

The U.S.S.R.

Washington's 'outbursts' scorned by Soviets' Brezhnev

At the end of the second week since Soviet troops entered Afghanistan, Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev issued his own statement characterizing American response to the Soviet move as "tantamount to serious miscalculations in politics." Brezhnev's surprise interview to *Pravda* on Jan. 13 was the latest and highest-level warning from the Soviet leaders that they think Washington's current policies will lead to world war.

No sane person in the West can doubt the sincerity of Brezhnev's statement. He, after all, became Moscow's highest official in a battle for detente during the late 1960s. He assumed power on behalf of a "war-avoidance" posture, defeating other factional alignments tending to war-preparedness or "war-winning" postures. Brezhnev's personal warnings now therefore confirm the fundamental character of overall strategic thinking among the Soviet leadership—to seek peace, to even compromise readily, up to the point that an impending correlation of international forces is properly perceived as threatening to the Soviet Union's very existence. At such a point—to which Carter administration policies in Europe, Asia and the Middle East brought the world by mid-December—the detente-faction leader and the Red Army commander join hands in a rapid shift to "war-winning" policy, and deploy all the means at their disposal to ensure maximum Soviet advantage in deemed-probable military confrontation with the West.

Executive Intelligence Review is carrying Brezhnev's answers to *Pravda's* questions in full, because we believe responsible Americans should have more than the cursory appreciation of Soviet thinking on these strategic questions that may be gained from the truncated versions of the statement that appeared in most publications here.

Brezhnev's words confirm our assessment last week of what led the U.S.S.R. to dispatch its forces across the border into Afghanistan. Issue by issue, Brezhnev re-

views the ingredients of the crisis: the Dec. 12 NATO decision on medium-range missile deployment, the visit of Defense Secretary Harold Brown to Peking, the arming of rebel forces in Afghanistan through China and Pakistan, the American search for Middle Eastern bases from which to deploy a "rapid response corps," and, finally, the erratic behavior of the Carter administration. In appearing personally with this global round-up of the situation, Brezhnev also laid to rest the rampant speculations that he had been out-voted by a militant faction in the Politburo.

What next from Moscow?

The military contingencies of the present alignment in Central Asia are reviewed in our military analysis in our International section. The very latest bulletins from Moscow show that the world is a hair's-breadth away from rapidly shifting into war-fighting, as they specify conditions which the U.S.S.R. would find "intolerable."

The Soviet news agency TASS, for instance, warned on Jan. 15 that "the mining of the Persian Gulf"—an option entertained for U.S. retaliation against Iran's holding of American hostages—"would be a distinct threat to world peace." On the same day, *Pravda* declared that "anyone trying to launch an attack on the states of the socialist community would experience an immediate counter-strike."

The section of Brezhnev's statement to *Pravda* that was most consistently omitted from American summaries, however, pointed to another track of Soviet foreign policy—detente centered in Europe. The entire second question of the interview is devoted to the potential for the West European powers to break from the most dangerous of Washington policies, and reflects how, despite the setback of Western Europe going along with the December NATO decision, the Soviets perceive this as a still marginally viable war-avoidance opportunity.

Along the same lines, a Jan. 10 commentary by V. Matveev, the government daily *Izvestia's* leading commentator, addressed Europe by saying "it is necessary to propose that all countries whose governments value the interests of peace, take notice of the very recent statements of official U.S. representatives, from which it becomes clear that the policy of instigating tension adopted by Washington is a long-term policy."

Diplomatically, Moscow is also turning to southern Asia, with a trip now scheduled to take Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to India Jan. 22. Indira Gandhi, who returned to power with hopes of leading India back to the path of industrial development—and not of seeing the subcontinent go up in flames, will host the Soviet Minister. He will be preceded there four days earlier by the President of France, Valery Giscard d'Estaing.

—Rachel Douglas



A personal warning Leonid Brezhnev's interview in Pravda

The Soviet daily Pravda interviewed President L. I. Brezhnev on Jan. 13. The following translation is by Foreign Broadcasting Information Service, with slight revisions by EIR.

Pravda: Leonid Ilich, how do you evaluate the present international situation, especially in the light of the American administration's latest steps?

Brezhnev: The consistent and creative pursuance by our party of the course of peace, detente and disarmament, of implementing the peace program, set forth by the 24th and 25th congresses of the CPSU, has made it possible to achieve much. Broadly speaking, the main accomplishment is that we have succeeded in breaking the tragic cycle: world war—brief spell of peace—world war again. We the Soviet people, our friends—the peoples of fraternal socialist countries, all those who have struggled and continue to struggle for peace, for detente, for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems have a right to be proud of this historic result.

The situation, unfortunately, has noticeably deteriorated at the junction of the 1970s and the 1980s. The peoples know the truth about who is responsible for this. I answer without any reservations—the imperialist forces, and primarily specific circles in the United States, are to blame for this. The blame is on all those who see in relaxation of tension an obstacle to their aggressive plans, to whipping up militaristic psychosis, to interference in the internal affairs of other peoples. The blame is on those who have a deeply ingrained habit of behaving in a cavalier manner with other states, of acting in the international arena as if they can do everything.

It has been clear for some time already that the leading circles of the United States and of some other NATO countries have embarked on a course hostile to the cause of detente, a course of spiraling the arms race

and leading to a growth of the war danger. The beginning of this was laid already in 1978, at the May session of the NATO Council in Washington where the automatic growth of the military budgets of NATO member-countries till the end of the 20th century was approved. Of late, militaristic tendencies in U.S. policy are found in the acceleration of new long-term arms programs, in the creation of new military bases far beyond the United States, including the Middle East and the Indian Ocean areas and in the forming of the so-called "quick reaction corps," this instrument of the policy of military interference.

Now take such an important document as the SALT II treaty. Its implementation would have opened the way to major steps in disarmament. As is known, this treaty received support in the whole world, including the NATO allies of the United States, and in broad circles of the international public. What did the Carter administration do with it? Hardly was the treaty signed when people in the United States began discrediting it. As to the process of ratification, the opponents of the treaty—not without the connivance of government circles in the United States—actually began using it to complicate the treaty's ratification. By his recent decision to freeze indefinitely the debate on the SALT II treaty in the Senate President Carter added one more touch to this unseemly process.

It was the United States that in December 1979 forced on its NATO allies the decision to deploy in a number of West European countries new medium-range nuclear-missiles arms, this leading to a new spiral of the arms race.

Washington virtually muzzled those of its allies who were inclined to positively respond to the Soviet Union's constructive proposals to hold talks on this matter.

Today the opponents of peace and detente are trying

to speculate on the events in Afghanistan. Mountains of lies are being built up around these events and a shameless anti-Soviet campaign is being mounted. What has really happened in Afghanistan?

A revolution took place there in April 1978. The Afghan people took its destiny into its hands and embarked on the road of independence and freedom. As it has always been in history, the forces of the past ganged up against the revolution. The people of Afghanistan, of course, could have coped with them itself. But from the very first days of the revolution it encountered an external aggression, rude interference from outside in its internal affairs.

Thousands and tens of thousands of insurgents, armed and trained abroad, whole armed units were sent into Afghanistan territory. In effect, imperialism together with its accomplices launched an undeclared war against revolutionary Afghanistan.

Afghanistan persistently demanded an end to the aggression, that it be allowed to build its new life in peace. Resisting the external aggression, the Afghan leadership, already under President Taraki and then later, had repeatedly asked the Soviet Union for assistance. On our part we warned those concerned that if the aggression was not stopped we would not abandon the Afghan people at a time of trial. As is known, we stand by what we say.

The actions of the aggressors against Afghanistan were assisted by Amin who, on seizing power, launched cruel repressions against broad segments of the Afghan society, against party and military cadres, against representatives of the intelligentsia and the Muslim clergy, that is exactly against those segments on which the April revolution relied. The people under the leadership of the People's Democratic Party headed by Babrak Karmal rose against this Amin Tyranny and put an end to it. Now in Washington and some other capitals they are mourning over Amin. This exposes their hypocrisy with particular clarity. Where were these mourners when Amin was conducting his mass repressions, when he forcibly removed and unlawfully physically exterminated Taraki, the founder of the new Afghan state?

The unceasing armed intervention, the well advanced plot by external forces of reaction created the real threat that Afghanistan would lose its independence and be turned into an imperialist military bridgehead on our southern border. In other words, the time came when we no longer could fail to respond to the request of the government of friendly Afghanistan. To have acted otherwise would have meant leaving Afghanistan prey to imperialism, allowing the aggressive forces to repeat in that country what they had succeeded in doing, for instance, in Chile where the people's freedom was drowned in blood, To act otherwise would have meant to watch passively the origination on our southern border

of a seat of serious danger to the security of the Soviet state.

When making the request to us, Afghanistan proceeded from clear-cut provisions of the treaty of friendship, good neighbourhood and cooperation, concluded by Afghanistan with the U.S.S.R. in December 1978, on the right of each state, in accordance with the U.N. Charter, to individual or collective self-defense, a right that other states have exercised more than once.

It was no simple decision for us to send Soviet military contingents to Afghanistan. But the party's Central Committee and the Soviet government acted in full awareness of their responsibility and took into account the entire circumstances. The only task set to the Soviet contingents is to assist the Afghans in repulsing the aggression from outside. They will be fully withdrawn

The crux of the matter is that the card on which the imperialists and their accomplices had counted was trumped.

from Afghanistan once the causes that made the Afghan leadership request their introduction disappear.

Imperialist and Peking propaganda deliberately and unscrupulously distort the Soviet Union's role in the Afghan affairs.

It goes without saying that there has been no Soviet "intervention" or "aggression" at all. There is another thing: We are helping the new Afghanistan at its government's request to defend the national independence, freedom and honor of its country from armed aggressive actions from outside.

The national interests or security of the United States of America and other states are not affected in any way by Afghanistan. All attempts to portray matters otherwise are sheer nonsense. These attempts are being made with ill intentions, with the aim of more easily fulfilling their own imperialist plans.

Also absolutely false are the allegations that the Soviet Union has some expansionist plans in respect of Pakistan, Iran or other countries of that area. The policy and psychology of colonialists is alien to us. We do not covet the lands or wealth of others. It is the colonialists who are attracted by the smell of oil.

Outright hypocritical are the attempts to talk at length about the "Soviet threat to peace" and to pose as observers of international morals by those whose record

includes the "dirty war" against Vietnam, those who did not lift a finger when the Chinese aggressors made their armed intrusion into Socialist Vietnam, those who for decades have kept a military base on Cuban soil contrary to the will of its people and government, those who are engaged in sabre-rattling, those who threaten imposition of a blockade and are exerting open military pressure on the revolutionary Iranian people by sending to the shores of Iran a naval armada armed with atomic weapons and including a considerable part of the U.S. carrier force.

A last point must be made in this connection. Interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is really taking place, and even such an august and respected institution as the United Nations, is being used for this. Indeed, can the discussion of the so-called "Afghan question" at the United Nations contrary to objections by the Government of Afghanistan be described as other than a rude flouting of the sovereign rights of the Afghan state?

The Afghan Government and its responsible representative in the United Nations state for all to hear: Leave us alone, the Soviet military contingents were brought in at our request and in accordance with the Soviet-Afghan treaty and article 51 of the United Nations charter.

Meantime under the cover of the clamor, assistance is being increased to those elements that are intruding into Afghanistan and perpetrating aggressive actions against the legitimate government. The White House recently openly announced its decision to expand the supply to these elements of military equipment and everything necessary for hostile activities. The Western press reports that during his talks in Peking the U.S. defense secretary colluded with the Chinese leadership on the coordination of such actions.

Concluding the Afghan theme it must be said that there is nothing surprising in the hostile reaction of imperialist forces to the events in Afghanistan. The crux of the matter is that the card on which the imperialists and their accomplices had counted was trumped.

In short, the events in Afghanistan are not the true cause of the present complication of the international situation. If there were no Afghanistan certain circles in the United States, in NATO, would have surely found another pretext to aggravate the world situation.

Finally, the entire sum total of the American administration's steps in connection with the events in Afghanistan—the freezing of the Salt II treaty, refusal to deliver to the U.S.S.R. a number of commodities, including grain, in accordance with some already concluded contracts, the termination of talks with the Soviet Union on a number of questions of bilateral relations, and so on—shows that Washington again, like decades ago, is trying to speak with us in the language of the cold war. In this the Carter administration is displaying contempt for

important interstate documents, is disrupting established ties in the field of science, culture and human contacts.

It is difficult even to enumerate the number of treaties, intergovernmental agreements, accords and understandings reached between our two countries on questions of mutual relations in various fields that have been recently arbitrarily and unilaterally violated by the government of President Carter. Of course, we will manage without this or that tie with the United States. In fact, we never sought these ties as some sort of a favor to us, believing that this is a mutually advantageous matter meeting the mutual interests of the people of our countries, and first of all in the context of strengthening peace.

But the arrogation by Washington of some sort of a "right" to "reward" or "punish" independent sovereign states raises a question of a principled character. In effect, by such actions the U.S. Government deals a blow at the orderly international law system of relations among states.

As a result of the Carter administration's actions the world is increasingly forming the impression of the United States as an absolutely unreliable partner in interstate ties, as a state whose leadership, prompted by some whim, caprice or emotional outbursts, or by considerations of narrowly understood immediate advantage, is capable at any moment of violating international obligations and canceling signed treaties and agreements. There is hardly any need to explain what a dangerous destabilizing impact this has on the entire international situation, particularly since this is the behavior of the leadership of a big, influential power from which the peoples have the right to expect a well-considered and responsible policy.

But, of course, these actions of the U.S. administration will not inflict on us the damage obviously hoped for by their initiators. The cynical estimates concerning the "worsening" of the food situation in the Soviet Union as a result of the U.S. refusal to sell us grain are based on nonsensical notions about our economic potential.

The Soviet people have sufficient possibilities to live and work calmly, to fulfill its plans, to raise its living standards. In particular, I can assure that the plans of providing Soviet people with bread and bakery products will not be lessened by a single kilogram.

We can regard the actions of the American administration only as a poorly weighed attempt to use the events in Afghanistan for blocking international efforts to lessen the military danger, to strengthen peace, to restrict the arms race, aims in which mankind is vitally interested.

The unilateral measures taken by the United States are tantamount to serious miscalculations in politics. Like a boomerang, they will hit back at their initiators, if not today then tomorrow.

Now if all these sallies against our policy are intended to test our mettle, this means that the experience of history is totally ignored. When the world's first socialist states was born in 1917 our people did not ask anybody's permission. And now, too, it decided itself what its way of life is to be. Imperialism tried to put us to test at the dawn of Soviet Government and everybody remembers what came out of this. The fascist aggressors tried to break us in the bloodiest war ever experienced by mankind. But they suffered a defeat. We were subjected to trials in the years of the cold war when the world was being pushed to the brink, when one international crisis after another was engineered. But then, too, nobody succeeded in making us waver. It is very useful to remember this today.

Pravda: What, in your opinion, are the prospects of the development of the situation?

Brezhnev: The situation in Europe today is much better than it was, say, in the early 1970's. But of course Washington's latest irresponsible actions are making

Like a boomerang, these serious miscalculations in politics will hit back at their initiators, if not today then tomorrow.

themselves felt here as well. The United States is not content with just about everything to poison Soviet-American relations. It would also like to spoil the relations of West European countries with the Soviet Union, relations in which, as is known, many useful things were achieved during the past decade. The United States is trying to undermine the spirit and essence of the Helsinki Final Act which has become a recognized milestone in strengthening security and developing peaceful cooperation in the continent. Last but not least, by its steps directed at aggravating the international situation Washington pursues the aim of subduing the European states, first of all its own allies.

But the cardinal interests of the European peoples are unbreakably connected with detente. The Europeans have already come to know its beneficial fruits from their own experience. They are inhabitants of a continent that has been singled more than once by devastating wars and they are by no means prepared, and we are convinced of this, to embark on a road of ventures at the bidding of

politicians from across the ocean. It is impossible to believe that there are states in Europe that would wish to throw the fruit of detente under the feet of those who are ready to trample it. Western states, and the United States, as well, need detente in Europe by no means to a lesser extent than the socialist countries, than the Soviet Union.

Much of a constructive nature can be accomplished in Europe for the good of peace in the near future, in particular, in connection with the forthcoming meeting in Madrid and the proposal by Warsaw Pact countries to hold a conference on military detente and disarmament. We resolutely are for consolidating the multiplying everything positive that has been created over the years in the European Continent through the collective efforts of states, big and small. We will further pursue a policy of peace and friendship between peoples.

In stark contrast to Washington's present extremist position our position is to continue the talks begun in recent years along many directions with the aim of stopping the arms race. This naturally, also applies to problems of lessening military confrontation in Europe.

I repeat we are for talks, but for honest and equal talks, for observance of the principle of equal security. It is the initiation of exactly such talks that we recently proposed on the question of medium-range nuclear arms. Nobody can expect the Soviet Union to accept NATO's terms designed to conduct talks from positions of strength. The present position of NATO countries makes talks on this problem impossible. We formally told the U.S. Government about all this a number of days ago. We look into the future with optimism. It is a well-founded optimism. We understand that the deliberate aggravation of the international situation by American imperialism is an expression of its displeasure at the consolidation of the positions of socialism, the upsurge of the national-liberation movement, the strengthening of forces coming out for detente and peace. We know that the will of the peoples has cleared through all the obstacles a road for the positive direction in world affairs that is well expressed by the word "detente." This policy has deep roots. It is supported by mighty forces and this policy has every chance remaining the leading tendency in relations between states.

Our people, our country are firmly advancing along the road of communist construction, fulfilling the assignments of the 10th 5-Year Plan, the tasks set by the party. Soviet people and our friends abroad can rest assured that the Leninist foreign policy course is unflagging. It was defined by the decisions of CPSU congresses and is embodied in our entire foreign policy activities. This course combines consistent peaceableness with firm rebuff to aggression. It has justified itself in the past decades and we will adhere to it further. No one will push us off this course.

Red Army commentator:

America's protests 'a pretext for new military build-up'

The following excerpts are taken from the Soviet military daily Red Star of Jan. 15. The article by Major General U. Sidel'nikov begins by restating Soviet President L.I. Brezhnev's charge that the United States' political reaction to Afghanistan, like the freezing of SALT II, is being used as a pretext for a military buildup.

Even earlier, there was no doubt that the United States of America and other NATO bloc countries adopted a policy of achieving military superiority, against international commitments they had accepted for themselves. The most convincing proof for this was the decision of the NATO session to deploy in Western Europe new American nuclear missiles, and also the five-year military program outlined at the end of last year in the speeches of the President and the Defense Minister of the U.S.A.

It is not out of place here to say that the struggle for military superiority ... is one of the features of the aggressive nature of capitalism. This aim acquired a special acerbicity under conditions of imperialism. The whole history testifies that once they have achieved military superiority over their opponents, the imperialist states came out as the instigators of aggressive, predatory local as well as world wars.

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community dispose over a sufficiently developed material basis to produce any modern type of weapon and military technology. If the United States of America is able to produce in this or that quantity the modern means of armed struggle, then the Soviet Union can also produce such means. If the U.S.A. and the NATO bloc as a whole achieved today military superiority in general or superiority in one type of weapon over the Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty, then tomorrow the Soviet Union and the countries of the

Warsaw treaty, by showing constant concern for their own security, will reduce this superiority to nothing.

The article then proceeds to show that the Soviet Union is not striving for military superiority for two reasons: 1) because it is conducting a policy of detente and disarmament and 2) because there now exists an approximate parity between East and West as the U.S.-Soviet communiqué from the Vienna summit states last summer. In that communiqué, both sides renounce the attempt to strive for military superiority. The Soviet Union, says Sidel'nikov, is strictly observing this commitment since "the principle of equal security ... is one of the most important conditions for the continuation of detente, including military detente. The principle of equal security corresponds to the defense character and the defense thrust of the Soviet military doctrine."

Some Western analysts claim that the Soviet Union has an offensive strategic military doctrine. Such claims, said Sidel'nikov, are evil and sinister.

The Social-Political essence and content of military doctrine of any state is determined not by the armament and the quality of it, or by its potentials, but by the *policy* of this state, by the military-political aims which it places in front of itself and of the armed forces.

The Soviet state is a peace-loving state. The armed forces were created and are improved with the aim of a reliable defense of the socialist achievements, of the peaceful labor of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the U.S.S.R. and its allies. Namely that is the basis of our military defense doctrine. The fact that our army and fleet are equipped with all types of weapons, that they are exercising offensive activities, is not because they want to attack anybody, but in order to *repulse the attack* of any aggressor, what ever means and forms of the armed struggle he applied. And to repulse an aggression includes defense as well as resolute counter-offensive strikes with the aim to destroy the aggressor fully, wherever he would be active—on earth, sea, and water.

Sidel'nikov lists figures from NATO and American military budgets to demonstrate the rearmament drive. President Carter is quoted saying that the American strategic forces are strong enough to destroy any potential enemy many times over. If this were so, asks Sidel'nikov, why does the U.S.A. need to rearm further? Because aggressive influential Western circles are preparing materially for war against the Soviet Union.

But these circles cannot but understand that the punishment for an attack on the U.S.S.R. and its allies will be terrible and inevitable and that those who attempt

to "many times destroy their potential opponent" might find themselves many times destroyed in the end.

The question arises: Do the politicizing generals and the bellicose politicians of the U.S.A. not calculate that they can protect themselves from such a punishment, by building a many times higher military superiority, based on the so-called potential of guaranteed destruction of the Soviet Union, in the war intended by them?

Sidel'nikov says yes, pointing to the new arms programs of the U.S.A., like the Trident, MX, and Cruise missiles. "A special role" in this scenario belongs to Western Europe. The U.S.A. wants to locate strategic missiles like the Pershing II there and thus turn their allies into hostages. "No lies whatsoever" can hide the fact that the U.S.A. wants to "turn away the threat of a nuclear response strike from American territory and subject the countries of Western Europe to this strike," says Sidel'nikov.

Sidel'nikov then deals with the question of war as a continuation of politics by other means. Some Western analysts deny that this doctrine is still valid for modern war. Sidel'nikov shows that it still does.

On the basis of a deep scientific analysis of the relations of the social-political and economic forces fighting each other on the international arena, our party arrived at the conclusion that in the contemporary stage of social development, world wars are not inevitable, that a new world war must and can be prevented, that it *does not have to* emerge as the continuation of politics, that it does not have to be chosen as a means for achieving political aims. Here too, first-ranking significance belongs to the question, *which* policy leads to assertion of peace on earth, to preventing a new world war and which has no need that it be continued in the fire of armed clashes, and *which* policy includes the danger of the emergence of war, which can lead to war and be continued by it.

In this connection, the question is posed thus: the consequence and realization of which policy is the U.S.A. course for military superiority? The answer can be only one: this course originates from the very nature of U.S.A. imperialism, from the very substance of the American Imperialist state and its traditionally reactionary policy, at the basis of which lies the idea of hegemonism, of the so-called "American exclusivity." ... namely the hegemonistic, global pretensions, the striving for imperialist supremacy ... to impose one's own will on other peoples, the striving to deal with other countries, including also the Soviet Union, "from a position of strength" also defines the policy of the current American ruling circles, their military-strategic policy from which results the policy to achieve superiority in military might.

The distant as well as the recent past convincingly testify to the fact that the aggressive, conquering wars of

imperialism were each time the continuation of such a type of policy by the imperialist states. The continuation of such a policy was the war unleashed by Hitler's Germany, the gigantic military power which was built by the efforts of imperialist reaction as a whole and thrust against the U.S.S.R.

It would be a crime to forget this lesson of history and to calmly watch how the current imperialist pretensions on "world leadership" lead to the realization of a policy which is threatening the peoples with the death of nuclear world war. Therefore, there is no task more responsible than the task to restrain the forces of war and aggression and to make stable peace the natural form of life of all peoples. Namely, this is the fundamental basis of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, its main backbone. The policy of peaceful coexistence, of mutually advantageous cooperation has no need of being continued by the force of weapons.

But we must take into account that there are forces in the world who are filled with such a hatred against socialism, against the Soviet Union, that they might take the risk to unleash a war against our country and against the other countries of the socialist community. A testimony for this is in particular the doctrine of "limited nuclear wars on regional levels," recently adopted by the Pentagon, which is providing for the delivery of "preventive nuclear strikes."

The armed forces of the U.S.S.R. are always ready to deal a crushing blow to any aggressor, to deal him an annihilating counter-blow. And if the imperialist aggressive forces try again to test our firmness and impose a war on us, then, on the part of the Soviet Union the policy (the single aim of which is to defend the socialist fatherland and the achievements of socialism) will also find its continuation in war. This—in the highest degree just—political aim does not change in the case that we have to answer to a nuclear attack with the same weapons.

Sidel'nikov then repeats the offer by President Brezhnev not to strike against those countries on whose territories there are no nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union is against the use of nuclear weapons. Only in "an emergency situation, an aggression against our country or against our allies on the part of another nuclear state can force us to resort to this ultimate means of self-defense."

From all that was stated above, it follows that no weapon, no means of armed struggle, including nuclear weapons, can "abrogate," or put in doubt the proposition that any war was, is and also remains the continuation of a certain policy by forceful means. The main thing is to *forever save the peoples from such a policy which leads to world wars and is continued by them, to forever save humanity from such wars.*