground Forces and Navy, which led to profound qualitative changes in their state and condition [sostoyanii]. As a result of radical changes in armament, technical equipment, and organizational structure of the branches of service, the combat arms [vidov Vooruzhennykh Sil, rodov voysk] and special troops, their combat readiness and that of the Soviet Armed Forces as a whole was brought to a higher level. Soviet art of warfare experienced further development, in particular in the forms and modes of modern strategic military operations, which began to assume on the whole the character of combined operations of the Armed Forces services and the combat arms.

It is quite natural that with the quantitative and qualitative changes which are taking place in military affairs, preparation for and execution of complex modern operations predetermine new content for the system of all types of support, especially rear services and technical. The scale of such support is in no degree comparable with the operations of the past war. Today requirements in materiel have increased 10-fold and more. At the same time one must bear in mind that with today's weapons, troops can sustain heavy losses in combat equipment and weapons in the course of combat operations. This results in a manifold increase in volume of repair and maintenance of combat equipment and weapons, as well as a change in the character of repair and maintenance activities. And this in turn requires a new, improved organization of technical support of modern operations. In these conditions the performance of the home front [tyla strany] acquires particular importance, for the home front must more rapidly replenish losses of an enormous quantity of combat equipment and weapons, without which it is virtually impossible to maintain the war-fighting capability [boyesposobnost'] of the Armed Forces at the requisite level.

Not only changes in the material and technological foundation of war exert a substantial influence on the development and improvement of military affairs. An enormous influence on all aspects of military affairs is also exerted by qualitative changes in army and navy personnel. The profound sociopolitical and spiritual transformations in the life and affairs of the Soviet society and a high level of Marxist-Leninist preparation and professional knowledge on the part of our military cadres create favorable conditions for successful military-scientific cognition and practical solving of the problems of development of military affairs.

The dialectical law of transition of quantitative into qualitative changes demands heightened attention to those changes which are taking place in the armament and organizational structure of troops, in the quantitative ratios of new weapons and military equipment adopted by the military, as well as prompt and timely determination of the qualitative prospects dictated by these quantitative changes. In present-day conditions only comprehensive [kompleksnyye; also "combined"] theoretical and practical research makes it possible to determine most correctly the requisite ratios among the different Armed Forces services and arms, the requisite correlations between the quantitative and qualitative indices of the various weapons systems and military equipment, as well as armed forces groupings [gruppировок] in the theaters of military operations.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

/The characteristic development trends in military affairs are revealed by Soviet military science on the basis of the dialectical law of negation of the negation./ Characterizing the essence of this law, V. I. Lenin wrote that dialectical negation is "not bare negation... but negation as an element of linkage, as an element of development, with retention of the positive..."¹²

As experience indicates, the depth of negation can vary. In some cases elimination of that which is outmoded, obsolete, impeding further progress is accomplished while retaining the foundation of the existing. A graphic example of this is the evolution of the organizational structure of troops. As we know, such organizational units as the regiment, division, and corps were born a long time ago and have continued to exist up to the present day. Their structural content underwent change and improvement over a protracted period of time, in relation to development of weaponry, by means of negation of obsolete, outmoded elements of forms of organization in the interest of fuller and more effective, efficient utilization of the performance characteristics of new weapons and military equipment, while retaining the fundamentals of the organizational structure proper. Today's motorized rifle division, for example, while differing radically in its content and combat capabilities from the division which existed at the time of the Great Patriotic War, nevertheless has retained the general form of structure of the rifle division of that period.

In other instances negation is accomplished more profoundly and thoroughly. There occurs departure from the very foundation of the existing and the formation of a new quality on a fundamentally different basis, since no modifications of the old foundation can produce the desired result. For example, smoothbore weapons appeared in Europe in the 14th century and existed through the span of several centuries. The rapid development of industry and advances in science and technology in the 19th century made it possible to produce rifled-barrel firearms. Possessing superior performance characteristics, they almost totally supplanted smoothbore weapons, that is, negation of one type of weapon by another took place. During World War II, however, and especially in the postwar period, a totally new kind of weapon began to be provided to troops and naval forces on an ever increasing scale -- smoothbore (rocket launchers, antitank guided missiles, and all other types of rockets and missiles). Possessing excellent combat performance and mobility characteristics, these weapons are already beginning to replace and even in certain measure to eliminate rifled-bore weapons. In other words, we are observing operation of the law of materialist dialectics; we have here a dialectical chain of negation, where one type of weapon is negated by another, although all positive elements which were inherent in the old weapon are retained and are continuing to improve.

An analogous situation is occurring in development of the branches of service and combat arms. In the era of feudalism a cavalry of mounted knights, in which the horsemen were protected by suits of armor, while their mounts were also covered by protective metal armor, was considered the main striking power in the armies of the European countries. With the invention of firearms when, to use the graphic expression of F. Engels, "bullets from burghers' guns pierced knights' suits of armor," this cavalry lost its striking power, and its negation took place. It was replaced by cavalry freed of heavy protective gear which had lost its significance. Cavalry became more mobile, highly maneuverable, while firearms enabled

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

cavalrymen to wage battle successfully not only mounted but dismounted as well. Such cavalry was widely used in this country in World War I and especially during the civil war, for offensive exploitation, for mounting counterthrusts in the defense, as well as actions behind enemy lines and disrupting the enemy's lines of communication.

With the development of rapid-fire automatic weapons, however, and in connection with the rapid development of aircraft and tanks, the role of the cavalry began to diminish sharply, and during World War II it could not longer utilize its combat characteristics with the past success. The cavalry had exhausted its potential as a combat arm. It is therefore quite logical that it was supplanted by a new combat arm -- armored and mechanized troops, which possess a qualitatively different technical foundation and incomparably greater firepower, striking power, and mobility. In other words, what took place was negation with replacement of the very foundation of the existing. Of course the process of negation does not end with this, however. As we know, at the present time diversified means of combating tanks, including air weapons, are experiencing rapid development. They have already achieved a quantitative and qualitative state which imperatively demands a careful study of the trends in and consequences of their development. And it is dangerous to ignore this trend.

Operation of the law of negation of the negation can also be clearly traced in the example of the navy, which evolved from oar-powered to sail-powered vessels, from sail to steam power, diesel power and, finally, to modern nuclear-powered guided missile warships.

An analysis of development of the art of warfare in the postwar period also enables one to identify a number of general characteristic patterns, among which are the following.

First, the scientific and technological revolution, which imposes heightened demands on the qualitative characteristics of military equipment and weapons and on the search for new modes and forms of conduct of combat operations, is exerting increasing influence on the evolution of military affairs.

Second, there is taking place an acceleration in the pace of development of military equipment and weapons, with a shortening of the time intervals between qualitative leaps forward in the development of various areas of military affairs, which in turn is affecting the pace of development of military affairs as a whole.

Third, there is taking place an increase in the importance of strategic weapons, which are today capable of exerting direct influence on the course and outcome of a war, and consequently the importance of operational-strategic command and control agencies [organov upravleniya] is also increasing.

Fourth, troop control processes are becoming more complex, which requires a fundamentally new approach to the organization of structurally precise control systems and providing them with the requisite modern control hardware [tekhnika upravleniya].

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

And finally, the air domain [vozdushnaya sfera], which gives modern operations a three-dimensional character and depth, is assuming an ever increasing role in combat actions and operations.

Thus development of military affairs takes place in strict conformity with the demands of the objective laws of materialist dialectics. /In connection with this it is extremely important that our military cadres thoroughly master Marxist-Leninist methodology and on this basis be able comprehensively to analyze the development of military affairs in the past, in the present and, most important -- be able to see and understand the future prospects of military affairs./ One should bear in mind thereby that the development of each phenomenon of military affairs takes place not in an isolated manner and is determined by the operation not of some one law of dialectics, but as a rule by the entire aggregate of laws, for each law exerts its own specific characteristic. Therefore each process in the military area must be examined in an interrelationship as a link in the overall chain of forward development of military affairs as a whole.

We know, for example, that bourgeois military-political circles, of fascist Germany in particular, when making preparations for World War II, counted principally on the element of blitzkrieg. In contrast to this, Soviet military science, innovatively applying Marxist-Leninist methodology in elaboration of questions pertaining to defense of the socialist homeland under new conditions, in the 1930's reached the valid conclusion that a future war which the imperialists might unleash against the USSR would be of a protracted nature and would demand maximum exertion of all the nation's material and spiritual resources, that aggressive and highly-mobile forms of combat would predominate in such a war, and military operations would take place over vast expanses of territory. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against fascist Germany fully confirmed the correctness of this conclusion. A correct answer to the question of the potential character of this war enabled the Communist Party and Soviet Government to determine in a prompt and timely manner the appropriate directions of organizational development of our Armed Forces, preparation of the Armed Forces and the nation as a whole for the future war against the forces of imperialism, and to lay down the foundations of our great victory.

In the 1970's, as a result of the consistent and unswerving struggle by the Soviet Union to implement the Peace Program advanced at the 24th and further developed at the 25th CPSU Congress and the coordinated foreign policy activity of the brother nations of the socialist community, through enormous efforts on the part of all progressive mankind success was achieved in channeling the development of international relations toward détente and peaceful cooperation between countries with differing social systems. A tragic cycle -- a world war followed by a brief respite of peace followed by another world war -- was broken precisely in those years.

The absence of a fatal inevitability of war, however, by no means signifies elimination of the possibility of a war occurring in the contemporary era, the principal conflict of which is the conflict between socialism and capitalism. "The transition from capitalism to communism," wrote V. I. Lenin in 1918, "is an entire historical era. Until it ends, the exploiters will inevitably retain a hope of restoration, and this /hope [it.]/ is transformed into /attempts [it.]/ at restoration."¹³

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

This has once again been quite clearly confirmed at the beginning of the 1980's, when imperialist circles in the United States and certain other NATO countries have sharply complicated international affairs with their reckless, militant policy, and today are continuing to push peoples toward a world thermonuclear catastrophe. The spearhead of the aggressive course of policy on the part of imperialism and its accomplices has been and continues to be aimed chiefly against the Soviet Union and the brother socialist nations.

Under these conditions the CPSU, following Lenin's teaching on defense of the socialist homeland, is continuously and purposefully working to strengthen the defense might of the USSR and to achieve further development of the Soviet Armed Forces. It proceeds thereby from a scientific analysis of the potential character of a war which imperialism, contrary to common sense, may force upon our nation.

/In present-day conditions a war, if the aggressive forces of imperialism succeed in unleashing a war against the USSR and the other nations of the socialist community, will become a decisive armed conflict between two diametrically opposed social systems -- capitalism and socialism./ In order to carry out their aggressive schemes, the imperialist nations have established in peacetime and are continuing to establish and strengthen a system of military blocs, particularly NATO. Therefore if it does come to war, it will assume a coalition character from the very outset and will pursue decisive political and strategic aims. On the part of the USSR and the brother socialist countries it will be a war in defense of the socialist homeland, the freedom and independence of their peoples, and therefore it will be a profoundly just war. On the part of the forces of imperialism and reaction, a war started by them, as a continuation of their aggressive policy aimed at the elimination of socialism and enslavement of the peoples of the nations of the socialist community, will be of an unjust, predatory character to the highest degree.

In discussing the scale and scope of contemporary wars, we should emphasize that a dialectical trend can also be seen here, which can be fairly clearly traced in historical facts.

The Russo-Japanese War is considered to be the first major war of the era of imperialism. This was an imperialist, unjust war on both sides. It was fought in a limited area of the Liaodong and Shandong peninsulas, the Yellow Sea and the Sea of Japan by two nations. By war's end the total number of participating troops amounted to approximately 1.5 million men. The war lasted more than a year and a half.

World War I, which began among eight European nations (Germany and Austro-Hungary, and their adversaries -- Great Britain, France, Russia, Belgium, Serbia, and Montenegro), gradually involved 38 countries. In the course of the war approximately 70 million men were mobilized into the armies of the belligerent nations. The war lasted more than four years.

A total of 61 countries and more than 80 percent of the Earth's population were drawn into World War II, the largest war in history, prepared for and initiated by the forces of international reaction. Military operations were conducted on the territory of Europe, Asia, and Africa (40 countries), and on the vast expanses of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the Atlantic, Arctic, Pacific, and Indian oceans. In the course of the war more than 110 million men were called into the armed forces of the belligerent nations. The war lasted 6 years.¹⁴

As we know, in the war of today [v sovremennoy voyne] imperialist circles are counting primarily on nuclear missile weapons in their various modifications, including neutron weapons. Employment of modern weapons can result in military operations encompassing all continents of the world from the very outset. Many hundreds of millions of people will inescapably be drawn into the the maelstrom of such a war, initiated by imperialism. It cannot be compared with any wars of the past in its fierceness, scale of human casualties and possible physical destruction.

As we know, the Soviet Union possesses nuclear missile weapons in its arsenal. But it threatens nobody with these weapons and does not seek to employ nuclear blackmail. On the contrary, since the very inception of nuclear weapons it has been the USSR which has waged and continues to wage a persistent campaign for reduction and total elimination of nuclear arms. "...We are against the employment of nuclear weapons," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has stated repeatedly, "but extreme circumstances [chrezvychaynyye obstoyatel'stva] and aggression against our country or its allies by another [drugoy] nuclear power and could [mogut] force us to resort to this extreme means of self-defense. The Soviet Union is doing and will continue to do everything it can to prevent a nuclear war, so that peoples do not become victims of nuclear attacks -- neither the first strike nor subsequent strikes."¹⁵

At the same time the Communist parties and governments of the USSR and the other nations of the socialist community are closely watching development of the international situation and the intrigues of world imperialism and are taking all necessary measures to strengthen their defense and to ensure that any aggression is reliably repulsed.

The Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole presently possess an adequate defense potential to defend their interests against encroachments by imperialism. A unity of political and economic goals, integration of economies, coordination [soglasovannost'] of foreign policy and measures in military organizational development, the moral-political unity and fraternal alliance of the peoples of our countries, the guiding and directing activity of the Communist parties -- all this, blended together, comprises an enormous force which enables us reliably to withstand any aggression.

In connection with the substantial changes which are taking place in weaponry and in modes of preparing for and conducting combat operations, naturally many of the fundamental theses which guide our military cadres in the practical business of operational, combat and political training of troops and naval forces are being further refined on a systematic basis. In other words, the organizational structure of troops and control agencies is being continuously improved and military-theoretical thought is being continuously developed on the basis of changes in the material and technological foundation of the Soviet Armed Forces and its further development prospects; training of military cadres and field, air and sea training

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of Army, Air Force and Navy personnel are organized and constructed taking this into account.

/Development of our Armed Forces is being carried out in a planned and orderly manner [planomernoye] in order to ensure reliable national defense, prompt and expeditious repulsing of an aggressor./ Special attention is devoted thereby to those forces and weapons [sily i sredstva] which ensure the combat power of the army and navy to the greatest degree.

The chief component of this power in present-day conditions are the strategic nuclear forces, which serve as the principal factor restraining the aggressor and which possess the capability, in case the aggressor initiates against the Soviet Union and the other nations of the socialist community a war with the employment of nuclear weapons, of immediately delivering a crushing response strike. Firing of land-based and sea-launched ballistic missiles is automated. Their performance characteristics provide the capability to strike enemy targets situated in virtually any part of the world and with a sufficiently high degree of accuracy.

The Ground Forces -- the most numerous and essentially the principal [osnovnoy] branch of our Armed Forces -- are constantly being improved. Today their firepower is comprised of tactical and operational-tactical rocket-artillery weapons, which are capable of hitting and destroying targets at distances of from tens to hundreds of kilometers. Today there is no infantry in the old definition of the term in the USSR Armed Forces. Infantry is fully motorized and protected by armor. In today's motorized rifle division the salvo throw weight and total engine horsepower are tens of times greater than those at the time of the Great Patriotic War. A division has hundreds of tanks, hundreds of infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers, and a large number of trucks. Modern tanks are capable of hitting virtually with the first round moving armored targets at ranges of several kilometers. Airborne troops have experienced further development. All this ensures the conduct of operations and battles with a rapid rate of advance and rapid deep exploitation.

The Air Forces, as a highly-mobile branch of the Armed Forces, are equipped with supersonic aircraft with automated weapon and flight control systems, with powerful propulsion units, and are armed with diversified rocket and bomb armament. The principal frontal aviation [frontovoy aviatsii] combined unit is the division, which contains approximately the same number of combat aircraft as was contained in the aviation corps during the Great Patriotic War.

The Air Defense Forces [voyskakh PVO] are equipped with sophisticated means of warning of a missile attack, multichannel surface-to-air missile systems with a high degree of resistance to jamming and effectiveness in hitting air targets within a broad range of altitudes, as well as first-class air intercept systems [aviatsionnyye komplekсы perekhvata] and radiotechnical [radiotekhnicheskiye; radar and other electronics] systems.

The Naval Forces have been developing particularly rapidly in the postwar period. Today nuclear-powered submarines carrying a diversified arsenal of missile and torpedo weapons, as well as missile-armed naval aviation comprise the foundation of the combat power of the Naval Forces. Modern surface units and submarines carry

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

powerful armament, possess incomparably greater speed capabilities than in the past, and possess greater endurance [avtonomnost'yu plavaniya] -- several months. Capabilities to put amphibious assault forces ashore have also increased greatly.

The character and features of today's nuclear missile war impose heightened demands on the combat, moral-political and psychological training of army and navy personnel. The basic principle of this training has remained and continues to remain unchanged. To learn that which is necessary in war, to learn to defeat a powerful, technically-equipped adversary in any and all conditions of modern war. Thorough knowledge and consummate mastery of weapons and combat equipment, excellent intellectual qualities, firm ideological-political conditioning, deep conviction of the rightness of the party's cause, and the ability to withstand unprecedented moral and physical stresses, to retain the will to achieve victory over the enemy in any and all conditions have assumed increased significance today. These qualities are developed in servicemen in the course of intensive peacetime combat and political training, on the basis of Lenin's demands that "intensified military training for a serious war requires not the burst of enthusiasm, not the shout of encouragement, not the fighting slogan, but protracted, intense, highly persistent and disciplined work on a mass scale."¹⁶

Training of officer cadres is a most important factor in boosting the level of army and navy combat readiness. The Soviet officer is first and foremost a patriot of the homeland, who is deeply convinced of the correctness of the ideas of communism, a highly skilled and qualified military specialist, and leader of a military collective [voinskogo kollektiva]. A statement made by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev from the speaker's stand at the 26th CPSU Congress, on the necessity of each and every leader developing "a work style in which efficiency and follow-through [ispolnitel'nost'], discipline, bold initiative and enterprise are organically combined, in which practicality and businesslike efficiency [delovitost'] are organically combined with a striving toward large goals,"¹⁷ applies in full measure to our military cadres. At the same time the specific features of military service also impose on officer cadres many additional specific demands, the principal demands among which are the following: commander volition and organizing ability, a high level of professional proficiency, general and military-technical knowledge [kul'tura], the ability to teach and indoctrinate subordinates, plus others. Only if he possesses all these qualities will each officer be able to ensure a high level of combat and mobilization readiness of the troops (forces) under his command.

Toward these ends an entire aggregate of activities are conducted each year in the Armed Forces, at which commanders, staff officers and political agency officers, in complex conditions approximating actual combat, learn to organize and conduct modern operations and battles, as well as troop control.

A special place in organizational development of the Soviet Armed Forces is occupied by party-political work, which encompasses literally all areas of military life and activities. V. I. Lenin attached exceptional importance to party-political work. He considered it to be an integral part of general party work and demanded that it be conducted steadfastly, without relaxing effort for a single day. Everyone is familiar with his statement that "wherever party policy is implemented most rigorously... wherever discipline is most firm, wherever political work in the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

troops is conducted most conscientiously... there will be no slackness in the army, there will be better smartness and spirit, and there will be more victories."¹⁸

A central position in party-political work is occupied by ideological work, ideological-political indoctrination of personnel, the forming of a Marxist-Leninist philosophical outlook and profound Communist conviction in personnel. Strengthening of military discipline as one of the most important components of the combat readiness of units and combined units is a focal point of daily concern on the part of political agencies and party organizations.

Matters pertaining to strengthening the nation's defense capability, further development and comprehensive improvement of the armed forces continuously occupy the center of attention on the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government and are handled through the joint efforts of the USSR Ministry of Defense, the ministries of the defense branches of industry, many scientific establishments, party and soviet agencies of the republics, krais and oblasts, all branches of service and the combat arms.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 24 June 1981.
2. "KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh s"yezdov, konferentsiy i plenumov TsK" [The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums], Moscow, 1972, Vol 10, page 145.
3. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 26, page 75.
4. K. Marks and F. Engel's, "Soch." [Writings], Vol 21, page 361.
5. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 37, page 118.
6. See "Iz istorii grazhdanskoj vojny v SSSR" [From the History of the Civil War in the USSR], Moscow, 1960, Vol 1, page 58.
7. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 42, page 290.
8. Ibid., Vol 40, pp 284-285.
9. Ibid., Vol 1, page 181.
10. Marks and Engel's, op. cit., Vol 20, page 176.
11. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 29, page 227.
12. Ibid., Vol 29, page 207.
13. Ibid., Vol 37, page 264.
14. See "Sovetskaya Voyennaya Entsiklopediya" [Soviet Military Encyclopedia], Moscow, 1978, Vol 6, page 265; Moscow, 1976, Vol 2, pp 409, 417.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

15. L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom: rechi, privetstviya, stat'i, vospominaniya" [Following a Leninist Course: Speeches, Messages of Greeting, Articles, Reminiscences], Moscow, 1979, Vol 7, page 300.
16. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 36, page 325.
17. "Materialy XXVI s"yezda KPSS" [Proceedings of the 26th CPSU Congress], page 51.
18. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 39, page 56.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Chapter Three. DEFENSE OF THE SOCIALIST HOMELAND -- THE CONCERN
OF ALL THE PEOPLE

Defense of the socialist homeland is an objective historical necessity and a most important condition of building communism. "...Having commenced our peacetime construction," stated V. I. Lenin, "we shall make every effort to ensure that it continues without interruption. At the same time, comrades, be alert: guard the defense capability of our country and our Red Army as the apple of your eye...."¹ History has fully confirmed the correctness of the precepts of our great leader. The ideas of defense of the socialist homeland elaborated by V. I. Lenin form the basis of Soviet military doctrine.

As we know, /military doctrine is defined as the system of views adopted in a given country for a given (specific) time, on the objectives and character of a potential future war, on preparation of the country and its armed forces for such a war, and on the modes of its conduct./ The military doctrine of any nation answers the following fundamental questions: what is the degree of probability of a future war, and with what adversary will one be dealing? What character may be assumed by a war which a country and its armed forces would be fighting [predstoit vesti]? What goals and tasks can be assigned to the armed forces in anticipation [predvideni] of such a war and what armed forces must the country possess in order to achieve the stated goals? Proceeding from this, how should one accomplish military organizational development and prepare the army and country for war? Finally, if a war breaks out, by what modes and methods [sposobami] should it be fought?

As is evident from the above, a nation's military doctrine contains two closely interlinked and interdependent aspects -- the sociopolitical, and the military-technical aspect. The sociopolitical aspect encompasses questions pertaining to the methodological, economic, social and legal foundations of the political objectives of a war. It is determining and possesses the greatest stability, since it reflects the class essence and political goals of a given nation, which are relatively constant during an extended period of time. The military-technical aspect, in conformity with the political goals, includes questions pertaining to direct accomplishment of military organizational development, technical equipping and training of the armed forces, and determination of the forms and modes of conduct of operations and a war as a whole. The political and military-technical views expressed in military doctrines are not permanent. As the international situation changes and as society and military affairs evolve, they are periodically refined.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Military doctrine is a historical category. Originally it was formed empirically, not on the basis of a profound analysis of the objective laws of war. In the course of the socioeconomic development of society and military affairs, especially with the appearance of mass regular armies, individual theses and principles of preparing a country and its army for war and the modes of its conduct began to be elaborated and classified, taking amassed combat experience into account. One must note thereby that bourgeois military thought, correctly noticing the general trends in development of military affairs, at the same time in most cases is unable deeply to reveal and comprehend the objective laws of war, let alone consider their influence on the conduct of war.

In World War I, for example, Germany, grossly ignoring the objective laws of war, set as its objective division of the world by force and the seizure of colonies, clearly failing to take into consideration that country's actual military-economic capabilities. The military doctrine of czarist Russia of that period was also expansionistic and of a contradictory character: military tasks were to be accomplished by numerically large armed forces, but with an inadequate quantity of weapons and a poor level of arms technology.

Prior to World War II Hitlerite Germany was openly pursuing an extremely reactionary policy aimed at gaining world domination, which was expressed in Germany's military doctrine, which specified the surprise attack, "blitzkrieg" conduct of military operations, seizure of vast territories of other countries, their natural and other resources, and mass annihilation of the civilian population. The hostility to the people and adventurism contained in this doctrine, overestimation of Germany's own military-economic capabilities and underestimation of the political, economic and military capabilities of its adversaries, the Soviet Union in particular, ultimately brought fascism to defeat.

As we know, the military doctrines of the United States, Great Britain and France in World War II, reflecting the interests of the ruling classes, pursued a principal goal of defeating their economic adversaries -- Germany and Japan -- of weakening to the greatest possible degree their anti-Hitler coalition ally -- the Soviet Union -- and thus securing for themselves a position of world domination. In conformity with these views, the strategic plans of these countries were ambivalent and conflictive throughout the entire war.

After World War II the military doctrines of the leading capitalist nations, the United States in particular, underwent a number of specific changes, in relation to the correlation of forces in the world arena. All of them, however, inalterably were and continue to be of a clearly-marked aggressive nature, reflecting the reactionary political aims of imperialism. Containing an anti-Soviet, anti-democratic thrust, the military doctrines of the United States and the other NATO countries specify achieving at all costs military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union and the other nations of the socialist community, dictating their will on the peoples of the world from a position of strength and ruling their destiny as the United States and the NATO countries see fit.

Thus there is expressed in the military doctrines of the capitalist nations a desire to perpetuate the rule of the exploiter classes within their countries, to destroy or maximally weaken the world socialist system, and economically and politically to enslave other nations.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

/Soviet military doctrine/ is a system of guiding principles and scientifically substantiated views of the CPSU and the Soviet Government on the essence, character and modes of fighting a war which may be forced by the imperialists on the Soviet Union, as well as on military organizational development, training and preparing the Armed Forces and the nation to crush the aggressor.

The ideological-theoretical foundation of Soviet military doctrine is Marxism-Leninism. Its content proceeds from the objective necessity of defending the socialist homeland against imperialist aggressors. Soviet military doctrine is grounded on the laws and theses of historical and dialectical materialism, Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army, and the conclusions of Soviet military science.

The military doctrine of the USSR and the other nations of the socialist community is grounded on progressive, just ideas of defense of the socialist achievements of the workers, peace and security of peoples.

Proceeding from this, one can easily see that the directional thrust of the doctrines of countries of opposing sociopolitical systems is fundamentally different and is always of a class character.

/The sociopolitical content of Soviet military doctrine/ is grounded on Marxist-Leninist teaching and proceeds from the character of the governmental and societal system of the USSR, the policy of the party and Soviet state, and the root interests of the Soviet people. Also proceeding from this are the fundamental principles of military organizational development in the USSR, which is carried out in strict conformity with CPSU policy in the military area, taking into account development of this country's economic, scientific, and moral-political potential, the cultural level and national traditions of the Soviet people. It is precisely this which in the final analysis always has determined and continues to determine the character of the Soviet Armed Forces, their power and invincibility.

The sociopolitical content of our military doctrine fully takes into account the radical changes in the correlation of forces in the international arena, the sociopolitical, economic and military capabilities of the countries of the socialist community, and the necessity of collective defense of these countries from potential aggressive aspirations on the part of the forces of imperialism and reaction. It includes points which reveal the sociopolitical essence of the contemporary war which the aggressor may force upon us, and it is expressed extremely clearly and precisely by the following statement by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev: "...We do not seek military superiority. It has never been and is not now our intention to threaten any other country or group of countries. Our strategic doctrine has a particularly defensive directional thrust."²

Scientifically substantiated theses on the moral-political and psychological preparation of Soviet citizens constitute a most important component part of the sociopolitical content of the military doctrine of the Soviet State. Our military doctrine views the forming of a high moral-political potential in the Soviet people, alongside the advantages of the economic and political system of the society of developed socialism, as one of the life-giving sources of its superiority over the forces of aggression.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

/The military-technical content of Soviet military doctrine/ encompasses a broad range of questions pertaining to organizational development, training and maintaining the Soviet Armed Forces at a high degree of combat readiness. It includes questions pertaining to improving and perfecting their technical equipment, organizational structure, and control system; improving the field, air and sea proficiency of troops, air and naval forces taking into account the character and specific features of the war of today; further development of Soviet art of warfare [voyennogo iskusstva]. In other words, this aspect of doctrine defines the ways, means and methods of accomplishing tasks pertaining to reliable defense of the socialist homeland, tasks assigned to the Armed Forces by this country's political leaders.

One of the main directions in increasing the combat readiness of the Armed Forces is a high level of their technical equipment, that is, furnishing the troops and naval forces with modern military equipment and weapons. The presently achieved level of development of the socialist economy enables us successfully to accomplish the most technically complex defense tasks and to design and build [sozdat'] in short order any weapon [vid oruzhiya] on which the enemies of peace would seek to place their hopes [sdelat' stavku].

A most important point of the military-technical content of Soviet military doctrine, dictated by the rapid development of nuclear missile weapons and the possibility of a surprise attack by the enemy employing these weapons, is the demand that the USSR Armed Forces be maintained at a high state of combat readiness, ensuring their prompt and expeditious deployment in order to repulse an enemy sneak attack, to deliver powerful response strikes on the enemy, and to achieve successful accomplishment of the assigned missions pertaining to defense of the socialist homeland. The point is to be able not simply to defend oneself, to oppose the aggressor with appropriate passive means and methods of defense but also to deliver devastating response strikes on the aggressor and to defeat the enemy in any situation conditions.

Thus the content of Soviet military doctrine in its most general form reduces to the following: predatory wars are alien to the Soviet Union as a socialist state; it never has attacked and is not now planning to attack any nation, either in the West or in the East, in the North or South to establish its own dominion or to change the existing societal system in other countries. Nor does the Soviet Union have any need to extend its borders. But it will defend with full resolve, vigorously and uncompromisingly that which belongs to the Soviet people and has been created by their labor. For this reason the peace-loving character of the foreign policy of the Soviet State and its constant readiness resolutely to repulse any aggressor are coalesced in the military doctrine of the USSR.

As we know, it is inadvisable [netselesoobrazno; also -- inexpedient] to maintain in peacetime Armed Forces which are fully deployed in the strength required in case of war. No nation is economically capable of doing this, nor is there any particular need to do so. Therefore in this country, in conditions of peacetime development [mirnogo stroitel'stva], just as in other countries, a certain portion of the Armed Forces is in a continuous state of readiness, that is, is at full strength in personnel and military equipment, while another portion is ready for rapid mobilization deployment. Hence /a high degree of combat readiness of troops

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

and naval forces is inconceivable without well organized mobilization preparation, directed toward ensuring prompt and timely shifting of military forces from a peacetime to a war footing. If an aggressor initiates war, the trained and prepared personnel and equipment resources assigned to the various combined units and units should reach them quickly and without delay. Therefore the task of achieving continuous preparedness for the immediate mobilization deployment of troops and naval forces, prompt and expeditious shifting of the Armed Forces and the entire national economy from a peacetime to a war footing [voyennoye polozheniye] is assuming particular national importance.

In most countries mobilization as a system began to be employed with the establishment of mass armies at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century, as a rule on the basis of universal compulsory military service. The wars of the beginning of the 20th century introduced substantial changes into matters pertaining to mobilization, especially World War I, which required the inflow of enormous manpower resources into the armies of the belligerent nations as well as great exertion on the part of a country's economy. Railroads, communications, shipyards and steamship companies, the financial system, the achievements of science and technology had to be placed in the service of the war effort. In other words, there was a sharp increase in the dependence of direct military capabilities on a country's economy.

The beginning and the course of World War II brought additional changes into the concept of mobilization and revealed to an even greater degree the direct link between carrying out mobilization and deployment of armed forces and shifting the entire economy over to a war footing and reorganizing nations' political, social, scientific, and other institutions. The greater part of the economy and a nation's resources was enlisted to provide for the direct needs of the war effort. Suffice it to cite the following example. In the last war approximately 90 percent of the material requirements of the armed forces of the belligerent nations was met with goods produced after the war began, as a result of mobilization of the economy. Thus, reducing the time required to accomplish mobilization and ensuring an orderly changeover of the economy to a war footing became most important problems.

As we know, in previous wars the question of mobilization deployment was not so acute. The weapons at nations' disposal and the comparatively low degree of troop mobility and maneuverability, even in the case of a sneak attack, essentially could not thwart an army's mobilization deployment [mobilizatsionnoye razvertyvaniye], let alone predetermine the course and outcome of a war.

The situation has become sharply altered in present-day conditions. The element of surprise [vnezapnosti] already played a certain role in World War II. Today it is becoming a factor of the greatest strategic importance. The question of prompt and expeditious shifting of the Armed Forces and the entire national economy to a war footing and their mobilization deployment in a short period of time is much more critical today. Therefore capability to furnish the troops and naval forces with trained and prepared resources of personnel and equipment and prompt changeover of the economy to the production of goods according to a wartime plan predetermine the necessity of precisely planned measures in peacetime and coordinated actions on the part of party, soviet and military agencies locally. The success of organized entry by the Armed Forces into a war and defeat of the aggressor will depend in large measure on full and high-quality execution of all these measures.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In the interests of increasing the nation's defense capability, coordination between mobilization deployment of the Armed Forces and the national economy as a whole is required today as never before, especially in utilization of manpower resources, transportation, communications, the power industry, and in ensuring the stability and survivability of the nation's entire vast economic mechanism. Essential in connection with this is a constant search in the area of improving the system of co-production among enterprises producing the principal types of weapons, making them more self-reliant [avtonomnosti] in energy and water supply, securement of requisite stockpiles, and establishment of a reserve supply of equipment and materials in case of war. Further improvement is also needed within the system of mobilization readiness of the national economy, proceeding from the position that a close interlinkage between the mobilization readiness of the Armed Forces, the national economy and Civil Defense is a most important condition for maintaining at the proper level our country's defense capability as a whole.

Concentration of all resources for achieving the stated goals, taking into account the greatly changed conditions of modern warfare and the complexity of mobilization deployment, is impossible without a stable system of centralized leadership of the country and the Armed Forces. Our country has certain experience in this area. Our country's State Defense Committee [Gosudarstvennyy Komitet Oborony] as well as the defense committees in cities in the combat zone, established during the Great Patriotic War, fully proved themselves. In a war today, if the imperialists force a war upon us, there will quite naturally be the need for an even higher concentration of leadership (management and control [upravleniya]), and evidently not only in combat-zone areas as was the case in the last war. In connection with this there is a substantial increase in the role and significance of corresponding local agencies [mestnykh organov], which in time of war could be in charge of all work connected with handling mobilization matters, territorial defense [territorial'noy oborony] tasks, execution of measures pertaining to civil defense, plus others.

Devoting constant attention toward providing the Soviet Armed Forces with modern weapons and combat equipment, our party does not forget for a single minute the precept of V. I. Lenin that the Soviet people are the most important component part of the combat power of the Armed Forces and the principal author of victory. It is precisely they who appear before the world as bearers of the insuperable moral strength of the Soviet society and its enormous spiritual potential. Therefore consolidation in the consciousness of the working people, especially the younger generation, of the ideas of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, pride in the Soviet land, in our homeland, readiness [gotovnosti] to stand to the defense of the achievements of socialism has been and continues to be one of our main tasks.

A high level of technical equipment of the army and navy imposes tough demands on quality of training and preparation [podgotovki] of induction-age youth, for the combat readiness of our Armed Forces and the nation's overall defense capability depend to a considerable degree on the availability and quality of military-trained reserves. One must bear in mind and take into account thereby that for a number of reasons not all induction-age individuals are conscripted into the Armed Forces in peacetime; there always remain on reserve status a substantial number of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

citizens who have not gone through active military service. In World War I, for example, the percentages of such individuals in relation to the total number of military registered persons were: in Russia -- approximately 80 percent, in Germany -- approximately 60 percent; in France -- 54 percent. In addition, in recent years the term of active military service in this country has been substantially reduced, while equipment and weapons have become substantially more complex. It is frankly difficult today to find a suitable job assignment for an uneducated individual in military units and on naval ships. Only persons with an adequate general educational level and sufficient technical training are capable of operating today's complex, in most cases crew-served combat equipment and weapons.

In this country preparation and accumulation of military-trained reserves is accomplished chiefly by having young men go through active military service in the USSR Armed Forces. In addition, young people receive appropriate basic military training [nachal'nyuy voyennuy podgotovku] at secondary schools and higher educational institutions, within the vocational and technical training system, and in DOSAAF organizations.

The continuous development and improvement of weapons and combat equipment and their relatively rapid replacement by new generations of equipment also demand that reserve-status officers, warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted personnel study them in a prompt, timely and thorough manner and learn to operate them with an adequate degree of skill.

The question of training and preparing the reserves essential for reliable defense of the socialist homeland is organically linked with preparation of Soviet youth for military service in the ranks of the Armed Forces. The enormous importance of national defense is emphasized in the USSR Constitution, which states that defense of the socialist homeland is one of the most important functions of the state and is the concern of the entire people, the sacred duty of each and every citizen of the USSR. The Fundamental Law also states that military service in the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces is the honorable obligation of Soviet citizens.

Also proceeding from this are the corresponding obligations not only of local party, soviet and military agencies, their responsibility for matters pertaining to reliable defense of our country, but also the personal responsibility of each and every Soviet citizen for the fate of the homeland.

An important role in this respect is played by the basic military training which youths receive prior to induction into the military at general-curriculum schools, vocational and technical schools, at training facilities [uchebnykh punktakh] of enterprises, establishments [uchrezhdeniy], kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and in DOSAAF organizations. Amassed experience in conducting such training indicates that young people who have received basic military training adjust more rapidly to the general routine of military service, more successfully master combat equipment and weapons, become excellent performers [otlichnikami] in combat and political training, as well as proficiency-rated specialists [klassnymi spetsialistami]. Therefore many officials of party and soviet agencies, enterprises, organizations and educational institutions, together with military commissariats, show constant care and concern for selection of military training officer [voyenrukov] cadres, for establishment and improvement of training facilities [uchebno-material'noy bazy], and exercise regular oversight over the organization and conduct of classes within the basic military training system.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The conditions of military labor in peacetime, and especially in time of war, demand of Armed Forces personnel a high degree of physical conditioning. The fact that the army and navy are equipped with sophisticated hardware, transport vehicles, and diversified mechanisms by no means lessens demands on the physical conditioning of servicemen. These demands increase to an even greater extent if we additionally consider psychological stresses.

We must state that in the majority of our republics, krays and oblasts much is being done to improve the overall physical conditioning of our young people. Great attention is devoted to organization of activities connected with meeting the performance standards of the "Prepared for Labor and Defense of the USSR" All-Union Sports Complex and the holding of championships in GTO [Prepared for Labor and Defense] multiple competition. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case everywhere. In some areas and localities they prefer to work only with those who have already achieved a high sports performance category, and fail to show adequate interest in mass military sports activities and in training those who should be in good physical condition for the defense of our homeland. Therefore it was quite correctly noted at the 26th CPSU Congress that aside from the outstanding achievements of Soviet athletes, for the majority of our citizens sports remain merely an armchair spectacle, and that the situation must be rectified. Propagandizing of sports frequently boils down merely to demonstrating their beneficial effect on one's health, but at the same time it is insufficiently stressed that sports also possess enormous applied military [voyenno-prikladnoye] significance and help form the character and personality [lichnosti] of the serviceman -- defender of the homeland.

Nor is it mere happenstance that the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers, in the decree entitled "On a Further Increase in Mass Participation in Physical Culture and Sports" (September 1981), stress that "the main task of the physical culture movement and the entire physical education system is to promote in every possible way strengthening of the health of Soviet citizens, improving their work efficiency and labor productivity and preparedness to defend the homeland and the achievements of socialism, and forming of excellent moral qualities...."³ In conditions of developed socialism, physical culture should in every possible way promote growth of the nation's economic and defense potential.

In examining the question of preparing youth for military service, one should particularly note the importance of a good knowledge of the Russian language. Unfortunately a good many young people are still entering the military today with a poor knowledge of Russian, which seriously impedes their military training. As we know, in the Armed Forces all regulations, field manuals, training manuals, equipment and weapon instruction, operating and maintenance manuals are in Russian. Orders, instructions and commands are also given in Russian. It is quite understandable that if young men have a poor knowledge of Russian, it is more difficult for them to master the weapons and equipment entrusted to their care, achievement of smooth teamwork on the part of weapon, equipment and vehicle crews proceeds much more slowly, and all this also has to some extent a negative effect on the degree of continuous combat readiness of subunits.

The interests of strengthening national defense demand further intensification of work in the area of indoctrinating working people, and especially youth, in a spirit of Soviet patriotism. In conformity with the CPSU Central Committee decree

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

entitled "On Further Improvement of Ideological and Political-Indoctrination Work" (April 1979), the tasks of military-patriotic indoctrination of the Soviet people, army and navy personnel have recently been carried out in a more practical and purposeful manner. In many republics, krays and oblasts military-patriotic work is being conducted in conformity with long-range plans extending beyond a year's time. Party, soviet and military agencies, Komsomol and DOSAAF committees are taking part in drawing up these plans. They provide for accomplishment of such important tasks as improving organization of military-patriotic work taking amassed experience into account, improvement of basic military training and training of specialists for the army and navy, raising the general educational level of pre-induction youth, development of physical culture and sports, and improvement of medical care and health-related activities. All this makes it possible to consolidate and coordinate the efforts of government agencies and public organizations on achieving the stated goals.

At the same time there remain unresolved questions in this important matter. Military-patriotic work is usually focused primarily on indoctrination of young people. This is due to the fact that it is young people who are conscripted into the military. Indeed young people comprise, if one may be permitted the expression, the human foundation of tomorrow's defense. This is all true, but it would be a mistake to forget that there are millions of people who are not serving in the military but who tomorrow, in case of enemy aggression, may be called on by the Communist Party and the homeland to enter active service. Nobody will give us additional time for their military-patriotic "finish-up indoctrination" ["dovospitaniye"]. Consequently this work must be conducted today not only with young people but with all categories of the population.

It was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress that the sons and grandsons of the participants in the Great Patriotic War are serving in the military today. Who will pass on their combat experience to these young people? Obviously people who have experienced the harsh school of war and who possess a wealth of labor and life experience. They can do this better than anybody else. Therefore it is necessary to work more with war and labor veterans, more extensively to enlist them in youth indoctrination activities and to assist them in organizing and preparing presentations.

While we are discussing military-patriotic indoctrination, we should like to stress a feature which we believe has become typical of the present generation of youth, and not only of young people. More than 40 years have passed since the end of the Great Patriotic War. During this time practically two generations of Soviet citizens have grown up who do not know through their own experience what war is and who have not experienced the difficulties of wartime. Peace for them is the usual state of society. Some of them believe that continuation and strengthening of peace require no efforts from them personally. Therefore at times they fail to perceive and underestimate the danger of war, which has not ceased to be a harsh reality of our time.

And is this not one of the reasons why, as was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, some young people, while educated and well informed, are at times politically naive, while preparedness to pursue one's profession or occupation exists side by

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

side with an inadequately responsible attitude toward labor? Underestimation of the threat of war today and, as a consequence of this, unconcern, complacency, and calm placidity is a dangerous phenomenon which is fraught with serious consequences.

Therefore it is the common duty and most important task of all party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations, by means of vigorous ideological and indoctrination work, to prevent the occurrence of complacency, calm placidity and elements of pacificism, and to combat them resolutely wherever they occur. It is essential to convey to Soviet citizens more thoroughly and in a well-reasoned manner the truth about the steadily increasing aggressiveness of imperialism and the threat of war which imperialism presents. Of course it should not be overly dramatized, but the full seriousness of the international situation should definitely be shown. An implacable attitude toward all manifestations of political unconcern and complacency, a firm and high-principled assessment of these phenomena and struggle against them is one of the most important obligations of all Communists and the duty of each and every Soviet citizen, regardless of where he may be and regardless of his area of work.

It is important to work more vigorously and purposefully to develop in young people a feeling of Soviet patriotism, to develop a clear-cut class position in assessment of events, awareness of a high sense of personal responsibility for defense of the homeland, and a striving to strengthen its economic and defense might through one's selfless labor. The Lenin Komsomol is called upon to make a large contribution to the military-patriotic indoctrination of youth. The Komsomol Rules [Ustav] state: "It is the sacred duty of the Komsomol to prepare young people for defense of the socialist homeland and to indoctrinate selfless patriots who are capable of resolutely repulsing an attack by any foe."⁴

Party and soviet agencies and public organizations of republics, krays and oblasts are faced with a very important task -- to raise even higher the level of responsibility both for improving the quality of preparation of persons subject to military service and for further improving the system of basic military training of induction-age youth and mass-defense activities. The basic thrust in improving the quality of this work is to bring activities closer to regular military training facilities and bases, and to conduct special training activities at these facilities within the framework of the overall amount of time allotted for military training and refresher training [perepodgotovku].

Various forms of military-sponsored activities [voyenno-shefskoy raboty] have become quite widespread in this country in recent years. Get-togethers are held between representatives of work forces, educational institutions, people active in the areas of science and culture with Soviet Army and Navy servicemen. Many production enterprises and kolkhozes maintain contacts with the military units in which their workers or kolkhoz farmers are serving. At many enterprises portraits of servicemen who have been rated excellent in combat and political training hang side by side on the Board of Honor with portraits of leading-performance workers. Delegations from enterprise work forces and organizations visit military units.

The patron relations established between the work force of Leningrad's Kirovskiy Plant Production Association and the men of the Lenin Komsomol Motorized Rifle Regiment, which was formed of workers from this plant during the civil war

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

years at V. I. Lenin's instructions, can serve as an example of such work. The workers of the Ural oblasts maintain close patron ties with a tank combined unit in the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany which was a volunteer tank corps during the Great Patriotic War. In the Belorussian Military District there is a combined unit which was once formed of workers from the Donbass. The miners still maintain close contacts with this combined unit. Friendship has linked the Komsomol organization of the Altay with the men of the cruiser "Sverdlov" for more than 2 decades. Many work forces send the best conscripts to units whose fighting history is linked to their home areas.

This work is very important. In the course of this work the Leninist principle of indissoluble unity of the army and people is implemented in a practical manner. Mutual patron relations promote the birth of patriotic initiatives in military collectives and a desire on the part of servicemen to take active part in building communism following their military service. It is natural that working people, when they come into contact with life in the Armed Forces, also more deeply perceive their own co-participation in strengthening defense. It is well known that the Soviet Armed Forces, in addition to their primary function -- reliably to defend the socialist homeland -- also perform an important social task -- they indoctrinate ardent patriots of our homeland, convinced internationalists, and active builders of communism.

The indoctrinational role of the Armed Forces has been highly praised at recent Communist Party congresses. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has repeatedly stressed its enormous importance in his speeches. "Military service in this country," he stated, "is not only a school of combat skill. It is at the same time a fine school of ideological and physical toughening, discipline and organization."⁵

On the whole the entire vast aggregate of measures connected with strengthening our Armed Forces and increasing the nation's defense capability depends in large measure on the efforts performed by local party, soviet, trade union, Komsomol and economic organizations jointly and in a common direction with the army and navy. This task always has been and remains a task of enormous national importance.

Defense of the socialist homeland is the concern of each and every Soviet citizen, the concern of the entire people.

FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 44, page 300.
2. L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom: rechi, privetstviya, stat'i" [Following a Leninist Course: Speeches, Messages of Greeting, Articles], Moscow, 1981, Vol 8, pp 144, 145.
3. PRAVDA, 24 Sept 1981.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

4. "Ustav Vsesoyuznogo Leninskogo Kommunisticheskogo Soyuza Molodezhi" [Rules of the All-Union Lenin Young Communist League], Moscow, 1981, page 4.
5. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom: Rechi i stat'i" [Following a Leninist Course: Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1972, Vol 3, page 285.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

CONCLUSION

The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era in the history of mankind -- the era of the collapse of capitalism and consolidation of socialism, which became the highroad of social development for many countries in Europe, Asia and Latin America and the banner of the revolutionary movement of the worker class and the national liberation struggle throughout the world. Imperialism irrevocably lost its power over the majority of mankind and is inexorably continuing to lose its positions in the world, one after the other. It is doomed. Its aggressive nature, however, not only has failed to diminish as a result of this but has increased to an even greater extent. Imperialist reactionary circles in the West, and particularly in the United States, are resorting to war with increasing frequency, hoping in this manner to hold back the forward development of history and to escape from the clutches of the general crisis of capitalism.

The international situation has become even more complicated at the beginning of the 1980's, as a result of the adventuristic course of policy taken by militarist circles in the United States and their NATO partners, a policy of undermining détente and of escalating the arms race with the aim of shifting the present world strategic balance in their favor and gaining military superiority.

The USSR and the other nations of the socialist community are placing in opposition to the policy of militant circles in the West, aimed at aggravating the international situation, a clear, consistent policy directed toward strengthening peace, curbing and cessation of the arms race, development of relations between nations of differing social systems on principles of peaceful coexistence, and expansion of mutually beneficial peaceful cooperation. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev clearly stated the foreign policy of the nations of the socialist community, "Our common credo in foreign policy is peace, peace for all, a reliable, just and indissoluble peace."¹

Steadfastly and consistently implementing a Leninist peace-seeking foreign policy, the Soviet Union at the same time objectively assesses the genuine danger of war emanating from imperialism. The party and government are guided by the well-known instructions of V. I. Lenin that "we should accompany our steps toward peace with maintaining maximum military preparedness, under no circumstances disarming our army. Our army is a genuine guarantee that the imperialist powers will refrain from the slightest attempts, the slightest encroachments...."²

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Thanks to the tireless concern and solicitude on the part of the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government, today the combat potential of the Soviet Armed Forces comprises a solid fusion of a high degree of technical equipment, military expertise and indomitable morale. This was once again clearly demonstrated by the "West-81" ["Zapad-81"] exercise held in the fall of 1981.

The source of the inexhaustible strength and might of the Soviet Armed Forces lies in the undivided leadership and guidance by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Under the wise guidance of the party, they have trod a heroic path and have covered their combat banners with the glory of unfading victories over the numerous enemies of our homeland, and today they have reached new heights in their development. "It is extremely fortunate," stressed USSR Minister of Defense Marshal D. F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, "that the Armed Forces are guided by such a tried and tested strategist, organizer and indoctrinator as the glorious Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee."³

The Soviet Armed Forces, from soldier to marshal, true to the precepts of the great Lenin, totally dedicated to their people, ranked solidly behind the Communist Party and its fighting headquarters -- the Central Committee -- are ever ready to rise to the defense of their socialist homeland. Marching shoulder to shoulder with the armies of the brother socialist nations, they are serving and will continue to serve as a reliable bulwark of world peace.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 8 September 1981.
2. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Works], Vol 40, page 248.
3. D. F. Ustinov, "Izbrannyye rechi i stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1979, page 325.

COPYRIGHT: Voenizdat, 1982

3024

CSO: 8144/0886

END

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY