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EXPLANATION OF U.S. MILITARY STRATEGIES

(Given in an unspecified political class on 66 resolutions)

[Truncated text]

The US military strategist now concentrates every effort to step up the execution of their war-like and aggressive plan. On the other hand, the military strategy of the Soviets have been penalized trying to find different military strategy. Succeedingly, they have followed one strategy to another from the "Deterrence strategy" under Truman to the "Flexible Reaction" strategy under Eisenhower. Recently, the war lost the called "War of doctrine has just entered into the conversation.

Military strategy is prevalent, but the concepts are the same, i.e., the US always seeks to secure and reserve to become the leading industrialized country in the world. In contrast, the US was the sole nation that led the USA's allies nations felt exhausted because they had used their whole manpower and resources. In contrast, the US was the sole nation that led the USA's allies nations felt exhausted because they had used their whole manpower and resources to contain the worldwide rebellion to prevent the USA's allies from entering the war of aggression.

Proclaiming their essentiality, that the byproducts' military force (Soviet Union) was still weak. American experts alleged on the one hand to use nuclear weapons as a "bogus" to threaten the peoples of the world, on the other hand, to mobilize the Navy, Army, and Air Force to conduct in all out war desiring to destroy the U.S.S.R. Parallelly, the so-called "flaw of deterrence" against the USA's move, the USSR made efforts to contain the liberation.

[Page 2 of original text]
But, very soon, the rapid development of the socialist bloc, especially of the U.S.S.R. in the military and economic fields, brought about the in-effectiveness of U.S. Deterrence Strategy. Meanwhile, US policy concerning the interference of force clining to put down the liberation movements ended in sad failure. The US suffered one defeat after another in the Korean war. While American regular armed forces, actually ground soldiers, hit their heads against the wall displaying films of this strategy, the so-called "military superiority" of the US was only a legend. The plan to use nuclear weapons as a "backstop" to thwart the world gained no result, and the mobilization of the Air Force, Navy and Army to conduct a war of aggression also brought about obstacles. As a result the "Deterrence" strategy" of the US proved to be insufficient.

The "Massive Retaliation" strategy

Following the "Deterrence Strategy" the US strategists introduced another strategy called "Strategic of Fitting Back Reactively" (also called the "Massive Retaliation" strategy).

The failure of Truman's military strategy taught the US a lesson: that US regular troops are not strong enough to wage a large scale war to overthrow such a powerful opponent as the socialist bloc, and that a conventional war with the participation of the Air Force, Navy and Army, it would be difficult to defeat the socialist nations and their revolutionary people.

US strategists found that the strategy used and played the decisive role in the defeat of the US and Japan during WWII. Therefore, depending on war logistics and nuclear weapons, US strategy is geared to, to execute the U.S.S.R. and other socialist nations must find the expeditious expansion of air power and the use of all available nuclear weapons, and the destruction of all opportunities and the capability to vigorously modernize and swiftly destroy the socialist bloc. The "US' considered this strategy as the most effective one: "This ill-fated strategy is the art and science of using nation armed forces to reach the political purpose."

Built on this strategy, Dulles said: "The only way to solve problems concerning the foreign policy is to strike heavy blows of retaliation against attempts by all countries not in favor of our lives."

Therefore, this military strategy was called the "Massive Retaliation" strategy.

Although the military strategy was named "Retaliation", US officials always emphasized that: "Favorable conditions must be created to deal the new first blow."

As a matter of fact, the so-called "Retaliation" was only a trick aimed at covering up the war-preparing and aggressive plan and to encourage the true nature of the strategy. The "Massive Retaliation" strategy also meant that the first successful blow would likely start small wars. On the part of nations which were struggling for independence, the US had its weaknesses, its liberation movement. The US only mobilized the Air Force and the Navy to interfere if necessary, and it did not directly engage in conflicts as it was not in control of the strategy, as well as the preparation of an all out war to smash the socialist bloc.
In order to put this military strategy into action, the U.S. stepped up the production of facilities carrying nuclear warheads to targets, such as strategic aircraft, long-range and short-range missiles, intercontinental missiles, nuclear powered submarines...

On the contrary, the role of infantry soldiers lowered, and the production of regular weapons was also considered secondary.

This was an extremely reactionary and cruel strategy because it allowed the U.S. to use nuclear weapons as the main tool to kill masses of human beings to achieve the U.S.'s ambition. In addition, it also was a wrong, foolish military strategy because:

- First, its reaction and cruelty were obviously seen. The more the catastrophic nature of nuclear war was discussed, the more the aggressive face of the U.S. was unmasked. U.S. strategy stirred up indignation in the hearts of the peace-loving peoples of the world, and it was also violently criticized by the world international opinion. Therefore, the U.S. was even politically isolated.

The very way of the liberation movement which is more than a millenium as powerful as nuclear weapons stopped the U.S. from belligerently executing its plan.

In consequence, the U.S. had intended to use nuclear weapons to expand its influence, but, in reality, it made its political weak.

- Second, this military strategy wasn't realistic because the assessment of the opponent's force by the U.S. was not objective, and was based on limited vision. The U.S. was wrong when it thought that, with nuclear weapons in hand it could engulf the socialist bloc. Certainly, the endless and rapid development of the U.S.S.R. and other socialist nations in all fields appeared to be beyond the imagination of the U.S. The full-blown liberation movement was blowing its hardest to continuously attack the imperialist.

In addition, the U.S. suffered a very loss:

though fierce conflict with other imperialist nations and its prestige was lowered in the other imperialist countries.

Therefore, the change in balance caused the "Massive Retaliation" strategy to fall.

- Third, this strategy proved to be influfible, being opposed to the regulations concerning victory, and countering the 2.7 Plan of aggression.

The U.S. meant to use the power of nuclear weapons to strike heavy blows against the opponent. But, the liberation movement was full blown and the U.S. was not able to strike.

Therefore, by using nuclear weapons, the U.S. could not defeat nations which were fighting for independence. Meanwhile, their regular armed force was not ready to enter into a conflict.
Moreover, the U.S. not only turned aside the military which we consider to be the force which decides the victory, when the U.S. relied on nuclear weapons as the only factor to determine the winning of a war, they fail to achieve the victory of the war of aggression that is, the spoils of war.

As a result, the U.S. was in a dilemma. To attack meant not to guarantee the victory, on the other hand, to defend meant not to achieve a defensive. The "massive retaliation" strategy fell into a full fall while the U.S. was attacked from all sides, bearing one failure after another despite its nuclear weapons.

The "Flexible Reaction" Strategy

In order to correct the shortcomings of the old strategy, the U.S. again searched their means to try another military strategy. In the end of 1959, after 4 years of searching and testing, President Kennedy noted that placing a placing in Mississippi, the U.S. government officials, introduced a new series of military strategies which had been studied and recommended by Taylor, a retired general.

To overcome the inflexibility and passivity of the old strategy, Taylor admitted that the U.S. would launch small wars to gradually change the balance when conditions were not favorable enough to wage a large war, along with the carrying out of an all-out war with the employment of nuclear weapons, regular troops and regular weapons should also be used to conduct "limited wars" or "special wars" to be ready to react in time, at any time, and any place.

Advocates of this military strategy reasoned that nuclear weapons have an effect much like a "shield" that is to contain the liberation movement and regular armed forces as a spear to launch attacks to establish the liberation movement, to hold old colonies and to take over control of new colonies. When the nuclear weapons themselves can not approve the liberation movement and can not control the socialist bloc.

With this strategy, the U.S. expected to adapt itself to circumstances more flexibly. For this reason, this strategy was called "the Flexible Reaction Strategy.

The "Flexible Reaction Strategy" was considered as a clever initiative of U.S. strategists. The "Victor" means, the "antagonize and even the leaders of the capitalist circle endorsed approval. To U.S. strategists, this was a "clean" and to defend will preserve their force, and that U.S. can raise from the defensive position to the offensive position and from the victory gained in "limited wars" to the victory in "total war" to reach the goal to become the master of the globe.

As far as the leaders of the capitalist circle are concerned, this was a good opportunity to reach the immediate objective, to stop the production of weapons and the long-range objective, to expand influence at every corner of the world.

To reach the execution of this military strategy, a number of the following specific problems had to be taken care of:

[Signature]
1/ Step up the process of perfection of nuclear weapons and devices carrying them to targets. And, at the same time, make every effort to study and manufacture anti-missile missiles of various kinds.

2/ Step up the production of regular weapons and make improvements on them. Urgently reorganise ground forces into 2 types:

One: Because in foreign countries - ready to wage any kind of war, reserved another force at home ready to reinforce the former in order to quickly stamp out the fire of small conflicts and to coordinate with each other such as being engaged in an all-out war. Improve the training of infantry soldiers who fight with regular weapons.

3/ Construct more military bases in foreign countries so as to deal with the situation in time.

4/ “Lighten the capability of air and sea transportation.

5/ Organise and develop satellite armies under the leadership of the U.S. and the under-strength situation.

6/ Strengthen military unions. Draw satellite states into the war beside the U.S.

In reality, this military strategy aimed to push the U.S. to the passive position. The U.S. would recognise, its passive situation before the attack of the liberation movement reflecting to the true nature, the Flexible Reaction strategy reflected the U.S. plan of aggression. Although it fell into the passive position and became weaker and weaker the U.S. still maintained its stubbornness clinging to the crazy ambition of crushing the socialist bloc, containing the liberation movement and dominating the allied nations in order to gain the monopoly and dominate the world.

Undoubtedly, this chimerical strategy came to a standstill, because:

- First, the full-blown revolutionary movement pressed the U.S. Empire with attacks from all sides. In spite of the passive position into which the U.S. fell, it also contended to disperse forces to cope with the situation and to construct more bases. In consequence, it was obvious that the U.S. was weakening its own forces.

- Second, the “Flexible Reaction” strategy concealed a contradiction under its surface. This contradiction which could not be solved was that the U.S. had a limited number of soldiers, meanwhile, its ambition was too big. This fact was seen through the disposition of troops and actions of the U.S. from that time. More than 2,000 military bases scattered all over the world were still in the offensive position. The number of reserved troops was insufficiently Peggy down in Vietnam, the U.S. fell into a condition of “melting the buckle and tongue most.” And it was also seen in the Dominican affair. Militarily speaking, the U.S. was in a very bad situation.

- Third, this military strategy was based on weapons. Although ground forces were strengthened, the U.S. also considered nuclear weapons, missiles, Air Force and Navy as their policy because the basic weak points of the ground force could not be corrected.
Five years passed since the "Flexible Reaction" strategy had been considered as a basic and official strategy, and the U.S. stuck at many heavy failures.

Though the "Flexible Reaction" strategy the U.S. could not crush the liberation movements, the U.S. had undergone failures in Vietnam, Cuba, Laos, the Congo and other places. The war of aggression conducted by the U.S. against South Vietnam which was the most important place for testing this strategy failed.

The "Flexible Reaction" strategy was based on the power of nuclear weapons to threaten the world, but in reality, nuclear weapons could not stop nations from rising up to struggle for the liberation of its people. However, in the face of military development of the Soviet Union, China and other nations in the socialist bloc, nuclear weapons proved to be ineffective. There is nothing more ridiculous than for one nation to use nuclear weapons to threaten another which has similar weapons, because, it was only a "suicide". Nuclear weapons not only didn't frighten anyone else but, they became a disaster for U.S. people themselves. The more the propaganda was "driven for nuclear weapons", the more the U.S. felt isolated.

The "Flexible Reaction" strategy was deepening the contradiction between U.S. and its allied nations. The U.S. kept nuclear weapons as its monopoly, and, on the other hand, it pushed its "allied nations" to the front line as targets. The U.S. only played the role "puppet owner" in supplying dollars and weapons. Furthermore, the U.S. attempted to let its "allied nations" under its domination, and it took the advantage of this opportunity to initiate the new colonies and spheres of influence.

Yet, U.S. period of domination over "allied nations" is over. France, East Germany, England, Japan... developed their force. Those nations were returning back to oppose U.S. and to regain interests from its hands. This fact was shown by the contradiction among NATO, SEATO, and the Middle East bloc, especially the contradiction between the French and the Americans about military strategy. As a result, the U.S. military allied bloc was disintegrated and became inactive.

And, this strategy also deepened the contradiction within the U.S. itself. To put this strategy into action, the community of U.S. administration militarised U.S. economy to the full. Therefore, the U.S. people had to bear the yoke of war expenses.

To overcome heavy failures committed in the "special war" in South Vietnam, U.S. had sent and was to send hundreds of thousands of soldiers there. Politically, this fact threw the U.S. citizens into a state of upheaval. The tide of struggle by U.S. people against the whole gang being in power rose.

Argument of U.S. strategists on the "War Escalation" doctrine

The ineffectiveness of the "Flexible Reaction" strategy was obviously seen. Recently, U.S. strategists tried another war doctrine called the "War Escalation" doctrine.

This war doctrine was represented and complemented by MacNamara /sic/. Phonetic spelling of name/, U.S. military expert. He arranged "special war" "limited war" and "all out nuclear war" into a chain, and he assumed the...
course of development from the lower scales to the higher scales is the course of development from the normal crisis to the all-out nuclear war.

Intrinsically, the so-called "escalation" of the U.S. Empire in the military field presents its own plan to pursue the war. The U.S. failed to apply the "Flexible Reaction" strategy in the Vietnam war, and then, it introduced the new doctrine that enlarging the war in all fields.

The purpose of the "escalation of war" is, on the one hand, expanding the war to oppose the socialist bloc and to contain the liberation movements; on the other hand, threatening the world.

The "War Escalation" doctrine was not a new strategy replacing the "Flexible Reaction" strategy. It was only a succession of complaints to the military-manpower of the "Flexible Reaction" strategy aiming to overcome the U.S. military weaknesses and to mix its strategy more flexible.

The "War Escalation" doctrine fits the U.S. reactionary attempt to declare the war and the confusion of itself as well.

The U.S. would like to apply the "special war" in order to subdue the peoples all over the world. But the more the U.S. escalated the war, the more it showed its aggressive face.

Furthermore, if the U.S. militarized all of its military forces, to wage the same war as in Korea despite its present futility, it will become bogged down and will suffer heavier failures.

The doctrine of "escalation of war" will counter U.S. attempt of aggression. Up to now, all aggressions have taken the advantage of the surprise factor to quickly engulf a portion of land. The reason why the U.S. applied this doctrine is that U.S. depended on the power of nuclear weapons and avoided the opposition of people inside as well as outside the country. Also, the doctrine of "escalation of war" was restricted in the political and military fields. Additively, U.S. forces and capabilities were insufficient. Being in the situation of being attacked from all sides, the U.S. could not carry out this doctrine, because it could not concentrate all of its military forces in a certain area in order to deal with the opponent. Politically, the deep-seated contradiction among the "specialist bloc" especially the contradiction within U.S. itself and the full-blown liberation movement did not allow the U.S. to act freely.

Since the beginning of 65', the U.S. doctrine of "escalation of war" has been tested in our country. But, in reality, it not only did not help the U.S. take an outlet but also proved to be a passive, awkward and limited doctrine.
The history has a-fined that all U.S. war doctrines and strategies which have been applied since the end of World War II have proved and will prove to be a failure, for:

- First, all U.S. war strategies—the "Deterrence strategy," the "Massive Retaliation" strategy, the "Flexible Response" strategy and the "War Escalation" doctrines—serve the invasion wars with the ultimate intention of world domination by the U.S.A.

Therefore, this strategy stands at the determination to fight of the revolutionary peoples and the opposition of the aspirational peoples, the U.S. people themselves and its allied nations. That is why the U.S. fell into the passive position.

- Second, the U.S. military strategies and most importunate movement. The capitalist countries are undergoing severe crises, while the socialist countries are rapidly developing and the liberation movement is full blown attacking imperialism everywhere. The balance of military forces has been tipped in favor of the revolutionary peoples.

Engaged in such a situation the U.S. may not avoid a failure in spite of its powers.

- Third, U.S. military strategies are based on the "superiority of weapons" and "war techniques." But, with the rapid development of the socialist bloc and with the full grown people's war, i.e., weapons and war techniques have become ineffective.

Fourth, the U.S. reaction economic and social organizations may not be the foundation on which any U.S. strategy is based. On the contrary, the more the U.S. follows its reactionary military strategies, the more reaction its economic and social organizations are.

The failure of U.S. military strategies reflect the necessary position of the imperialism. The U.S. imperialists, in the last minutes of their life, in order to shake and crush they my be, they cannot go contrary to the historical evolution of mankind.
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--- END OF TRANSLATION ---
A document, undated, unsigned, prepared by an US/VC agency, contains an explanation and assessment of US Military Strategies since the end of World War II drawn in an unspecified political class on 1966 resolutions.

According to the document, President Truman applied the "Deterrence Strategy" which was replaced by the "War-ive Retaliation" strategy under President Eisenhower. At the end of 1960, President Kennedy's Government tried another military strategy called "Flexible Reaction" strategy which proved not to be very effective and was supplemented by another war doctrine called "War Retaliation doctrine.

All US war doctrines or strategies are based on US superiority war equipment and weapons, especially nuclear weapons which once was the monopoly of the USA. However, all of them, including the newest one, have proved and will prove to be a failure for the three following reasons:

1. US strategies serve invasion wars with the ultimate intention of world domination by the USA.

2. The Capitalist countries are undergoing severe crisis while the socialist countries are rapidly developing and the liberation movement is in full blown.

The balance of military forces has been tipped in favor of the revolutionary

[Over]
people.

With the full essay on people's warfare, US weapons and war techniques have become ineffective.

[Full translation follows]