

political objectives in promulgating the concept of sufficiency has been to reduce Western perceptions of a Soviet military threat, something difficult to accomplish by a build-up of forces.

By 1988 certain critical limits were placed on the notion of sufficiency. A subtle shift occurred in which the actual goal of defending or protecting the state came to be emphasized; rather than the goal of repulsing an aggressor. In addition, an emphasis on the minimum levels of weapons necessary for defence, came to replace the hypothetically threatening levels required by the idea of dealing a "crushing rebuff" to an aggressor. By 1989, the latter phrase had all but dropped out of use. For example, in terms of with conventional armaments Yazov defined defence sufficiency as:

...the minimum level of the military possibilities of the state (or coalition of countries), of such a composition and structure of armed forces that will facilitate reliable protection of the country and its allies, but at the same time exclude the possibility of leading major offensive operations.<sup>17</sup>

Finally, sufficiency started to be defined in direct opposition to the principle of "superarmament" (*sverhvooruzhennosti*)<sup>18</sup> or "being armed to the hilt"

---

<sup>16</sup> (...continued)

about political objectives the adequacy of forces for 'defence' can only be judged by reference to political objectives" (p. 63). Even Serebryannikov, a conservative in the Soviet military, admitted a similar idea when he said that, "...giving priority to defensive action is a political act...". Lt. Gen. Vladimir Serebryannikov, "More on the defence doctrine dilemma", *New Times* (12), 21-27 March 1989, p. 17.

<sup>17</sup> Yugoslavian interview with D.T. Yazov, "We Are Not Hawks", 4 November 1988 in *FBIS-SU*, 22 November 1988, p. 74. This has been a fairly standard definition of conventional sufficiency since the idea of dealing a "crushing rebuff" dropped out of favour. In many cases, definitions still include the idea that aggression must be repelled, but with the qualifier that this must not threaten the other side. Yazov goes on to make this point in the interview.

<sup>18</sup> D. T. Yazov, *Oboronnnoe stroitelstvo: novye podhody*, (Defensive Development: New Approaches), (Moscow: Military Publishing House, 1989), p.14; and M. Moiseyev, "Soviet Military Doctrine: Realization of its Defensive Thrust", *Pravda*, 13 March 1989 (1st ed.), p. 5, in *FBIS-SU*, 13 March 1989, p. 1.