


126109

JPRS-TAC-87-020

18 MARCH 1987

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



DISSEMINATION EXEMPTED II

19980209 159

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

32
157
A08

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.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

18 MARCH 1987

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

- USSR Journal Review of French Book on SDI
(Alexei Kireyev; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,
No 12, Dec 86)..... 1

- PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY: Western Europe Uneasy Over Star Wars Plan
(Li Yunfei; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 14 Feb 87)..... 3

- Briefs
Japan's Envoy Tells U.S. of Concern on ABM Treaty, SDI 5

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

- TASS Assesses U.S. Defense Information Center Study
(Nikolay Turkatenko; Moscow TASS, 29 Jan 87)..... 6

- Moscow: Position on Talks Confirmed by January Plenum
(Nikolay Shishlin; Moscow Television Service, 1 Feb 87). 7

- USSR's Karpov: Disarmament's 'Rosy Glow' Versus Reality
(Viktor Pavlovich Karpov Interview; Moscow
KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 13 Feb 87)..... 9

- Karpov on USSR 'Model of New Mentality'
(Viktor P. Karpov; Moscow Domestic Service, 10 Feb 87). 15

- Moscow Talk Show Considers Possibility of Dealing With U.S.
(Moscow Domestic Service, 13 Feb 87)..... 21

- Moscow Talk Show on Hopes for Nuclear-Free World
(Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobyshev, et al.; Moscow Domestic
Service, 15 Feb 87)..... 25

PRAVDA Reviews Reykjavik Documents Brochure (B. Kotov; Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jan 87).....	32
USSR's Zagladin: UK Not Intermediary With U.S. (London Press Association, 6 Feb 87).....	34
Thatcher, Gorbachev Talks Anticipated	34
Delegation Ends UK Visit	35
USSR's Gerasimov Comments on FRG's Role (Gennadiy Gerasimov, Interview; Hamburg BILD, 12 Feb 87).	36
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
Soviet Foreign Ministry News Conference on INF Proposal (Various sources, 2, 3 Mar 87).....	37
TV Broadcast, by Gennadiy Gerasimov, et al.	37
Radio Reportage	40
PRAVDA Report	41
Soviet Media Report on U.S. Reaction to Gorbachev Offer (Various sources, 1-5 Mar 87).....	44
U.S. Said Interested, Cautious	44
IZVESTIYA Cites U.S. Reactions, by A. Blinov	44
Nunn: 'Highly Positive'	45
Rogers' Statement 'Discordant'	45
Further U.S. Reaction, by V. Gan	46
Reagan Summons Negotiators	46
Vremya on U.S. 'Madmen' by Vladimir Dunayev	47
Reagan Statement Cited, by L. Koryavin	48
Soviet Media Reports on World Reaction to Gorbachev Offer (Various sources, 1-4 Mar 87).....	49
'Broad Flood of Commentaries'	49
Initiative 'Met Favorably'	50
West European Response 'Positive'	50
Bogachev on 'Discordant' French Statement, by Vladimir Bogachev	51
France Claims 'Unanimity'	52
PCF Condemns Government Stand	53
UK Press, Public Comment, by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy	53
UK's Kinnock on 'Opportunity'	54
UK's Healey: Obstacle Removed	54
Bogachev on UK Equivocation, by Vladimir Bogachev	55
Sweden Sees Source of Hope	56
Praise From Belgium's Tindemans	56
FRG Welcomes Initiative, by Yu. Yakhontov	57
FRG Government 'Satisfaction'	58
Genscher Supports Initiative	58
Canada's Clark 'Acclaims' Proposal	58
XINHUA Reports Proposal	59

USSR: Commentaries on Significance of Gorbachev Offer (Various sources, 1-5 Mar 87).....	60
NST Plenary Session	60
Moscow TV: New Opportunity	60
Statement by CD Delegate	61
PRAVDA: 'Historic Chance' Offered, Editorial	62
Test of U.S. Sincerity, Editorial	64
Dobrynin Meets Sen Pryor	66
'Graphic' New Thinking, by V. Kuzar	67
'To Get Out of Cul-de-Sac', Vladimir Zagladin Interview	68
Central Committee Aide: Summit Possible	70
AFP: U.S. Presents Draft Treaty To Eliminate INF From Europe (Paris AFP, 5 Mar 87).....	71

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA Reprints, Rebuts Adelman Article on CW Issue (Kenneth Adelman; Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Feb 87).....	73
---	----

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS Reports on Vienna CSCE Developments (Moscow TASS, 17 Feb 87; Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Feb 87).....	78
Meeting on Troop Cuts	78
East Bloc Proposals	78
USSR Roundtable: NATO Brussels Declaration, Pact Budapest Appeal (Dushan Rovensky, et al.; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 2 Dec 86)..	79
French Report on NATO, Warsaw Pact European Disarmament Talks (Paris AFP, 11 Feb 87).....	83

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR's Shevardnadze Supports Tlatelolco Treaty (Moscow TASS, 14 Feb 87).....	84
Moscow Comments on U.S.-New Zealand Nuclear Dispute (Moscow Domestic Service, 3 Feb 87).....	85
TASS: White House Rejects Treaty of Rarotonga (Moscow TASS, 6 Feb 87).....	86
USSR Academician Goldanskiy Comments on U.S. Nuclear Tests (Moscow TASS, 3 Feb 87).....	87
Soviet Paper on Congressional Divisions on Moratorium (I. Ignatyev; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 8 Feb 87).....	88

Petrovskiy: USSR Ready for Test Monitoring Talks (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 16 Feb 87).....	92
FRG: FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU on U.S. Nuclear Test (Editorial; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 5 Feb 87).....	93
Turkish Officials on Deployment of Nuclear Weapons (Ankara Domestic Service, 5 Feb 87).....	94
Canadian Party Sees Nordic Nuclear Weapons Free Zone as Model (Nils Orvik; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 28 Jan 87).....	95
RELATED ISSUES	
Moscow Forum for 'Nuclear-Free World' 14-17 February (Various sources, various dates).....	98
Moscow TV Preview, by Gennadiy Gerasimov, et al.	98
U.S. Said Casting Aspersions on Forum, by Igor Ignatyev	101
PRAVDA Preview	102
IZVESTIYA Poll	104
Conference Opens	106
Sakharov Speaks	106
Sakharov Criticizes SDI	106
IZVESTIYA Report on Sakharov	107
Scientists' Roundtable	107
East Germans Participate	112
Television Coverage	112
Gorbachev Addresses Forum, by Mikhail Gorbachev	114
Gorbachev Receives Participants	125
Gorbachev Speech Circulated at CD, by Yevgeniy Korzhev, Vladislav Shishlo	125
U.S. Reaction 'Inarticulate' by Aleksandr Zholkver	126
Dobrynin Receives Generals	126
Dobrynin Meets Trade Official	127
Dobrynin Meets U.S. Scientists	127
Dobrynin Meets U.S. Businessmen	128
News Conference, by Vitaliy Sobolev	128
IZVESTIYA Cites Velikhov Speech, by Y. P. Velikhov	131
Forum Message to Hyder	133
Demichev Meets Religious Leaders	133
Religious Leaders Adopt Appeal	133
Forum Ends; Pozner Comments	135
Roundtable Assesses Results, by Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, et al.	136
Zholkver on Forum Reaction, by Aleksandr Zholkver	143
Primakov, Falin View Forum	144

Disarmament, East-West Relations Discussed in Munich (Various sources, 31 Jan-1 Feb 87).....	145
CSU's Strauss on Options	145
Woerner on Balance of Forces	146
SPD's Bahr on Proposed Corridor	147
Papers Comment on Meeting	148
Editorial Denounces Perle's Statement, by Werner Holzer	149

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR JOURNAL REVIEW OF FRENCH BOOK ON SDI

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 86 pp 127-129

[Article by Alexei Kireyev]

[Text]

The authors of the book under review, journalists Carlos de Sa Rego and Fabrizio Tonello, analyse the military-political essence of the US Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), its history, and the economic mechanism of its implementation. On the very first pages of the book, they assert that it would be impracticable and unproductive to develop a "space shield" which is advertised by the US Administration as a means of "putting an end to the nuclear era" (p. 8). In the authors' words, "only one thing has become clear following three years of research, namely that there will be no shield. At the dawn of the 21st century, just like today, nuclear weapons will be able to destroy the whole of civilisation" (p. 111).

The book notes that as early as the 1960s the USA was vigorously developing space arms systems. Even at a time when certain headway in Soviet-US relations was being made, the US military-industrial complex never ceased working on new weapon systems. Since 1974, the Pentagon jointly with Rockwell International and TRV carried on research in using lasers and particle-beam weapons in the ABM mode, later to be integrated into the Star Wars programme. As for the current US President, since his very first days in office he has shown interest in a "space shield" against ballistic missiles. In the spring of 1982, the ultra-conservative Heritage Foundation published a report entitled "High Frontier" which asserted that placing in orbit 432 satellites, each armed with 50 small missile killers ca-

pable of destroying ICBMs in flight, would be sufficient to ensure reliable anti-missile defence (p. 23).

The report instantly drew the White House's attention. Yet, even military experts regarded the US President's statement of March 23, 1983, in which he set the task of rendering nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete, as a sensation (p. 25). Even the first official comments made it clear that the new ABM concept as proposed by the President provided for orbiting battle systems designed to hit ICBMs and other objects in flight.

An assessment of military and political aspects of the new ABM system was given in the reports prepared by two independent commissions set up immediately after the President's March speech. The reports were not published verbatim but it was clear from the discussions among those in the know that they contained no single indication of the ABM space system capability to provide security for the whole of the USA. No surprise, then, that the SDI programme failed to elicit unconditional support among the legislative body. In 1985, the Pentagon succeeded in wringing only \$ 1,400 million out of the requested \$2,500 million for Star Wars, and in 1986 only \$2,750 million instead of \$3,700 million (p. 82).

Nonetheless, military experts hold that in the coming years SDI would swallow up the bulk of the outlays for military R&D and would become an 'oxygen mask' for the war industry" (p. 84). It is quite understandable, therefore, why major mi-

lilitary contractors of the US military-industrial complex rushed to enter the fierce competition for contracts. Since 1983, 260-odd companies have already been granted contracts worth over \$3,000 million. (p. 86). A special Star Wars lobby has also taken shape, consisting of major military-industrial corporations, small-scale highly specialised firms working on technological novelties, and research institutions engaged in military development. Six-hundred million dollars have been earmarked for the period till 1989 for university SDI-related research alone (p. 89).

The book shows how the USA has gradually drawn its allies into SDI. The involvement of West European countries and Japan in the transnational structure of the US military-industrial complex began in March 1985 with the well-known letter of Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger in which he made an ultimatum-resembling demand that the US NATO allies define their attitudes to the SDI programme within 60 days (p. 100). Just the arrogant style of the letter stirred up irritation in Western Europe. The allies were particularly wary of having been "invited" to partake of the programme only as sub-contractors. France expressed well-founded apprehensions that the joint implementation of the Star Wars plans would make Old World countries fall even farther behind the USA and Japan in the field of state-of-the-art technologies, and proposed to step up West European scientific and technological integration within its proposed Eureka project (p. 101). Yet, as the authors note, Paris' warning was not heeded in other West European capitals. In the FRG, a bitter political struggle erupted between SDI proponents and opponents, resulting in a compromise decision to start talks with the USA on joining SDI but to view it only as an ordinary commercial venture rather than a military-strategic programme. Eventually, however, the FRG became a full-fledged partner in SDI, which was formalised in an agreement concluded by the two governments in the spring of 1986 in Washington.

Eager to demonstrate its "Atlantic solidarity", Britain as early as December 1985 signed a "memorandum of understanding" with the USA, setting down general rules

for the participation of British firms and companies in putting into effect the Star Wars programme. What is more, during the talks the British side failed to wring from the Americans an assurance that its share in the SDI programme would amount to \$1,500 million as it wished (p. 106).

Virtually all West European military-industrial companies, according to the authors, wish to cut off the biggest possible piece of the SDI pie. Yet, as it follows from the report of the Federation of American Scientists, almost a half of the Star Wars-related projects will be off limits to West European firms since they fall under the Soviet-US ABM Treaty banning the transfer to other countries, and the deployment outside the national territories, of ABM systems or their components limited by the Treaty. Furthermore, one-third of the US projects has been designed for technologies which are merely unavailable in Western Europe. Since about 13 per cent of the projects are aimed at developing hardware capable of yielding a quick commercial return, one would be hard put to see the US Congress permitting the Administration to finance would-be rivals of the US firms. The upshot of all the above is that, in the opinion of American scientists, West European enterprises would be able to claim not more than 3 per cent of all outlays for SDI (p. 110). This would hardly provide a significant impetus to West Europe's scientific and technological development.

The authors believe that the implementation of the Star Wars programme, which is so dangerous for mankind, would in the coming decades whip up the arms race and increase mistrust and instability in relations between the USSR and the USA. They also express the supposition that the countries of Eastern and Western Europe can, by pooling their efforts, set about safeguarding in earnest their own security. Thus far, they believe, the position of Western Europe has been equivocal and inconsistent.

The alarm expressed by the authors of the book under review in connection with the Star Wars programme is consonant with the thoughts and sentiments of the progressive public in Western Europe which is vigorously opposed to Washington's aggressive military-space plans.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English Translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO 1812/084

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY: WESTERN EUROPE UNEASY OVER STAR WARS PLAN

HK140822 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 14 Feb 87 p 6

["Roundup" by correspondent Li Yunfei (2621 0061 7378): "Strategic Defense Initiative Again Causes Unease in Western Europe"]

[Text] London, 12 Feb -- British Prime Minister Thatcher said at a joint press conference with Italian Premier Craxi in London yesterday, what we have to tell the United States is that since the Strategic Defense Initiative deployment issue is extremely important to everyone, they should consult their allies about it. According to public opinion, it was rather unusual for Mrs Thatcher to publicly express herself in this way. This shows that the Strategic Defense Initiative is again causing unease among the Western European allies.

There has recently been a constant stream of reports from the other side of the Atlantic that research on the Strategic Defense Initiative has made rapid progress, and it may be possible to initiate the first stage of deployment between 1993 and 1995. For this reason, the United States is currently discussing a reinterpretation of the U.S -Soviet 1972 treaty on anti ballistic missiles. It was originally thought that Strategic Defense Initiative deployment would be achieved in the next century, but it will be done before then.

Western countries paid attention to these reports after they came out. FRG Chancellor Kohl requested President Reagan to continue to abide by the antimissile missile treaty; NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington also sent similar letters to Weinberger and Shultz; and the British ambassador to the United States was ordered by Thatcher and Geoffrey Howe to hurry and have a meeting with Shultz on 6 February before Reagan convened a meeting of the National Security Council.

The reason why the countries of Western Europe are uneasy is that, as they see it, if the United States goes ahead with this plan, the anti-missile treaty will cease to have effect, hopes for a U.S.-Soviet disarmament agreement will be dashed, and a new round of the arms race will be sparked off between the superpowers. There was veiled criticism from the countries of Western Europe when the United States broke the provisions of SALT-II last November. These countries held that limitation by treaty was always better than no treaty at all. As for the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, although the countries of Western Europe support it, they also harbor reservations in varying degrees. At the end of 1984, Prime Minister Thatcher and President Reagan agreed on four views on this question. One of their views was that the actual

deployment of this scheme should be a topic of future talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. Based on their own security considerations, the countries of Western Europe hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will be able to reach some kind of disarmament agreement to ease the arms race, but they do not want the immediate establishment of a "nuclear-free zone," nor do they expect a perfectly fool-proof Strategic Defense Initiative.

Prime Minister Thatcher and Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe are scheduled to visit the Soviet Union at the end of next month to play more of a part in easing East-West relations and reducing armaments. This will be relatively useful for the Conservative Party in winning over the electorate in the next general election. If the United States breaks the antiballistic missile treaty and tension rises in U.S.-Soviet relations, this will obviously have an unfavorable effect on Britain.

According to reports, President Reagan decided on 10 February to send someone to consult the Western European allies. At the same time, however, people have noted some harsh words from U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director Adelman. He said that the way in which the United States interprets the antimissile missile treaty is no concern of the Western European allies, as they are not qualified to tell us how we should correctly interpret the treaty. Hence, whether the United States will listen to the views of the Western European countries and soothe their unease is a question of concern to public opinion here.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4059

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

JAPAN'S ENVOY TELLS U.S. OF CONCERN ON ABM TREATY, SDI--Washington, 10 Feb (KYODO)--Japan Tuesday urged the United States to observe the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty in proceeding with the Strategic Defense Initiative, Japanese Ambassador to U.S. Nobuo Matsunaga said. Matsunaga told reporters he made the representation to Michael Armacost, the under secretary of state for political affairs. Matsunaga said he also told Armacost that Japan wants to be consulted prior to a U.S. decision to deploy the space-based antimissile system known popularly as "Star Wars." Armacost assured Matsunaga that SDI would not violate the ABM Treaty, which the United States concluded with the Soviet Union in 1972. Japan has agreed to allow Japanese private sector to take part in the research of SDI projects, on the condition that the SDI program falls within provisions of the ABM Treaty. Matsunaga also said Armacost told him that there was only a debate calling for partial deployment of the SDI system and the administration had made no decision about it. Armacost also said he was not aware the administration would make a decision in the near future. Matsunaga said he told Armacost that the Japanese Government "is watching with great concern" about moves within the United States seeking early deployment of the SDI program. Armacost said Britain, West Germany and Australia and other U.S. allies have similarly expressed concern about a possible early deployment of SDI. [Text] [Tokyo KYODO in English 0437 GMT 11 Feb 87 OW] /9738

CSO: 5260/068

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

TASS ASSESSES U.S. DEFENSE INFORMATION CENTER STUDY

LD292222 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 29 Jan 87

[Text] Washington, 29 Jan (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The Reagan Administration's course in the military field is directed not at curbing the arms race but at escalating it, the authoritative Washington-based Defense Information Center concluded in a study released here under the title "The Unravelling of Nuclear Arms Treaties: Another Step Toward Nuclear War."

"Recent events demonstrated sharp contradiction between the Reagan Administration's rhetoric on negotiating arms reductions and its actions. President Reagan has said many times that he is committed to negotiating an arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union, yet his actions have undermined both the prospects for new agreement and the effectiveness of existing agreements," the authors of the study say.

They recall that on 28 November 1986, the U.S. Administration exceeded the limits of the SALT II Treaty by fielding the 131st B-52 bomber carrying cruise missiles. Today the administration is subverting such a basic Soviet-American agreement as the ABM Treaty by going ahead with its Strategic Defense Initiative.

The "defensive" weapons of the ABM systems, developed under SDI, can be justifiably viewed by the Soviet Union as a component of the first-strike strategy, the study notes. SDI is openly aimed at thwarting the ABM Treaty also for the simple reason that the later document prohibits the development, testing and deployment of systems or components of ABM defenses in the sea, air, space or mobile ground-based modes.

SDI, meanwhile, is directed at the development of space-based systems, that is, those systems expressly prohibited by the ABM Treaty. The commitment to that program is absolutely incompatible with the treaty whatever "broad" interpretations of the ABM Treaty are used by the administration. If the ABM Treaty becomes a "dead letter," major defense systems would be deployed and any opportunity for reductions in or even a halt of the escalation of offensive weapons would be killed simultaneously, the authors of the study say.

This course, they conclude, jeopardizes other Soviet-American agreements and accords still in effect, thus escalating world tension and aggravating the risk of the accidental outbreak of nuclear war.

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

MOSCOW: POSITION ON TALKS CONFIRMED BY JANUARY PLENUM

LD011950 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Feb 87

[From "The International Panorama" presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello, comrades: It has turned out that January 1987 has been marked by the resumption of many important negotiations, and many international meetings are beginning and continuing. They could all be enumerated, but one can read about this in our press. Well, how are the talks going? Perhaps I shall dwell on the most vital, the most important, namely, the nuclear and space weapons talks which have entered another round.

The U.S. representative at these talks expresses satisfaction with the pace, with the dynamism with which these talks began, and he also expresses satisfaction with the fact that the level of these talks has been raised at a Soviet initiative. As is well known, the talks are being conducted on our side by Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs. Indeed, certain progress can be felt at these talks, although this progress is, of course, very, very modest. At the same time one feels a clear force exerting a braking influence on these positive elements that have become apparent.

There exists a point of view, quite widespread inside and outside the United States--probably familiar to you--that the White House is in a state of paralysis and that it has become practically lifeless. It would appear that this point of view is confirmed by the content of President Reagan's State of the Union Address to Congress. This address is amazingly devoid of any constructive ideas directed toward improving the international atmosphere. It drops a few words about how the United States is interested in constructive relations with the Soviet Union, but I would repeat that there is simply no concrete confirmation of this statement in the address.

Our attention is also drawn to another point: that a U.S. state figure has over the last few days been making particularly persistent statements about the need for the speedy introduction, by stages, of SDI elements. Moreover, it is clear that they want to make SDI the tombstone of the whole disarmament process. What is this? I think that there are many elements of bluff here; bluff with regard to Congress, from which they want to extort agreement to a

new military budget amounting to \$312 billion and bluff with regard to the Soviet Union, to whom they are, in a way, giving a signal: agree to a minimum of action and uncouple the Reykjavik package; otherwise, everything will be difficult. There are, of course, objective obstacles with regard to the possibilities of the current U.S. Administration, but in any case the overall U.S. point of view, its position, is to a greater extent, probably, represented by the braking forces.

There is another position, the Soviet position which is a moral, lofty position dictated by an aspiration to arrive at a nonviolent, nuclear-free world. The work of the January plenum of the party Central Committee, which has, one must say, made a simply shattering impression in the West, has actually become a confirmation of this position. By the way, such Russian words as restructuring [perestroyka], acceleration [uskoreniye], and of course openness [glasnost] are now often given in the Western press without translation into the language of the country represented by this or that organ of the mass media.

Furthermore, of course, political observers in the West are impressed by many things. Much attention is particularly being paid to the key that has been chosen by the plenum of the party Central Committee to deepen all the revolutionary changes there are occurring in our country; namely, the development of socialist democratism, the deepening of socialist democratism. These profound changes that are taking place in our country, the process of renewal which has been introduced into our life, the process of renewal that the Soviet Union is introducing into international life are being noticed. This world-wide echo that has been aroused by the plenum of the party Central Committee and the responses, very rich in content and positive for the most part, to this plenum's work, show that the work that has been done by the Soviet Union over the recent period is beginning to bear fruit; it is beginning to have an effect on broad public circles. [video shows Shishlin speaking to camera.]

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR'S KARPOV: DISARMAMENT'S 'ROSY GLOW' VERSUS REALITY

PM131648 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Feb 87 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Viktor Pavlovich Karpov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Arms Limitation and Disarmament Administration, by our correspondent A. Novikov under the rubric "Topical Interview": "Disarmament -- the Ideal of Socialism"; date, place of interview not stated; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] How is the USSR-U.S. dialogue in the arms control sphere developing? What stage have the USSR and the United States reached in the quest for mutually acceptable solutions? What are the prospects for the disarmament process? Our correspondent talks on these topics with Viktor Pavlovich Karpov, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary and chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Arms Limitation and Disarmament Administration.

[Novikov] Looking back, one recalls M.S. Gorbachev's words at the Reykjavik press conference to the effect that the Geneva talks are deadlocked and are marking time. What is the situation at the talks now? Has the discussion got moving?

[Karpov] Throughout the period since the Reykjavik meeting we have made the greatest efforts to achieve that. On 7 November, that is, soon after the summit meeting, we submitted detailed proposals on all the avenues of the talks -- space, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range missiles and the commencement of full-scale talks on ending nuclear tests -- with a view to embarking on the drafting of accords as soon as possible. At the end of the sixth round of talks, which the American side wanted to end earlier (in fact it ended on 12 November), we proposed holding the next round in December, but the U.S. side was not prepared for such a discussion. As a result a compromise was reached -- to meet at the beginning of December for a working meeting with a smaller group.

However, here too it unfortunately did not prove possible to lay the foundations for the seventh round of talks, which began on 15 January. Therefore the new round basically started at the point where the sides had parted at the end of the previous round.

The United States is gradually accumulating reservations which appear to be not very major ones or even look purely technical. But if you examine them closely, they very substantially change the U.S. attitude to Reykjavik. This change is in the direction of the even more categorical negation of everything that was achieved there. Take, for instance, the question of medium-range missiles in Europe. Formerly it was said that they should all be eliminated: either by destroying the launchers and missiles or by

dismantling them. Now, however, the American side is making a new proposal which sounds roughly like this: Let us envisage, in addition to these two methods, the possibility of a third -- that of refitting the medium-range missile launchers as launchers for shorter-range missiles. This means that the United States would have the same number of missiles in Europe, only with a shorter range.

There are many such examples, but this one alone indicates with sufficient eloquence the line the United States is now pursuing at the talks. At the same time Washington is trying to bathe the Geneva talks in a rosy glow and portray that everything is going well there and the sides are making progress in agreeing on their positions. The administration states that if the Soviet side makes concessions on a number of serious issues, then it will be possible to reach accords. That is, the real state of affairs is turned upside down.

To make progress it is clearly necessary for the American side to assess its own positions more soberly, and for it finally to display political courage and political farsightedness and travel its part of the way to an agreement.

[Novikov] Can this be hoped for? For instance, speaking in Munich on the eve of the new year, U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle described the dream of a nuclear-free world as an absurd whim. "The stupidity of the idea of a world free from nuclear weapons," he said, "is not made any less by the conditions which Western statesmen usually attach to the attainment of this goal not to sweep aside this idea as the empty propaganda it is." The question arises: Is not this position the platform -- the real platform, not the verbal one -- on which all U.S. foreign policy is based? Is it possible to achieve any accord at all with an administration which preaches such views?

[Karpov] The U.S. Administration's position on disarmament questions is determined by the interaction of many factors. It is well known that the most right-wing conservative forces now set the tone in Washington. They are the Heritage Foundation, notorious for its extremist views, and circles that have direct links with the Pentagon and whose views are expressed by R. Perle.

At the same time we cannot close our eyes to the fact that an objective reality exists -- the reality of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race, which is associated with the increasing danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. This danger is no less for the United States than for the Soviet Union, and many people in the United States have long since recognized this fact. So in Washington different viewpoints oppose each other and interact with each other. This is a complex situation, and is also combined with various kinds of scandals like "Irangate" -- it probably does not yet provide a clear picture of the direction in which the U.S. Administration's policy will develop.

Certain politicians ask us whether we are prepared to conduct a serious discussion with the Reagan administration at all or whether we are not more inclined to wait for the current President to go, in the hope that more realistically minded people will come to the White House. No! Our policy cannot be based on short-term considerations. The line of following the path of nuclear disarmament, as formulated in the program announced by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January 1986, is our principled line. It does not depend on short-term fluctuations or on who is in the White House -- Democrat or Republican.

The possibility of progress now depends on the U.S. Administration -- we realize that, and we will continue to work with it: to explain our position and seek new points of contact.

[Novikov] A book entitled "Reagan and Gorbachev" came out in the United States recently. In the authors' opinion, in gambling on "Star Wars" Reagan has decided to strike a crushing blow against the USSR's postwar achievements in the international arena. This means, first and foremost, the USSR's attainment of strategic parity with the United States. How far is this White House hope justified?

[Karpov] The Soviet Union will not permit such a turn of events. We have the potential to parry U.S. attempts to violate the strategic balance that has become established and has been characterized by approximate parity for more than 10 years now. An unexpected, rapid breakthrough from the viewpoint of securing military advantages requires large-scale programs, considerable efforts, and many years of work. The Soviet Union will therefore be able to take compensatory measures on its part, which will not give the United States the opportunity to secure such military advantages.

Therefore for us to maintain parity in response to U.S. attempts to violate it is basically an instrument of the policy of peace, an instrument of lessening the danger of nuclear war. It is clear that as the mountains of weapons grow, the danger of war will also grow -- as a result of the new character of the arms and their greater dependence on computer technology.

In this respect there is a great threat inherent in the "Strategic Defense Initiative." Thus its first echelon, which it is planned to "suspend" over the Soviet Union, is supposed to come into operation literally in seconds to destroy Soviet missiles. It is impossible to take a crucial political decision in seconds, and that means computers will give the order for the use of weapons. Thus a nuclear war could start as a result of erroneous actions by computer technology.

Here the human factor will be present in an utterly distorted form: in the form of possible mistakes written into the computer program which could be multiplied to an incredible scale with unpredictable consequences.

[Novikov] The U.S. Administration, continuing its nuclear tests, has refused to join in the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. Does this not mean our counterparts in the talks regard the Soviet program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the century as utopian?

[Karpov] The Americans have a complex attitude toward our program. They are trying to take from it whatever appears most advantageous to them. In particular, the United States is not averse to talking to us about 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive arms over the next 5 years. They confine this readiness mainly to their classic triad: ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers. As for long-range sea-launched cruise missiles, of which the United States plans to site several thousand -- with nuclear and conventional warheads -- on submarines and surface ships, these do not come into this category. The United States would like to keep that channel of the arms race.

What is at issue here? Formerly, in the fifties, the United States possessed a vast pool of heavy bombers and counted on impunity in the event of a first nuclear strike against the USSR. The creation of strategic ICBM's in our country eliminated the U.S. invulnerability. Now they would not mind creating additional potential around us for the infliction of a nuclear strike on USSR territory, having first reduced the potential for a retaliatory strike on our part against their territory. In this event they are prepared to accept a reduction in their ballistic missiles, but at the same time they want to hold on to the possibility of creating cruise missiles and deploying them on ships and submarines, thus ensuring potential for a nuclear strike against the USSR's territory -- to no less a degree and perhaps even to a greater degree than that potential exists today.

That is why, while agreeing verbally with the USSR that nuclear disarmament is a noble goal, the United States seeks to use only that part of the program which would objectively weaken the Soviet Union and give the United States unilateral military superiority.

As for the real content of the U.S. proposals on 50-percent reductions as submitted in Geneva, it turns out that while formally reducing the number of its strategic nuclear warheads to 6,000, the United States would like to retain the possibility of increasing these nuclear warheads on other categories of arms, categories which are not counted, to approximately 15,000 -- as many as they have now. They would like the Soviet Union to reduce the number to 6,000 for those categories of arms which would at present enable us to make an effective retaliatory strike.

[Novikov] It has often been suggested recently that the U.S. President may soon approve the so-called "early deployment" of SDI. What does this mean and what would it entail for USSR-U.S. relations?

[Karpov] This question is giving rise to serious debates in the United States too. Even some supporters of the general idea of SDI -- as it was formulated by President Reagan on 23 March 1983 -- consider the deployment of the ABM systems envisaged by the program to be possible only if that deployment will ensure reliable coverage of the territory of the United States, that is, that substantial damage could not be done either to the population or to industry in the United States. Incidentally, in the speech in which he announced the SDI program, Reagan uttered a highly significant phrase. What it amounted to was that if this program is implemented in combination with the preservation of U.S. strategic offensive nuclear weapons, it could be seen as a sign of aggressive intentions. That is, the intention to make a first strike against the other side from under this shield, and cover yourself against a retaliatory strike. That is precisely how C. Weinberger's proposal to commence the deployment of limited ABM systems on U.S. territory in the nineties looks.

In this regard a comparison is often made: In a downpour a strong umbrella is useful, but in a drizzle one with holes will do. Perhaps it is this "umbrella with holes" that it is planned to deploy in the United States in the nineties. Of course, if the United States embarks on the deployment of such a system, it will mean the flagrant violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty, basically a break with that treaty, and the creation of a completely new strategic situation in relations with the Soviet Union. This will amount to an invitation to a new stage of the arms race, with all the ensuing dangerous consequences.

[Novikov] The 1972 ABM Treaty has frequently been mentioned recently in the press and in statements by politicians. Our editorial mail shows that not all our young readers clearly understand why this document has acquired such significance specifically today. Could you say a few words about that?

[Karpov] The ABM Treaty was born because of the recognition by both sides that the deployment of large-scale ABM defense systems would mean a destabilization of the situation and a stimulus to increasing and improving means of overcoming that ABM defense so as to prevent the other side from counting on impunity in inflicting a first strike.

If the ABM Treaty is called into question and if it is counterposed by the deployment of large-scale ABM systems as is envisaged in the "Star Wars" program, this means calling into question the whole possibility of reaching agreement on strategic offensive arms reduction, and even more on their elimination.

[Novikov] The United States accuses the Soviet Union of violating the ABM Treaty, citing the construction of a radar station near Krasnoyarsk. At the same time it has such a radar station itself at Thule (Greenland) and is building another at Fylingdales Moor (Britain). Who is really violating the treaty?

[Karpov] First of all I would like to say something about the U.S. radar stations -- the one in Greenland, which is already virtually built and is now undergoing startup and tuning tests, and the one in Britain where preparations for construction are in progress. The creation of these radar stations is contrary to the provisions of the ABM Treaty.

The point is that at the time of the treaty's conclusion the United States had in Greenland and Britain and the Soviet Union had in the Moscow region low-power radar stations designed to give warning of a missile attack for ABM purposes.

In the process of the drafting of the ABM Treaty limitations, it was deemed possible to allow these American and Soviet stations to remain -- stations based on earlier technology and without the so-called phased-array antennas. Item "b" of Article V of that treaty stipulated that after its conclusion the two sides do not have the right to build missile attack warning stations other than on the periphery of their national territory, oriented outward. Greenland, like Britain, can in no way be considered part of U.S. territory. Especially since a new radar station is being built in Greenland. This is by no means a modernization, as the United States tries to claim, since the new station has phased-array antennas, which the five radar stations which were there before did not have. It has nothing in common with them. Compare for yourself: Its design potential is many tens of times greater than the potential of the old stations and the limit established by the treaty.

That is why, from 1975, we have raised the question with the United States of whether these stations -- of the "Pave Paws" type -- conform to the demands of the ABM Treaty. After all, in effect the United States is now moving toward the violation of several articles of the treaty -- as regards the siting of these stations on the territory of the United States itself, as regards the construction of new -- I emphasize: new -- radar stations on the territory of Greenland and Britain, and as regards their power.

The United States began to actively debate the Krasnoyarsk radar station question at precisely the time it had decided to deploy its own radar stations in Greenland and Britain. The Krasnoyarsk station -- and we informed the United States of this in detail -- is designed for tracking objects in space. Its location, its operating principles, and, finally, the wavelength on which it will operate are designed precisely for tracking things in space, particularly the launching of manned spacecraft. Unlike U.S. radar stations it will operate in the meter waveband, not the centimeter or decimeter band, which in itself makes it unsuitable for use within an ABM framework -- it is not accurate enough to measure the coordinates of objects in space. We therefore regard the complaints against us as unsubstantiated.

Nevertheless we proposed a radical way to get rid of this question to the U.S. side: The United States would dismantle its radar station at Thule and abandon the construction of the other -- on Fylingdales Moor -- and we would do likewise with our station, which is under construction. The Americans rejected this option.

[Novikov] A final and somewhat personal question, Viktor Pavlovich: Do you as a person and as a politician believe in the possibility of nuclear war and consequently in the possibility of a global catastrophe, or is that kind of threat an abstract one as far as you are concerned? Can you picture what it would be like?

[Karpov] In many respects we cannot picture what a nuclear war would bring us. We have still not gotten accustomed to seriously contemplating the catastrophic consequences the use of nuclear weapons could entail. Scientists recently pointed to an important aspect which we had not envisioned before -- the possibility of a "nuclear winter." They proved with facts and calculations what this threatens mankind with and what would be the result of the use of even a limited number of nuclear charges not only for the region where the nuclear war was being waged but for the whole of the globe. Irreparable and irreversible consequences!

There are probably other as yet unconsidered factors linked with the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons. If the Chernobyl reactor accident caused serious consequences, you can imagine what the explosion of several nuclear warheads would mean for Europe, for example. At one time British scientists calculated it would take only five average-yield nuclear charges to make the British Isles uninhabitable. They were calculating the consequences for Britain alone, disregarding the fact that millions of people in other countries would also suffer.

We still cannot picture the entire magnitude of the catastrophe which a nuclear war could entail. We will probably never identify it completely. That is just as well. It is better for us not to know all these consequences, better to prevent than to experience them. I therefore think the struggle to avert a nuclear war and reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons is the path which leads most directly toward security and the guaranteed possibility of mankind's development in the 21st century on a new basis -- the basis of a nuclear-free world under the conditions of all all-embracing system, of peace and security, as the Soviet Union is proposing.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

KARPOV ON USSR 'MODEL OF NEW MENTALITY'

LD111717 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Program entitled "The Soviet Plan for a Nuclear-Free World -- a Model of the New Mentality" with Viktor P. Karpov, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium and head of the Directorate for Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems, in Moscow, date not specified -- live or recored]

[Text] Since human civilization came about, there has been a principle: If you want peace, prepare for war. War has served as an instrument of policy; people approached war as an art form. War may have yielded colossal destruction, but war has also brought victory and the opportunity to become established as an empire, as a state. As the empires fell, others arose, but the principle if you want peace, prepare for war has existed up to our times, to the 20th century.

Then nuclear weapons appeared, nuclear weapons that radically changed, or rather, should have changed, people's very mentality, their attitude to questions of war and peace. Albert Einstein, at the dawn of the nuclear age, said that nuclear weapons have changed the world but have not changed people's consciousness. This really is true. The nuclear age demands a new approach, a new approach to those problems that also arise, and to questions of war and peace. On these matters -- the problems of war and peace -- new dimensions have appeared, dimensions that can be described in short as the problem of the future of humankind, the problem of its survival.

The problem of nuclear disarmament announced on 15 January last year by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is intended precisely to ensure the survival of humankind and to give it the opportunity of using all of its available material and spiritual resources at its present stage of development, to ensure moving into the 21st century without nuclear weapons and into a world without wars.

Wherein lies the significance of this program? It is, first and foremost, that it is comprehensive. It encompasses all the fundamental elements of the equation that should lead to a genuinely nuclear-free world and ensure the security of peoples. This program is at the same time not utopian, although it does proclaim a very far-reaching aim, namely liberating humankind from nuclear war, from the nuclear threat altogether. This program has formulated a far-reaching aim, but it also outlines realistic ways of achieving it, ways prompted by life itself and the objective development of military technology, including nuclear technology. In short, this program is one of practical actions, a program for real disarmament, as distinct from the slogans that the West at times falls back on.

Our program is one projecting 15 years of very active, intensive and singleminded work so that, initially, in the first phase, there will be a reduction in nuclear strategic weapons by the United States and the Soviet Union, as the leading nuclear powers, by 50 percent. They then proceed to the second phase, now with the participation of other nuclear powers, to begin the liquidation of other kinds of nuclear weapons, first and foremost weapons designated as tactical. Then, moving steadily to the third phase, is the liquidation of all remaining nuclear weapons.

Our program for nuclear disarmament is not at all restricted only to nuclear weapons. It is understandable that now, with the development of science and technology, other types of weapons are also being refined. There are chemical weapons, weapons of mass destruction and there is the possibility of developing weapons using new physical principles: beam weapons, laser and other kinds of weapons that could, in their destructive might, compare with and perhaps even surpass nuclear weapons. Therefore, the Soviet program talks not only about the liquidation of nuclear weapons, but also about the liquidation of other kinds of mass destruction weapons, first and foremost chemical weapons, and also stresses the need for a sharp reduction in conventional weapons. The goal is to bring these weapons to the minimum level of reasonable sufficiency, sufficient to maintain security on the basis of a worldwide, all-encompassing system of international peace and security.

After being put forward, the program has been developing, growing richer with new proposals from the Soviet Union. It has been made concrete on all its levels. First of all, it is essential to mark the significance of the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan as far as nuclear and space weapons are concerned. The Soviet side went to this meeting with a precise, clear program. This program was designed to really open wide the door to a world without weapons, a world without wars, starting with sharp and deep reductions in the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States. This would make it possible in the next 10 years to completely liquidate the Soviet as well as the U.S. strategic offensive means. With the participation of other states, the process will move toward further even greater reductions, and to the subsequent liquidation of all nuclear weapons.

The question was formulated in a concrete way. Concrete prospects were drawn up by our side and ways of achieving these tasks were revealed. However, everything hinges on the U.S. unwillingness to close the road of the arms race in space. Sometimes it is asked why the Soviet Union has made this issue, the issue of not allowing weapons into space, an obstacle to reaching an agreement on real nuclear disarmament. This is not so. The issue is formulated differently.

Namely: The United States, having proclaimed its SDI program, in essence would have liked, when talking to us about the liquidation of nuclear weapons, to simultaneously open the road in the development of new types of weapons, space weapons. These weapons could change sharply the general strategic balance and could alter the question of peace guarantees and security for all. Because of this, it has been necessary to try to decide the questions comprehensively and not individually. The stubborn unwillingness of the U.S. Administration to take into account this interdependence, to take real measures to close the road of sending weapons into space has become an obstacle to reaching an accord.

I participated in the Reykjavik meeting and can, as a witness, say the two contrasting positions the Soviet Side confronted there made a deep impression on me. As a representative of our group of experts, I had to negotiate with the U.S. experts regarding the implementation of those decisions drafted in Reykjavik that were agreed upon during the 1st day of the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan.

What struck me most of all? The very disparity of the two positions: our position, which was calculated on major practical decisions in the sphere of nuclear disarmament, and the narrowness of viewpoint, approach and thinking of the U.S. experts. They do not think in terms of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons but in terms of retaining nuclear weapons, of adapting the very aim of nuclear disarmament to the strategic tasks of the United States and of guaranteeing the U.S. nuclear potential for waging a nuclear war.

It would seem a paradoxical position: We are talking about nuclear disarmament while at the same time, the United States wants to ensure its nuclear potential to wage a nuclear war. Nonetheless, this paradox is a reality. In the United States, in Washington, the administration is not averse to speculating about nuclear disarmament. It willingly admits such an aim does exist, the aim of eliminating nuclear weapons. However, in so doing, it puts forward its own understanding of how a non-nuclear world could be attained. The U.S. side essentially opposes the Soviet program of nuclear disarmament through the elimination of nuclear weapons with its Star Wars program, which is depicted as a means of making nuclear weapons innocuous and obsolete.

But let's have a look at how this Star Wars program combines with the aims of nuclear disarmament. What is the meaning of this program? It is to set up an impenetrable umbrella over the United States, as President Reagan stated as early as 1983. Now, many people in the United States, who come into contact with this program in one way or another, are taking part in wider scale debates as to whether this program makes sense, whether it can be attained, and what it will provide in terms of security for the United States itself, and for the world.

On the one hand, the desire is more and more apparent on the part of the more militaristically minded U.S. circles, defense Secretary Weinberger first of all, to bind the United States to decisions that would signify the deployment [razvertivaniye] at least in part, of the Star Wars program, at the beginning of the nineties, thereby making the process irreversible. On the other hand, there are a great many scientists who now believe the program itself cannot be implemented in the form in which it has been declared, and Weinberger's attempts to set about making the decision to deploy this program are aiming to get money out of congress, as they say, and thereby to spur on work to develop [po sozdaniyu] a strategic defense programme.

It is being said this program is one of eliminating nuclear weapons but if one looks at the real policies of the United States one can see that the plan indicates something totally different. Along with the development [sozdaniye] of anti-missile systems in space and on earth, the United States is planning and implementing a broad program of modernizing its nuclear arsenal and developing [sozdaniye] new strategic systems: the MX missile, Trident-2, long-range cruise missiles, and the new strategic bombers, including the Stealth bomber. All, in purpose and design, must have a single intent: dealing the first disarming strike. It must be noted that when, on 23 March 1983, President Reagan announced his Star Wars program, he noted this aspect and spoke of the fact that if the United States were to take the road of combining anti-missile systems with offensive weapon arsenals, this could be seen as evidence of aggressive intent. What the administration is now doing confirms this, that here we are dealing precisely with aggressive intentions. It is not a question of some short-term undertaking designed for a brief period. No, as recently stated by Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when speaking of the nuclear arms sphere, it is a question of modernization and renewal by the United States; not of a sprint, as he put it, but a marathon. What he is talking about is a protracted program relying on a complete overhaul of the U.S. offensive nuclear potential.

All in all, to draw a conclusion, the U.S. nuclear program is designed, in combination with the SDI program, to guarantee that it is the United States that can wage a nuclear war, calculating on winning with a minimum of losses. This is definitely apparent already. We are able to talk about this on the basis of the real tendencies of nuclear arms development [razvitiye] in the United States. We are, of course, obliged to seek answers to the U.S. aggressive programs and to think about how to make America's nuclear systems as unthreatening as possible to the Soviet Union. However we believe this route, the route of arms race competition, is a dangerous one. It will not lead to strengthening strategic stability nor to lessening the danger of nuclear war breaking out, but, on the contrary, it will more likely increase this danger. Our route, then, the route we are proposing, is one of a gradual move toward a non-nuclear world. In this respect, our program, a year before it was announced, had demonstrated real possibilities of moving in this direction.

There are now, as it were, two poles in the development of mood and thinking on questions of war and peace. One pole, around which the vast majority of people throughout the world is concentrated, ensures broad support for the Soviet program and is in favor of its being very rapidly implemented. At the same time, another tendency is to be observed, that of growing opposition in certain countries among the upper level of the political leadership, opposition to any movement in favor of a non-nuclear world.

Last year, on several occasions I had to speak with political figures from various countries -- Britain and the United States, West Germany and France -- and I could say that year showed great change in thinking and approach in many of Western Europe's political circles as well as in the United States itself. These changes, however, were inconsistent and contradictory. On the one hand, the position of those in favor of taking genuine measures for disarmament was strengthened.

On the other hand, opposition and counter-action to these measures also strengthened, on the part of those who are banking on strength and tightening tension in Europe still further.

It is very noticeable that even in such countries as France, which has experienced the woe of World War II, a tendency is currently to be observed among the political circles close to the government to place possibility of a non-nuclear world in doubt. This possibility is placed in doubt above all by referring to the fact that, as it claimed, 40 years of peace in Europe have been ensured by nuclear weapons. If it were not for nuclear weapons, there would allegedly have been war in Europe along with its devastating consequences. It is not true that 40 years without war in Europe have been guaranteed by nuclear weapons. Those years have been ensured and guaranteed by the peace loving foreign policies of the socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union.

There can, of course, be no return to a pre-nuclear world, to the world before World War II. This is not objectively possible. The new non-nuclear world must be based on a new security system, a comprehensive security system, which would be adopted in such a way, with the agreement of all participants, so as to guarantee the security of everyone with a minimal number of conventional weapons.

What are the prospects for such a solution? Reykjavik has shown it is possible to move toward nuclear disarmament, it is really possible to count on such a solution if there is good will on the part of the United States and on the part of the other nuclear powers. Objectively, nuclear weapons can be eliminated. This, I repeat, requires political will. Here is the curious part. I don't know whether you, listeners, have paid any attention to this but there is a problem, the problem of ex-es: ex-generals and ex-political figures, who, retiring from their posts in the government or the army, begin to take up other positions on issues of war and peace than those they held in their official posts. They are opposed to the policy of war and in favor of disarmament and of taking immediate measures that would avert the danger of nuclear war breaking out.

What is this all about? It is, apparently, explained by the fact that, in state service, they come to understand the depth of the contradiction between the actions of the imperialist countries and the real requirements of mankind, people's real needs. They come to understand the necessity for new thinking but, in their official posts, they are bound by discipline, by state discipline. When they retire from these posts, they gain the opportunity to act on the basis of their experience; and act they do. There is an organization, Generals for Peace, which united ex-military figures from the NATO countries and other European and American countries, which is actively in favor of peace. They are in favor of the sort of peace that would guarantee the absence of war, that would, that is, essentially render the military caste unnecessary.

Of course, objective factors come into play here, factors linked to the very nature of nuclear arms and to the very nature of science and technology development in our nuclear age. The new political thinking does not, of course, lie in our claiming we know everything already, we have ready cures or we can already settle our problems on the basis of our 15 January program. Our program is leadership for action. It is, of course, not mere dogma nor something fixed that should not be subject to improvements taking into consideration new circumstances. On the contrary, we imagine that as it is implemented our program should absorb anything progressive mankind is now creating or is being born of contemporary thinking.

I would like, in this connection, to look at the Delhi declaration on a non-nuclear and non-violent world, which was signed during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to New Delhi. This declaration has absorbed many philosophical views of Buddhism, the teaching of which, as much as 2000 years ago, proclaimed a non-violent world. This is natural since a non-violent world answers people's hopes. Cooperation for the sake of achieving such a world is naturally becoming an ever urgent task. Achieving these aims of a non-nuclear, non-violent world is obviously no easy task and of course it requires laborious and protracted work.

However, a powerful factor that will help deal with these tasks is our foreign policy, the policy of the Soviet Union formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress. The congress' program the program of nuclear disarmament and our concrete steps in foreign policy, are a powerful factor influencing the minds of the people of the present. Restructuring the entire life of the Soviet Union is seen as a readiness and determination on the part of the Soviet Union to take the path of also restructuring international relations along the new principles of a non-nuclear and non-violent world.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

MOSCOW TALK SHOW CONSIDERS POSSIBILITY OF DEALING WITH U.S.

LD140404 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 13 Feb 87

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Vladimir Pasko with Vitaliy Chukseyev, TASS chief foreign news editor; Vyacheslav Vladimirovich Sychev, CEMA secretary; Vladimir Beloshapka, correspondent for Southeast Asia; Sergey Pravdin, "a colleague of Pasko's"; Pavel Kasparov, commentator and former correspondent in Paris; and Konstantin Patsyuk, journalist on international affairs]

[Excerpts] [Pasko] Hello, comrades! Letters connected with disarmament problems and USSR-U.S. relations continue to make up the greater part of the mailbag reaching our program. This is natural. The topicality of the problems is obvious: People are worried that in an important sphere, such as disarmament, there are no positive changes. The arms race is continuing and is threatening to spread into space. The authors of the letters vigorously state opinions on this score, and it is clear to whom the reproaches are addressed.

Is it really that difficult to understand what threat, including also the threat to the Americans themselves, that the arms race in our age is fraught with? This is an excerpt from a letter received from Odintsovo, Moscow Oblast.

Do people in Washington really hope to sit out a nuclear war in a shelter, if, of course, it takes place? This is a letter from Comrade Kulin for Syktyvkar.

Do the American people know of our proposals? War veterans Polina Yakovlevna and Boris Petrovich Nastavniny from Sestroretsk ask. This question interests many of our listeners. It cannot be answered unequivocally: part of it, yes -- but not as whole. The U.S. press presents their compatriots with an image of the Soviet Union that is very one-sided and mainly in a negative context.

We were participants in the war, this is written by another listener of ours, Comrade Malkov from the village of Golyshevo in Kurgan Oblast, even though fewer and fewer of us remain. We get together and discuss politics. Perhaps it is time to stop trying to persuade the United States and to do as they do.

What can one say? As the saying goes: There are as many views as there are people. But policy should not be built on emotions. I think that you will agree with this. Becoming like the United States would not do us any good. Their policy, from a position of strength, attempts to secure for themselves superiority in the world; incessant demonstrations of military might and the diktat that they are trying to implement toward other people are being condemned everywhere.

The debates on various aspects of the situation in the world, which are being held at the United Nations annually, confirm this convincingly. During votes on problems of disarmament and the strengthening of international security at the latest UN General Assembly session, the United States was left in a minority 43 times along with its allies, and was left in complete isolation 11 times; even those allies are disassociating themselves from Washington's shameful course.

Policy should be built on realities. Only in that case is success assured.

What realities are we speaking of today? The first of them, undoubtedly, is that nuclear war is not to be tolerated. If it occurs, this would be a catastrophe for everyone. The second one is that weapons spreading into space will not strengthen but weaken the security of those who are going all out for this and it will make nuclear arms control impossible. The third reality is that building one's well-being at the expense of others in our time is an anachronism that endangers civilization.

There are quite a few people in the United States who recognize these realities. The growing opposition to the present U.S. Administration's course testifies to this. Take, for instance, the draft resolution in Congress in defense of the SALT II treaty, the movement for the prevention of the militarization of space and for a cessation of nuclear tests. The trouble is that those ruling the United States do not wish to see the consequences of their action.

As you probably know from reports over the radio, television, and in the papers, during the whole of the last week an acute struggle was continuing in the United States. It was provoked by the government's manifest intention to abandon the next accord with the Soviet Union -- the ABM Treaty signed in 1972. I asked Vitaliy Yakovlevich Chukseyev, TASS chief foreign news editor, to tell us about this in greater detail.

[Chukseyev] The Reagan administration has mounted a new frontal attack on the 1972 USSR-U.S. treaty on limiting ABM systems which now is one of the few remaining effective barriers along the road to a further arms race. It is precisely in this way that the discussion taking place in Washington as to whether the United States should start accelerated tests and deploy Star Wars components is being assessed throughout the world.

The latest discussion of this question took place in the White House early this week, and even though the decision made by this conference is being kept a deep secret, informed observers unanimously are coming to the conclusion that the U.S. Administration has already made its choice, having give in to the pressure of the conservatives in the Washington echelons of power. It should be explained that by conservatives the U.S. press means: Caspar Weinberger, chief of the Pentagon; the most right-wing figures from Reagan's entourage and congressmen; and other advocates of the military-industrial complex. In other words, we are dealing with people who are advocating the illusory policy of achieving military superiority, of power diplomacy

[silovaya diplomatiya], and of violating existing international norms and agreements. Thus, now also, the so-called broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty that seeks to revise it unilaterally by means of jurisprudence in the Washington fashion has been launched. Incidentally, the U.S. press testifies that President Reagan himself is a champion of such a broad interpretation.

Touching on the specific plans that the Pentagon is putting forward, observers are writing, for example, that the military is striving for space-killer systems -- the principle of whose operation is based on the use of kinetic energy -- to be tested in the coming years. As is lamented in military circles, however, such tests cannot be carried out until a broader interpretation of the ABM treaty is adopted. So, without going into the technological details that now concern the organizers of the Star Wars program, one ought to note that far-reaching aims are being pursued by way of sabotage with regard to this agreement.

As THE WASHINGTON POST commented in this regard, the Pentagon's persistence is explained by a desire to clear the way for real tests of such systems before an accord with the Soviet Union -- which is insisting on severe limitations with respect to development work on SDI -- can be secured at the Geneva talks. THE BOSTON GLOBE elaborated on this by commenting that the supporters of Star Wars wish to lay down and fortify the bureaucratic and industrial foundations of SDI, a situation that would allow this program to remain intact even after Ronald Reagan -- its main initiator and supporter -- leaves his post. Judging from the responses from various capitals, these plans aroused the most decisive, worldwide opposition and concern over the attempts to torpedo the ABM Treaty, a sentiment that has been expressed by even the United States' closest NATO allies.

The British newspaper THE DAILY TELEGRAPH stated that the intentions of the Reagan administration concerning the Star Wars program have aroused alarm in the North Atlantic Alliance, whose members, with the exception of the United States, consider that the violation of the tenets of the ABM Treaty will do serious damage to the prospects for reaching agreement on nuclear-weapons issues. Indeed, in recent days the government of Great Britain has, several times, made representations to its senior partner at various levels. Alarm and concern have been expressed by the leaders of the Netherlands, Norway, Italy, and Canada, and even Japan has joined the chorus of protest.

It is no coincidence that the White House intends to dispatch its emissaries to various countries of Western Europe in the near future for consultations, as has been officially announced, but in reality it is to work over and twist the arms of its allies. The impression is being created that attempts to revise the ABM Treaty is the next phase in a thought-out program of the present U.S. Administration in the sphere of the arms race. As is known, they were preceded by the decision on the unilateral rejection of the SALT II treaty and the continuation of nuclear-weapons testing, despite the fact that the Soviet Union has adhered to a moratorium on all nuclear explosions for 1 and 1/2 years, and other steps.

Judging from all this, the U.S. newspaper NEWS DAY somberly summarized: The legacy of the present administration is that the world will get the most expensive and dangerous arms race in its entire history.

This is why discussions are underway throughout the world on how to protect our planet from a nuclear death that such a reckless policy is capable of engendering and on how to ensure the creation of an all-embracing system of peace and security. In this context, the attention of the world public is focused on Moscow, where the forum "For a Nuclear-free World, for the Survival of Humanity" is opening. Describing the interest that this meeting has aroused, the newspaper THE NEW TIMES wrote: World celebrities are heading for Moscow. And another U.S. newspaper, THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, reported: It is expected that the forum will attract hundreds of scientific, commercial, religious, and cultural figures. To this one may add that gathering in the capital of our country are people of various political views, but who are united by one thing: the desire to ensure a nuclear-free future for the world and the salvation and survival of our own and future generations.

At this meeting, one may expect an interesting, acute, and most probably difficult dialogue, but it is already possible to say with certainty that this forum will become a demonstration of new political thinking the contemporary world.

[Pasko] Thank you, Vitaly Yakovlevich, but, before going on to the next topic of the broadcast, I would like to say the following: We are building our policy by proceeding from reality. We appeal to the United States to do likewise.

We remind the United States of the need for new thinking, presence of mind, accurate evaluations, and, above all, the understanding of the fact that no matter how strong someone is, he cannot command the contemporary world. Comrade Gorbachev spoke about this at a recent meeting with a delegation of the U.S. Council on International Relations.

For the time being, USSR-U.S. relations are at a crossroads, and, nevertheless, disarmament accords with the United States are, in my view, possible. What is this conviction based on? Above all on the fact that the United States itself has an objective interest in this. The fact that a large number of Americans, including those who harbor no sympathy for our system, responded to our invitation to come to the present meeting in Moscow, to come to discuss and to attempt to find some points of contact in the approach to the resolution of common problems, strengthens this certainty.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

MOSCOW TALK SHOW ON HOPES FOR NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD

LD151808 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 15 Feb 87

["International Observers Roundtable Program" with Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh, publicist, and Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, Central Television and All-Union Radio political observers]

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello, comrades. The Forum for a Nuclear-free World, for the Survival of Mankind is now being held in Moscow, and is being attended by representatives of 80 states. The voices being heard at the forum are not those of the professional politicians, but of ordinary people. Ordinary people and the voices of ordinary people always bring new qualities to the antiwar, antinuclear struggle. Aside from the doubtless importance of solving questions of war and peace at government conferences and meetings, the broad public forum is also of enormous importance: It creates an international atmosphere conducive to achieving agreement between governments.

[Kobysh] I think this forum has several special features. The main one is probably that which is expressed in the slogan: For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival. On 15 January 1986, through the voice of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, our country posed that problem: In our proposals, as you know, a program for creating a nuclear-free world is put forward. Representatives of the broadest sections of the world public have now come together under that slogan, and have come to Moscow to discuss concrete, practical measures that would lead to the creation of a nuclear-free world and to the survival of mankind.

[Zorin] I would like to draw attention to the fact that a year ago, when the well-known proposals for a nuclear-free world were put forward in a statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, it was a declaration. A year has passed and we see that today this has become a real force. An idea becomes a material force when it takes hold of the masses. The idea put forward a year ago has been embraced by vast masses of people throughout the world, and today it has become a material force and a real factor influencing the course of the political process.

[Kobysh] I think it is very important to say that this forum is taking place in Moscow. I cannot imagine such a representative forum being held in Washington. Evidently that is impossible to imagine, because those...

[Zorin, interrupting] At all events, all those people would not have gone to Washington to discuss Star Wars.

[Tsvetov] I think Reagan would simply have had nothing to say to them. I think he might have spoken, but he just would not have had anything to say to those people. He would not have been able to offer them any inspiration. He could not inspire them with the idea of universal death.

[Kobysh] Altogether, the forum is going about its work in a very unusual way. There are eight extremely serious symposia of the top experts in the field, and they are discussing concrete problems with reference to the main topic: Creating a nuclear-free world to ensure mankind's survival. These are scientific symposia of physicists, natural scientists, political scientists, cultural figures, clergy, and so on. The way they are working is also something new: They are not just making speeches. They are working very concretely, very much to the point, each in his own sphere.

[Zorin] I think this forum has convened at a very opportune time. I think it would be correct to say that the world, mankind, all of us, stand at a crossroads, and have come to a parting of the ways. Until now we have always thought of a crossroads as a place where three roads diverge; but now we live in a time when there are only two: one leads to universal death, the other to universal survival. Whereas before when choosing which road to take we felt that success lay in providing for our security and creating a threat to that of the other side; now the situation is completely different. Now, the aim can be achieved by concerning ourselves not only about our own security, but also about the security of the other side. Only in that way can we achieve universal survival. As Mikhail Sergeyevich said, very simply and very pithily: Either we will live together, or we will die together.

[Kobysh] That, really, is why the forum is being held. When I said that there is a great variety of people taking part, they differ not only in profession and field of study, but in their political convictions, too. Everywhere you look, there are people who occupy opposite political positions. What has brought them to Moscow is their realization that mankind stands at a critical crossroads. The point of the forum is to bring home to people that we cannot go any further on that path. That is why these different people are here. To us, the Soviet people, our idea of a nuclear-free world is clear and self-evident as the only possibility. Of course, every Soviet person is at a loss to understand how it is possible if mankind has reached the last ditch and it is a question of live or die that anyone -- except perhaps some madman from the military-industrial complex who is making money from missiles and the arms race -- can have an interest in anything else.

[Tsvetov] Vitaliy Ivanovich, a day or 2 ago I received a letter which I would like to quote. It is from Comrade Glebov, Petr Ivanovich, who lives in Novgorod. In his letter he says: We are proving so clearly why all countries need to ban nuclear weapons that even I, who got no further than the eighth grade and industrial technical college, understand perfectly. Yet Reagan, who has probably had a higher education, does not understand. Or is he only pretending not to understand? Well, before answering Comrade Glebov, let me say that level of education and level of sense of responsibility for what happens to people and to the world can fail to coincide; it is no wonder, therefore, that a man with only technical college behind him may have a sharper awareness of the situation, a clearer understanding, than someone who has graduated from an institution of higher education.

[Kobysh] Well, yes, but on the other hand, can one understand by what arguments this madness can be justified?

[Zorin] I think it is necessary to pause and consider these questions. That the military-industrial complex has something to gain, is clear enough; but then, of course, they have to explain to the public in the United States and in the Western countries why this obviously fatal political line is being pursued. It must be said that it is being done quite skillfully. I think our listeners would be interested to hear the system of arguments by which the circles that have an interest in continuing the nuclear arms race push their ideas forward and try to gain wide support. I would say there were three main arguments: First of all, they reason like this: Yes, Gorbachev's proposal for a nuclear-free world by the year 2000 is fine; who could object to it? But it is not realistic; it is in the realm of political fantasy. Can you see the powers which possess atomic weapons suddenly renouncing them? Once atomic weapons exist, we have them. Once the wheel has been invented, there is no turning back from it: The wheel exists. That is the first argument.

[Tsvetov] Really, as you say, it does sound very convincing.

[Zorin] But, in the first place, this is both deception and an example of the old way of thinking. Yes, it was possible to argue like that before we reached the line, the crossroads, that we have just been talking about. But when we are faced with mankind's task of saving itself, that logic no longer works. Either mankind has enough common sense and, in the end, the simple instinct of self-preservation, or it has no future. It is by appeal to this completely new situation that the Soviet Union proposes a plan that is not fanciful, but entirely realistic. Incidentally, the relatively recent past has provided some sort of model, though not on such a large scale: There were the highly-destructive chemical weapons, tried out in WWI. It is the wheel again: chemical weapons had been invented. Yet, by the political efforts of the states, a situation was achieved such that not even the piratical forces that ruled Nazi Germany dared to use chemical weapons in WWII.

[Kobysh] The only difference is that it did not lead to universal destruction. Now it is an entirely different situation.

[Zorin] Undeniably; that is why I say that the analogy is incomplete. But mankind already has some experience of that kind; and so, in the present situation, when the political self-awareness of the masses in the whole world is so high, it is not a political fantasy. A simple example will confirm that that is so: When Gorbachev's proposal was put forward, he was accused of indulging in fantasy. But, a few months passed and in Reykjavik that proposal was the real, concrete, businesslike agenda that was on the table at the talks and that was discussed.

[Kobysh] The sides were within a stone's throw of signing an agreement.

[Zorin] Consequently, life itself has shown that what they tried to dismiss as fantasy is not fantasy, but the necessity of the present day.

The second argument is this: they say, alright, let us suppose that it is possible to destroy nuclear weapons. But, the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries have more so-called conventional weapons. If we take the course of abolishing nuclear weapons by the year 2000, we will thereby be giving the advantage to the Soviet Union and its allies, while the West will be in a worse position, because that superiority in conventional weapons is balanced by nuclear weapons.

[Tsvetov] Sorry to interrupt. When it suits them, the representatives of the U.S. Administration say just the opposite. I have in front of me two quotations. One is from Nitze, special arms control adviser to the U.S. secretary of state, and the other is a statement by Shultz. Nitze said that the numerical strength of armed forces is not a sphere in which the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries have superiority. Shultz added: When it is said that in a nuclear-free world we would be surpassed in general purpose forces, I simply do not believe it.

[Zorin] The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries are very precisely and very consistently pursuing a line that says: Let us sit down at the conference table for conscientious talks. We are also willing to conclude any agreements on a drastic reduction in conventional weapons. We do not separate the idea of a nuclear-free world from that of reducing conventional weapons and of disarmament. So that argument, too, will not stand up to serious criticism.

Finally, the third argument with which they try to justify resisting the idea of a nuclear-free world: So far, say the adherents of the nuclear arms race, we have succeeded in preserving peace for more than 4 decades, thanks to the existence of atomic weapons. The fear that the world would perish if those weapons were used has become a factor supporting peace. Remove that fear, destroy nuclear weapons, leaving only conventional weapons, and the world will return to the days when wars were continuous. Atomic weapons guarantee peace. Well, of course, the distorted logic of that argument is perfectly obvious. Yes, for 40 years we have succeeded in preserving peace, not thanks to the existence of nuclear weapons, but in spite of it.

[Tsvetov] Quite right.

[Zorin] There have been moments of desperate danger. There have been moments when only good luck saved mankind from disaster. What, after all, are 4 decades in the perspective of human history? How much longer can we maintain peace by tottering on the peak of the atomic mountain? It is beyond dispute that they are scraping the bottom of the barrel by putting forward this argument, but I have mentioned it before. These, I think, are all the arguments used by those who are now trying to prevent the Soviet Union's proposals from being accepted.

[Tsvetov] Comrades, recently there was a CPSU Central Committee plenum which elaborated upon and firmed up the resolutions of the 27th party congress. Once again, the plenum outlined the course toward economic reconstruction and toward the perfection of democracy -- in short, toward strengthening socialism. This has been done by the party in such a way that the present course will be the predominant and fundamental one for generations to come. This means that the politics of peace have been programmed, if one may put it like that, for generations to come, insofar as socialism and peace are indivisible.

Thus, the United States, too, is at the crossroads of which we were speaking at the start. The Reagan government also wants to program the coming generations of the U.S. Administration on a specific political course. This government -- and I mean the present government -- has trampled the treaty on limiting strategic weapons, SALT II. Now it is setting its sights on the ABM Treaty. It is hurrying to put into space elements of weapons intended for Star Wars. That is, the government hopes to bind the country to a permanent and unceasing arms race, the ultimate result of which is universal destruction.

[Zorin] Well, I think that to this one must add two new nuclear tests, which have just recently been carried out by the United States; carried out in a provocative manner; carried out after the statement by the Soviet Union that the continuation of tests would force us to put an end to the moratorium, the response to which was the tests that were carried out. This is the same activity and, in the same context of which we were speaking, an attempt to program a specific political course for the future.

[Kobysh] Yes, and in general, it is now sad to speak of this. I wish that it were not so, but the impression is being created that any administration that comes to power in the United States will be forced to continue implementing the military program it has already been obliged to carry on its shoulders. In practical terms, all this is projected into the next century and millenium.

There you have Western Europe, which is in great disarray as a result of the statement of Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

He stated a few days ago that the United States' NATO allies have no right to tell us what the correct interpretation of the ABM Treaty is. In Europe -- that is Western Europe -- among the United States' NATO allies this has been construed unequivocally as an insult, as an attempt to tell them to fall in with Washington and do as I do. The impression is being created that at this very moment, Weinberger, the leader of the Pentagon, and his closest associates want to bind the Reagan administration to the speediest phased development [razvertyvaniye] of an ABM system in the Star Wars spirit.

[Zorin] Right now they are hurrying to put certain kinds of weapons into space as soon as possible to make this irreversible, to put a stop to the discussion, in fact, to deprive Americans of the right -- of which the U.S. leaders boast so much -- of choice.

[Tsvetov] I would like to return to the question of nuclear tests. We have just been saying that the United States has carried out the second nuclear test explosion this year. A few days ago, a very interesting article, in my view, appeared in the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. Insofar as this newspaper is published for the most part in Moscow, I would like to mention a few of its comments for our listeners; they are very interesting. It is said in the newspaper that the administration wants to force us to slam the door shut and then heap responsibility for the arms race upon us. The United States wants to revive the thesis of equal responsibility of the USSR and the United States for the arms race if we were to join in these nuclear test explosions. Then, those representatives of the West who, under the influence of the unilateral moratorium, have stopped supporting the doctrine of thermonuclear deterrence will unite again with the White House. Well, the moratorium is a powerful stimulus for the propagation of a new way of thinking. It has weakened the position of nuclear space militarism. The longer we preserve the unilateral moratorium, the stronger the international pressure on the Washington administration will be.

While it seems to me that these conclusions deserve attention, the following question arises: In the interim, will the United States not strive to achieve military superiority over us? I am no military specialist, but insofar as I am familiar with the comment of foreign military specialists, many of these state that it is certainly not essential to carry out nuclear explosions to check the combat capability or readiness for use of the nuclear weapons which already exist. Laboratory research is sufficient.

[Zorin] This is something on which all serious specialists are agreed. But I would like to counter the view expounded in the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: The fact that they are attempting to provoke us is not in doubt. The fact that our moratorium sticks in Washington's throat is also not in doubt. But, if we are obliged to renew tests -- and I think that the Soviet Union simply cannot permit itself to endlessly continue the unilateral moratorium -- then the effect of a moratorium lasting more than 1 and 1/2 years will not disappear. It is now already a historical fact. It opened many eyes to the truth. The moratorium has effected an enormous breach in the wall of lies which has been erected around our country and, in particular, to a significant degree, it seems to me, buried the myth of a Soviet threat. For this reason, even in the event that we have to renew nuclear tests -- and if the United States continues to behave as it does not, then we shall of course renew these tests -- the political effect of the moratorium has been and will remain very great, and not a fleeting phenomenon.

[Tsvetov] But, if we stop adhering to our unilateral moratorium, will this not have a negative influence on the antinuclear and antiwar movement, which as a result might conclude that the movement is pointless and ineffective?

[Zorin] In regard to this, I would like to draw attention to the very important and perhaps key statement by the Soviet Union when it was announced that we would be obliged to resume tests and end the moratorium. It was stressed that we are not closing the door, that we are willing to renew the moratorium at any moment, and that we would stop nuclear tests as soon as the United States joins the moratorium. Consequently, from the viewpoint of your question, I would answer as follows: It should not only not discourage peace supporters, but should provide a stimulus to their activities. However, it should be made quite clear who needs to be put under pressure. Whereas previously among certain circles, including some in the peace supporters' movement, there existed the illusion that pressure had to be exerted on both great powers, it is now becoming increasingly clear and to an ever-growing number of people just upon whom depend the existence of that moratorium, the end of nuclear tests, and the end of the creation of new types of nuclear weapons.

[Kobysh] I think, colleagues, that you are both correct and I hope that I will also be correct in the following statement: These last two explosions by the United States are not merely a matter of perfecting nuclear weapons; they are also, of course, a political provocation. Moreover, the second explosion was set off precisely on the eve of the forum that has assembled in Moscow, timed to coincide directly with it.

[Zorin] How closely the Pentagon follows the activities of the forces campaigning for the creation of a nuclear-free world and for the survival of mankind!

[Tsvetov] They have no choice but to do so.

[Zorin] Yes, but the other day something different, so to speak, took place that illuminated their policy in an even more pitiless manner perhaps: China followed us in signing the Raratonga Treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean. All this may sound very exotic to some people, but I should mention that it is an extremely important thing. The idea is to make the whole of the southern part of the Pacific Ocean nuclear-free -- a colossal expanse. China is the second nuclear power to sign it; the United States refuses point-blank, categorically, to sign the Raratonga Treaty. Their reasons? Not only because they want to store nuclear weapons there and because they have bases there, etc. I think that first and foremost it is because they are battling against the proliferation of the idea of being without nuclear weapons. This is what frightens them most of all. They are frightened by the fact that people now want to live in a nuclear-free world.

[Kobysh] People want to live in a safe world and that which has taken place over the past few days off the coast of Lebanon, for example, is a factor which raises tension in the world. I think we should mention these actions by Washington as well today.

[Zorin] I think you are very right to remember Lebanon because a very serious, very dangerous, and potentially, perhaps, explosive situation has taken shape there now. An ABC correspondent has just reported that everything has been prepared for delivering a strike - and a swift strike - if, I quote, even only one of the U.S. hostages in Lebanon is killed. After all, he might be killed by extremists on the instructions of the United States's secret services, and there immediately would be a swift strike by U.S. aircraft carriers.

[Tsvetov] So, what we are seeing is a display of great cowboy daring on a global scale. Somebody once wrote -- and very aptly in my view -- that daring is panic running ahead. The fact that the United States is attempting to undermine all the efforts of the antinuclear and antiwar movement with such earnestness and persistence shows up, on the other hand, the administration's fear of this movement. It seems to me that the Forum for a Nuclear-free World, For the Survival of Mankind being held in Moscow at the moment is an example of the unity of the democratic forces of the entire world in the name of the main, the most important thing: in the name of all of us, of all of our lives, of us sitting at this table and those listening to us.

I would like to conclude our roundtable by quoting Frederic Joliot-Curie. He said that no one people or single individual is capable of protecting itself against war; only joint efforts by the peoples of all countries will make it possible to achieve that aim. On that, I bid you farewell. All the best.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRAVDA REVIEWS REYKJAVIK DOCUMENTS BROCHURE

PM231050 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 January 1987 First Edition carries on page 5 a B. Kotov article under the heading "Reykjavik: Reestablishing the Truth" reviewing a brochure entitled "Reykjavik" Documents and Materials." Inset into Kotov's article is a table headed "Figures on the Numbers of Strategic Offensive Arms of the USSR and the United States (On 11 October 1986)," with the footnote: "These figures were presented to the U.S. President by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee during the Reykjavik meeting"; the table itself is identical to that reportedly published in MOSCOW NEWS, supplied by the referent item.

The text of Kotov's article reads:

"This small brochure, only just over 20 pages, is very weighty in terms of its political content. Headed 'Reykjavik: Documents and Materials,' it re-establishes and asserts the truth about that crucial event in international life in our disturbing times, the Soviet-American summit meeting in the capital of Iceland 11-12 October 1986.

"And today it is a more than urgent task to assert the truth about what happened in Reykjavik, because statesmen in the United States and a number of other Western countries, and, at their prompting, the bourgeois mass media, are continuing to falsify the sides' positions and the actual meaning of the talks which took place. Seeking to mislead the public, the 'interpreters' of the results of Reykjavik across the ocean keep changing tack. After unsuccessful attempts to attribute the 'peacemaking initiatives' at the meeting to the White House incumbent, they rapidly switched over to tactics of political apostasy. Like the luckless character in Saltykov-Shchedrin who threatened to 'undiscover America,' Washington's 'hawks' would now like to 'undiscover Reykjavik.' 'In my opinion nothing happened in Reykjavik,' U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger, for instance, stated quite recently without turning a hair.

"The collection of documents published by APN contains key extracts from the 10 and 12 October 1986 statements by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the Icelandic capital and from his speeches on Soviet television on 14 and 22 October, as well as other official materials. They provide irrefutable evidence that as a result of the Reykjavik meeting

and the large-scale, bold peace initiatives put forward there by the Soviet Union, a fundamentally new situation has emerged and the struggle for nuclear disarmament has reached a higher level. Now, from the vantage point of Reykjavik, as M.S. Gorbachev noted, 'new prospects can be seen for resolving the problems which are so acute today--I mean security, nuclear disarmament, the prevention of new rounds of the arms race, and a new understanding of the opportunities opening up before mankind.'

"The brochure publishes for the first time the full text of the Soviet draft directives to the USSR and U.S. foreign ministries on preparing agreements in the nuclear disarmament sphere. This document was presented to the American President by the Soviet leader during the talks. It dealt with the preparation of three draft agreements: in the strategic arms sphere, in the sphere of medium-range missiles, and on the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems and on banning nuclear tests.

"The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President, the draft directives say, in particular, 'believe that these accords are accords of principle and constitute a turning point along the path of the implementation of the tasks set by them in Geneva in November 1985: to limit and reduce nuclear arms, to prevent the arms race in space and stop it on earth, and to strengthen strategic stability and universal security.'

"As is well known, these agreements were not concluded. Although in Reykjavik they came within literally two or three paces of adopting decisions which could have become historic, the USSR and the United States could not take those steps. The turning point in world history did not take place. Although it was possible. The fault lies with Washington's unconstructive stance, its stubborn adherence, dangerous to the cause of peace, to the space militarization plans.

"The Soviet leader also presented to the President a comparative table of figures on the numbers of strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the United States.

"As the reader can easily see for himself, these figures utterly demolish the myth propagated by the Western propaganda services about 'Soviet nuclear superiority,' which supposedly prompts the White House to insist on the implementation of the pseudodefensive 'strategic initiative.' Moreover they testify to nearly a 50-percent U.S. superiority in the number of nuclear warheads [zaryady] on strategic delivery vehicles.

"The documents and materials contained in the brochure, which is published both in Russian and in a number of foreign languages, will enable many people abroad to assess objectively and on their merit the results of Reykjavik. In general the collection convincingly demonstrates the persistent efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet state to save our planet from nuclear catastrophe."

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR'S ZAGLADIN: UK NOT INTERMEDIARY WITH U.S.

Thatcher, Gorbachev Talks Anticipated

LD061540 London Press Association in English 1509 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] A senior Soviet Government official today expressed hopes of holding further face-to-face talks with Britain on the nuclear problem.

Mr Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the International Department of the Soviet Central Committee, said his country wanted to know precisely where Britain stood in the struggle for disarmament.

But he made it clear that Mrs Thatcher was not being seen as a mediator between the Soviet Union and the United States in the hopes of achieving an agreement on arms control.

Mr Zagladin, speaking at a press conference at the Soviet Embassy in London, said the Soviet Union already had relations with the US and talks were taking place in Geneva.

But commenting on Britain's role, he added: "We feel we should have a frank and constructive dialogue with Britain on all these issues. We would like to know more accurately how Britain sees its role in the process and in the struggle for disarmament.

"There is an agenda for discussion. We would like this direct dialogue to continue".

Mr Zagladin had headed a Soviet foreign affairs delegation which was ending a week long visit to Britain. He had been asked to the embassy to comment on Labour's non-nuclear defense policy.

Asked if the Soviets saw the Labour Party as too ideological, he replied: "The choice of whether it is the government or its alternatives is the business of the country itself -- in this case Britain.

"We would like to have relations with Britain regardless of which party is in power. That has been right in the past. That is right now.

"Our position is clear. We stand for nuclear disarmament. We want a world without nuclear weapons. We welcome any steps in this direction and on the basis of that position we evaluate the action and the position of the other side".

The forthcoming visit by Mrs Thatcher to Moscow for talks with Mr Gorbachev, was one which the Soviets attached "no small significance".

Delegation Ends UK Visit

LD061647 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] London February 6 TASS -- A delegation from the foreign affairs commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet has ended a visit to Great Britain. The delegation was led by Vadim Zagladin, secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union. The visit was at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons in the British Parliament.

During numerous conversations and meetings with British government officials, parliamentarians, political and public figures, the delegation held a frank and serious exchange of views on a broad range of urgent international problems. Top priority was given to questions of ending the arms race and preventing the militarization of outer space and issues of bilateral relations.

The British side was interested in the information about the outcome of the January plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and about the profound revolutionary changes currently taking place in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet parliamentarians visited Scotland.

It was agreed that parliamentary contacts between the USSR and Great Britain would be continued.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR'S GERASIMOV COMMENTS ON FRG'S ROLE

DW121115 Hamburg BILD in German 12 Feb 87 p 12

[Second part of interview with Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov by correspondent Tewe Pannier; date and place not given]

[Text] Yesterday in BILD, Gorbachev's confidant Gerasimov asked Federal President von Weizsaecker to go to Moscow. In the second part of the interview, BILD asked: Will there be a new Reagan-Gorbachev summit meeting soon?

Gerasimov: Better to ask President Reagan that. However, he is currently very involved in his Iran affair, with Congress, and with his health problems. Moreover, the Americans are not at all flexible in the Geneva talks. All these signs make us pessimistic. We are for a summit if it will produce results. Such a summit meeting, however, must be prepared -- we can do that only in Geneva. At present the conditions for a summit meeting are not fulfilled, unfortunately.

BILD: Can the Federal Government help to achieve some progress in disarmament?

Gerasimov: It could contribute to progress if only it wanted to. However, I see no such signs. England, France, and the FRG look to me like Dr Strangelove, who loved the bomb (a U.S. film figure of the sixties): First they are greatly concerned about the missiles in their back yard, and now they cannot be without them. They say that the superiority of the Soviet Union in the conventional field is the reason. But we say that nobody has the advantage in conventional weapons. The London Institute for Strategic Studies has found that at present nobody in Europe dare wage an offensive war. However, we are prepared to discuss the dismantling of conventional weapons in Europe. I am very much disappointed by the attitude of the Europeans.

BILD: Is Gorbachev helpful to East-West relations?

Gerasimov: Yes, naturally. Democratization can bring very positive influence to bear on East-West relations. It is much easier for the West to deal with an open society than with an apparently closed one, headed by bureaucrats whose intentions are not quite clear.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1291

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY NEWS CONFERENCE ON INF PROPOSAL

TV Broadcast

LD022314 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1955 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Special program on 2 March news conference at USSR Foreign Ministry held by Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff; and Viktor Karpov, chief of the Arms Limitation and Disarmament Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; when not read by unidentified announcer, journalists' questions delivered in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation; video shows panelists seated at table in front of journalists, cutting alternatively from panel to audience -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Announcer] Answering a question from a correspondent of the Japanese paper SANKEI SHIMBUN about why the Soviet leadership has decided to single out the issue of medium-range missiles from the set of issues at the Reykjavik talks, Comrade Bessmertnykh said:

[Bessmertnykh] In Reykjavik and after, in the political contacts and at the Geneva talks themselves, the Soviet side proceeded from the need, desirability and expediency of resolving the whole package of matters. The logic of the interconnection between these issues was explained clearly and convincingly enough. It continues to be valid. At the moment we consider this is the very best way of resolving all problems. However, recently a number of circumstances have appeared to which the Soviet leadership has paid attention.

The Soviet leadership examined this matter from a broad point of view, in the context of the common international desire and the mood of the public for headway to be made on these matters, the growing anxiety in the world, as well as the dangerous, alarming situation arising in Geneva. Since from all the problems, and there are four main ones making up this package of matters, the problem of medium-range missiles lends itself most readily to resolution -- for its parameters have been agreed upon for all intents and purposes -- a decision has been taken to open the door to accords by coming to an agreement upon possible future accord on medium-range missiles.

I want to stress that the possibility of resolving the problem of medium-range missiles does not cancel the logical, mutually penetrating [vzairmnopronikayushchaya] linkage existing between the problem of resolving a radical reduction in strategic offensive weapons and resolving the matter in the Politburo, which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev referred to, was guided first and foremost by the high degree of responsibility for the present situation. Such boldness, realism and political adherence to principles lay at the basis of the major proposal the Soviet Union put forward.

[Announcer] A question from a correspondent from the Belgium paper DRAPEAU ROUGE: What is the situation at the Geneva talks? Will the present proposal really open new prospects and will headway be possible on the matter of strategic missiles as a result of this proposal? Comrade Karpov, chief of the Arms Limitation and Disarmament Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs answers:

[Karpov] Those discussions that have taken place to date in Geneva on the issue of reducing strategic, offensive weapons, bearing in mind also the task of scrapping them altogether, do not as yet provide a basis for saying that right now is the moment for an easy resolution of all matters under discussion there. However, on a practical basis from the whole course of the discussions in this round of the talks, it becomes increasingly obvious that the U.S. side would like generally to bring down the whole problem of scrapping offensive weapons only to a 50 percent reduction, only to this.

A whole range of questions is also being exposed which are complicating the achievement of accord even on a 50 percent reduction. It is still the position from which the United States had acted both at the previous rounds and before Reykjavik a position in relation to establishing a whole system of sub-levels for strategic offensive weapons by the end of the first stage of reducing them, sub-levels which are being proposed artificially, reckoning on breaking the structure of Soviet strategic weapons to the benefit and advantage, the unilateral advantage of the United States. Apart from this, there are serious doubts about the readiness of the United States to solve the question of long-range sea-based cruise missiles, although in principle accord was reached in Reykjavik on this account on the need to seek such a solution. Even this is not the main thing. The main thing is that the reduction of strategic offensive weapons and the elimination of them depend on whether accord is or is not reached concerning the prevention of the arms race in space. On this question there is no progress at the negotiations. The U.S. side has both blocked a solution of this question and is continuing to block it. It is no secret that the U.S. side on 7 February at the Geneva talks officially proposed to be guided by the so-called broad, or extended interpretation of the ABM Treaty, which, if such an interpretation is adopted, means in essence that the United States would receive the right to do anything it wants to create [sozdaniye] its, to implement [realizatsiya] its Strategic Defense Initiative program, by carrying out the creation [sozdaniye] and testing of space-based ABM systems and elements of them. It is clear that such an interpretation of the ABM Treaty basically does not correspond either to the spirit or letter of that treaty, and is an attempt to legalize the U.S. SDI program, which is incompatible, with the provisions of the ABM Treaty. This is the main difficulty at the talks.

[Announcer] Correspondent from Czechoslovakian radio: In connection with the fact that the Soviet Union has taken a number of steps in the area of arms limitation including on medium-range missiles, the question arises -- will not this have a negative effect on the defense capability of the USSR and of its allies? The answer is given by Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of General Staff of the Armed Forces, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR.

[Akhromeyev] In the struggle for peace, a reduction in and elimination of the nuclear threat for the peoples of the Soviet Union and for all other peoples, our country is making certain compromises, including unilateral steps. You are aware that for a year and a half we have been observing a moratorium on nuclear tests and removed some of our SS-20 missiles from operational duties. In other words, the Soviet Union is proving not just by words and not just by its proposals, but in deeds, its constructive nature

and its good will. The U.S. Administration, though, makes no positive steps in reply. It continues to spiral the arms race. In the political aspect the United States by so doing is exposing itself to the whole world as instigators of the arms race and as a source of the threat of war.

All the measures which we proposed at the talks are being thoroughly discussed and analyzed by the leadership of our party and state with the involvement of military leaders, too. Here possible changes in the military-political situation and the potential opportunities of our state and of our allies are weighed. The extent of unilateral steps and compromise proposals is being determined. The Soviet leadership constantly retains the problem of the security of its own country and that of our allies and universal security at the center of attention. The security of our country and that of our allies is a reliable one. The Soviet Armed Forces and the armed forces of our friends are in a state of preparedness, guaranteeing a rebuff to any aggressor.

[NHK correspondent] A correspondent of the Japanese NHK Television company: How can one tie up the new Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles with the prospects of a meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan?

[Bessmertnykh] The Soviet Government has just submitted a very important proposal which opens up possibilities for solving not only the problem of medium-range missiles, but also other questions which are being tackled by our delegation in Geneva. Understandably, we do not yet know what the results of an examination of this and other key issues at the Geneva talks will be. That is why today, here and now, the question which was asked about a summit meeting is probably premature. Nevertheless, it is well known that the Soviet Union has been and continues to be in favor of summit meetings being held and that such meetings should be substantial, serious and rich in content. In this context we will analyze the situation which will emerge, first and foremost, around questions concerning the problem of security. By this I mean the problems being examined at Geneva.

[Correspondent] A correspondent of the West German newspaper KOLNERSTADTANZEIGER: Could you assess the reaction to the new proposal in various Western capitals?

[Bessmertnykh] If one may summarize the reaction in the world to the new Soviet initiative, then it is a positive one. Even Western news agencies, replying to the same kind of question, are saying -- this information has just come in -- in the West the Soviet leader's initiative has been received positively. Indeed, we already have official statements from a number of governments in Western Europe, the United States, and certain other countries, which express the hope that the new Soviet proposal will open up the possibility for reaching a practical accord which, in turn, will enable remaining problems which perplex the world to be solved.

Of course, and we should expect this, we also hear the voices of those who object to the possibility of solving the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe. For example, General Rogers, the outgoing commander in Chief of the NATO Armed Forces, and other people like him are saying that: We have always heard that from them. The overwhelming response and reaction from both government and -- especially -- public circles is very positive and we, naturally, find satisfaction in this.

[Announcer] Replies to other questions by journalists were also given.

Radio Reportage

LD021854 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Passages in quotation marks recorded]

[Excerpts] On 2 March at the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry a news conference was held for Soviet and foreign journalists in connection with the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee of 28 February. [passage omitted]

Later, replies were given to questions from the correspondents. A question from the correspondent of the American ABC television company for Marshal Akhromeyev: How many SS-20 missiles will be dismantled? Will all missiles targeted on Europe be dismantled?

[Akhromeyev] "I must give extremely specific information: If an agreement is concluded on the total elimination of U.S. medium-range missiles deployed [razvernuty] in Europe, and of Soviet missiles also deployed [razvernuty] in Europe, 243 SS-20 missiles will be dismantled; I repeat, if in turn the Pershing-2 and U.S. cruise missiles deployed [razvernuty] in Europe are fully dismantled. Since we are in favor of the missiles being dismantled fully, this means there will be no other medium-range missiles in Europe, on the territory of Europe, either belonging to the Soviet Union or to the United States. In Asia the SS-20 missiles will be reduced to such a quantity as to ensure that there will remain on them no more than 100 warheads."

[Announcer] A question from the NOVOSTI correspondent. The West talks about the superiority of the Soviet Union in the sphere of conventional weapons. What can you say on this point?

[Akhromeyev] "I must, whether I like it or not, link this question with the so-called Soviet military threat, which many leaders of the NATO countries and unfortunately the mass media of those countries, are using to frighten their peoples. This has been done over a period of many years now, although there does exist in Europe a military balance in conventional arms and armed forces. This balance exists in the numbers of armed forces of the Warsaw Pact states and of the NATO states. Here the balance is, as they say, virtually absolute. In weaponry there are differences in certain sorts and types of arms. Armed forces are formed both in each military alliance, and in each state in relation to the conditions in which the state and military alliance are living. So, the states of the military alliance of the NATO bloc in Europe have more antitank weapons, much more than the Warsaw Pact; more strike aircraft -- fighter-bombers and bomber aircraft. The Warsaw Pact has more tanks, more fighter-interceptors. All these quantitative relationships, if one takes them and examines them on a large scale, give an approximate equality of military forces. We are ready for negotiations, ready for negotiations. We are ready in negotiations to set out figures on the numbers both of our armed forces, and those figures which are known to us on the armed forces of the NATO states. The other side does not consent -- for almost a year now it has failed to consent even to begin such negotiations. The question arises: What therefore is the basis for talking of military superiority of the Warsaw Pact in Europe, which in fact does not exist in nature?

[SANKEI SHIMBUN correspondent, in Russian] "The Japanese paper SANKEI SHIMBUN. Please tell us what is the main reason why the Soviet leadership has decided to separate the question of medium-range missiles from the package of questions?

[Bessmertnykh] "In Reykjavik and afterwards, in the political contacts and at the Geneva talks themselves the Soviet side proceeded from the need, desirability and expediency of resolving the whole package of matters. The logic of the interconnection between these issues was explained clearly and convincingly enough. It continues to be valid. At the moment, we consider this is the very best way of resolving all problems. However, recently a number of circumstances have appeared that the Soviet leadership has paid attention to, primarily the loud and clear calls at the Moscow forum to resolve this matter, and not only at this forum. The second and very important reason -- I am not listing them in order of importance, I am just presenting them in the form of a list -- is the situation that began to take shape in Geneva. Deadlock loomed ahead once again. The smell of naphthalene that we used to talk about before Reykjavik could be felt. The U.S. delegation conducted talks on all the basic issues, sometimes for outward appearance, and sometimes only on the most petty technical aspects, so to speak.

"On the issue of the medium-range missiles the behavior of the U.S. delegation was simply incomprehensible, that is to say it was not apparent whether this delegation had instructions to behave this way or whether it was just behaving this way of its own accord, but it did not even agree, so to speak, to recognize as one texts that were absolutely identical down to the last comma. Therefore, the Soviet leadership examined this matter from a broad point of view, in the context of the common international desire, and the mood of the public for headway to be made on these matters, the growing anxiety in the world, as well as the dangerous situation, the alarming situation arising in Geneva.

"Since of all the problems -- and there are four main ones making up this package of issues -- the problem of medium-range missiles lends itself most readily to resolution, because its parameters have been agreed upon to all intents and purposes, and I have cited today a quote from the pronouncements of the U.S. secretary of state on this score -- I could cite even more -- a decision has been taken to open the door to accords through coming to an agreement upon a possible future agreement on medium-range missiles.

"So this is a political issue and a security issue at the same time. Finally these issues have to be resolved specifically. We must not allow the deadlock to continue, particularly today."

[Announcer] Answers were given to other questions from journalists as well.

PRAVDA Report

PM031157 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

["Paving the Way to Accords. Press Conference at USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] Moscow 3 Mar -- On 2 March there was a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in connection with CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's 28 February statement.

Taking part were A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; and V.P. Karpov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Administration for Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems.

A.A. Bessmertnykh made the following statement:

The Soviet leadership made a decision of cardinal importance with the aim of speedily taking a real step towards the complete deliverance of Europe from nuclear weapons. On 28 February Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, announced a new major initiative of the Soviet Union aimed at resolutely advancing the talks on nuclear and space weapons. The USSR offers the United States:

"First, to conclude without delay a separate agreement on the total abolition of medium-range missiles in Europe and their drastic reduction -- to 100 warheads -- in the Asian part of the USSR and in U.S. national territory. In other words, this problem is being separated from the range of issues discussed at the Geneva talks;

Second, to start immediately talks on operational-tactical missiles with the clear goal of reducing and totally eliminating missiles of this class."

"In addition, the Soviet Union has stated that it will withdraw from the GDR and Czechoslovakia by agreement with the governments of those countries operational-tactical missiles with an enhanced range as soon as an agreement on the elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe is signed. The above operational-tactical missiles are known to have been deployed by the USSR in those allied countries as a countermeasure to the introduction of American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe.

The Soviet leadership, proceeding from the interests of strengthening the security of our country, that of our allies and European and international security, has thus demonstrated anew its political will for real steps towards nuclear disarmament and displayed a high sense of responsibility for the fate of peace."

It is to be hoped that the American leadership will at long last join in that peaceful enterprise, a search for accord on the security of nations, including the American people, and, saving efforts now made to create artificial barriers at the talks and engage in rhetoric on the misinterpretation of the ABM Treaty, get down to real business. The world is living through a crucial moment, people's worries keep growing and it is time to stop intrigues around nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet side proceeds from the assumption that nuclear disarmament is quite real politics. Reykjavik demonstrated this fact.

The Iceland meeting cleared the way for efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament, freed the talks from an accumulation of trivia and stereotyped approaches and opened the door to a new age. The U.S. leadership, however, stopped on the threshold and backed up."

"At subsequent rounds of the talks we were upholding and continue to uphold the possibility of resolving the entire range of issues -- outer space, strategic offensive weapons, medium-range missiles and a total nuclear test ban -- in their entirety, thus ensuring the harmonious process of strengthening international security at progressively lower levels of armed confrontation.

"This approach remains preferable today as well. However, since the Geneva talks have run into the danger of becoming deadlocked anew, because of the position of the American side, the USSR has agreed to seek a solution to the problem of medium-range missiles in the first place. In addition, this question lends itself to solution easier than the others today."

Secretary of State George Shultz said on October 17 last year that "there was no reason which could prevent a competent agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces from being achieved on the basis of what the two leaders had told each other." Since there is no reason not to conclude such an agreement, it should be concluded, and without delay.

The Soviet offer gives a pragmatic chance for it because, in addition to everything else, it takes into consideration the fact that we were told after Reykjavik that the inclusion of the problem of medium-range missiles in the total complex of tasks at the Geneva talks made accord more difficult to achieve. Well, now those who believed it -- and we heard such views from Washington and European capitals -- should show us that they were sincere in their intentions to advance towards accord."

"The Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles does not push to the sidelines, let alone remove from the agenda, the question of substantial reductions in and eventual elimination of strategic weapons. Agreement to this effect will be possible given a decision not to deploy weapons in space since the two issues are organically interrelated.

We expect from the United States a concrete positive reply to our proposal on medium-range missiles.

We hope that the new important initiative made by the USSR will encourage the U.S. to take reciprocal constructive steps on the entire range of nuclear and space weapons, A.A. Bessmertnykh said in conclusion.

The press conference participants answered journalists' questions.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1320

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET MEDIA REPORT ON U.S. REACTION TO GORBACHEV OFFER

U.S. Said Interested, Cautious

LD011816 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1711 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] Washington, 1 Mar (TASS) -- The proposal put forward by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to examine the question on medium-range missiles in Europe separately from other problems of arms control has been received with interest in the White House said Daniel Howard, deputy press spokesman of the White House. According to our preliminary evaluation, he said, this proposal is a positive development. The United States, he announced, intends to put forward in Geneva proposals "couched in a specific treaty terminology."

At the same time, official representatives of the administration who have obviously been taken unaware by the Soviet proposal have expressed "cautious pessimism" regarding the possibility of the conclusion of an agreement on medium-range missiles in the immediate future. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, they have singled out "many difficulties" in this matter, such as the position of a number of East European countries. Not having asked these countries what their reaction to the Soviet proposal is and having set about speaking on their behalf -- and effectively giving them directions as to how they should "react" -- they are asserting objections in Washington against the conducting of on-site inspections have been recorded in "all five West European countries when U.S. medium-range missiles have been deployed." In the opinion of a number of observers, the administration is finding it increasingly difficult to brush aside Soviet initiatives and has now decided to play the "allies" card in its striving to erect more and more fresh obstacles on the path of progress in arms control.

IZVESTIYA Cites U.S. Reactions

PM021409 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 March 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent A. Blinov dispatch: "Senator Sam Nunn: 'It is up to the U.S. Administration'"]

[Text] Washington -- The CBS company opened its evening news program with film of the Soviet television program "Vremya." U.S. television viewers heard an account of the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, containing the proposal to the United States to conclude an agreement on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe.

Commentaries on the report stress the particular importance of the new Soviet initiative for ensuring progress on limiting nuclear arms. In an interview with a CBS

correspondent Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated that the Soviet proposal opens up a "historic opportunity" to reach an accord on the limitation of medium-range nuclear means and in the long term promotes an accord on strategic arms. He noted that such accords could help strengthen security in the United States. Now it is up to the U.S. Administration, Senator S. Nunn stressed.

Other leading U.S. television companies also broadcast an account of M.S. Gorbachev's statement.

"M.S. Gorbachev's proposal opens the door to productive Soviet-U.S. talks," the observer J. Smith of THE WASHINGTON POST writes. Items in the U.S. press material stressed that the Soviet proposal is based on what was achieved at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik and takes into account the mood of wide circles within the community of European countries in favor of lowering the level of military confrontation on the European continent.

As THE WASHINGTON POST reports, U.S. Administration officials regard the report from Moscow as "very good news." Dan Howard, a White House press spokesman, stated that U.S. Administration circles have studied with interest the contents of the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and consider the Soviet initiative a "positive step." At the same time, in his words, the U.S. side intends to state its own specific position in relation to the accord on medium-range nuclear means at the talks in Geneva.

Nunn: 'Highly Positive'

LD010913 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] Washington, March 1 (TASS)--President Reagan has now an opportunity to conclude a history-making agreement in the field of arms control not only as regards medium-range weapons, but also as regards strategic weapons, said Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Arms Services Committee. Speaking in a CBS Television interview, he pointed out that, in his opinion, the USSR's proposal that a separate treaty be concluded on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe is a highly positive one.

Nunn noted that in his opinion, much progress could be made in that field. Everything necessary for that is there, and it takes only serious talks.

Rogers' Statement 'Discordant'

LD030729 Moscow TASS in English 0631 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Brussels March 3 TASS -- American General Rogers, who resigns from the post of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe in the middle of this year, made an overtly militaristic instigative speech at the Belgian Royal Institute of International Relations last night.

Rogers, who is one of the initiators of the deployment of American "Pershing-2" nuclear missiles and cruise missiles, imposed upon Western Europe, asserted that allegedly the Soviet Union-proposed undelayed elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe was contrary to the interests of the North Atlantic bloc, that allegedly consent to the Soviet proposal would negatively affect Western security.

Rogers' statement was discordant with the favorable response of the overwhelming majority of West European countries to the USSR's new peace proposals on disarmament.

Further U.S. Reaction

PM041339 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 87 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gan report under the general heading "Sincere Desire for Peace: That Is How International Public Views New Soviet Initiative: 'Valuable Proposal'"]

[Text] Washington, 3 Mar -- The Soviet proposal to conclude without delay an agreement with the United States on the complete elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe is being discussed widely in Washington.

Many people here agree with the view of CBS TV, which noted that the "proposal may be a historic turning point. If everything goes normally, the two powers will be able for the first time to really reduce armaments and not simply to set more new ceilings on nuclear arsenals."

White House and State Department spokesmen were bombarded with questions by correspondents at press conferences today. Everyone wanted to know what the administration thinks about the proposal, what is its approach, and how soon the conclusion of an agreement can be expected. These questions are no surprise, especially if you consider Washington's disappointing record in the arms control sphere and its blatant obstruction of improvements on the central problem of our time. The answers which the White House and the foreign policy department gave sounded encouraging. Their spokesmen confirmed the administration welcomes the Soviet initiative and considers it a "positive development." Journalists were promised that in the near future the United States will submit a specific draft treaty on medium-range missiles at the Geneva talks. The United States, M. Fitzwater, the President's press spokesman, said, "remains ready for progress in all spheres of talks on nuclear and space arms."

However, such statements are received with a certain amount of skepticism. As commentators are pointing out, Washington has never experienced any difficulties in producing peace-making rhetoric or fine-sounding words while doing the complete opposite.

Very many Americans would like to believe that this time the opportunity for progress will not be missed. In conversation with your correspondent, former Senator G. McGovern, the eminent politician and public figure, said: "This is a very valuable proposal. It gives the administration the opportunity to work on questions on which preliminary agreement was reached in Reykjavik. In my opinion, the Soviet initiative indicates the USSR's readiness to take a practical and constructive step on arms control. I hope that the administration will make a move and accept this good idea."

Reagan Summons Negotiators

LD032205 Moscow TASS in English 2204 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Washington, March 4 (TASS)--President Reagan appeared on national television on Tuesday with a special statement on questions of arms control.

He said he welcomed the proposal made by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to reach agreement on medium-range missile in Europe separately from other agreements. "To seize this new opportunity I have instructed our negotiators to begin presentation of our draft INF treaty text at Geneva tomorrow," the President said.

The President said that the U.S. negotiators were being urgently summoned to Washington already this week for consultations.

Vremya on U.S. 'Madmen'

LD031738 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Mar 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; U.S. correspondent Vladimir Dunayev report]

[Text] The reaction of White House representatives this time was both quick and positive. The same can be said of the legislators, too. The overwhelming majority of congressmen and senators who have spoken over the past few days have welcomed the statement by Comrade Gorbachev.

Here is the disturbing thing: The Pentagon at this precise moment has announced unexpectedly it is preparing to conduct a training alert on the U.S. Pacific coast. This is, after all, also a reaction to Comrade Gorbachev's statement, an original Pentagon reaction.

Within the administration itself there continues unabated a conflict between responsible politicians and irresponsible ones who have now led the administration, and indeed the country, into a quagmire of scandal in general.

There is a change of personnel under way in the White House. A group of people, very militantly inclined, have left the White House for various reasons, and have been replaced by more moderate, so to speak, politicians. Still, there remain sufficient madmen here and, to judge from the first comments from many retired generals, it can already be estimated, what arguments will be cited against an accord on medium-range missiles.

First, the Reagan administration is weakened by scandal, so we must not talk to the Russians now, it is dangerous now. If an accord was reached in Reykjavik on these missiles -- well, the President was strong at that time, but now he is weak, and, so to speak, it is better to wait and force through preparations for Star Wars.

Second, the second sort of argument goes: Are all the West European countries ready to rid themselves of U.S. missiles? Let's ask them. There are signs that pressure will be brought so that if even one country states that it is not ready for this it will be possible for that reason to withdraw, to retreat, to break the existing accord.

It must be said that these forces, the militant forces of America, so to speak, the military opposition, if you like, is not so much scared by this accord on Euromissiles, but most of all it fears that this accord will become the beginning of a change in the climate, and will open the way for other accords. This is very dangerous, and for this reason this entire military-industrial horde is gathering to provide a repulse.

Precisely for this reason those responsible U.S. politicians who know what it is to conduct policy in a nuclear age have welcomed the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, noting especially its timeliness, and so to speak its surprising [as heard] importance at precisely this time, a time when much is being determined in world politics.

Reagan Statement Cited

PM051057 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin dispatch: "R. Reagan's Statement"]

[Text] Washington -- The new Soviet peace-loving initiative set forth in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is continuing to be widely commented on in the United States.

The general tenor of the comments is optimistic. Heightened interest has been shown in the Soviet proposal in the United States. What is important is that it is seen as a real opportunity to overcome the deadlock in the disarmament talks process.

President Reagan appeared in the White House press center for the first time in 3 months. He addressed journalists and dwelt on the Soviet proposal. His statement was carried on U.S. national television. The President emphasized he "welcomes the proposal advanced by General Secretary Gorbachev to reach an agreement on medium-range nuclear missiles separately from agreements in other spheres."

"So as not to miss the opportunity which has presented itself," the President said, "I have instructed the American participants in the Geneva talks to submit the text of a draft treaty on medium-range nuclear weapons as early as Wednesday," R. Reagan said he has also ordered the leaders of the U.S. delegation to be summoned to Washington from Geneva this week for consultations to embark on the practical process of negotiations.

At the same time, Reagan placed special emphasis in his speech on the question of "verifying" [proverka] observance of agreements -- a question which, as is known, the United States has constantly used as an artificial obstacle in the way of reaching real accords.

The disarmament topic is so urgent and the danger of nuclear confrontation so great it is becoming impossible to brush these problems aside.

However, Washington's reaction still cannot be considered unequivocal. They are continuing to juggle with facts in assessing the two countries' military arsenals. Many have seized on the false thesis that with the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe there will still be a "Soviet advantage" in terms of operational-tactical missiles. Here they deliberately overlook the fact that Gorbachev's statement points precisely to the USSR's readiness to embark at once on talks on eliminating other missiles, too.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1324

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET MEDIA REPORTS ON WORLD REACTION TO GORBACHEV OFFER

'Broad Flood of Commentaries'

LD021306 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0350 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] [Announcer] The main topic of reports coming from abroad is the new Soviet initiative put forward in Comrade Gorbachev's statement on Saturday. Striving to break the deadlock over the problem of nuclear weapons, the USSR has proposed to separate the issue of medium range missiles in Europe from the package of initiatives we made in Reykjavik. The USSR has proposed concluding a separate agreement on these missiles, and to do this without delay. Commentator Vladimir Pasko reports on the world's initial reaction to this proposal.

[Pasko] The USSR's new initiative has given rise to an exceptionally broad flood of commentaries and statements. The fact that the governments of a number of countries considered it necessary to express their attitude to it even before the start of the working week bears witness to the importance attributed to our proposals. In Europe, the governments of the GDR, FRG, Norway, and Belgium issued appropriate statements. In doing so Erich Honecker, the GDR leader, informed Chancellor Kohl, through his permanent representative in Bonn, of the GDR Government's readiness to come to an agreement with the USSR Government on the issue of the withdrawal of the enhanced-range strategic missiles [strategicheskkiye rakety povyshennoy dalnosti] deployed [razmeshchennyy] on the republic's territory -- if, of course, the FRG comes out in favor of implementing the new proposal.

The governments of Vietnam and Japan have already expressed their support for the Soviet initiative. Premier Nakasone commented that the dialogue should start first with the problems upon which an agreement is possible: His comment serves as a reminder that at the Reykjavik meeting the USSR and United States essentially reached agreement on eliminating their medium-range missiles in Europe.

Our proposal gave rise to lively reaction in the United States. Correspondents working in this country relate that on Saturday, Washington's radio stations reported Comrade Gorbachev's statement every 10 or 15 minutes, invariably beginning the news with the phrases: The USSR is demonstrating new flexibility in its approach to arms control talks with the United States. The ABC television company described this proposal as a major step, and at the same time a challenge to the United States. In addition to famous public figures such as retired Admiral Laroque and Keeney, president of the Association of Arms Control, the Soviet initiative was welcomed by a group of well-known senators, including Nunn, head of the Senate Arms Forces Committee.

As for the White House, its spokesman Deputy Press Secretary Howard, declared the following: The proposal represents a positive development. At the same time, he added that the United States intends to put forward proposals at Geneva couched in specific treaty terminology. I must say frankly that many observers doubt whether Washington will meet even this new Soviet initiative halfway. We will not make guesses. I shall point out, however, that the West can no longer link the problem of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe with other problems. The USSR has once again demonstrated its will, in spite of all the obstacles, to resolve the problem of nuclear armaments. It is now up to the United States.

Initiative 'Met Favorably'

LD021107 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] The Soviet initiative has been met favorably in the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Japan, Canada and other countries. Prime Minister of Sweden Ingvar Carlsson stressed that the proposal of the Soviet Union gives rise to hope for a decisive turn in the question of arms control. The leader of the Labor Party in Great Britain, Neil Kinnock, described the Soviet proposal as the basis for making a big step forward in the field of reducing nuclear arms.

Reports from Washington say that doubt is expressed there about the possibility of signing such an agreement soon, though a representative of the White House said the Soviet initiative is a positive development.

In contrast to such feelings was the reaction of France, says the FRANCE PRESSE. The French Foreign Ministry, ignoring the opinion of the experts on the parity between the Armed Forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, said the implementation of the agreement on medium range missiles will give the Soviet Union and its allies advantage in other types of arms.

West European Response 'Positive'

LD011809 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] The statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU, has evoked a wide response in the countries of Western Europe. Our correspondent in Brussels, Kipras Mazheyka, reports:

[Mazheyka] A bright, encouraging and long-awaited piece of news. This is the leitmotif of many responses to our new peace-loving initiative. Yesterday, a number of West European radio and television studios began their news broadcasts with this information.

Brussels is the only town in the continent that can receive 17 television channels at once, of which 13 are foreign ones. Without leaving the correspondent's post, it is possible to make a sufficiently objective judgment here as to reaction in, for instance, France and Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Britain, Italy, and West Germany to yesterday's statement from Comrade Gorbachev, broadcast in "Vremya."

The tone of initial reaction is positive. Also striking is the unusual promptness with which this time the mass media set about reporting this important event. Withdrawing

all medium-range missiles from Europe is the equivalent of taking the explosives out of detonators in the powerhouse. General Secretary Gorbachev has put forward a realistic program that has instantly gained the recognition of mankind, which is weary of living in fear of a nuclear catastrophe, pointed out an observer for Netherlands television.

Moscow proposes to do away with the balance of terror, established on the scales of mutually assured nuclear destruction. But what is the reaction in the ruling circles of the West European countries?

Thus far it has not been made clear. It should not be forgotten that today is Sunday when not only the doors of government establishments are closed, but so are those of the newspaper kiosks.

Bogachev on 'Discordant' French Statement

LD021857 Moscow TASS in English 1841 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 2 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

The proposal of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on medium-range missiles evoked lively interest in the European capitals. FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said that it is "in keeping with the main wish of the FRG Government in disarmament sphere," That "the Soviet Union's readiness to start without delay talks on theatre missiles suits the FRG demands and the interests of European security". According to press reports, even the "chief Atlanticist", NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington described the Soviet initiative as a substantial step forward and confirmed that it was favourably received in the North Atlantic Alliance.

A special statement of the French Foreign Ministry struck a discordant note to the response of other West European countries to the Soviet proposals. The statement, specifically, says, that in the opinion of France "the aim must be to avert the emergence of nuclear-free West Europe," (as if the Soviet Union ever proposed to West Europe to unilaterally eliminate its nuclear arms).

Expressing dissatisfaction with the USSR's latest step toward the implementation of the program for a nuclear-free world, the French Foreign Ministry resorts to strange manipulations aimed at misrepresenting the essence of the Soviet Union's initiatives.

Thus, virtually rejecting the Soviet proposal, a spokesman for the French Foreign Ministry, at the same time, puts forward France's "own" condition which is that the elimination of U.S. "Pershing" missiles and cruise missiles and SS-20 Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe must be accompanied by a "global agreement applying both to Europe and Asia". Meanwhile, it is declared unambiguously in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement that the elimination of the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe will be simultaneous with a cardinal reduction of the number of such Soviet and U.S. missiles to 100 warheads respectively, in Asia and in the United States national territory.

The spokesman for the French Foreign Ministry pretends that the USSR proposes to put off the solution of the question of missiles of a smaller range to remote future and describes as "unsatisfactory" the version he invented himself. If he studied closer the text of the Soviet leader's statement, he would see that the USSR expresses the readiness to withdraw a longer-range theatre missiles from the GDR and Czechoslovakia

as soon as the agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles of the USSR and USA in Europe is signed. As far as other theatre missiles are concerned, the USSR is prepared to embark on talks for their reduction and complete elimination without delay.

The stand of the spokesman for Quai d'Orsay on the question of medium-range missiles can hardly be determined only by the striving to be original and unorthodox.

The statement of the French Foreign Ministry shows again the contradictoriness of public declarations of the Chirac government. In the opinion of many Soviet observers, some of these declarations pursue the aim of pleasing Washington, while others are aimed at justifying in the eyes of the world community the non-constructive stand of Paris on problems of war and peace.

Meanwhile, "independence" of the French Armed Forces, the principles of "defence along all azimuths", France's special status in NATO that, it would seem, stems from its having quitted the military structure of the North Atlantic bloc are recalled in France less and less often. France is ever firmer geared to the United States military chariot. It performs separate assignments now in the sphere of the production of neutron weapons and continued nuclear weapon testing, now in the sphere of talks on arms limitation and reduction.

France Claims 'Unanimity'

LD041845 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 4 Mar 87

[Text] Paris March 4 TASS -- The perspective of elimination or a cut in the Soviet and American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe "accords with the interests of France and peace", French President Francois Mitterrand said today. It was, as he put it, with "genuine interest" that he familiarised himself with Mikhail Gorbachev's recent proposals on that score. Newsmen were told about it by an official spokesman for the president's office, who summarised Francois Mitterrand's statement at the cabinet meeting. As the spokesman noted, the president had added that every cut in the intermediate nuclear force in Europe should be "balanced, simultaneous and verifiable."

He also recalled his known stand, according to which the French nuclear force "ensuring France's security through deterrence can neither be equated with the intermediate nuclear force nor taken into account at the Soviet-American talks". In President Mitterrand's opinion, the spokesman for the presidential office said, "it is necessary to do everything so that Europe firmly asserts the unanimity of its views" on that issue.

Prime Minister Jacques Chirac said in his turn that "all talks, that could lead to a cut in the Euromissiles, provided such a cut is balanced, simultaneous and verifiable, cannot meet with a negative reaction from us." This was disclosed in a statement to newsmen by a spokesman for the French Government, who was speaking on the attitude of the country's leadership to the Soviet proposal on a cut in nuclear weapons.

The spokesman for the French Government said that the stands of President Francois Mitterrand and Prime Minister Jacques Chirac on that issue are "fully concurrent." In particular as regards the fact that France "does not participate in these talks to the extent the inviolable principle of our diplomacy is in effect in that field: The

French nuclear deterrent force has a different character and a different meaning than the intermediate nuclear force". In Jacques Chirac's opinion, the spokesman added, the French nuclear deterrent force is the "central system designed to ensure the defence of our vital interests, and that is why it should be kept totally aside any talks on the intermediate nuclear force, i.e. Euromissiles".

PCF Condemns Government Stand

LD032255 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Paris March 3 TASS -- The new Soviet proposal aimed at an early elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe is of extreme importance, says a statement of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party circulated here today. This initiative confirms again the Soviet Union's resolve to wage the struggle for a nuclear-free world, the document says. The French Communist Party supports this proposal which meets with broad response of international public, is in keeping with the aspirations of peace forces, the statement says. The Political Bureau of the French Communist Party condemned the stand of the French Government which actually rejected the Soviet proposal.

UK Press, Public Comment

LD011910 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] Our correspondent Vsevolod Shishkovskiy reports from London:

[Shishkovskiy] The first commentaries on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement emerged as early as yesterday in Great Britain. All the evening news bulletins on television and radio opened with these. Political observer John Snow, reporting the new Soviet peace initiative, described it as a magnanimous step ensuring Europe's complete liberation from nuclear weapons. Most of the commentaries in today's British newspapers, which got frontpage coverage, evaluate it in the same way. Reporting the Soviet leader's statement in detail, the commentaries stress that the Soviet initiative opens up a real opportunity for an urgent solution to the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe. It is also emphasized that there is not just a basis for such a step, but also what amounts to a ready agreement, established in Reykjavik.

The Foreign Office has announced that the British Government is now studying the text of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement with great attention and interest, and in the next few days will give an official response to it.

As for the progressive British public, it evaluates the new Soviet peace initiative as an exceptionally important step toward preventing the danger of a thermonuclear catastrophe. The Soviet leader's statement, said Gordon Schaffer, chairman of the British Committee for European security and Cooperation and International Lenin Prize winner, is fresh evidence of the Soviet Union's firm aspiration to achieve the security of the globe and bring about the implementation of the program for a nuclear-free world which it has put forward.

UK's Kinnock on 'Opportunity'

LD012210 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2147 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] London, 2 Mar (TASS)--Neil Kinnock, leader of the British Labor Party has evaluated the major new Soviet foreign policy peace initiatives as a basis for making it possible to take a significant step forward in the sphere of reducing nuclear weapons.

In a statement made yesterday evening [1 March], he noted that the latest proposals by the Soviet Union expounded in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, represent an opportunity to purge Europe of medium-range nuclear missiles and tactical nuclear weapons. Every political leader of the European continent, including British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Neil Kinnock pointed out, should strive actively to ensure that this opportunity becomes a reality.

UK's Healey: Obstacle Removed

PM031209 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

["Own correspondent" dispatch under general heading "An Important New Soviet Initiative. International Reactions to M.S. Gorbachev's Statement"]

[Text] Last Obstacle Removed [subhead]

London, 1 Mar -- M.S. Gorbachev's statement removes the last obstacle to a speedy conclusion of an agreement on the elimination of all medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, D. Healey, foreign secretary in the Labor Shadow cabinet, told the PRAVDA correspondent.

In recent times, D. Healey noted, British Labor Party leaders repeatedly have appealed to the USSR Government to separate the medium-range missile agreement from the other components of the Reykjavik package and reaffirm the promise given by the Warsaw Pact countries last June on the withdrawal of operational-tactical missiles deployed in the GDR and Czechoslovakia in response to the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles.

Now, Healey said, the way has been cleared for the speedy conclusion of an agreement which will rid Europe of the most destructive types of nuclear weapons and open up the prospect of further talks on the elimination of other types of nuclear weapons from our continent.

In his speech at the Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity," M.S. Gorbachev put forward the idea of creating a security system in Europe based on purely defensive principles, ruling out the use of nuclear or any other types of offensive arms, D. Healey went on, saying that this idea was supported in the speeches of a number of West European politicians, including FRG Foreign Minister Genscher. If British Prime Minister Thatcher followed this example and used our country's prestige in support of the ideas that have been put forward, then the United States and other members of the Western alliance would have no choice but to follow suit. This would pave Europe's way to the kind of real security it has not known since the end of World War II.

Bogachev on UK Equivocation

LD041814 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 4 Mar 87

["Truly Balanced Approach Is Needed"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 4 March (TASS)--TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has made several statements in succession, evaluating the latest Soviet initiatives on medium-range missiles. The London press has characterized these statements of the British head of government as a positive and balanced reaction to Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal.

The British journalists call this reaction positive undoubtedly because Thatcher characterized the Soviet leader's initiative as a good step forward and balanced because the British premier did not miss the chance of reaffirming her commitment to the American "Star Wars" program.

It seems, however, that the list of issues which, according to Margaret Thatcher, are yet to be agreed in the context of the Soviet proposal is not quite balanced. The British premier is satisfied with the Soviet Union's suggestion that the problem of medium-range missiles be detached from the complex of other arms control and disarmament questions but immediately demands that a new "NATO package" be formed, which would include, in addition to medium-range missiles, conventional armed forces and armaments, chemical weapons, etc. Meanwhile, she knows full well that the USSR has long tabled proposals on these matters. If the NATO members displayed goodwill, these problems could be resolved without any prejudice to the security of any country.

Discussing medium-range missiles in Reykjavik, the Soviet Union agreed to leave aside the British and French nuclear forces, and it was a large concession on the party of the USSR: Those two countries are U.S. allies and their activities are closely concerted without the NATO framework.

Britain and France continue intensively to escalate their nuclear missile arsenals. Britain recently deployed on its submarines 64 new Chevaline A3-TK missiles, each capable of delivering up to 6 precision warheads over longer distances. In the mid-1990s, Britain is planning to fit out its submarine fleet with American Trident-2 missiles, which can be used to deliver a first nuclear strike against missile silos. According to the Stockholm-based International Peace Research Institute, 30 British Buccaneer, 180 Tornado and 30 sea Harrier planes carry nuclear weapons.

Britain has 120 helicopters with nuclear depth charges and London is planning to deploy new nuclear-capable Tornado planes in West Germany.

One American journalist remarked that if Britain's nuclear force was a joke, that joke was becoming less and less funny.

Is not it time for the British Government to take its first goodwill step on arms control and show restraint in building up its nuclear arms arsenal instead of tying problems into new "packages."

Sweden Sees Source of Hope

LD020940 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] Stockholm March 2 TASS -- Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson spoke highly of the fresh Soviet peace initiative that an agreement be immediately concluded on eliminating American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe which was set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Speaking at a rally at Linköping University held on Sunday in tribute to the memory of Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, he pointed out that this Soviet step is a source of hope a resolute turnabout. I hope that this can lead to a specific dialogue between the USSR and the USA and above all to specific results, the Swedish prime minister stressed.

Praise From Belgium's Tindemans

LD022052 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] Brussels March 2 TASS -- Belgian Foreign Affairs Minister Leo Tindemans described as positive Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals on medium-range missiles in Europe.

Speaking over Belgian television on Sunday he said that the Soviet-American summit meeting in Iceland had nearly produced an agreement on eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe. It is, therefore, only logical that that problem should be singled out of the whole package at the talks to be considered separately. As soon as the Soviet proposal was officially tabled at Geneva talks the latter would automatically assume a new dimension.

The Belgian foreign minister said that if the Soviet proposals were endorsed and produced concrete results the attitude of Western Europe to the U.S. SDI programme would radically change.

Leo Tindemans rejected allegations by the NATO supreme commander in Europe, U.S. General Bernard Rogers, who said that the removal of medium-range missiles from Europe did not meet the interests of the West. The minister called the Soviet initiative far-going. He said that if the Soviet proposals were accepted now an agreement could be soon reached on both medium-range and operational-tactical missiles and even on conventional weapons.

"If I understood Mikhail Gorbachev's statement right, he proposes to eliminate all medium-range weapons in a five year period. This means that no one should increase the number of missiles already deployed. If the agreement on Soviet proposal is reached before 1988 additional 32 missiles will not be stationed," Leo Tindemans said in conclusion.

FRG Welcomes Initiative

PM041031 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch under general headline "An Important New Soviet Initiative. International Reactions to M.S. Gorbachev's Statement"]

[Text] The Initial Reaction in Bonn [subhead]

Bonn, 1 Mar -- The FRG Government reacted with unusual and uncharacteristic speed to M.S. Gorbachev's statement on Saturday evening, which, moreover, was a festival night (the Spring carnival is underway on the Rhine). Literally less than an hour after the news of the new Soviet initiatives had been received, an official spokesman of the FRG Government declared that the cabinet welcomed the USSR proposals for the elimination of medium-range missiles. He said that the FRG Government is hoping that the USSR and the United States will get down to talks soon.

West German radio and television broadcast the news of the new Soviet proposals throughout the country. Today, too, from early morning onward, radio and television news bulletins have, as a rule, opened with reports from Moscow.

Only a few newspapers are published in the FRG on Sunday. I have in front of me BILD SONNTAG, whose circulation runs into millions. right at the top it carries a banner headline: "Gorbachev Proposes: Missiles out of Europe!" And the newspaper continues in bold print: "A new sensational proposal from M.S. Gorbachev -- he is prepared to remove all Soviet medium-range missiles from Europe provided the Americans remove theirs." Briefly explaining the essence of the new Soviet initiatives, the newspaper notes that the Soviet leader has called on the United States to give a swift and positive response.

WELT AM SONNTAG front-pages the news from Moscow. It highlights the passage in the statement which says that the USSR has decided to "untie" the package of disarmament proposals and to no longer link the question of the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe with the U.S. stance on SDI. The newspaper carries a detailed summary of the statement, quoting its individual propositions.

The newspapers also report in detail the FRG Government statement, which says in part that "ensuring that European security interests are fully taken into account is of decisive importance" for the government. Soviet readiness to open talks on operational-tactical missiles is welcomed in particular. This also "accords with the wishes of the Bonn government." The Cologne newspaper SONNTAG EXPRESS also reports the Soviet statement as a major event.

"I approve of your new initiative," said Peter Schmitz, a cashier at a Frankfurt bank, who had arrived in Bonn and was reading the report at one of the stations' newstands. "Your proposals must defuse the tense situation in Europe. I can barely imagine that we will no longer have the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles here.

"I am only afraid of one thing, you know," Schmitz went on, "namely that Washington might come up with some kind of reservation, some kind of proviso; after all, it has happened many times before. You only had to suggest a compromise and new demands were put forward. Do not think that I am a pessimist; I simply am no longer young enough to be an enthusiastic optimist. Nonetheless, I am hoping that this great cause will be crowned with success."

FRG Government 'Satisfaction'

LD010710 Moscow TASS in English 0533 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] Bonn March 1 TASS -- The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany "is expressing its satisfaction with the proposal made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on concluding a separate agreement with the United States with a view to eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe," Friedhelm Ost, a spokesman for the FRG's Government, stated last night.

The FRG's Government, "which attaches special importance to European security issues," the spokesman pointed out, is expressing hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will reach an appropriate agreement as soon as possible.

A communique read by Friedhelm Ost emphasises that the Government of the FRG welcomes the Soviet Union's readiness to conduct talks on other aspects of disarmament in Europe.

Genscher Supports Initiative

LD011904 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] Bonn March 1 TASS -- The proposal to conclude a separate agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, advanced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, cleared the way for reaching agreement on the complete elimination and destruction of all Soviet and American medium-range nuclear missiles, FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said here today. This also meets the aspirations of the FRG Government, he said.

The Soviet Union's readiness to embark subsequently on talks on theatre missiles meets the interests of European security, he went on. It can be hoped that this will have a positive effect also on talks on other aspects of disarmament. The FRG Government will be contributing to this, the minister said. Its striving for a broadest of cooperation and intensive dialogue with the Soviet Union will be promoting a successful course of the talks on disarmament. The FRG Government also hopes that the existing agreements in the sphere of arms limitation will be observed.

Canada's Clark 'Acclaims' Proposal

LD020658 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] Ottawa March 2 TASS -- Canadian Foreign Minister Joseph Clark acclaims the proposal contained in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central committee. To single out the issue of medium-range missiles in Europe and to conclude immediately a separate agreement on it. A statement by the minister circulated on Sunday contains a call on the Soviet Union and the USA to conduct negotiations on this proposal in a "constructive spirit". In Clark's opinion, the achievement of an agreement without delay on Euro-missiles and the revival of the process of top-level meetings would help improve East-West relations and would give an important impetus to other arms control negotiations.

XINHUA Reports Proposal

LD011949 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Excerpt] Moscow, 1 Mar -- [passage omitted] Beijing -- In a report from Moscow, the XINHUA agency says: "The Soviet Union has proposed to the United States that a separate agreement be concluded on eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe. Moscow is willing to take the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe out of the package of issues and conclude a separate agreement on it, and it is prepared to do this without delay. The USSR is also willing to start talks immediately with the object of reducing and eliminating completely other missiles for operational-tactical purposes."

/12858

CSO: 5200/1323

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: COMMENTARIES ON SIGNIFICANCE OF GORBACHEV OFFER

NST Plenary Session

LD021002 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] Geneva March 2 TASS -- Delegations from the Soviet Union and the United States held a plenary meeting here today at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms at the Soviet side's suggestion.

At the meeting, the Soviet delegation, acting in keeping with Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of February 28, 1987, tabled proposals providing for the taking of the problem of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe from the package of issues and for the immediate conclusion of a separate agreement on this matter.

Moscow TV: New Opportunity

LD012222 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Mar 87

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Text] Hello comrades. Today is the 1st day of spring according to the calendar, and correspondingly, one would wish to get into the right mood. There is now every reason for this by the way.

Yesterday, a new major Soviet foreign policy initiative was made public which will take the whole disarmament process, and the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva out of a stalemate into which these talks and this process had fallen as a result of the U.S. obstructionist policy.

The Soviet Union proposes to separate the problem of medium medium-range missiles in Europe from a package of issues, to make separate agreements on this and to do so without delay. For such a step there exists not simply the foundation of an accord, but an accord that is in fact ready. You will recall in Reykjavik we put these proposals forward in a package and an accord was reached on this. After Reykjavik, the U.S. Administration asserted the Soviet Union allegedly linked the resolution of all disarmament problems in a single package and for this reason, it was said, there was no progress in this direction. Now, such a premise does not exist. The opportunity exists to rid our common European home within a very short period of time of a significant portion of its nuclear burden.

The assurance has frequently been given in the West that the issue is only about taking the issue of medium-range missiles out of the Reykjavik package. Well, it now remains to be proven that this is indeed the case and support the Soviet initiatives. It is most important that this historical opportunity not be allowed to slip.

Yes, spring has arrived, however, a true springtime warming in the international situation, unfortunately, does not yet exist. Those same forces attempt to disrupt our plans, to heap up new obstructions in the path of weakening international tension. Our reply is clear: We will advance and will, at the same time, strengthen our defense capability.

Last week, a nuclear explosion was conducted in our country. This step, you understand, was made compulsory but not necessary. For 17 and 1/2 months our nuclear test sites had remained silent. Five times, five, we extended the moratorium. The United States responded with 26 explosions in Nevada. It was of course impossible to continue endlessly in this fashion. We are keeping open, and will continue to keep open all doors for honest steps to limit and reduce armaments, as is testified by our latest initiative. We are prepared to make this particular nuclear explosion the last one if, in its turn, the United States ends nuclear tests.

Statement by CD Delegate

LD031342 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Geneva March 3 TASS -- The text of the statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with the Soviet Union's proposal for detaching the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe from the other arms control and disarmament issues and concluding a separate agreement on it has been released at the disarmament conference as an official document today.

Addressing a plenary meeting, the leader of the Soviet delegation, Yuriy Nazarkin, said that that new initiative constituted another major step towards the fulfilment of a program for a nuclear-free world.

Criticising the concept of nuclear deterrence, which is being upheld by some Western countries, the Soviet delegate noted that it led to the escalation and improvement of nuclear weapons, which meant the further arms race. To reconcile oneself with this would mean voluntarily to doom humanity as a whole to imminent peril. The fulfilment of the SDI program is fraught with even greater dangers: Whatever "defensive" labels are pinned on it, it is intended to tip the balance of forces in favour of the U.S.

A new building of international security can be erected and cemented only on trust, Yuriy Nazarkin said in conclusion. But it would be wrong to phrase the problem as follows: trust before everything else, including disarmament. The Soviet Union advocates a different road: to trust through joint actions, and its latest IMF [as received] proposal is proof positive of this approach.

The latest Soviet initiative was hailed by the leader of the GDR delegation, Harald Rose, who stressed that it was paving the way to the creation of a nuclear-free Europe, reductions in the nuclear arms arsenals and eventually a nuclear weapon-free world.

The positive character of the Soviet proposal was also noted by U.S. delegate Linn Hansen. He said that the United States also wanted real progress and planned shortly to submit to the Soviet side the terms of a treaty on medium-range missiles.

PRAVDA: 'Historic Chance' Offered

PM021930 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 87 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Historic Chance Not To Be Missed. Our Country's Important New Initiative"]

[Text] On 28 February a statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was made public announcing that the Soviet Union is offering to single out the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe from the complex of issues, to conclude a separate agreement on it, and to do so immediately. This decision is yet another major step toward implementing the Soviet program for a nuclear-free world put forward at the beginning of last year.

The peoples of the world are experiencing a crucial period in their development. The mind of man has made a great discovery -- the atom has begun to serve society. There are still forces in the world that would like to turn this discovery against mankind. Madmen in the imperialist camp are nurturing plans for unleashing nuclear war. Moreover, by expediting the creation [sozdaniye] of components of space strike weapons, they would also like to turn outer space into an arena for nuclear war.

Common sense refuses to tolerate this prospect or to accept the logic of mankind's suicide. The CPSU and the Soviet state, which operate in close alliance with the fraternal parties and the socialist community countries, most fully reflect in their policy the peoples' desire for peace and progress.

On 15 January 1986 the Soviet Union presented mankind with a document of historic importance -- a realistic and specific program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction. The CPSU and the Soviet state are firmly convinced that in the nuclear missile age questions of the security of states and peoples must be raised in a fundamentally different way from before. Nowadays you cannot attempt to ensure your own security at the expense of others. The new political thinking leads to the only correct conclusion: In our time the security of the planet and the survival of mankind can be ensured only through the joint efforts of all states and peoples. True security is now achieved not by weapons but by political means.

Step by step the Soviet Union, supported by other peace-loving countries and the forces of reason and good will in the world, is paving the way for building a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. Our country tirelessly puts forward new peace initiatives, encapsulating in them the peoples' peace-loving aspirations.

The basis exists for implementing the step that has now been announced by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Back at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik virtual agreement was reached on the question of medium-range missiles in Europe. It was agreed that over the next 5 years the Soviet Union and the United States would eliminate all their medium-range missiles in Europe. It was agreed that over the same period the number of Soviet missiles of this class in the Asian part of our country's territory would be reduced to 100 warheads on the understanding that the United States could keep a similar number of medium-range missile warheads on its national territory.

As soon as an agreement on eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe is signed, the USSR is prepared to withdraw from the GDR and the CSSR, by agreement with those countries' governments, the enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles

deployed there was a countermeasure to the deployment of the U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in West Europe. As for the other operational-tactical missiles, the USSR is prepared to immediately embark on talks with the aim of reducing and totally eliminating them. The USSR is placing appropriate proposals on the negotiating table at the Geneva talks with the United States on nuclear and space arms.

While it is singling out the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Government still regards it as an extremely important matter to reach an agreement on substantially limiting and then eliminating strategic arms in organic interconnection with a decision on not allowing the deployment of weapons in space.

As is well known, the Geneva talks are effectively marking time. There is just one reason for this: The U.S. Administration has retreated from what was achieved in Reykjavik. The accords on the whole range of questions discussed in the Icelandic capital are being sabotaged. [paragraph continues]

What are prevailing are narrow egotistical interests, a refusal to abandon the gamble on military technical superiority, and illusory hopes of dashing ahead, primarily via space, which is what Washington's notorious "broad interpretation" of the ABM Treaty is designed to assist.

Some people are attempting to pin the responsibility for the existing situation at the talks on the Soviet Union, claiming the talks would get moving if the USSR singled out the question of medium-range missiles from the package of proposals submitted in Reykjavik. For the sake of the noble cause of nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union has done this. The ball is in the U.S. court, and the U.S. court alone.

There is a real opportunity to rapidly free our European home from a considerable proportion of its nuclear burden. The realization of this opportunity would mean a real and major step toward the subsequent complete liberation of Europe from nuclear arms.

The world can see that the CPSU and the Soviet state are guided by the consciousness of lofty responsibility to mankind. The USSR persistently seeks mutually acceptable solutions in the interests of building a nuclear-free world. The foreign policy course formulated by the 27th party congress is being consistently implemented.

The nuclear militarists and the military-industrial complex are trying to assure the peoples that nuclear disarmament is infeasible. Not true! The talks in Reykjavik showed nuclear disarmament is a realistic matter. In the Icelandic capital the parties to the talks were virtually just a step away from agreement on a whole range of decisions that, taken together, would have meant a deep breakthrough in the front of the nuclear danger. "This," the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee says, "is the greatness and the tragedy of Reykjavik. Its greatness because an attainable prospect of a nuclear-free world opened up. Its tragedy because powerful forces opposed the agreements, remaining captive to strong-arm nuclear thinking."

The tragic aspect of Reykjavik can and must end. The highest interests of mankind imperatively demand this. The recent internal forum in Moscow showed the peoples' strengthening desire to free the planet from the nuclear burden.

The large-scale new initiative launched by our country is approved and supported by the Soviet people. It is meeting with a broad positive response among the peoples of Europe and other continents, who see it as yet another act of good will by the Soviet Union.

There is an historic chance to solve the problem of nuclear disarmament. This chance must not be missed!

Test of U.S. Sincerity

PM031341 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Historic Chance"]

[Text] Moscow again. Another constructive use of new political thinking intended to raise civilization to a qualitatively higher level.

All mankind -- on every meridian and parallel, especially in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals -- is discussing and commenting on the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, published on the last day of winter, 28 February. It says that, after examining the complex of issues relating to implementation of the program for a nuclear-free world, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has decided to take another major step in this direction.

What is the essence of this major step? The aim is to develop the greatness of Reykjavik and translate it into practical action, and also to minimize its tragedy; it is also to prove once again, in practice, that Reykjavik was not a failure but a breakthrough, that it was not just exploratory [prokhodnoy] talks but a moment of truth when great prospects opened up for embarking on the road to a nuclear-free world. Now for the specifics:

The Soviet Union proposes singling out the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe from the complex of issues and concluding a separate agreement on it, and doing so without delay. Not only the basis for this step exists but, to all intents and purposes, a ready-made accord. It was agreed in Reykjavik that the USSR and the United States would eliminate all their medium-range missiles in Europe over the next 5 years. Over the same period the number of Soviet missiles of this class would be reduced to 100 warheads in the Asian part of our territory, on the understanding that the United States could keep the same number of medium-range missile warheads on its own national territory.

As soon as an agreement is signed on eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the USSR will withdraw from the GDR and the CSSR, by agreement with the governments of these countries, the enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles deployed there as a countermeasure to the deployment of Pershing-2s and cruise missiles in Western Europe. With regard to other operational-tactical missiles, we are prepared to immediately begin talks aimed at reducing and totally eliminating these missiles.

These are the proposals the Soviet Union is putting on the negotiating table at the talks with the United States in Geneva. The importance of these proposals is obviously tremendous. They open up a real opportunity to free our common European home from a considerable part of its nuclear burden. This would be a real, major step toward completely freeing Europe from nuclear weapons. The European peoples are particularly close to one another because of the colossal ordeals that have fallen on them. It is enough to recall the two world wars which came to a head and raged mainly on the European Continent. That is why today the broad European public sincerely welcomes the new Soviet initiative -- the fruit of new political thinking. One of the characteristic and, what is more, fundamental features of this thinking is the ability to listen to the public's voice, to understand the concerns and interests of other peoples, and not to isolate one's own security from the security of one's neighbors in our interdependent world. Moscow has listened very carefully and acted in accordance with people's innermost aspirations and the urgent demands of the time.

Reykjavik showed that nuclear disarmament is a totally realistic policy. In Reykjavik the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting were literally just a step away from an accord on a whole range of decisions which, in total, would have signified a profound breakthrough in the front of nuclear danger. This did not happen, and everyone knows who is to blame for this. The complex of proposals encompassing strategic offensive weapons, medium-range missiles, space weapons, and nuclear tests is being sabotaged by Washington. People on the Potomac do not wish to give up their gamble on military-technological superiority or their illusory hopes of dashing ahead -- via space, if not on earth. Instead of deep reflection, they are resorting to the "broad interpretation" of existing accords which contain the nuclear arms race to a certain extent.

This is the strategy of those who have backed away from Reykjavik. Their tactics amount to artless attempts to lay the blame at another's door. In particular, they cite the fact the Soviet Union insists on resolving the complex of problems discussed in the Icelandic capital as a package. So if the Soviet Union were to single out the question of medium-range missiles from the Reykjavik package, reaching an agreement on eliminating these missiles in Europe would present no particular difficulty, those across the ocean claim and even assure people. Fine. The statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee makes provision for precisely this. So Washington has now been given a good opportunity to prove in practice its good will, the seriousness of its intentions, and its sincerity.

It goes without saying that while singling out the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union still considers it very important to reach an agreement on substantially limiting and then eliminating strategic weapons. Naturally, the conclusion of such an agreement, and this has been repeatedly stressed by the Soviet leadership, must be made conditional upon a decision on preventing the deployment of weapons in space, because these issues are organically interconnected.

The nature of the times in which we live is truly critical. The contradiction between war and peace and between the existence and extinction of civilization dominates all human affairs, especially in international politics. The new thinking, common sense, and, finally, the survival instinct reflect the determination of the human race to resolve this contradiction in time and to the benefit of peace. The international forum "For a Nuclear-free World, for the Survival of Humanity" held recently in Moscow once again demonstrated this determination and, at the same time, the expectations, concerns, and intense striving of eminent representatives of science, culture, politics, and religion in connection with this great contradiction of the nuclear age.

The Soviet Union's new initiative is in many respects a response to these expectations, concerns, and strivings. The Soviet Union has once again demonstrated its will and determination -- despite all the difficulties and artificial obstructions -- to resolve the problem of nuclear disarmament. The world has once again seen for itself how the problems of our country set itself in its domestic policy and the problems which must be resolved in the international arena merge into one indissoluble whole. The tasks of accelerating and restructuring socialist society, preventing a nuclear catastrophe, demilitarizing the world, and humanizing international relations form the linchpin of our party's strategic course. That is why the words "restructuring" and "openness" are now regarded abroad as synonyms for the words "progress" and "peace."

The new initiative, which is oriented toward completely freeing Europe from nuclear weapons, offers another historic chance to the peoples of this continent that has suffered much and to all mankind to curb the nuclear apocalypse and take an important step toward a world free from wars and weapons. This chance cannot, must not be missed!

Dobrynin Meets Sen Pryor

LD031925 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 3 TASS -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had a meeting with a delegation of American politicians, businessmen and public figures led by Senator David Pryor.

The members of the American delegation expressed satisfaction at the chance they received to see for themselves wide-scale changes taking place in the Soviet Union in the political, social, economic and public spheres.

They noted that lately the interest in the life of the Soviet Union has grown tremendously in the U.S. and that there was a growing awareness of the possibility for improving relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and for creating conditions for the development of trust and mutual understanding between the people in both countries.

In that context they set forth their considerations concerning the existing reserves for making headway along these lines and expressed the hope for the development of Soviet-American cooperation in many fields.

Issues central to Soviet-American relations were discussed from the position of constructive interest, primarily, the vital need of an active search for agreements on the substance of the problems raised in Reykjavik.

Special emphasis was made on the principled importance of the new peace initiative set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev in his recent statement -- to conclude without delay a Soviet-American agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. Broad sections of the American public link no small hopes with it. At that point the American side expressed good wishes to be conveyed to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The meeting passed in a business-like and well-wishing atmosphere.

'Graphic' New Thinking

PM041055 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Mar 87 First Edition p 3

[Article by Captain First Rank V. Kuzar under the "Observer's Opinion" rubric: "Decision of Fundamental Importance"]

[Text] "Breathtaking proposal..." Favorable prerequisites..." Very important peace challenge to the West..." That is the progressive public's reaction to the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, setting forth the new Soviet initiative. To judge by the responses from the mass media, it has left no one in the world indifferent. That is no accident.

The Soviet Union's decision of fundamental importance consists in highlighting the problem of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe from the package of questions which are being examined at the Geneva talks and immediately concluding a separate agreement on this problem. What should I like to note in this regard? First of all that already there is virtually an agreement for this step. At the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik the sides agreed the USSR and the United States would completely eliminate all their medium-range missiles in Europe and drastically reduce these missiles -- to 100 warheads -- in the Asian part of our country and to the same number on the United States' national territory.

As soon as an agreement is signed on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the USSR will withdraw its enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles from the GDR and the CSSR by agreement with these countries' governments. Our country is also prepared to embark immediately on talks on operational-tactical missiles with a view to reducing and totally eliminating them.

The Soviet Union has thus taken a major new step on the historic path begun by the Soviet-U.S. talks in the Icelandic capital. For all people of good will Reykjavik has become a moment of truth, a breakthrough to a world free of nuclear weapons. That is what would happen if the U.S. leadership had not stopped, had not gone into reverse. Reykjavik continues to live and to win the minds of ever new people. It is in vain that the enemies of nuclear disarmament are making efforts to try to prove these were ordinary talks which ended in failure.

The USSR's new initiative is graphic evidence of the Soviet leadership's new political thinking--Thinking which gives a clear and precise answer to the burning questions of the present day and the only correct decision in line with the urgent requirement of the time. The Soviet proposals are dictated by the interests of the security of our country and of our allies and by the desire to free our common European home of cumbersome nuclear arsenals.

In putting forward the new initiative the Soviet leadership also considered the fact that the West has frequently stressed its readiness, if the Soviet Union removes the medium-range missiles question from the Reykjavik package, to immediately conclude a corresponding agreement. This opportunity has now been offered. Our country is waiting for the people across the ocean to take advantage of this change and to prove their words do not deviate from their deeds.

It should be noted that Washington's first reaction, albeit restrained, was as a whole positive. Pell, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, spoke of the broad opportunities opening up for talks. Senators (Stiven) and Lugar spoke from optimistic positions. Representatives of the ruling circles of a number of West European countries also expressed their attitude toward the Soviet proposal. In particular the capitals of the FRG, Belgium, and Denmark assessed it as an important step forward. The British newspaper THE GUARDIAN stressed that the Soviet Union's proposal "opens the way for the biggest breakthrough in arms control since the heyday of detente in the early seventies."

Those who are reluctant to renounce the gamble on military superiority and the illusory calculations of reversing the course of history, those who see Europe fenced in by nuclear missiles, have also shown themselves. It is obviously with their permission that items have appeared in the press expressing fears that the U.S. missiles may be removed from Europe. After all the Europeans would then allegedly be defenseless in the face of "Soviet superiority in conventional armaments." Other fabrications are also being disseminated.

Well, this is not the first time something of the kind has been observed, especially when there is nothing of substance to object or respond to. It is also opportune to think of time. It does not wait. Every new day brings evidence of the actions of the nuclear militarists seeking to turn space into a "Star Wars" arena and thus place mankind on the brink of catastrophe.

The specific Soviet proposal for the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe was put on the Geneva conference table 2 March. There is a unique opportunity to ensure that Europe ceases to be seen as a potential theater of nuclear war. A situation has been created in which it is possible to embark immediately on the reduction and then the total elimination of nuclear weapons on the planet.

'To Get Out of Cul-de-Sac'

DW042359 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2055 GMT 4 Mar 87

[Interview in Moscow with Vladimir Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, by correspondent Lutz Lehmann on the "Brennpunkt" program -- Zagladin responds in German -- in Moscow, date not given, recorded]

[Text] [Lehmann] Why did the secretary general untie the Reykjavik negotiating package just now?

[Zagladin] Well, we have pondered much following the forum. Everything said there was reflected by us very, very profoundly. We had other talks, with statesmen and with representatives of the public, first with European interlocutors. We then considered everything we had heard before; that was the first thing we did. Secondly, we noticed in Geneva that we were very close to a cul-de-sac once again. We wanted to get out of the cul-de-sac.

[Lehmann] It was only in Reykjavik that the Soviet Union linked the intermediate-range missiles with the problem of strategic and space weapons. Was that a mistake from today's point of view?

[Zagladin] No. That was no mistake. Even today we are convinced it would be better to solve all three main problems of nuclear disarmament at a time, we are still convinced. I have already mentioned that we thought about everything, reflected upon everything; now one must make a step forward, a step that really might clear things up.

[Lehmann] Can that partly be attributed to the fact that only in this year, presumably, there is the chance to come to an agreement with this very U.S. President?

[Zagladin] Well, we are prepared to make an agreement with this President, with another President, with any President.

[Lehmann] But the election campaign in the United States will come.

[Zagladin] Yes, certainly. One must not lose any time.

[Lehmann] From the Soviet viewpoint as well as from the U.S. one, verifiability will play an important role. That would mean U.S. checks in the USSR, but checks by the USSR in Western Europe, too. Will that not be a problem?

[Zagladin] No, absolutely not. We are for a very serious control, a thorough one, if we really go and start nuclear disarming, if we really do. Of course, there must be control measures that are as deep as disarmament measures.

[Lehmann] Well, if the USSR accepts controls on its territory to take place, then it must win the Western Europeans for such controls.

[Zagladin] Yes, of course. That is among the subjects of the negotiations. We will not only discuss with the United States, but with our European partners too.

[Lehmann] Automatically, you will have to talk with the FRG, for example, and with the UK.

[Zagladin] Yes, of course. We have already had many discussions with those countries, and we will continue them. We want to build up our common house of Europe together, that means one must discuss.

[Lehmann] Now that Secretary General Gorbachev has just separated the intermediate-range disarmament from the space weapons problem, President Reagan is demanding a modified Soviet attitude toward SDI in that context, and he wants to make it a key question. Under that condition, do you give any chance at all to intermediate-range disarmament?

[Zagladin] First as to the SDI problem, that problem really remains very, very important. The ABM Treaty must be valid, must remain valid. That is our conviction.

[Lehmann] No change concerning its interpretation?

[Zagladin] No change of our position on that question. We believe if there were no ABM Treaty, then there would be no brake to a further arms race, with new, more dangerous forms coming up. That means everything must remain the same as for the ABM Treaty. That does not mean negotiations on intermediate-range missiles could not be a chance. On the contrary, there is indeed a chance about them. We think there is a very serious chance today, which really must be used. We believe, we hope that a success in this sense, in this direction might introduce a new, qualitatively very new

stage in international politics, because hitherto we have only made an arms race together. Now the disarmament process must be started. By that very serious reduction of a great class of nuclear weapons, one might start that process; that is very serious.

[Lehmann] But did I get you right, Mr Zagladin, that the USSR's position on the ABM Treaty and on space weapons is absolutely unequivocal and unchangeable?

[Zagladin] Yes, we have the same opinion as the Western European countries -- the ABM Treaty must remain. On that basis, there must be talks with the Americans, and a solution must be found.

Central Committee Aide: Summit Possible

LD051456 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1439 GMT 5 Mar 87

[Text] A summit meeting between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev could be a possibility if there is a quick arms control agreement in Geneva on medium range nuclear weapons, a senior Soviet official said in London today.

Mr Andrey Grachev, a political expert on the staff of the Soviet Central Committee, said: "It is quite natural within this framework that the question of a possible new summit, which has been set aside after the Reykjavik statement, might reappear."

Mr Grachev was part of a three man Soviet delegation who answered questions for more than an hour at the Soviet Embassy on Mr Gorbachev's proposals to rid Europe of medium range nuclear weapons.

Mr Yevgeniy Primakov, director of the Soviet Institute of World Economics and International Relations, said the Western response to the Soviet proposals had been positive, but he noted an attempt to link the offer with shorter range nuclear weapons and conventional armaments. It was important not to approach the issue with double standards, he said. The Soviet Union was prepared to sign an agreement without delay on medium range weapons and to start negotiations on shorter range weapons.

He added: "We would be prepared to consider all necessary measures of verification including the possibility of some international verification and the possibility of on-site inspection. These provisions should be applied to both sides."

Major General Geli Batenin [name as received], a military expert on the Soviet General Staff, said the Western response had been encouraging. "But there seemed a tendency to say 'yes -- but?' The question is, what is behind the 'but'."

He said it might be a specific desire to see the fine print of an agreement which was logical. But great care had to be taken not to distort the meaning of the zero-zero option, which meant the removal of medium range weapons on both sides.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1321

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

AFP: U.S. PRESENTS DRAFT TREATY TO ELIMINATE INF FROM EUROPE

AU051439 Paris AFP in English 1433 GMT 5 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, March 5 (AFP) -- The U.S. draft treaty presented at Geneva in response to a Soviet proposal to eliminate U.S. and Soviet intermediate range missiles from Europe is "very positive", Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said here Thursday.

The Soviet Union was hopeful that agreement could be reached, he told a news conference in the first official Soviet reaction to the U.S. move.

Mr. Gerasimov said the U.S. counter-proposals, which were in line with negotiations at the U.S.-Soviet summit in Reykjavik last October, were contained in a "voluminous" document which would take time to examine.

"We see that things have started to move," Mr. Gerasimov said, adding that there remained technical problems, "and they are important ones," such as verification and dismantling the weapons.

"There is not a high level of trust between us, but we should not turn these technical problems into obstacles," he said.

He said the American side "should not waste time" in seeking an agreement at Geneva, where the Soviet side presented its proposals on Monday, as Ronald Reagan's term was running out as U.S. president.

The U.S. draft treaty agreed to the elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe, based on outlines worked out in Reykjavik. Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at the weekend dropped his insistence that an agreement on intermediate weapons be linked to space arms and strategic missiles.

In the Geneva document, the Americans also agreed to each side keeping 100 intermediate range warheads outside Europe, with the Soviet missiles in Soviet Asia and U.S. missiles probably in Alaska. But Washington insisted that short-range weapons should be included in a treaty.

The Soviet Union has offered discussion on short-range missiles, and had pledged to pull back such weapons with a range up to 1,000 kilometres (625 miles) from East Germany and Czechoslovakia as soon as a treaty was signed on "Euromissiles".

Noting favourable reaction in Western Europe since Mr. Gorbachev broke the deadlock Saturday, "although there are attempts to play down the Soviet proposal", Mr. Gerasimov said that Europeans should be "dancing in the squares" now that the Soviet Union had accepted the idea of a "zero option" in Europe, originally proposed by Washington.

But he said he expected the "poor Europeans" to take fright at the thought of being unprotected in the future by nuclear weapons, commenting on reservations expressed by North Atlantic Treaty Organization Commander-in-Chief Bernard Rogers, who "luckily" was retiring.

Mr. Gerasimov added, however, that at a time that there was a chance of eliminating cruise missiles in Europe, "it cannot but cause regret" that the United States had tested one of these missiles over Canada in the last few days.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1322

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA REPRINTS, REBUTS ADELMAN ARTICLE ON CW ISSUE

PM101636 [Editorial report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 February 1987 First Edition carries on page 4 a feature under the rubric "From Different Standpoints," comprising an article by Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and a reply by PRAVDA international observer Vladislav Drobkov. The Adelman article carries the editorial note: "This article was published in the British magazine JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY in the 31 January issue. It is quoted here in a slightly abbreviated form." It is headed "'The United States Needs a Chemical Deterrent,'" and reads:

"Our priority task is a comprehensive, effectively verifiable and global ban on all chemical weapons.

"But until the attainment of such a ban we must ensure deterrence through a strong defensive position and an awesome potential for a retaliatory strike.

"Our stockpiles have now become obsolete and their quality continues to deteriorate.

"In the near future Congress will decide whether to continue to finance the necessary modernization of the chemical retaliatory strike potential.

"Thus the Congress will decide whether the United States should have a reliable deterrent in case of an attack on American and allied forces using chemical weapons.

"The administration's proposal is not to increase the number of armaments in existence.

"In effect it will even lead to a reduction in the arsenal, which will become more reliable and safer to handle.

"Compared with 1969, when the United States unilaterally stopped producing chemical weapons, the threat of the appearance of chemical weapons, the threat of the appearance of chemical weapons throughout the world has changed substantially.

"At that period it was calculated that only 5 other countries possessed chemical weapons, whereas today this figure has increased to at least 15, and more and more countries are trying to acquire such weapons.

"An even more sinister fact is that the taboo on the use of chemical weapons which existed so long has been undermined in the last 10 years.

"The Soviet Union has used chemical weapons in Afghanistan and helped its Vietnamese allies to use such weapons in Cambodia and Laos.

"Iraq has used chemical weapons against Iran in the last 3 years.

"Moreover the Soviet Union has continued to produce chemical weapons even since 1969, despite the U.S. decision to halt production.

"Today the Soviet Union has a major, modern, and diverse offensive chemical potential.

"By contrast, the American arsenal is small, largely obsolete, and the number of means of delivery is highly limited.

"With time this potential is increasingly losing its reliability.

"This disproportion creates a threat to us and our allies, lowers the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons, and gives rise to the need to adopt appropriate measures.

"Both at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, with the participation of 40 countries, and at bilateral talks with the Soviets, the United States seeks an agreement in the arms control sphere banning not only the use of chemical weapons (like the 1925 Geneva protocol), but also their manufacture, development, storage, transfer, and acquisition.

"We cannot really rely on achieving this goal unless we give the Soviets at least some grounds for serious talks.

"The Soviets have a clear military superiority in the sphere of chemical weapons, and see no incentive to renounce that superiority, which would happen in the event of the imposition of a comprehensive chemical weapon ban as a result of talks.

"Against the background of the struggle which the administration has waged over the last few years to persuade Congress to finance the modernization (not the buildup) of the chemical potential for a retaliatory strike, some progress was achieved both at the multilateral talks in Geneva and at bilateral talks between the United States and the USSR.

"The modernization of the American chemical weapon arsenal with a view to restoring a reliable retaliatory strike potential and thus an effective deterrent preventing the Soviet Union from using its weapons will give the Soviets some incentive to continue serious talks.

"At the Geneva summit meeting President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev agreed to step up efforts to conclude an agreement on a chemical weapon ban.

"We have held a round of bilateral meetings with the Soviets.

"Moreover we are intensifying our efforts at multilateral forums with a view to accelerating talks on the conclusion of an effective treaty.

"At the time of the last round of our talks on chemical weapons, after many years of virtual deadlock because of important verification issues, we noted increased activeness on the part of the Soviet delegation.

"Since this activeness promotes the talks, we welcome it.

"Much work lies ahead for us. The path to the conclusion of a treaty will hardly be rapid, despite all our efforts.

"Let us make it clear: Our efforts must include the implementation of plans for the modernization of our limited arsenal.

"The administration, Congress, and the public clearly advocate the banning, and not the creation, of chemical weapons, and that will continue.

"In order to have the opportunity to achieve this, we must ensure that our delegation does not take part in talks empty-handed.

"Thus Congress should meet the administration's request to finance the production of binary chemical weapons."

The reply, by PRAVDA international observer Vladislav Drobkov, is headed "What If We Are Our Own Deterrent?" and reads:

"Thank you, Mr Adelman!

"On reading your article I finally realized that the present American administration has decided once and for all to adopt the language of the heroes of Orwell's book '1984,' who called the war department the 'Ministry of Peace' and 'truth' 'lies.' Only by adopting this--to put it mildly--unusual approach to world affairs is it possible to argue that for the sake of a ban on chemical weapons it is necessary to launch the production of a new, even more murderous variety of such weapons.

"Let us look at the specific 'bricks' from which K. Adelman is trying to build a kind of ideological foundation for a vast gas chamber. How sick and tired we are of assertions about 'Soviet superiority' (nuclear, naval, in the sphere of conventional arms, chemical--depending on the current American 'need') and the corresponding calls to 'ensure deterrence through a strong defensive position and an awesome potential for a retaliatory strike'! Is not this how Washington has tried to justify every new step along the path of building up its own militarist might?

"Was it not behind the screen of 'deterrence' that the United States began the development of all arms, without exception--from the first ICBM's to

nuclear-pumped x-ray lasers? The 'retaliatory strike potential' has grown and grown. But to this day the United States has not renounced a single type of arms which it swore it wanted to put an end to.

"I am afraid that chemical weapons will be no exception. Not for nothing is the Pentagon, which has already begun production of the new binary weapons, in no hurry to destroy the old chemical shells, bombs, and missiles.

"It is also hard to believe Mr Adelman when he talks about 'reducing the arsenal' of toxic gases. Taking into account the increased toxicity of the new gases, this 'reduction' can be compared with adopting 5 nuclear bombs to replace 10 TNT bombs and shouting about 'reducing the arsenals by half.' And it hardly matters to the Europeans, for instance, how many times over-- 5, 10, or 100 times--the American chemical weapons shipped here could destroy all living things on our continent. After all, we all have only one life.

"Mr Director has described as 'sinister' the fact that the 'taboo on the use of chemical weapons' has been undermined. And of course, he accuses the Soviet Union and other states of this. But he forgets to remind his readers that the 'facts' concocted by the U.S. special services about Soviet and Vietnamese 'chemical attacks' have been exposed many a time by entirely competent and independent experts, including Americans.

"He also 'forgets' that it was not Soviet, but American chemical weapons that were used and seized in Afghanistan. The same gap in the memory has accounted for the thousands of tons of toxic chemicals dropped by the United States on the long-suffering land of Vietnam, on its peaceful villages and cities. I wonder, does Mr Adelman even remember those of his compatriots who suffered from the American 'agent orange,' 48 million liters of which the USAF dropped on Vietnam?

"Mr Director clearly does not want to cloud his readers' memory with the generally known fact that the Pentagon has already tried, not long ago, and with success, to deceive American congressmen. In order to fulfill Congress' condition for the commencement of production of binary shells, the White House stated that the NATO allies have agreed to their deployment in Western Europe. In fact a number of bloc countries had reservations and expressed objections against this.

"As for the claim that the U.S. chemical arsenal is 'small, largely obsolete, and the number of means of delivery is highly limited,' let me just mention a few facts. According to the American weekly DEFENCE NEWS, the Pentagon now has 3 million units of chemical ammunition containing 150,000 tons of toxic substances. Production of binary chemical weapons, that is, weapons consisting of two components, is now being stepped up in the United States. In the new Pentagon budget a further 500 million dollars is appropriated for these purposes. And in the next 10 years the United States plans to spend more than 12 billion on preparing for chemical warfare. Is that not enough for you, Mr Adelman?

"This list could be continued for a long time. But it seems to me that it is not only a question of the director's bad memory. The point is that on reading his article you cannot help wondering: What kind of simpletons are these empty accusations and equally empty statements on the U.S. Administration's 'desire' to put an end to chemical weapons intended for?

"After all, the whole purpose of his article--to secure new appropriations for the chemical arms race--completely undermines confidence in such assertions. Especially since Washington would only have to stop engaging in propaganda and start sincerely wanting to put an end to barbaric weapons, and it could be done now.

"In any event, the Soviet Union has more than once proposed to the United States that we do precisely this. We call for mankind to be delivered from the threat of destruction through the elimination of all--nuclear, chemical, and biological--arsenals of weapons of mass destruction.

"But suppose Washington's desire to put an end to these weapons does exist, not only in words. Then why did the United States and its closest allies, in November 1986, vote against the draft resolution on banning chemical and bacteriological weapons in the UN First Committee? Why has the United States still not given a constructive answer to the appeal contained in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 Statement for the elimination not only of chemical weapons themselves, but of the industrial base for their production? Why has there been no such response to the detailed Soviet initiatives in this sphere put forward at the Geneva Disarmament Conference?

"But Mr Adelman should know very well that if anyone needs 'detering' in the chemical arms race, it is the United States. And if he has to go against his conscience in trying to persuade the congressmen to fork out for the continued production of binary weapons, it is clearly not just for the fun of it. After all, the American administration simply does not and cannot have any other arguments in favor of building up stockpiles of chemical weapons--only hypocritical declarations and accusations."

/7358

CSO: 5200/1307

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS REPORTS ON VIENNA CSCE DEVELOPMENTS

Meeting on Troop Cuts

LD171609 Moscow TASS in English 1556 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Text] Vienna February 17 TASS -- An exchange of views on starting consultations on issues of reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe was held at the French Embassy here today.

Representatives of the countries grouped in the Warsaw Treaty and NATO took part in the exchange. The Socialist countries were represented by the heads of the delegations to the follow-up meeting on security and cooperation in Europe, currently under way here.

The head of the Soviet delegation, Ambassador Yu.B. Kashlev and Major-General V.M. Tatarnikov, a member of the delegation, took part in the exchange of views from the Soviet side.

East Bloc Proposals

PM231651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the Vienna Meeting"]

[Text] Vienna, 21 Feb -- The Vienna meeting of representatives from CSCE states is discussing proposals submitted by the delegations.

Yu.B. Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation, submitted to the meeting's plenary session a number of new proposals coauthored by the group of socialist countries. They revolve around the affirmation of new thinking on security questions and the development of military detente in Europe. A number of proposals concern human rights and humanitarian cooperation, the right to work and housing, and the expansion of contacts among people.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1306

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR ROUNDTABLE: NATO BRUSSELS DECLARATION, PACT BUDAPEST APPEAL

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 86 p 5

[Roundtable discussion among Dushan Rovensky, head of the international department of the newspaper RUDE PRAVO (Czechoslovakia), Josef Szaszi, deputy editor-in-chief of the newspaper MAGYAR HIRLAP (Hungary), and Horst Schoetzki, commentator for the foreign-policy monthly HORIZON (GDR), conducted by IZVESTIYA commentator Sergey Dardykin: "Response or Evasion of Response? The NATO 'Reaction' to the Warsaw Pact States' Budapest Appeal"]

[Text] "It must be carefully studied," was the West's first reaction when, at the Conference of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest last June, the Warsaw Pact states put forward a detailed program for reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe. "We shall study it seriously," promised official Bonn. "Closely and in depth," stated Italy's Prime Minister B. Craxi. "In a fitting manner," assured NATO headquarters in Brussels. "In the most serious fashion," affirmed the U.S. Department of State through its press spokesman B. Kalb, backing up the European allies. And now, a year later, the promised answer has appeared--NATO's declaration on conventional arms control adopted at the Brussels session of the NATO Council on the level of foreign ministers. Is it really possible to consider this document a reply to the Budapest Appeal? IZVESTIYA asked this question to a number of the socialist countries' prominent writers on international affairs who specialize in the problems of European security and disarmament.

J. Szaszi: When I read the text of the Brussels declaration, I recalled a very old Hungarian tale. In it a wise king, in order to test a girl he liked for quick-wittedness, gave her the following assignment: "Bring me a gift but do not bring it to me." After a certain time the girl came before the king with a dove in her hands. Drawing closer, she suddenly opened her palms and, following the bird with her eyes as it flew away, she said: "It's ready, your majesty! I have brought it and not brought it." That's just like what NATO has done: both replied and evaded a reply. But the analogies to the tale end there--and not just because in the tale everything ended with a wedding feast for all society, whereas here the matter of reducing arms in Europe stood in place and continues to stand in place.

Let us recall what the Budapest Appeal was about. In the first year or two it proposed to carry out a one-time mutual reduction of 100,000 to 150,000 men in

the number of the opposing military and political alliances' troops. Then, at the beginning of the '90s, there was to be a reduction by another one-fourth, which would come to approximately 500,000 men on each side. At the same time, a proposal was made to reduce tactical strike aviation and battlefield nuclear weapons. According to the socialist states' idea, all these measures would be accompanied by effective and reliable verification with the use of both national technical means and international procedures, including on-site inspections. And so, specific figures and dates were named, possible forums for negotiations and possible verification measures were proposed, and a procedure for reductions was proposed whereby the danger of mutual attack would be reduced, strategic military stability would be increased, and confidence would grow.

And what was NATO's response? Diffuse and vague formulations in which the world "reduction" doesn't even figure. Moreover, the NATO declaration doesn't contain a single allusion to the Budapest Appeal, as though people in the West weren't familiar with its content. A natural question arises: What was six months of "careful study" spent for? In order once again to reduce everything to the premise that NATO is inferior to the Warsaw Pact in conventional weapons?

IZVESTIYA: In other words, to reduce everything to fruitless arguments over figures, which have already brought the Vienna negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in Central Europe to an impasse.

D. Rovensky: That's indeed the impression one gets. The assertions regarding NATO's imaginary lag are not supported by an elementary inspection of the facts. Let's recall just the following fairly well-known fact: NATO has 94 divisions in Europe (counting France and Spain), whereas the Warsaw Pact has 78.

IZVESTIYA: Usually citing the fact that France and Spain do not formally belong to NATO's military organization, the West objects to counting their divisions when reckoning the overall balance. However, exactly why shouldn't they be counted? How can one, for example, attribute the participation of French units this fall in joint maneuvers with American and West German troops to the interests of "purely national defense"? Moreover, they didn't take place somewhere on the coast of the English Channel but on the territory of the FRG in direct proximity to the socialist states' borders.

D. Rovensky: The West also passes over in silence the fact that the average size of one NATO division is larger than in the Warsaw Pact armed forces. That's as to the question of the numbers of armed forces. Now for the question of conventional weapons. It is claimed, for example, that NATO is inferior in number of tanks. But in reality that bloc has approximately the same number of tanks in Europe as the Warsaw Pact.

J. Szaszi: No one denies that, considering their different structures and the diversity of the types and forms of weapons, a precise comparison of both sides' armed forces is no easy matter. But when we say that an approximate balance of forces exists in Europe, we by no means have in mind that the picture of one side's conventional arms is a mirror image of the other. And

if there are no signs of progress at the Vienna talks after 13 years of work and 40 rounds, the reasons for this are by no means technical ones. The main reason lies elsewhere: NATO is striving not for a reduction of its military potential on a mutual basis but for a buildup of it. And the Western side has been using the Vienna talks as a kind of cover for this (whereas we have been trying to reach an agreement!), and as one more forum for loudly defending the thesis concerning the Warsaw Pact's military superiority and the "threat from the East."

IZVESTIYA: To all intents and purposes, this same thesis can be read without difficulty between the lines and in the text of the Brussels declaration.

H. Schoetzki: The most correct thing to say would be that it appeared in the world at the same time as NATO. And the propaganda for this thesis has become a kind of a ritual that is scrupulously sustained every time that it's necessary to push through the next arms program. When Gen. Rogers, the supreme commander of NATO armed forces in Europe, publicly states (and this has literally become a habit with him) that the North Atlantic bloc "would not hold out for more than two days in the event of an attack by the Warsaw Pact," he is being intensely hypocritical. Of course, the general knows quite well that the Warsaw Pact has no intention of attacking him. But let's leave that aside for the time being. What's more important is something else: Rogers should know better than anyone else that it is NATO during its numerous maneuvers that has long been working out massed conventional-weapons strikes aimed at a deep penetration into the territory of the Warsaw Pact states. He who, in words is crying about the vulnerability of defense but in deeds--and frequently in the most provocational fashion--is preparing for an attack, can scarcely believe sincerely in his own weakness. And all the arguments concerning the imaginary lag in the area of conventional weapons are aimed, first and foremost, at an obvious goal: to persuade public opinion in the NATO countries that Western Europe absolutely can't get by without the American nuclear "umbrella."

A telling fact: After the Reykjavik meeting it was the high NATO officers such as Rogers and his West German colleague Gen. Mack who sounded the alarm over the fact that the American side had even entered into a discussion about the possibility of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe. According to these gentlemen, the West simply cannot give up the concept of a "first nuclear strike," since it "is inferior" to the Warsaw Pact in conventional weapons. And, in their view, only two alternatives can be discussed: either NATO should engage in "catch-up arming," or the socialist states should disarm unilaterally.

IZVESTIYA: Thus, a stalemate is artificially maintained. When the question of nuclear arms is raised, we are told: Let's first deal with conventional weapons. But when the Warsaw Pact states propose a balanced program of reductions in conventional arms, in response they are presented with knowingly unacceptable conditions or an evasion of any response at all.

H. Schoetzki: A recent commentary in the NEW YORK TIMES fairly "graphically" reflects the NATO position on conventional arms: "The cement mixers that will cover in concrete everything that threatens to change the landscape or open

any prospects for doing so have already begun operations." Translated into normal language: NATO's plans do not include the real reduction of armed forces and arms in Europe.

J. Szaszi: This is precisely why the Brussels declaration must be assessed, on the one hand, as a forced step: NATO had to react in some fashion to the Warsaw Pact states' proposals, which had received such wide response in the world. On the other hand, it must be assessed as a rather clumsily camouflaged attempt to evade discussion on the essence of the issue.

IZVESTIYA: NATO has "reacted," but what next?

J. Szaszi: The text of the NATO declaration provides no grounds for optimistic forecasts for the near future. It states that the Western side intends to continue to "study" the problem of verification (verification, and not reduction!) of conventional weapons, i.e., to continue to procrastinate. Our position is that proposals have been submitted, and they remain in force. The question has been raised, and we continue to await an answer.

8756

CSO: 5200/1267

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRENCH REPORT ON NATO, WARSAW PACT EUROPEAN DISARMAMENT TALKS

AU111502 Paris AFP in English 1457 GMT 11 Feb 87

[Text] Vienna, Feb 11 (AFP) — Informal contacts between NATO and the Warsaw Pact are to start here next Tuesday to plan a framework for talks on conventional disarmament in all of Europe, western sources said here Wednesday.

The discussions will be held during a working breakfast at the French Embassy and involve all 16 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and seven Warsaw Pact countries, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) sources said.

The two sides will try to set out a mandate for future discussions on disarmament from "the Atlantic to the Urals" as proposed by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Western sources said each country would decide its representation, but that most countries would not be sending their CSCE delegation head.

The number of meetings to be held, or how neutral and non-aligned countries would be kept informed was not revealed by the sources.

NATO agreed last week at a meeting in Brussels to propose the contacts to the Warsaw Pact.

Last December the United States and France thrashed out a compromise on NATO's idea of how the talks should be organised, agreeing that they be held under CSCE auspices, but with the two alliances leading negotiations.

NATO and the Warsaw Pact have been holding Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks here for 13 years, that have focused, without success, on a zone covering West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg and East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

France did not take part in these talks because they were led by the two military alliances.

The French government had objected to the alliances openly leading the "Atlantic to the Urals" disarmament talks, because this would conflict with its limited membership of the Atlantic alliance.

/9274

CSO: 5240/047

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S SHEVARDNADZE SUPPORTS TLATELOLCO TREATY

LD140931 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 14 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 14 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR Foreign minister, has addressed to A. Stempel Paris, secretary-general of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL) and in his person to the states participating in the treaty on a ban to nuclear weapons in Latin American (Tlatelolco Treaty) a message of greetings on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the treaty.

The first international treaty legally sealing the establishment of a nuclear-free status in a vast and densely populated geographical area, serves as a serious obstacle in the way of proliferation of nuclear weapons, the message says. It marked the start of the process, which is gaining in strength, of turning various regions of the world into nuclear-free zones.

A fresh evidence of the viability of that process is the coming into effect of the treaty proclaiming the South Pacific to be a nuclear-free zone (Raratonga Treaty). The USSR was the first among the nuclear powers to express preparedness to become a guarantor of the nuclear-free status of that zone by signing the respective protocols to the treaty."

Being a consistent supporter of creating nuclear-free zones, the Soviet Union is profoundly convinced that progress in that direction undoubtedly accords with the task of strengthening the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war, creating the climate of international trust and detente, and eliminating nuclear weapons," the message says.

The USSR signed and ratified the additional protocol to the Tlatelolco Treaty and strictly abides by its commitments, firmly declares for strengthening Latin America's non-nuclear status.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1299

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON U.S.-NEW ZEALAND NUCLEAR DISPUTE

LD040406 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1726 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] As the U.S. Embassy in Wellington has stated, the United States does not intend to extend the U.S.-New Zealand memorandum on mutual understanding, which is presently in force. Its term expires in June. In this way New Zealand will be automatically excluded from the ranks of the United States' allies. As is pointed out in the embassy's statement, the United States will review their commitments to safeguard New Zealand's security. This statement could have been expected. This is what Vladimir Beloshapko, our correspondent on the countries of Southeast Asia, has to say:

[Beloshapko] For the last 2 years the government of New Zealand has been subjected to constant pressure from Washington. The cause of this is Wellington's antinuclear policy which, since January 1985, has forbidden U.S. ships equipped with nuclear arms or nuclear propulsion systems to call in at New Zealand ports.

The disobedient ally is threatened with trade and economic sanctions. Essentially, its participation in the ANZUS military bloc, which also includes the United States and Australia, has been frozen. And now, the latest punitive measure. Of course, it hardly puts the security of New Zealand under threat, as they claim on the other side of the ocean, for nobody at all is threatening that country. It is a matter of something else: uncereemonious, crude attempts by a powerful military power to impose its will on a small state, resorting to any means to achieve this, right up to open blackmail.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1299

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: WHITE HOUSE REJECTS TREATY OF RAROTONGA

LD062349 Moscow TASS in English 2255 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Washington, 6 Feb (TASS)--Washington has rejected the call of countries of South Pacific to observe the terms of a treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific (the Treaty of Rarotonga). A spokesman for the Department of State reported on Thursday that the United States Government has been studying the question of whether to sign the three protocols to the South Pacific nuclear-free zone treaty, the Treaty of Rarotonga. He stated the U.S. is of the opinion that the growing number of proposals for regional nuclear-free zones might potentially undermine the policy of deterrence which has been the corner stone of the West's security from the time of World War II.

Commenting on this decision, THE WASHINGTON POST writes today that it reflected a negative attitude of the present administration to anti-nuclear sentiments. The newspaper quotes the pronouncement of a Pentagon official who has not been identified. He explained the United States refusal to agree to observe the terms of the Treaty of Rarotonga by the administration's antipathy to the spread of proposals for nuclear-free zones. The Pentagon official complained that such proposals hamper the United States military activity.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1299

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR ACADEMICIAN GOLDANSKIY COMMENTS ON U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS

LD032107 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 3 Feb (TASS)--The nuclear tests conducted by the U.S. are aimed first and foremost at perfecting the available nuclear weapons and creating "extraordinary" third generation weapons, said Academician Vitaliy Goldanskiy, a prominent Soviet physicist.

The new generation of American nuclear weapons will include nuclear-pumped x-ray lasers, weapons with directed intensification of radiation and electromagnetic impulse as a result of the nuclear device blast. It is precisely to this end that it is planned to conduct tens and even hundreds of test blasts in the Nevada test-range.

The academician explained that the work done by American scientists to miniaturize nuclear warheads will lead to an increase in the number of warheads that can be delivered by one missile, which, in its turn, will result in a new spiral of the arms race.

Besides, Goldanskiy said, work is under way within the SDI framework to design weapons for the impulse or destructive impact on matter by laser beams, beams of neutral particles accelerated to a speed of tens of kilometers a second.

American scientists are planning to concentrate the nuclear blast energy in a long needle inside the x-ray laser. When exposed to a stream of x-ray radiation arising at the time of the explosion, the needle becomes some kind of a plasma of a very high density. Each nuclear warhead is expected to pump by its explosion several tens of needles of the x-ray laser, and fast computers will send these needles against targets after computing the trajectory of missiles already in flight.

In the opinion of the scientist, a source of much alarm is the fact that SDI should be based on a perfectly functioning computer program. This is as improbable as the existence of a library of 5,000 books with 300 pages each printed without corrections and containing not a single misprint. In this case "misprints" stand for the threat of an accidental outbreak of war when the whole sophisticated SDI system is put to action by an originally false alarm system, academician Goldanskiy said.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1299

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET PAPER ON CONGRESSIONAL DIVISIONS ON MORATORIUM

PM101119 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Feb 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS Washington correspondent I. Ignatyev dispatch: "American Legislators Split on Problem of Banning Nuclear Tests" -- first four paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Congress Appeals to White House [subhead]

Last 18 December 130 members of the U.S. House of Representatives sent President R. Reagan a letter. It says notably that "The introduction now of a moratorium on nuclear tests with the right of inspection [inspektsiya] could form the basis for concluding a treaty with the Soviet Union which would put an end once and for all to all tests of nuclear weapons. Consequently, we urge you to act now and give a signal to the whole world that the United States is sincerely interested in ending all nuclear tests."

The moratorium bill introduced for the House's examination on 6 January this year stresses that "Congress considers that a mutual and verifiable [poddayushchiysya proverke] moratorium on tests of nuclear warheads on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union would make a decisive first step toward mutual reductions of nuclear arms."

The White House remains deaf to these appeals.

Indignation is the feeling our readers are registering in their countless telephone calls and letters to the editorial office over the latest U.S. nuclear explosion in Nevada. Many people are asking how the American public has regarded this foolhardy step by its government. We asked TASS Washington correspondent to reply to that question. His report follows:

Washington -- An improvised press conference was arranged the other day without the notification usual in such cases. Democrat Representatives Patricia Schroeder and Richard Gephardt came to the House of Representatives press gallery immediately after the end of a session of Democratic members of the lower house.

Such meetings, which discuss the line to be fought on a given issue on Capitol Hill, are traditionally held jointly with the session. It is not always even reported what the legislators have been examining. This session was a special one; the subject of its discussion was known long before it began: The Democrats in Congress were discussing their stance on the moratorium on nuclear explosions.

P. Schroeder and R. Gephardt are responsible for the draft resolution listed in the congressional records as H-R 12. The resolution provides for the introduction in the United States of a ban on nuclear tests with a yield in excess of 1 kiloton if the Soviet Union continues its moratorium. More than 140 congressmen had already declared their determination to support the document, Patricia Schroeder reported. According to her, their number had shown a marked increase since the nuclear explosion on 3 February -- the 1st this year and the 25th since the Soviet moratorium came into effect. This step by the Soviet Union, the congresswoman from Colorado said, has created "one of the greatest opportunities for the process of arms control." "The Russians have not conducted a single test for 18 months, and even administration representatives acknowledge that we are ahead in this sphere," she stated.

"Ending tests," Richard Gephardt added, "would lead to a lessening of the danger of nuclear weapons being used. We must seek to strengthen security by sensible measures such as an agreement banning nuclear arms or a strategic arms limitation treaty. Whatever the President may say, I consider his policy a course leading toward a full-scale arms race."

Democrats in Congress have supported this stance. The session endorsed a document urging the President to postpone new nuclear explosions and urgently begin talks with the Soviet Union to achieve a mutual and verifiable [poddayushchiysya proverke] ban on nuclear weapons tests.

The document is said to have been unanimously endorsed. As the press secretary of Thomas Downey, Democratic congressman for New York, ironically remarked to me, the opponents of this measure inside the Democratic Party decided not to appear at all at the session.

One such opponent is Republican Gerald Solomon. He is a convinced opponent of the United States following the Soviet Union's good example. Seated commandingly at his desk, behind him the flags of the United States and New York -- whose electors he represents on Capitol Hill -- the gray-haired legislator explained his stance:

"I think there have been serious breaches of various agreements by the Soviet Union. In some cases they were, in my opinion, deliberate, in others not, and in a third group the question of whether the breaches were deliberate or not has hinged on the interpretation of the agreements. Take, for example, the Krasnoyarsk radar station. We regard its construction as a breach of the ABM Treaty, whereas the Soviet Union does not. It is possible this is a legitimate argument. However, such things do exist.

"Here I have a list of Soviet breaches" -- he then showed me a copy of a White House propaganda pamphlet about "Soviet breaches" of accords in the arms control sphere, peppered with words like "possibly" and "perhaps." "There are breaches in virtually every aspect. I do not believe we can have any kind of moratorium until treaties are concluded that provide for on-site inspection [proverka] either by USSR or U.S. representatives or through the intermediaries of third countries to ensure they are respected. Otherwise, we will always have to rely on the other side's word, but we interpret things differently. That is why we must sit down at the negotiating table in Geneva or Vienna and discuss a really mutual, verifiable [poddayushchiysya proverke] treaty on a moratorium that provides for on-site inspection [proverka]. I want to say, using the words of President Reagan -- and I do not believe anyone could be more sincere than he -- the goal must be to remove all nuclear arms."

"Why then," I asked, "does the White House, despite the USSR's readiness to adopt any kind of verification [kontrol] measures, including on-site inspection [proverka], and despite the Soviet Union's strict observance of a unilateral moratorium over 18 months, state it does not intend to renounce nuclear tests?"

"Because there is no treaty banning nuclear tests. The Soviet Union, as you know, insists that we abandon the 'Strategic Defense Initiative,' which, in my opinion, does not bear the character of a nuclear program but is to the benefit of both sides. This stance shows again the insincerity of the Soviet Union, which links SDI -- that is to say, a quite irrelevant question -- to agreements. [paragraph continues]

We cannot put ourselves in a position where the United States may fall behind just because the Soviet Union has not held nuclear tests for 18 months. Nuclear arms reduction is the main problem. Forget the nuclear moratorium! We must sit around the negotiating table and lay our cards on it. We will not achieve anything by nuclear test bans or the like. The main task is to rid ourselves of terrible nuclear arms."

This "judgment of Solomon" is, to put it mildly, lifted from official statements made by the Reagan administration.

Democratic Congressman for the State of Massachusetts Joseph Kennedy, son of Robert Kennedy -- who was assassinated by a hired gunman -- is the representative of an influential political clan in America. He met me with a smile and firm handshake at the entrance to the as yet unfurnished official office which has been his since the U.S. supreme legislative elections last November.

"I am convinced," said the 34-year-old politician, who was one of the first signatories of Resolution H-R 12, "that our stance now reflects to a larger extent the mood of the American people. This was confirmed at the recent elections. The members of Congress who came through the election battle have a better feel for the mood of ordinary Americans. They are indignant that the President opposes a nuclear test ban. The impressive demonstration of a new type of leadership being given by Mikhail Gorbachev and the readiness to ban nuclear tests demonstrated by the Soviet Union, to which the U.S. response has been 25 nuclear explosions, have also played a role in developing these feelings. Both I and my constituents are outraged by the administration's approach. Nuclear tests are an integral part of the 'Star Wars' program which the present administration is pushing through, and my constituents are very resolutely opposed to SDI. We think we will be able to achieve an end to nuclear tests in the United States by prohibiting the financing of further nuclear tests.

"It is well known there are various standpoints in the United States on how to build relations with the Soviet Union," the congressman continued. "Some people think that affairs can only be conducted with the USSR from a position of strength. Others are ready to observe certain agreements until there are actual breaches of those treaties. Everyone acknowledges the danger of nuclear war breaking out. We have already stockpiled enough arms to blow each other up. The time has come therefore for effective disarmament measures. The time has come to think about the kind of direction we are moving in when we possess the potential not only to destroy each other but to eliminate the whole world. It is important to conduct affairs by attempting to find points of contact and by seeking to establish long-term relations rather than by adopting extreme positions."

Yes, the split in the Congress itself and in relations between the country's supreme legislative organ and the administration is becoming increasingly apparent. The polarization of political forces caused by the explosion in Nevada could lead to a major clash between the Congress, where there is now a Democrat majority, and the Republican administration.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1299

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PETROVSKIY: USSR READY FOR TEST MONITORING TALKS

PM161203 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy has received O.R. (Grimson), chairman of the "Parliamentarians for Global Action" organization, and N. Dunlop, the organization's general secretary. There was a detailed exchange of opinions on the question of ensuring all-embracing security equal for everyone.

Here special attention was devoted to the problem of banning nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet side emphasized that, although the USSR will be released from its unilateral moratorium because of the U.S. nuclear tests, it is prepared to return to the moratorium any day or month if the United States decides to end its nuclear explosions. It was also stated that the USSR is prepared to take up the offer by the "Delhi Six" to assist in monitoring the cessation of nuclear explosions and to send its representatives to a meeting of experts on this question even if the United States does not revise its negative attitude to the offer by the six states" leaders.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1299

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

FRG: FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU ON U.S. NUCLEAR TEST

DW051200 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 5 Feb 87 p 3

[Editorial by "GRO": "Arbitrary"]

[Text] That this U.S. nuclear weapons test was necessary may be justified by some weapons specialists. Nevertheless, it is harmful to the international relations of the United States. After 18 months, the test will touch off some adverse reaction: With the best of intentions and despite all its propaganda, the Soviet leadership cannot hold its own military in check anymore. Tests will also be resumed there, as well. Because the Soviet military experts suspect that the test in the Nevada desert has to do with SDI development — the Star Wars program — they will demand something similar.

The arbitrariness with which Pentagon decisions are made under Caspar Weinberger, produces similar arbitrariness in the reaction of the other side. It has a mutual effect. The losers are the diplomats who still pursue the illusion of being able to secure peace. Secretary of State Shultz has hardly any influence in Washington's foreign policy anyway.

And what about Reykjavik? That was long ago.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TURKISH OFFICIALS ON DEPLOYMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

TA052014 Ankara Domestic Service in Turkish 1700 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Social Democratic Populist Party [SDPP] leader Erdal Inonu has reiterated that the SDPP opposes the deployment of strategic nuclear arms in Turkey and called on the government to announce whether or not it has changed its policy in connection with this issue.

At a news conference in Ankara, Inonu pointed out that the Voice of Germany broadcast a statement by National Defense Minister Zeki Yavuzturk that is inconsistent with the government's known policy regarding this issue. According to Inonu, Yavuzturk said: We want all of NATO's deterrent weapons deployed in Turkey.

Inonu said:

[Begin recording] All deterrent forces include the intermediate and long-range nuclear missiles held by the West. Our party is opposed to the deployment of strategic nuclear weapons in Turkey. We do not believe that the deployment of these weapons — which we do not have any control over, and which no one is seriously considering using — will strengthen our defense. In fact, efforts are being made throughout the world to eliminate these weapons and to save humanity from nuclear missiles. Talks are being held between the superpowers to this end and agreements are being signed in Europe to remove these weapons from wherever they are deployed. Under such conditions, it is meaningless to deploy such arms in Turkey. [end recording]

Inonu said that he is concerned about Yavuzturk's statement, demanding that the government issue a statement on the subject immediately. Yavuzturk, in his turn, announced that Turkey's policy on the subject has not changed and that he did not make such a statement to the Voice of Germany. In his statement, the defense minister noted:

[Begin Yavuzturk recording] As you know, the implementation of nuclear policy in Turkey is well-known and there is no question of changing this policy. I have not made any statement to the Voice of Germany regarding nuclear policy. Moreover, the deployment locations of these weapons were determined in the 1978 agreement. Turkey is not a party to these issues. [end recording]

/9274

CSO: 5200/2495

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

CANADIAN PARTY SEES NORDIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE ZONE AS MODEL

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 28 Jan 87 p 2

[Op Ed Article by Professor Nils Ørvik: "The Nordic Model for a Nuclear-Free Zone: Canada Looks to Norway"; first paragraph is AFTENPOSTEN introduction]

[Text] In Canada a debate is expected concerning the earmarking of a brigade for reinforcements for North Norway, and a white book from the government has been announced for March. The country's armed forces have F-18 planes. The article's author is Professor Nils Ørvik at Queen's College, Kingston.

"Look to Norway," launched by President F.D. Roosevelt, became an international motto during the Second World War. The little nation of Norway's valiant resistance to the occupation forces was held up as a model for everyone.

This cry sounded again a few weeks ago, this time in England, when Denis Healey stepped forth to defend the British Labour Party's defense program. As we know, Labour voted in October of last year to dispose of British nuclear weapons and to close the American nuclear bases as soon as the party again comes into power in England. With Mrs. Thatcher's persistent difficulties, all this can happen this year. Denis Healey defended the party's unilateral nuclear disarmament with a "Look to Norway." Norway has shown, he said, that a country can splendidly be a loyal member of NATO and at the same time be free of nuclear weapons.

Pioneering Country

Canada established itself as the same type of pioneering country more than 10 years ago, when the Trudeau government quietly disposed of the nuclear weapons which from Lester Pearson's time constituted a natural part of the Canadian defense system. Canada, like Norway, has actually been a nuclear-free zone since the middle of the 70's. Unlike Norway, Canada never had a nuclear debate. Defensewise, the country is in the American "inside pocket," and since the USA surely has an abundance of these weapons, most figure that deployment a few miles south or north of the border plays a minor role.

Ideological Luxury

However, energetic attempts have been made in recent years to make Canada a nuclear-free zone according to the formula of the Nordic zone model. Of course, this occupies a prominent place in the Labor Party's platform and is supported at least in principle by the non-socialist parties, too. Until recently it was just the Canadian social democrats, the New Democratic Party (NDP), which had made such a zone arrangement for Canada part of its platform. The NDP has also for years demanded complete withdrawal from NATO, an ideological luxury which not even strongly left-oriented socialist parties in West Europe have been able to afford for a rather long time. Since the NDP has now begun to advance in the polls, there too they have begun to work toward replacing the crass withdrawal demand with worn-out statements of support, comparable to those Sissel Rønbeck, Thorbjørn Jagland and other newly reversed NATO friends have launched in the Norwegian socialist camp.

No to SDI

The NDP has never been in power and was not taken quite seriously until recently. Considerably greater attention was aroused when the Liberal Party (LP) at its annual congress in November also adopted a binding resolution which goes very far in the direction of what can be called a Scandinavian model. The party first attached to its platform a no to space weapons (SDI) and a ban on all tests and experiments with cruise missiles. But it was the simultaneous vote to make Canada a nuclear-free zone which became the central item of its new defense proposal. There are grounds for recalling that the Liberal Party is in many ways like the Norwegian Labor Party. The LP has been in power all along since the war, with a couple of brief conservative interruptions. Pierre Trudeau holds the length record as prime minister here, as Einar Gerhardsen does in Norway. The party is now well ahead of the conservatives in the polls and will be able to take over the power of government in Canada within two years, if it does not have an unexpected setback.

Basis for Pressure

It can be expected that the Liberal Party's zone resolution will provide even more impetus for working for such a zone in Canada. The Canadian disarmament movement is doing the agitation. As in West Europe, the strategy here is first to concentrate on city councils and provincial legislatures. When sufficiently many votes have been gotten there, they are used as a basis for pressure on the national level. They have gotten about 150 such zones established up to now. There were 61 votes for and 38 against in the provincial parliament in Ontario (about eight million inhabitants).

One of the most effective arguments is the Scandinavian example. It is claimed that if the NATO country of Norway, which has a common border with the Soviet Union, can all the same find it nationally secure to support such a zone arrangement, then Canada, which is thousands of miles from the Soviet Union, must be able to safely do the same! The many provisos and nuances which are emphasized so strongly in Norway are never mentioned. It is the principle which is the decisive thing here.

Norwegians for the most part hardly have anything against foreign countries' "looking to Norway." It has always been a desire to increase Norway's influence in NATO. Obviously this has been achieved now. But the responsibility and the cost which can go along with a prominent place in the international show window must not be disregarded.

Reinforcements for Norway

This is especially important in relation to Canada. The Canadian government in March of this year will present a white book on the armed forces which is expected to raise questions about Canada's NATO obligation to earmark a brigade for reinforcements for North Norway. Doubts about this were intensified after the major exercise last fall.

After the LP's zone resolution in November has now drawn the Nordic zone model so strongly into the picture, it is probable that this will be used in the debate. In the process, the skeptics will be able to claim that if Norway feels so secure towards the Soviet Union that it is considering fitting the country into a nuclear-free zone, there cannot be any reason for Canada to continue keeping the big and expensive reinforcement forces for aiding Norway. This is not to say that this argument will tip the scales, but such as the mood is now, it will certainly meet with a good deal of sympathy when the decision is to be made.

8831

CSO: 5100/2422

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW FORUM FOR 'NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD' 14-17 FEBRUARY

Moscow TV Preview

LD030001 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1958 GMT 2 Feb 87

[News conference on the "Moscow International Forum for a Non-nuclear World and the Survival of Mankind," on 2 February at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow, moderated by Gennadiy Gerasimov, with Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and leader of the promoting group; Academician Yevgeniy Chazov; Vladimir Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Union of Writers; Yevgeniy Pitovranov, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry; Professor Kislov, deputy director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Metropolitan Yuvenaliy -- recorded]

[Text] [Gerasimov] Comrades, ladies, and gentlemen: An international forum for a nuclear-free world, for the survival of mankind, will soon be held in Moscow.

[Velikhov] I think you know, insofar as this is already being discussed in the press, that a forum will be held in Moscow from 14 to 16 February. At the present moment, up to 30 January, 740 participants from 80 countries have expressed their desire to take part in the forum. There will be 169 science students [estestvenniki], and requests to attend the forum are still coming. Mainly all those we invited have been proposed by a promoting group: 51 political scientists, 52 medical scientists and physicians, 63 representatives of business circles, 258 figures in culture and the arts, 147 representatives of the clergy.

You are aware of how developments in world affairs have been developing since Reykjavik, and actually our forum is the first major scientific meeting to discuss the main points that were put forward at Reykjavik, that is the path to a nuclear-free world through a whole number of specific steps. The situation now is becoming even more exacerbated. You know, that parallel with the attempts and, so to speak, and obvious desire to solve this task by way of talks -- talks are going on in Geneva -- at the same time, attempts are being made to make the introduction of weapons into outer space, the creation [sozdaniye] of a space-based tier of antimissile defense, irreversible. You are familiar with statements made by the U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger and a number of other officials on this. So, we see there is a very acute struggle now. That is why it is very important that the scientific world conducts a detailed, professional, and most serious discussion and formulates its proposals.

The idea, which was born in the scientists' promoting group -- and I will have more to say on that -- met with great support among all groups in the creative intelligentsia,

all those concerned, as indeed all of us are, about questions on how to ensure mankind's survival, how to solve the fundamental problem. As a result of this came the idea of independent, so to speak, forums to discuss the same problem but from different viewpoints. The Soviet promoting group emerged, as it were, spontaneously, with various groups showing an interest in staging this major undertaking. Representatives of various professions entered into it: scientists, members of the Academy Arbatov, Goldanskiy, Bogolyubov, Likhachev, Primakov, Sagdeyev, Academician Kuzin of the Academy of Medical Sciences -- I say apart from those present here -- well-known Soviet Writers Aytmatov, Voznesenskiy, Zalygin, the film director Klim, the composer Sviridov, the artist Ulyanov, the ballerina Plisetskaya. They are a part of the Soviet promoting group that is now taking part in the preparation of this forum. I think that is all that I want to say.

[Gerasimov] Thank you. Let's us turn to some questions. Yes, please?

[NHK correspondent] NHK company, Japan. In what way are you going to influence the policies of senior governments in the West as a result of the meeting?

[Chazov] I have to say we already have examples of influencing public political opinion throughout the world. I recall 1980 when the movement of physicians was launched and when nuclear illusions existed about the possibilities of surviving a nuclear war, or the possibilities of winning a nuclear war. We, scientists and physicians, proceeding from precise scientific data, showed it was impossible, should a nuclear war break out, mankind would face just one fact: the fact of self-destruction. Incidentally, this data is well known throughout the world, but at one time there were doubts about it. Today no one can maintain that anyone can win a nuclear war. I believe the scientific data, reliable data, which will be obtained at this forum, will play a definite part in changing public opinion in Western countries and in changing the opinions of politicians. We still believe in the wisdom of mankind.

[Terekhov] Terekhov, main editorial board of (?news broadcasting). A question for Academician Velikhov: at the end of March, it will be 4 years since the announcement of SDI by President Reagan. Can you say what these 4 years of the threat of SDI and work on it have brought the world, one; will this question be discussed at the forum, two; and three, are there scientists, rather is there a transformation in the approach of scientists, to this SDI, i.e. some used to support it, but no longer do, or the reverse, did not support it but is now are active proponents?

[Velikhov] First, I would say that the main thing is what this defense initiative has hindered. It has hindered the process of nuclear disarmament. I think we all agree we could have moved way ahead of this, at least we could have reached accord on the 50 percent reduction in strategic weapons, the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe, a whole series of other major questions could have been decided, if there had not been the threat of a violation of the antimissile defense treaty of '72 and the threat of weapons being put in space. From the viewpoint of support by scientists, there indeed exists a polarization throughout the world. We see that what we had assumed: a deterioration in international relations, an undermining of the system of accords, all of this is a result of this concept, and today, the majority of scientists share this view.

It must be said that in parallel with our forum, at the same time, the American Society for the Advancement of Science will be holding seminars and discussions in Chicago precisely on this matter. We shall see what will emerge from it, but in general, I know the views of the major U.S. scientists, of the major organizations of scientists in the United States, such as the federation of U.S. scientists, the Union of Concerned

Scientists. Their view point coincides with ours. We all feel the '72 treaty is fundamental, the basis of the process of reducing and preventing a space arms race and curbing it on earth. Any work which violates this treaty, still more the deployment [razvorachivaniye] of a space echelon, will lead to a sharp worsening of the international situation and an intensification of the threat of catastrophe.

[Elevtheroptipia correspondent] Elevtherotipia, Greece: I have a question of Academician Velikhov and also for Dr Chazov. How do you think the new moral atmosphere, or moral climate of the Soviet restructuring will affect the quality of this forum, the quality of debate not only, of course, on the stereotype of the enemy, but also in general international relations? This is a new question arising.

[Velikhov] We feel the practice of open discussion of questions both with those whom we consider to be like-minded and with those... [Velikhov changes thought], I am not talking about allies, it is not a matter of allies. In many questions, those who think like we do can have absolutely different political points of view and choice, so to speak, in their views; but, so to speak, when it is a matter of radical questions, they can be like-minded, and it must be said that the majority of scientists from this viewpoint are like-minded. We are ready to discuss this also with our opponents, those who not only have a different political viewpoint, but also a differing viewpoint on specific questions we will be discussing. It seems to me this practice is very important, because we must give political leaders, political leadership, a correct picture of the viewpoints of scientists -- not paint it too rosy or too black -- but give precisely the real picture of what scientists are thinking on this most important matter.

[Chazov] Well, I can only agree with what Yevgeniy Pavlovich has said. I should like to add just one thing: The great philosopher Plato said that truth is beautiful and very difficult to prove, and the proof of the truth is born among us scientists in the discussion of all varying views and aspects. We should like -- as was already said here -- all views to be heard. I think this is the meaning of the new political thinking which exists in the Soviet Union. The second thing I would like to say is that such a free discussion will help create an atmosphere of confidence. After all, we will say that today the major factor playing a role in a complex political situation is that of confidence, the factor of confidence between peoples, governments, and countries.

So, the more we sit down together and discuss and debate, the more understanding, more confidence, and more comprehension there will be. I must say that in the United States, whenever we go there -- the situations have been different -- there are groups who will not see us, who oppose us, and even specific individuals, and there are even towns which, during the arrival of our delegations, proclaim a Soviet Union Day. This shows there are forces which exist in the United States that are striving to create an atmosphere of confidence and would like this confidence. But all this, of course, must be conceived in such a free discussion, and I believe the coming forum will be an example of such a discussion.

[Yuvenaliy] I would like to add this. I think the unity of religious forces is of very great significance. But, if we are talking today about the stereotype of an enemy, or about false propaganda, it is met most of all in the West in the religious field. They played on this most of all in the cold war, and therefore I think that such an atmosphere of frankness [otkrytost], confidence, and openness [glasnost], with which our forum will be imbued, will also give a very positive role in the world's religious circles.

[SANKEI SHINBUN correspondent] (Suzuki) of the Japanese SANKEI SHIMBUN newspaper: It seems to me that in the second half of the seventies, there was a fundamental change in the Soviet Union's basic thesis of a world nuclear war and the survival of the capitalist and socialist systems. If such an appraisal is correct, please tell us what brought it about.

[Kislov] You will realize yourself that a radical change has come about not only in what is happening in the world right now, not only in the amount of -- one must say it -- terrible nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons that have been stockpiled, and those terrible arsenals which hundreds of thousands of times exceed the power of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, but also in our understanding of this situation, and in our understanding of the threat which is hanging over mankind. If we are talking about the seventies, could anyone have seriously thought about or had any idea about such a concept as a nuclear winter? Yet now, it is thanks, perhaps to our good doctors -- not only our doctors, but also those of other countries -- that this question has been raised. Physicians and doctors of the most varied professions are worried by this. Now this problem is becoming very clear and very acute for a large number of people on our planet. Yet something like 10-15 years ago many, I would say the majority of scientists had not even contemplated this problem.

[Velikhov] The Soviet Union has always been in favor of liquidating mass destruction weapons, first and foremost nuclear weapons. But, only in the beginning, of course, were our positions different because the United States had a monopoly in nuclear weapons and then they acquired superiority over the Soviet Union in this weapon and its means of delivery. Later, when parity was achieved, the situation altered radically, but the Soviet Union's position has not altered. We are still in favor of nuclear weapons being eliminated on the basis of an appropriate system of accord, step-by-step. Now we have in our hands a plan for this liquidation. There were specific proposals at Reykjavik on how to set out along this path, a path from stockpiling nuclear weapons to their destruction. That, essentially, is what has changed during those years.

U.S. Said Casting Aspersions on Forum

LD140010 Moscow TASS in English 2331 GMT 13 Feb 87

[Text] Washington February 14 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

The interest being shown by the peaceloving public of the world to the international forum "For Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity" obviously exasperates Washington.

The forum which has been called on the initiative of Soviet cultural figures opens in Moscow today.

U.S. Administration spokesmen who explain U.S. official stand every day pointedly ignore the forthcoming large-scale dialogue in the Soviet capital on the problems of peace.

Dan Howard, deputy press secretary of the White House for foreign policy problems, in answer to the TASS correspondent's question, said that there was no reaction in the United States to the forum and that he did not know whether any statements would be made after the forum ended.

He did not give any explanations why Washington decided to surround with a wall of silence the current exchange of views on the most vital issue of our times. Meanwhile more than 100 people out of more than 900 participants in the forum are American cultural figures, scientists, businessmen, former political figures and statesmen.

However, behind the outward indifference of the Reagan administration, there are active backstage attempts to cast aspersions upon the Moscow forum and to put pressure on its participants.

THE WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper, which is close to the administration, reports that U.S. [State] Department officials warned the American participants in the Moscow forum to be on their guard and not to allow themselves to be used for "Soviet propaganda purposes".

By overtly intimidating the Americans who went to the capital of the USSR, the U.S. Department of State apparently expected them either to give up the trip altogether or at least refrain from interviews and public pronouncements on disarmament issues.

A U.S. State Department official, who requested to remain unnamed, explained through THE WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper that the forum in Moscow was only a public opinion manipulating exercise being held with a view to "providing audience for Soviet rhetoric on arms control issues".

State Department officials have got a rather poor imagination. This apology of "arguments" is not new. The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions had likewise been declared in Washington as being "Soviet propaganda". President Reagan had referred to the participants in the American anti-war movement as credulous people who swallowed Moscow's propaganda bait.

In short, the White House hurries to label as propaganda any actions aimed at achieving real disarmament.

But through such methods Washington is far from managing to break the trend to the growth of the number of peace campaigners. The widely-representative nature of the Moscow forum is an eloquent proof of that.

PRAVDA Preview

PM161309 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its first edition for 14 February 1987 publishes on page 4 under the headline "Understanding One Another: 'For a Nuclear-Free World, For Mankind's Survival' -- That Is the Slogan of the International Public Forum That Opens in Moscow Today" a half-page feature devoted to the Moscow peace forum. The feature opens with the following editorial introduction:

"The meeting's slogan has prompted almost 1,000 people from all over the world to leave even the most urgent work and set out on the journey here.

"The names of many of them are to be found in encyclopedias. The creators of artistic works and scientific discoveries and acknowledged masters of music and painting cannot be imagined outside the framework of a humanitarian world outlook. Thus the forum's slogan has become for them the voice of conscience, as it has for the luminaries of medical science, who know that if nuclear war broke out they would be powerless in the face of the 'final epidemic' that would afflict mankind.

"The guests include ecologists, political scientists, and social figures who now feel acutely the need for an honest and open dialogue and greater mutual understanding. They also include prominent representatives of those Western business circles who -- to use ancient mythology -- revere not Mars but Mercury and are convinced that international trade and economic cooperation open the way to peace and accord. Moscow is also host to more than 200 religious figures, concerned at how to strengthen trust among the peoples in the world.

"Yes, the grim realities of the present day that nuclear war would be a catastrophe for everyone without exception have crystallized and acquired clear shape in mankind's mind. Clearly it is the awareness of that threat which made the convening of the Moscow forum possible.

"Of course, we know that this is not a meeting of like-minded people -- the forum is being attended by representatives not only of different countries but also of different political, ideological, and religious views -- but they have come to Moscow to compare their views and to discuss them in free, totally unrestricted discussions and possibly debates and, it is to be hoped, to reach agreement among themselves.

"These discussions will be held behind closed doors within the framework of a number of roundtables, which will also be part of the Moscow forum. It is not envisaged that their work will result in the adoption of resolutions or joint communiques, but it is to be presumed that the participants in the forum will convey to people and to thousands of their fellow-countrymen a truth born of that debate and the comparison of opinions. This also will help in the elaboration and affirmation of the new political thinking, which is vitally necessary for the creation of a world free from nuclear weapons and for mankind's survival.

"Soviet people receiving the forum participants here in Moscow wish them successful work. Their sincere wish is a wholehearted wish for peace to those near to them and to all mankind."

The feature contains interviews by unnamed PRAVDA correspondents with five experts from the spheres of the environment, peace and security, medicine, science, and music, and contains the following interview with Pepsico Chairman D. Kendall by A. Pecherskiy and S. Tikhomirov under the headline "In Krasnaya Presnya Today":

"People customarily termed businessmen are gathering now for a roundtable meeting at the International Trade Center in Krasnaya Presnya. Representatives of business circles from 24 countries are here, including the United States, the FRG, Japan, and Sweden. The meeting's slogan is 'Problems of Peace and Business Cooperation.'

"We are talking here with Mr D. Kendall, chairman of the Pepsico Company and director of the American-Soviet Economic Council.

"The last time I was in Moscow, he said, was in July of last year. I can now see that changes are taking place in your country so rapidly that, it seems to me, even the Soviet people must find it difficult to keep track of them.

"At the roundtable meeting we shall talk about new forms of economic cooperation and ways of improving East-west relations by means of trade. We must find a way to build bridges for better mutual understanding between our countries. This, of course, may also be achieved by developing cultural ties, tourism, and student exchange with an improvement in the political climate in the world.

"Trade helps mutual understanding and has a direct influence on the international atmosphere. There is no doubt that our countries will compete with one another, but that does not mean that they have to be hostile. There is no reason why we cannot cooperate and work together for the good of peace in the world. There are a tremendous number of problems requiring solution.

"I am pleased by the great changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union's foreign economic policy. Your country's overseas partners, such as us, now can cooperate directly with USSR enterprises. The idea of creating mixed associations and companies has always interested us very much. I believe that now it is necessary to examine practical steps in this direction.

"There are already 17 plants operating in the Soviet Union which were built with our assistance. The decision to create joint enterprises undoubtedly presents even more favorable opportunities for expanding cooperation.

"I hope very much that Soviet-U.S. relations will improve. If we business people get to know one another better we will be helping to resolve political problems, too."

The feature ends with a 300-word article by D. Kosyrev who describes preparations for the roundtable meeting of physicians at the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Presidium.

IZVESTIYA Poll

PM161147 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Muscovites on War and Peace"]

[Text] The first briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists took place in the press center of the international Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, For Mankind's Survival" 12 February.

K.A. Khachaturov, chief of the press center, reported that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will meet with the forum participants in the Kremlin Monday.

By way of preparation for the forum, which is being held 14-16 February, a public opinion poll was conducted in Moscow. V.N. Ivanov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Institute, reported its results at a briefing in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center 12 February. Tabulated copies of the poll results were distributed at the briefing.

	Percentage of those replying		
	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
1. There will be no victors in a universal nuclear war. The USSR and the United States will be totally destroyed	89	4	7
2. Regardless of the outcome of past wars, life has continued. Human civilization will perish following a universal nuclear war	83	6	11

3. A limited nuclear war is an absurdity. If nuclear weapons are used, a universal nuclear war is inevitable	88	4	8
4. There are no reasons that could justify to mankind the use of nuclear weapons	93	3	4
5. The further buildup and improvement of Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals will give neither side any advantage	83	6	10
[figures as published]			
6. The stockpiling and improvement of nuclear weapons increase the risk of their accidental use	95	2	3
7. Putting nuclear weapons into space will increase the risk of their accidental use	93	1	6
8. The total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only way to avoid nuclear war	93	2	5
9. The total elimination of nuclear weapons is possible	71	6	23
10. A total nuclear test ban will be an important step toward nuclear disarmament	96	1	3
11. The elimination of nuclear weapons must be accompanied also by a reduction in conventional arms	84	7	9
12. The USSR will never be the first to use nuclear weapons	93	1	5
[figures as published]			
13. The United States will never be the first to use nuclear weapons	8	37	55
14. The elimination of nuclear weapons will increase the likelihood of nonnuclear East-West conflicts	30	38	31
[figures as published]			

15. Since nuclear weapons have been invented, they cannot be "uninvented." Therefore, their total elimination is impossible

22

48

30

16. The interests of mankind's survival must take precedence over all others

96

1

3

Conference Opens

LD140722 Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 14 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 14 TASS -- The international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity" has opened here today. In the course of the three-day forum, round-table discussions will be held. Within the framework of these discussions more than 900 foreign scholars, people prominent in culture, political, public and religious figures, representatives of business circles will discuss together with their Soviet colleagues a broad range of issues in connection with the fight for the elimination of nuclear threat, for all-round international cooperation.

Sakharov Speaks

LD141350 Moscow TASS in English 1338 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow February 14 TASS -- Soviet Academician Andrey Sakharov participating in the international forum "For Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity", which opened here today, expressed conviction that a nuclear-free world is possible.

The academician declared for a drastic cut in the nuclear weapons on the basis of stability and equal security.

This was reported at a briefing by Soviet scholar Lev Semeyko. He also quoted Sakharov as speaking out for building up confidence between states, including for a broadening of the democratisation processes.

Academician Sakharov refused to grant an interview to newsmen and said that he would address the concluding press-conference on the results of the forum on February 17.

Sakharov Criticizes SDI

LD151631 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1535 GMT 15 Feb 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, 15 Feb (TASS) -- A TASS correspondent reports: The way to preserving a star peace and the renunciation of any weapons orbiting in space, these themes became the subject of a compelling dialogue for scientists participating in the "roundtable," which is taking place within the framework of the International Forum "For a Nuclear-free World, for the Survival of Mankind." [passage omitted]

Academician Andrey Sakharov spoke condemning SDI. He called it a "destabilizing program," negatively affecting the stability of the military-strategic balance.

According to the scientist, SDI will require enormous expenditure of material reserves. At the same time this program can be countered by the measures of another side, including both the development of strategic offensive weapons and the creation of means for the destruction of space combat platforms. These can be created more simply and more cheaply, when compared with SDI. The content of his speech was conveyed today to journalists at a briefing by Andrey Kokoshin, deputy director of the Institute of the USA and Canada, as the "roundtable" session is taking place without representatives of the press.

IZVESTIYA Report on Sakharov

PM161159 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 February 1987 Morning Edition carries on page 3 under the headline "Strenuous Days of Debate" a 2,200-word report prepared by IZVESTIYA's Press Group citing remarks made by some of the participants in the international Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival." The report includes the following paragraph:

"At a briefing between sessions Western journalists raised the question of Academician A.D. Sakharov's speech. As Italian Professor G. Marini Bettolo, who chaired the session, pointed out, the speech contained a number of interesting arms control suggestions and voiced support for the idea of a considerable reduction in nuclear forces on the basis of equilibrium."

Scientists' Roundtable

LD150330 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2040 GMT 14 Feb 87

[Special program replacing "Novosti": "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival: Is a Nuclear-Free World Possible?" A roundtable discussion of scientists attending the forum conducted by Political Observer Vladimir Pozner, with Hans Peter Duerr, of the FRG; Jerome Wiesner and Samuel Ting, of the United States; Frank Barnaby, of the UK; and Soviet Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov; Western participants not further identified; studio discussion conducted in English with superimposed Russian translation; slantlines indicate portions audible in English that differ from Russian translation; date not given -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Esteemed comrades! As we reported earlier, the forum, "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival" opened today in Moscow. We present a roundtable discussion with some of those taking part.

[Pozner] Since the slogan of this forum is, "For a Nuclear-Free World," I want to ask you whether that aim is realistic. Can we hope to achieve it? Who would like to answer that question?

[Duerr] I see a possibility of radical reductions of nuclear arsenals as the first stage. I'm skeptical about the possibility of immediately reducing to zero; that's for the future. We need to greatly reduce the quantity of arms to exclude the possibility of an accidental conflict, which I think is the main danger. I don't think either side will start a war deliberately, but that doesn't mean that war's impossible. The situation is extremely unstable, and therefore, as well as the nuclear question, other problems also have to be examined.

[Pozner] We'll do that. You mentioned a drastic reduction of nuclear weapons: Is that realistic?

[Wiesner] From the point of view of security, certainly. Whether it's politically realistic is another question. The fact is the political leadership has to deal with a population that doesn't understand the difference between nuclear weapons and conventional armaments, for which the quantitative aspect is indeed important. People have not yet understood that for nuclear weapons there's a very low threshold of stockpiling. It only takes a hundred bombs to cause terrible destruction. It follows that any quantity above that is pointless. Everyone recognizes this, but it's a point of view that has not yet become an effective political doctrine. This is true both of political leaders and of nations. In our country, for example, 70 percent of the people voted for a freeze, and yet they voted for a President who was against a freeze.

[Pozner] But didn't they vote for a freeze after they'd elected the President? /Didn't that happen that way?/

[Wiesner] Yes, and they'd still vote for a freeze. The trouble is they don't trust the Soviet Union. That's a fact that has to be faced. They don't realize nuclear weapons above a certain point are...[changes thought] make no contribution to their security.

[Barnaby] In answer to your question, Vladimir, I'd like to say that if we don't achieve a radical reduction of nuclear weapons and stop the arms race, a world nuclear war will break out. Therefore mankind has the choice: either nuclear disaster and the possible destruction of the human race, or nuclear disarmament. It's a simple choice.

[Pozner] But is it a choice?

[Wiesner] Nuclear disarmament means different things to different people. For us, reducing the number of a few hundred is nuclear disarmament. You probably mean that.

[Pozner] Certainly. /Well, in that sense.../ Well, that being so, what must be done to achieve nuclear disarmament, at least in your sense? What do we have to do?

[Barnaby] Well, the first thing we have to have is a test ban treaty. That's the first step.

[Tikhov] Yes, but my feeling is that everyone sitting at this table agrees on the need for a radical reduction. If we first reduced them by 50 percent -- 75, 95, then, as Professor Wiesner said -- and he knows what he's talking about -- more than enough arms would remain. That course is different in principle from the course toward increasing the quantity of arms. Because when you are reducing AMBS, it's a completely different state of mind, a completely different situation. Then we'll see the light at the end of the tunnel; and that light will be a nuclear-free world.

[Wiesner] I see. Well, I think the world is moving toward unification; we're living through the turmoil of that right now.

[Pozner] Are there any examples in the world of science of cooperation that would indicate that all this is possible?

[Ting] Well, I think I can give you an example: In nuclear physics, which is my field, there's a longstanding tradition of fruitful international cooperation. It began, for example, in the Soviet Union, in Dubna, where there's an excellent institute; then, in Serpukhov, where for a time there was the biggest accelerator in the world. Now the biggest accelerator is being built in Geneva, and taking a very active part in that are the Soviet Union, the United States, and also the People's Republic of China.

This cooperation is proceeding very successfully, above all, because all the participants are sincerely interested in science. Apart from that, it is proceeding because governments are supporting this cause. So it is really possible in that period. As far as the other fields are concerned, I am insufficiently conversant with it, but I hope this also applies to it.

[Wiesner] All the nuclear powers, and especially the Soviet Union and the United States, must understand that, in having so many weapons, each side can operate independently, without the most complicated talks. Too much discussion concerns monitoring [kontrol], signing various treaties, and there are too few unilateral actions. One side could decide upon an important step, and the other would follow it. Thus, we can reduce the number of weapons. Of course, the point comes when monitoring and agreements become important. We still have a long way to go before that.

[Pozner] Are you saying the Soviet Union, and not the United States, could unilaterally reduce their armaments, without fear of harming their security, and in the hope the other side will do the same?

[Velikhov] He has made a very important point. He says, if one side takes a step, then the other side will follow it. But we took that step in 1983, when we stopped testing space weapons; that is, antisatellite weapons. Then we declared a moratorium on nuclear tests. In neither case did anybody follow us. I should like to ask, How many such steps must we take?

[Duerr] You must be persistent, you must continue in the same spirit, and it will definitely happen.

[Wiesner] I agree.

[Duerr] You must have more patience; you must not expect the other side to immediately meet you halfway.

I admire your boldness regarding the moratorium, although the United States is not meeting you halfway. I think that, finally, they will move from their position because it is already evident the climate is changing. The question is heard more and more frequently: Why don't we stop testing? Time is required. I very much want your patience to suffice for you to continue to pursue that path.

[Pozner] Are you saying that as a European who is watching the two superpowers from the sidelines?

[Duerr] In a certain sense, yes.

[Pozner] What do you think, as the second European in this room?

[Barnaby] I do not entirely agree. I think in the political sense monitoring [kontrol] is important. It is of cardinal importance.

[Wiesner] You see, both sides know all that is necessary for their security. No mutual monitoring of any kind is necessary. When a lower level is reached, mutual monitoring then becomes important. I agree it is important from a political point of view, because it speaks of good intentions. From the point of view of national security, it has no significance at all.

[Barnaby] I should like to continue my thought, Vladimir, since there is a connection between that issue and what scientists can do. One of the main reasons for my visit is

to agree with Academician Velikhov with regard to the participation of British scientists in the experiment on monitoring measures being conducted in the Soviet Union. It is very important we scientists should prove that monitoring really is an important business. That will have a great political impact, and will assist in the achievement of an accord on limited nuclear tests, and then an agreement on the complete and universal banning of nuclear tests.

[Wiesner] You don't want to prove that that is an important business because this is a political issue, but that the matter is real, and possible.

[Velikhov] (?It seems to me that) this is an example of very fruitful cooperation. To be sure, prior to this experiment there were around 300 meetings of experts in Geneva which discussed questions of monitoring. Expenditure on coffee and champagne was greater than expenditure on the equipment that we use in Semipalatinsk. [laughter] We came to an agreement, and we set up this apparatus in a month. We carried out the first phase of the experiment and embarked on the second phase. This showed each and every one that it is possible to verify and monitor even the smallest explosions, amounting to just a few tonnes. And so the question of verification can be closed. I think this is a good area for scientific cooperation.

[Wiesner] When I advise your country to be persistent, then of course I give the same advice to my own country. It is true they don't always listen to me. In the United States we often swing like a pendulum in seeking a solution. We have had administrations that have wanted to achieve nuclear disarmament -- not disarmament but significant reductions. At times your country has not been ready for this. We had to be patient and not give up on our aims and hope that in the not too distant future there would be two administrations, both yours and ours, which would simultaneously aspire toward this aim.

[Pozner] Some people are saying we have reached the final crossroad; that is, that we have reached the moment when we must make a choice. It is like a Russian fairy tale, when the hero stands on a road which splits into three. His fate depends entirely on the direction he chooses. Don't you think we have reached this point, the time in history when we must choose. Is there still time?

[Wiesner] That depends on what you mean. Right now, we cannot reach any final solution to the question of nuclear weapons, although that is what we would like. If, let's say, another 3 years go by, then it won't be too late. There is another aspect: We are expending resources needed to protect the environment, to protect people. The day will come when there will be irreversible processes in our climate throughout the ecosystem. Then it will be too late to reverse the process. If even now we are using all our resources to produce nuclear weapons instead of looking after the health of the planet, the day will come when we will be very sorry. It is still not too late, but we have little time.

[Duerr] I agree with Jerome Wiesner, but nonetheless I think we really have reached a parting of the ways, at least as far as space weapons are concerned. We must make a decision. If we take the wrong path, the damage will be enormous, and following Wiesner's example, I would say, let's not use up resources on weapons; let's use them to resolve the global problems facing mankind. That will bring us closer together, for we will all come to a greater understanding that we are all in the same boat. That is an extremely important truth, and political figures should understand it. As for the environment, developing countries, energy resources and so on we must resolve these problems as part of a whole. The military aspect is, to some degree, secondary, although it may ruin us. It too must be resolved. This must in essence all be done at the same time.

[Pozner] Dr Ting, what do you think? Are we at a crossroad?

[Ting] Usually it takes between 10 to 15 years to create a new system. If you look back over the last 30 years, then you will see that radical changes took place every 10 to 14 years.

[Pozner] You are talking about military systems, about military equipment?

[Ting] Yes, military. Therefore it is undoubtedly true that sooner this movement is stopped the better.

[Pozner] Professor Barnaby, what do you think about the crossroad theory.

[Barnaby] It is possible we are talking about a 10-year term. I think if we spend \$100 billion per year on military science, and that indeed is what we are spending; if 500,000 scientists are involved in military research, that is 1 in 4 scientists -- if this continues for 10 years then the possibility of a catastrophe is perfectly realistic. Therefore, I consider this to be an urgent problem.

[Wiesner] The catastrophe may happen right now. The danger does not lie in the Soviet leader on the U.S. President deliberately unleashing a nuclear war. The danger lies in the fact the system can launch itself. That can happen right now, as we speak, and not 10 years from now.

[Barnaby] There is another danger: Nuclear war may start in the Near East, spread to the European Continent, and draw in the superpowers.

[Pozner] That danger does exist, but this theme is outside the framework of our discussion. Academician Velikhov, what is your view of the crossroad theory?

[Velikhov] I agree with Professor Duerr. Weapons have existed on the ground, in the air, and on the water for many thousands of years. There are no weapons in space -- space is free. We have the historic possibility of keeping space free of weapons. This, I think, is very important. If any country sites weapons in space, then after this, from the technical point of view, it is extremely simple to litter space with the most varied military rubbish.

[Wiesner] I believe there is no chance for space to be entirely free of weapons. The point is space is an unsuitable place for the siting of weapons -- everyone understands that. Weapons are vulnerable in space. If the United States or the Soviet Union sites weapons in space, then the other side will take the necessary steps to make itself secure. This is an unsuitable place for the siting of weapons.

[Velikhov] I agree. Space is a very attractive place, too, if you consider how many weapons you can site there.

[Wiesner] Space looks attractive until you look at it! [Laughter]

[Pozner] Perhaps! I would like to thank all of you, and wish you success. Your efforts are much needed by all of us. Once again, thank you.

East Germans Participate

LD141057 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0804 GMT 14 Feb 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, 14 Feb 87 (ADN) -- Under the motto "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity", an international forum for peace began on Saturday morning in Moscow. The 2 days of discussions are attended by about 900 prominent representatives of political and social life, scientists, cultural workers, business people as well as religious dignitaries from more than 80 countries. [passage omitted]

Representing the GDR at the discussion between natural scientists are Professors Guenther Drefahl, Werner Scheler, Werner Kalweit, Heinz Stiller and Karl Lanius. The roundtable discussion "on Ways of Survival in our Mutually Dependent World" is attended by Professor Helmut Koziolk while Professor Moritz Mebel is attending the discussion of medical experts. Hermann Kant, Stephan Hermlin and Professor Hans-Peter Minetti are invited to the discussion among cultural workers. The meeting of economic experts is attended by Prof Hans-Joachim Lemnitzer while the circle of religious figures includes Bishop Horst Gienke, senior church official Christa Lewek and Dr. Peter Kirchner. [passage omitted]

Television Coverage

LD161654 [Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0755 GMT on 16 February 1987 links up with All-Union Radio for an "Intervision" relay of the forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, For the Survival of Mankind" held in Moscow's Great Kremlin Palace.

At 0758 GMT the audience applauds, the entrance of CPSU Central Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and other participants.

At 0800 GMT USSR Academy of Sciences Vice President Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov opens the proceedings. He notes that the forum has over 1,000 participants from over 80 countries and continues:

"I would like also to mention with the deepest respect and say a few words about our colleague the U.S. Astrophysicist Dr Hayden, who has already been on a hunger strike for over 120 days with a call to governments to make a real pledge to destroy nuclear weapons by the year 2000. His friend Dr Teller is taking part in our forum. He is a well known designer of nuclear weapons, who has concluded it is necessary to eliminate them completely. He conveys to you, Mikhail Sergeyevich his expression of support for the 15 January ideas. Dr Teller also proposes that forum participants should sign an address from us to Dr Hayden. Those who wish to sign will find this appeal in the foyer."

Next, Velikhov introduces a succession of foreign participants, each of whom addresses the conference.

The first such speaker is Prof Bernard Lown of Harvard University and a member of the organization "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear war" [IPPNW]. Lown, speaking in English with a superimposed Russian translation, praises the efforts of Dr Chazov and the IPPNW to avert war. He says that the United States needs glasnost, not "jumbled incoherence." Referring to the Soviet nuclear test moratorium, Lown says: "The Soviet moratorium, which continued for such a long period, was a courageous step which was supported worldwide; we doctors hope that the Soviet Union

will further extend its moratorium." Lown goes on to discuss the results at Reykjavik and the need for funds to combat disease in the third world.

The next to speak is Prof Frank Von Hippel of Princeton University, listed in bureau records as coauthor of *ADVICE AND DISSENT*, subtitled *SCIENTISTS IN THE PUBLIC ARENA*.

Von Hippel, speaking in English with a superimposed Russian translation, praises the Soviet nuclear test moratorium and says that nuclear stockpiles represent a serious course. Next he says that SDI would not be a sensible course to adopt and says that total abolition is the only solution. Von Hippel refers also to the possibility of a "second wave of detente" and speaks about scientific cooperation in the study of Halley's Comet.

He goes on to say: "Academician Andrey Sakharov took part in our discussions. He stressed the importance of openness and glasnost to ensure that there is a growth of trust between the representatives of different countries. And this view is shared by many of the forum participants." (Sakharov is picked out by the camera twice during the session -- during speeches by Egon Bahr and by M.S. Gorbachev). Von Hippel further says: "Mr General Secretary, we consider that the process of democratization and openness that is taking place in the Soviet Union at the present time is very important."

Below the superimposed Russian translation Von Hippel can be heard to add in English "and could make a great contribution to the ending of the nuclear arms race."

The next speaker to be introduced is Rinaldo Ossola, head of the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce. Ossola, speaking in English with a superimposed Russian translation, notes that the forum is evidence of a significant shift in the world situation and an improvement in the international climate. He says that the Soviet Union is developing in a democratic direction.

Next, Egon Bahr of the FRG addresses the meeting. Speaking in English with a superimposed Russian translation, he said that he speaks on behalf of political scientists, who examined the situation after Reykjavik and discussed the abolition of nuclear weapons. He points out that the possibility of mutual assured destruction should be replaced by the possibility of mutual assured security.

Velikhov then introduces Metropolitan Pavel Mor Grigoryev, a religious figure from India. Speaking in English with a superimposed Russian translation, Grigoryev praises the Soviet nuclear test moratorium and accuses the United States of continuing the arms race. Speaking of the work of religious figures at the forum, he says: "We concentrated on three elements: the human factor, the need for a new moral international order and the role of religious organizations, especially in cooperation with other forces in our common struggle to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons and to create a new society without war and without violence as was stated in the declaration signed at New Delhi."

Next to speak is British author Graham Greene. Speaking in English with a superimposed Russian translation, Greene summarizes the results of the work of the culture and arts group at the forum and notes the dangers of substituting words for action. Greene talks about the traditional hostility between Catholics and communists, but notes that they are cooperating in Latin America "against the death squads in El Salvador, against the Contras in Nicaragua and against General Pinochet in Chile." He says: "There are no divisions between Catholics and communists on these questions." Green concludes by

saying: "I even have a dream, Mr General Secretary, that one day -- perhaps before I die -- I shall know that there is an ambassador for the Soviet Union giving good advice in the vatican.

Velikhov next introduces retired British General Michael Harbottle. Speaking in English with a superimposed Russian translation, Harbottle speaks of the work of the Group of Generals for Peace and Disarmament. He speaks of his pride at representing the NATO group of retired generals at the forum and says: "I would like to pay my respects to Anatoliy Dobrynin, because in 1982 he helped me to speak to the retired generals from the Warsaw Pact countries, and in 1984 we had our first meeting". Harbottle concludes by saying: "In the future we must work out new standards for security based on other than military factors".

The final foreign participant at this session is Veselin Neyk, chief editor of the Bulgarian magazine NATURE PROTECTION. Speaking in Bulgarian with a superimposed Russian translation, Neyk voices gratitude for the chance to participate in the forum and speaks of the relevance of the forum for the protection of the environment.

After the addresses by the foreign speakers, Velikhov introduces CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev after which the relay concludes at 1020 GMT.

Gorbachev Addresses Forum

LD161435 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0918 GMT 16 Feb 87

[Speech by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev at the forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Mankind" held at the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow -- live]

[Text] Ladies and gentlemen, comrades,

The destinies of the world and the future of humanity have concerned the best minds in various lands ever since man first thought of the morrow. Until relatively recently these and related reflections have been seen as an imaginative exercise, as the other worldly pursuits of philosophers, scholars and theologians. In the past decades, however, these problems have moved onto a highly practical plane. The reasons are obvious, I think, to everyone here present.

The development and subsequent stockpiling of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles beyond all reasonable bounds have made man technically capable of terminating his own existence. The simultaneous accumulation of explosive social material in the world, and attempts to continue tackling forcefully, with stone age methods, the problems of a cardinally altered world make catastrophe highly likely in political terms, as well. The militarization of mentality and of the way of life weakens and even removes altogether any moral inhibitions with regard to nuclear suicide.

We have no right to forget that the first step, which is always the most risky, already has been made. Nuclear weapons have been used against human beings, and used twice. There are dozens -- I repeat dozens -- of recorded and acknowledged moments when the possibility of using such weapons against other countries was seriously considered. I am not saying this by way of criticism or condemnation, though they are more than merited. I am saying this to stress once again how close mankind has come to the point of no return.

World War I shocked contemporaries for its unprecedented scale of destruction and suffering, for the brutality and technical impersonality of the process of annihilation, but appalling as the wounds it inflicted were, World War II surpassed the records -- if that word can be used in this case -- of World War I many times over.

One strategic submarine today carries a destructive punch equivalent to several World War II's. There are scores of such submarines and their nuclear systems are far from being the only ones. The imagination is powerless to envision the hell and the negation of the idea of man if any part, however small, of the present nuclear arsenal is used.

World War II, like World War I, was followed by attempts to arrange the world in such a way as to preclude the repetition of the wholesale slaughter of peoples. Although these attempts have not quite lived up to expectations, they have nevertheless left some trace. There is the United Nations Organization; there are regional and other structures for state-to-state and public contacts -- structures that did not exist before. In brief, the political search continues for ways to break the world community out of the vicious "logic" that resulted in the world wars.

A nuclear war would leave no problems, and there would be no one left to sit at the negotiating table, let alone the negotiating tree-stump or stone. There would be no second Noah's Ark for a nuclear deluge, everyone seems to understand this. So it is time to realize that we can no longer expect things to take care of themselves. There are still quite a few people in the world who think precisely in this way. International contacts and the policy of governments and states have to be brought into line with the realities of the nuclear age without delay. The question stands like this: Either political mentality is geared to the requirements of the times, or civilization and life itself on earth may perish.

In all human affairs, and especially in international politics, we should not for a moment forget the currently dominant contradiction between war and peace, between the existence and nonexistence of humanity, and we must work to resolve it in good time and in favor of peace. This requires us to seek out, foster, and share with each other all the best that history has produced, to look for new creative approaches to chronic problems.

Not merely the progress but the very survival of the human race depends on whether or not we find the strength and courage to overcome the threats hidden in the modern world. We believe that there are grounds for expecting so. A notable feature of recent decades has been that for the first time in its history mankind as a whole, and not only individual representatives, has begun to feel that it is as one entity, to see global relationships between man, society, and nature, and to assess the consequences of the scale of mankind's material activities. This feeling did not come alone, it has brought with it a struggle to remove the nuclear threat. It cannot be denied that it already has become a great moral and political school in which the masses of the people and whole nations are learning the difficult but necessary art of living in peace with each other, of striking a balance between general and particular interests, of looking at the present and future boldly, square on, of comprehending them, and, in doing so, drawing due conclusions for action. Your forum is evidence of this.

Ladies and gentlemen, Comrades,

Before describing the substance of all these problems in detail, I wish, on behalf of the people and the government of the Soviet Union, to extend cordial greetings to you all -- participants in the Moscow forum -- politicians and journalists, businessmen and

scholars, doctors and people of culture and the arts, writers and representatives of various churches. We value and appreciate that such a forum is being held and that such a great number of famous and influential people have gathered for it from all over the world. We understand that every one of you has duties and commitments. Nevertheless you postponed them and traveled the thousands of kilometers here to voice your concerns, to share your thoughts with people worried by the same problems.

This alone is very significant, for the forum includes representatives of various population strata, people from all continents, from dozens of states.

The forum is a true embodiment of world public opinion. The ideas of the forum, the cares and sentiment that have brought you here are near and dear to the Soviet people and they can understand them. It is in this spirit that I once again address words of greetings and gratitude to you for the work you have done these past days as described by representatives of all the roundtables, and I think that the voice of this forum, of each of you, will be heeded sooner or later. We are encouraged by the fact that for all the diversity of opinions, views, positions, and evaluations, the salient feature of the forum has been a common wish to pool efforts against the nuclear danger, and in tackling other global issues before mankind. It is very important that the ideas and spirit of the forum have reached the broad public and political circles and, more important still, have been reflected in the work of those at the helm of states. As I understand it, this desire was expressed by all the representatives here at your general meeting the Great Kremlin Palace. At any rate, the Soviet Government will give due attention to what has been stated at the forum. This must be so because these ideas concern the most vital and most essential thing -- how to save a future for mankind.

I have a few things to say on the matters discussed at the forum and I wish to present the point of view of our government, but before doing that, I would like to draw your attention to the following:

You have arrived in the Soviet Union at a time when essentially revolutionary changes are under way here; they are of immense significance for our society, for socialism as a whole, and for the entire world. It is only by understanding their content, meaning, and aims that one can form a correct opinion about our international policy. Before my people, before you, and before the whole world, I state with full responsibility that our international policy is more than ever determined by domestic policy, by our interest in concentrating on constructive endeavors to improve our country. This is why we need lasting peace, predictability and constructiveness in international relations. It is often said -- we still hear it -- that there is some threat stemming from the USSR, a Soviet threat to peace and freedom. I must say that the reorganization that we have launched on such a scale and which is irreversible shows to everyone: This is where we want to direct our resources; this is where our thoughts are going; these are our actual programs and intentions; on this we intend to spend the intellectual energy of our society.

Our main idea is to bring out the potential of socialism through activating all the people's strength. To do so we need full and free functioning of all public and state agencies, of all production collectives and creative unions, new forms of civic activity and restoration of those which were unfairly forgotten. In brief, we want a broad democratization of all society. Further democratization is also the main guarantee of the irreversible nature of the ongoing processes. We want more socialism and hence more democracy. This is how we are continuing the cause of our great revolution. And our peoples have welcomed this enthusiastically.

To preclude any false interpretation and speculation (we hear a lot of it from the West), I wish to emphasize that we are going about our reforms in accordance with our own socialist choice, on the basis of our notions about social values, and are guided by criteria of the Soviet way of life. We measure our successes and our mistakes solely by socialist yardsticks, but we want to be understood and we hope that the world community will at last acknowledge that our desire to make our country better will hurt no one and that the world will only gain from this.

Reorganization is an invitation to any social system to compete with socialism peacefully. We will be able to prove in practice that such competition benefits universal progress and world peace, but for such competition to take place and unfold in civilized forms worthy of 21st Century humanity, we must have a new outlook and overcome mentality, stereotypes, and dogmas inherited from a past that is gone, never to return. It took time for our society and the Soviet leadership to develop an interest in the new mode of thinking. We pondered a good deal; we criticized ourselves and others and asked ourselves difficult and challenging questions before we saw things as they are and became convinced that new approaches and methods are required for resolving international problems in today's complex and contradictory world, a world at a crossroads. We came to conclusions that made us review something that once had seemed axiomatic, since after Hiroshima and Nagasaki world war ceased to be a continuation of politics by other means. Nuclear war would incinerate the architects of such policy, too. We made ourselves face the fact that the stockpiling and sophistication of nuclear armaments mean the human race has lost its immortality. It can be regained only by destroying nuclear weapons. We rejected any right for leaders of a country, be it the USSR, the United States, or another, to pass a death sentence on mankind. We are not judges and the billions of people are not criminals to be punished, so the nuclear guillotine must be broken. The nuclear powers must overstep their nuclear shadow and enter a nuclear-free world, thus ending the alienation of politics from the general human norms of ethics. A nuclear tornado would sweep away socialists and capitalists, the just and sinners alike. Is this situation moral? We Communists do not think it is.

It may be said that we have come the hard way to the new outlook which is called upon to bridge the gap between political practice and universal moral and ethical standards. Last year at the party congress, the highest forum of Soviet society, we set forth our vision of the world, our philosophical concept of its present and future, but we did not confine ourselves to proclaiming our theoretical doctrine. On its basis we formulated a definite political platform for an all-embracing system of international security. It is precisely a system, and it rests on the principle that one's own security cannot be built at the expense of others. It is a system that organically blends all the main spheres of security: military, political, economic, and humanitarian.

In the military and political domain we put forward a program to abolish nuclear weapons by the year 2000. It was announced on behalf of the Soviet people 13 months ago, on January 15, 1986. We are convinced that this date will go down in the history of the struggle to save civilization from death. Prior to that, we moved that all nuclear explosions be halted, and repeatedly extended our unilateral moratorium. We conceived the idea of the Reykjavik summit and took there initiatives which, had the other side responded, would have signified the end of the arms race and a radical turn towards disarmament and the elimination of the nuclear danger. Along with our allies, we undertook bold and large-scale steps concerning confidence-building measures and the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe. We expressed readiness to have chemical weapons totally abolished. In Vladivostok, we invited Asian and Pacific countries to search jointly for security for each and all in that huge and rising

region of the world, for mutually advantageous and equal cooperation. We signed the Delhi declaration, in which our philosophical and political approach to the construction of a nuclear-weapon-free and nonviolent world merge with the approach of the great India and the billions of people represented by the Nonaligned Movement. As firm advocates of a new world economic order, we formulated and submitted for consideration by everyone a concept of international economic security. Finally, our new approach to the humanitarian problems from the "Third Helsinki Basket" is there for all to see. I must disappoint those who think that this has been the result of pressure on us from the West, that we want to gain someone's fancy in the pursuit of some ulterior motives.

No, we do not. This, too, is a result of the new way of thinking. Thus, in every direction we seek to translate our philosophical vision of the world into practical politics. Naturally enough, it takes confidence for a new edifice of international security to be erected and cemented. We understand that the road to it is not simple, and that it is not only we who are to cover it, although we -- if you recall our history -- have more cause for mistrust. I will not go into polemics about that. Let me just state that along with a deficit of new attitudes everyone feels a shortfall of confidence. I am not going to look into the reasons for this situation on a wider plane, although much might be said. We now must look forward, not be captives of the past.

Confidence needs to be built up through experience in cooperation, through knowing each other better, through solving common problems. It is wrong in principle to say that first comes confidence and then all the rest: Disarmament, cooperation, and joint projects. Confidence -- its creation, consolidation, and development -- comes from common endeavor. This is the rational way. In any case, that is what we think.

I repeat: Everyone must begin with himself. It is not the pose of a self-appointed supreme judge of the whole world but respect for others and an unbiased and self-critical view toward one's own society that international relations need so badly now. One of the chief results of the reconstructive drive in the Soviet Union is a general and universal boost in confidence for our society. This bolsters our conviction that it is possible to establish trust in the sphere of international relations too. The new mode of thinking is still laboring to break through in world politics; trust is making around very slowly. I think this is why more and more people are realizing that the fate of the major cause of our time should not be left to politicians alone. This cause does not concern only politicians. We are witnessing the emergence and rise of a worldwide mass movement embracing scientists, intellectuals of different professions, clergymen, women, young people, children (more and more), and even former military men and generals -- they are here, taking part in the work of the forum -- who know full well what modern weapons are. This is the result of people becoming more and more aware of the state of the world, what a very dangerous point it has come to and how real the impending threat is. I believe that your forum is a major contribution to the mass movement for a nuclear-free world and for mankind's survival. I welcome the contribution made by the Moscow forum.

I would like to say a few words here about the Reykjavik meeting. It was not a failure; it was a breakthrough. That was not just another round of negotiations but a moment of truth, when a momentous opportunity to embark upon the path leading to a nuclear-weapon-free world was glimpsed. The Reykjavik meeting made such a great impression everywhere in the world because we approached the issue of reducing nuclear arsenals in an entirely new conceptual key, as a political and psychological problem rather than just a military and technical one. We almost found a solution, but what are we to do with that almost which stopped us from reaching the finish in Reykjavik?

I shall not discuss here why that happened; I hope you know our view. What I want to say is that when, at a certain moment, both sides agreed at Reykjavik to make deep cuts in their nuclear arsenals and then eliminate them entirely, they virtually recognized that nuclear weapons can no longer effectively guarantee security. It was an important political judgement. What happened in Reykjavik irreversibly changed the nature and essence of the debate about a future world. However, some people were scared by the new opportunities and they now are pulling back hard. However, hard though the past may tug, there is no returning to it. I am sure that mankind can and will throw off the chains of nuclear weapons quite soon, but this will require a fight, a hard struggle.

The new political outlook sets out to raise civilization to a qualitatively new level. This alone serves to show that it is no one-off adjustment of position but a methodology for international affairs.

There is probably no one in this hall or elsewhere who considers nuclear weapons innocuous. However, quite a few people sincerely believe them an evil necessary to prevent a greater evil -- war. This viewpoint underlies the doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

Let me say the following:

First, even if we stick to this doctrine, we would have to admit that the nuclear safeguard is not failsafe or of endless duration. It may at any time become a death sentence to mankind. The bigger the nuclear arsenals, the less chance they will be kept obedient. The proliferation of those weapons, the increasing sophistication of the technical systems allied to them, the increasing scale of transportation, and the constant risk of technical failure, human weakness, or malice, taken together represent an enormous set of chance factors on which the survival of mankind depends.

Second, if we look at deterrence from a different angle, we see that it is, in fact, a policy based on intimidation. Each model of behavior has its inner logic. When threats are a political means, the natural wish is that each such threat should be taken seriously. For them, one has always to back up threats by definite action. In this case, that means military force. The only conclusion one can draw is that the policy of deterrence, considered in a historical context, does not reduce the risk of military conflict. In fact, it further increases that risk. Nevertheless, even after Reykjavik, some leaders continue to cling to such a doctrine. The most adamant supporters of that doctrine are those who are inclined, in a confrontation with us, to appeal to morality, but what is their own moral face, from the viewpoint of normal contemporary morality? They are convinced, and make no secret of the fact, that speaking with and building relations with others can and must be done only on the basis of threats, force, and the permanent possibility of using that force. How would we react if we met such a person in the street? Why do such standards, which long have been recognized as primitively savage in relations between individuals, continue to be considered by seemingly highly enlightened figures as almost a natural norm in interstate relations?

Third, when disarmament is discussed, a common thesis is that man is violent by nature, that he has a "war" instinct, and that this instinct is indestructible. Is war then the perpetual concomitant of human existence? If we accept this view, we shall have to reconcile ourselves to the continuous development of ever more sophisticated weapons of mass destruction. Such thinking is unacceptable; it is reminiscent of times when ever more sophisticated weapons were invented and used to conquer other peoples and to enslave and pillage them. That past is no model for the future. Man living on the threshold of the 21st century knows a great deal and can do a great deal. That is why

he must realize the need to demilitarize the world. We believe it is possible to build such a world and we shall do everything to ensure the success of what is perhaps the most ambitious social goal ever.

The theme of nuclear deterrence has another aspect. In politics one must not forget the problem of the rational and the irrational. This is particularly so in our complex world, where the very content of such notions is most subject to the particular historical experience of the peoples and to very different political cultures and traditions, and many other factors. It is very difficult to find a common denominator that would seem rational to all. This confirms the fact that the more nuclear weapons there are, the greater the risk of a fatal malfunction. Nevertheless, the development of more powerful and sophisticated, what are cynically called exotic weapons continues.

The uniqueness, I might even say drama, of the situation is emphasized by the threat of the arms race spreading into space. If this happened, the very idea of arms control would be compromised. Distrust, mutual suspicion, and the temptation to be the first to deploy new weapon systems would increase tremendously. I think this is clear to anyone, however ignorant of military matters. Destabilization would become a reality and would be fraught with a crisis. The risk of accidental war would increase by several orders.

We regret that continued American testing put an end to our moratorium. Yet, our initiative has not been wasted. By our moratorium we showed the world that not staging nuclear tests is realistic, provided the political will exists. I wish to assure this authoritative audience and reply to Dr Lown, who urged us to extend the moratorium: The Soviet Union will not relinquish its efforts to get nuclear testing banned and to bring about major reduction and eventually the complete elimination of nuclear stockpiles.

Now I would like to talk about the passions that flared up in recent days about the deployment of a first phase of SDI. The advocates of deployment insist on a broader interpretation of the ABM Treaty. Incidentally, while debates on this subject are going on in Washington and between NATO allies, the administration already has officially suggested in Geneva the legitimization of such an interpretation. So these discussions are not a method of sounding out public opinion. This is close to being the real policy, if it is not already the real policy. This should disturb us all. In fact, it is a matter of demolishing the ABM Treaty. From the very start, the political and philosophical essence of the latter was to ensure stability due to the absence of antimissile defense, and in this way to end the eternal competition between the sword and the shield, which is particularly dangerous in a nuclear age. We arrived at the ABM Treaty as a result of a lengthy discussion lasting many years, in which the best minds, capable of assessing the whole situation, took part. This was recognized then, and today they want to smash the treaty through a broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty, which is a most important obstacle to the arms race. If the treaty is destroyed, the nuclear missile race will acquire new dimensions and will be complemented by the arms race in outer space, the inevitable consequences of which I have just mentioned.

In November 1985, President Reagan and I made the following pledge in Geneva: To prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms, and to enhance strategic stability. This was signed in Geneva in the joint statement. By undermining the ABM Treaty, the U.S. Administration scorns that pledge and the signature the United States put to that termless treaty 15 years ago.

The situation requires stricter observance of international law rather than undermining it or knocking out major elements of it.

Another matter we are considering is why some countries are arrogating a right to invent and develop new weapon systems which, even if not deployed or used, threaten other countries and peoples. This problem transcends the borders of national sovereignty; it is an international problem.

Here is yet another problem: At present, the national sovereignty of a state extends to the atmosphere above it. Every state has the right to defend it from intrusion. Weapons in space would create a far greater threat. So the aim of the plans to deploy weapons in space is to create a new instrument of blackmail against independent states. Is it not time to enter into international law a ban on the deployment of any weapons in space over the heads of people in other countries? [applause] Of course, I reckoned on louder and more concerted applause, but that will do. [applause]

Now allow me to deal with another major reality of our time. It also requires a new way of thinking. I mean the unprecedented diversity and increasing interconnection and integrity of the world. Our world is united not only by internationalization of economic life and by powerful information and communications media, but also faces the common danger of nuclear death, ecological catastrophe, and global explosion of the poverty-wealth contradictions of its different regions. The world today is a multitude of states, each having its unique history, traditions, customs, and way of life. Each people and country has its own truth, its own national interests, and its own aspirations. This is the most important reality in today's world. It did not exist 30-40 years ago. This is a reality that manifested itself as a result of the choice made by the peoples themselves. They have chosen their path of social development. However, this process has been faster than the ability of some politicians to grasp the meaning of irreversible change. In the sphere of nuclear weapons and in other spheres they live to old preconceptions. The way out is also in bridging the gap between the fast pace of events and the realization of what is going on and what consequences it may have. This must be done before it is too late.

We know that some leaders still view the world as their domain and declare their vital interests wherever they like. This stimulates the arms race because such views result from a policy of strength designed for political and economic domination. This is an ingrained, antiquated mentality from the time when it was considered right to exploit other peoples, manage their resources, and decide their destinies, taking the law into their own hands. To what does the preservation of these views lead? To new regional conflicts and to the incitement of hatred. Such conflicts assume dangerous proportions, involving more and more countries as their interests are affected directly or indirectly. Regional conflicts have a very negative impact on international relations as a whole. People are being killed in wars, declared and undeclared, at the front and in the rear. Countries suffering from abject poverty and mass hunger are being drawn into a wasteful arms race.

The settlement of regional conflicts is a dictate of our time. Our initiatives on the Middle East may serve as an example of our approach to the problem. It is a major nerve centre on our planet. The interests of many nations, and not only of the Arabs and Israel, intersect there. It is a crossroad of histories, religions, and cultures. Therefore we believe in the need for a very responsible, cautious, and even delicate approach. Power politics, piracy, and constant threats of force are unacceptable.

We say: Let us search and act together. This applies to the Iran-Iraq war, the Central American crisis, the Afghan problem, and the situation in the south of Africa and in Indochina. The main thing is to honor the rights of the peoples to decide their own destiny themselves, not to interfere in the internal affairs of other states.

We are against all attempts to artificially destroy historical ties. Yet, justice requires regulation of international economic activities so that the rich cannot rob the poor. Can one live content in a world where three-quarters of the countries are deep in debt, while a handful of states are omnipotent usurers? If the situation does not change, there will be a social explosion that could destroy modern civilization. A fair political settlement of regional conflicts is prompted by the same logic of an interrelated and integral world, logic that also requires the solution of other global problems such as food, ecology, energy, and worldwide literacy, education, and medical care.

Another plight of the modern world is terrorism. It is a great evil, yet, as I have said recently, attempts to wipe it out by state-sponsored terrorism are a still greater crime against humanity.

This method leads to more deaths and undermines international law and the sovereignty of states, and that is without mentioning moral principles and justice. It creates a vicious circle of violence and bloodshed, the overall situation deteriorates. We have already said at the UN and other international fora -- and I would like to say it again today -- we are prepared to cooperate with all other countries in fighting every manifestation of terrorism.

All the problems I have spoken of here today are important, and with their solution new vistas will open up before human civilization. Yet, their dependence on one another is not identical: Without halting the arms race we shall not be able to solve any other problems. The Soviet Union and the Soviet people consider themselves part of an international community. The worries of all mankind are our worries, its pain is our pain and its hopes are our hopes. With all the differences between us, we all must learn to preserve our one big family of humanity.

At our meeting in Geneva, the U.S. President said that if the earth faced an invasion by extraterrestrials, the United States and the Soviet Union would join forces to repel such an invasion. I shall not dispute the hypothesis, though I think it is early to worry about such an intrusion. It is more important to think about the troubles that have entered our common home. It is more important to realize the need to eliminate the nuclear threat and accept there is no roof on earth or in space to save us if a nuclear storm broke out.

Our idea of creating a comprehensive system of international security, and our other initiatives clearly show that the Soviet Union is willing and ready to renounce its nuclear power status and reduce all other armaments to a minimum reasonable amount. The USSR does not want anything it would deny others and does not seek even an ounce more security than has the United States. However, the Soviet Union will never agree to an abridged status or discrimination.

Look at all our proposals. They do not mean leaving any of our weapons outside negotiations. Our principle is simple: All weapons must be limited and reduced, and those of wholesale annihilation eventually scrapped. Should we have any balance to redress, we must redress it not by letting the one short of some elements build them up, but by having the one with more of them scale them down. The historic goal before us, that of a demilitarized world, will have to be achieved stage by stage, of course. In each phase there definitely must be respect for mutual interests and a balance of reasonable sufficiency constantly declining. Everyone must realize and agree: Parity in a potential to destroy one another several times over is madness and absurdity.

It is important, in our view, while scaling down military confrontation, to carry through such measures as would make it possible to lessen, or better still, altogether

exclude the possibility of a surprise attack. The most dangerous offensive arms must be removed from the zone of contact. Quite naturally, military doctrines must be purely of defensive nature.

Already I have had occasion to say that now that we are coming to consider major measures for actual disarmament affecting the most sensitive area of national security. The Soviet Union will be pressing for the most stringent system of supervision and verification, including international verification. There must be complete certainty that the commitments are honored by all. Could we not take the Soviet-American experiment at Semipalatinsk as a prototype of such supervision?

There is yet another aspect to note as far as verification goes. It is common knowledge that the United States has numerous military bases on the territory of other countries. We would like to have an inspection access to them to be sure that there is no activity going on there that is forbidden under any eventual agreement. In this sense, there apparently will have to be cooperation of the states that host those bases. Of course, it will be better still to revive the old idea of dismantling foreign bases and bringing the troops stationed there back home. We apply this to ourselves too. We have already taken the first practical steps. As you know, we are withdrawing some of our forces from the Mongolian People's Republic, upon agreement with our Mongolian friends. We have brought six regiments back from Afghanistan, and we shall pull out the whole of our military contingent within time limits as short as possible. But there has to be reciprocity on the part of the United States and Afghanistan's neighbours, as well as international efforts to resolve this problem.

We do not claim to know the ultimate truth. We readily respond to proposals made by other countries, political parties, public movements, and just individuals. The Soviet Union has supported the idea of a nuclear-free corridor for Central Europe, and nuclear-free zones for Northern Europe, the Balkans, the South Pacific, and other regions. We are ready to hold consultations on each proposal to seek the best version, one that would suit everyone.

Dear guests, Comrades:

A promising and noble idea has been expressed at your forum -- that of setting up a human survival fund. Such an institution could be used for open discussion of ways to avert the threat of nuclear war. The fund could encourage research on the burning international issues and contribute toward drafting projects on the problems facing humanity, including combatting the latest baneful diseases. We would welcome active participation by the Soviet public -- both material and intellectual -- in the activities of such a fund.

I do not doubt that the good seeds your forum has planted will produce a good crop. The forces of militarism -- and they are synonymous, as often as not, with the forces of ignorance and intellectual sterility -- are not omnipotent. The movement of scientists for elimination of the nuclear danger, the passionate and most competent speeches by physicians, environmentalists, personalities engaged in culture and the arts, and the various antinuclear groups and associations are all unmistakable evidence of the determination of sound-minded people everywhere to save the precious gift of life on earth, perhaps the only one of its kind in the universe.

I see politics and political sciences represented in this audience and I wonder whether we can, with the knowledge and experience we have today, move step by step toward more balanced and harmonious international relations and toward an all-embracing system of international security, dependable and equal for all. I think we can and must do that. I think it was the hope and desire to find a positive answer to this question that have brought you to this forum, too.

Our great scientist, Vladimir Vernadskiy warned everybody back in 1922 (just imagine, 65 years ago): "It will not be long before man gets bold of atomic energy, such a source of power as will give him an opportunity to build a new way of life as he wants....will man be able to use that power for his own good, not for self-destruction? Has he learned to use the power that science will certainly give him?"

Scientists must not close their eyes to the possible implications of their research effort and of scientific progress. They must feel responsibility for the consequences of their discoveries. They must bind their work to better organization of all humanity."

Just think that over. At one time, the human ambition, without second thought, was to subdue the forces of nature. Now, invading nature without considering all consequences well in advance might turn it into a deadly enemy of humanity. The Chernobyl accident reminded us of that in a tragedy of relatively local proportions. But the nuclear arms race is inexorably pushing us towards universal tragedy.

For centuries, men have been seeking immortality. It is difficult to accept that every one of us is mortal. But to tolerate the doom of all humanity, of human reason, is just impossible.

Unfortunately, many of our generation have grown accustomed to nuclear weapons. Many have come to see them as a kind of idol demanding more and more sacrifices. Some even declare the nuclear arms race a guarantee of peace.

Alas, nuclear weapons have gone far towards molding the image of the times we live in. Naturally, destroying them does not mean going back to what was before. Discarding nuclear deterrence must not give free rein to trigger-happy individuals.

This is by no means an idle issue. Some would say the answer is to upgrade other components of military power, conventional arms. That is a bad and wrong way.

Humanity must get stronger and overcome the nuclear sickness and thus enter the post-nuclear age. It will be immune to violence and to attempts to dictate to others. Today, international relations are made soulless by worship of force and militarization of mentality. Hence the goal of humanizing international relations.

Is that possible? Some believe it is, others think not. No use arguing about it now. I think life will have its way. By and large, the peoples are coming to realize that. They already realize that a nuclear war must never be fought. So let us take the first big step: Cut the nuclear arsenals and keep space weapon-free. Let us start from the vantage-ground of Reykjavik, and then move on. And see how that will affect the international atmosphere. My own feeling is that each such step will make for greater confidence and open fresh vistas for cooperation. And more democratic thinking at the international level, equality, and independent and active participation of all nations, large, medium and small, in the affairs of the world community must help the process.

To humanize international relations, there have to be appropriate actions in the humanitarian field too, notably as regards information, human contacts, professional exchanges etc. That will help create moral guarantees for peace and hence contribute toward working out the material guarantees. The information aggression practiced by some countries not only leads to mental degradation, but obstructs the normal communication of people of different countries and cultural inter-enrichment. It breeds ill-feeling and alienation between peoples. On the other hand, you must agree that a people that knows and values the culture and art of other peoples can have no ill-feeling toward them.

adies and gentlemen, comrades,

In view of the rising danger of a new spiral in the arms race and of the drastic exacerbation of regional and, what we call, global problems, we must waste no more time trying to outplay each other and to gain unilateral advantages. The stake in such a game is too high -- the survival of humanity. Therefore, it is now vital to take the critical factor of time into account.

So let the ideas of this forum reach every corner on earth, hasten enlightenment and broaden mutual understanding. Let your efforts help advance towards a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world -- for the sake of the immortality of human civilization.

Gorbachev Receives Participants

LD161649 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1606 GMT 16 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 16 Feb (TASS) -- Today a reception was held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in honor of the participants in the forum.

During the reception, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, animatedly exchanged opinions with Dr Terry Taylor from the United States; Petra Kelly from the FRG, a Bundestag deputy from the Greens Party; Peter Ustinov of Great Britain, a writer and cinema figure; Marcello Mastroianni of Italy, a film actor; Gert Bastian of the FRG, a retired major general; Donald Kendall of the United States, chairman of the board of directors of Pepsico Inc; Otto Wolff Von Amerongen, president of the Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce; Ove Nathan Denmark, a scientist; and other forum participants.

Andrey Gromyko, Yegor Ligachev, Nikolay Ryzhkov, Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Anatoliy Dobrynin, and Vadim Medvedev also had conversations with the guests.

The reception passed in an atmosphere of friendliness, ease, and frankness [otkrovennost].

Gorbachev Speech Circulated at CD

LD171942 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 17 TASS -- TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Korzhev and Vladislav Shishlo report:

The text of the speech made by Mikhail Gorbachev at the international forum For a Nuclear Free World, for the Survival of Humanity was circulated today among participants in the conference on disarmament. Yuriy Nazarkin, representative of the USSR at the conference on disarmament, called attention to a coherent concept, set forth by the Soviet leader, one of demilitarisation of the world, including in the first turn elimination of mass destruction weapons.

Mikhail Gorbachev's call for a new political thinking, for concrete steps to advance towards a nuclear weapon-free and non-violent world met with a favorable response from a number of delegations whose representatives addressed today's plenary meeting.

It will take joint political efforts, coupled with an honest and mutual respect for national interests, to guarantee the security of the countries and peoples in the nuclear-space age, said Harald Rose (the GDR). Therein lies the call for a new approach in international relations. Unfortunately certain circles are very far from such a mode of thinking. But they, too, will ultimately have to meet this historic challenge because there is no other alternative in face of the growing threat of destruction hanging over the human race.

Luvсандorijiyn Bayart, chief delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic, stressed in his statement that it was important now to go ahead with consolidating and developing the new situation created in Reykjavik so that its spirit be fully reflected in disarmament talks at different levels.

Continuation of the arms race is increasingly proving to be a hopeless way that can only lead to a destabilization of the situation, a senseless waste of resources and an increased war danger for all, including those who advocate it. The need now is for urgent practical steps to stop and reverse the arms race, the leader of the Mongolian delegation said.

U.S. Reaction 'Inarticulate'

LD191036 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2027 GMT 18 Feb 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] There is a curious remark in the French newspaper LE MATIN to the effect that Washington's reaction to the Soviet leader's speech has been inarticulate. Indeed at first a White House spokesman stated the U.S. Administration is carefully studying the speech. Today a State Department spokesman in answer to the insistent questions of journalists asserted: We are studying his remarks with interest; he added Washington is ready to consolidate the progress already achieved by the Soviet Union and the United States.

At the same time, however, the self-same spokesman stated that United States considers itself fully justified in its so-called broadened interpretation of the USSR-U.S. ABM Treaty. This would meanwhile mean practically scrapping this very important accord and the start of the practical deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the SDI. By the way this is the same conclusion reached by the two leaders of the U.S. delegation which back in 1972 prepared this permanent treaty; Gerard Smith, former leader of the U.S. Arms Control Agency and Harold Brown, former U.S. secretary of Defense.

The gist of the matter is that the current Washington administration is clearly busy not with cutting its number of weapons but increasing them to implement its global policy of force.

Dobrynin Receives Generals

LD151900 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT 15 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has received today members of the western public group "Generals for Peace and Disarmament", who are participating in the international forum "For Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity."

A detailed exchange of views was held in a constructive atmosphere.

The Western generals, former military leaders of high rank, expressed concern about the alarming situation, which emerged in the world as a result of the continuing weapons race, expressed the opinion that it is necessary to find ways to preventing a nuclear catastrophe.

Anatoliy Dobrynin briefed the generals on the Soviet peace and international security concept, our practical steps in that direction. He pointed out the significance of the participation of former military leaders in explaining to public the dangerous global consequences of nuclear war, their active contribution to the struggle for preserving peace and for the survival of humanity.

Mutual conviction was expressed that the present-day situation necessitates new military-political thinking in this nuclear age and corresponding actions in that connection.

Dobrynin Meets Trade Official

LD191837 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 19 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 19 TASS -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has received James Giffen, president of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council, who attended the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, For the Survival of Humanity".

Giffen shared the impressions of U.S. businessmen who had taken part in the forum. He made special mention of the impressive speech delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev. He stated that favourable prospects for the development of Soviet-American trade and economic cooperation were opening up and emphasized the role that the council was to play in that mutually advantageous sphere in the setting of the major foreign economic reforms initiated by the Soviet side. The conversation was held in a businesslike and benevolent atmosphere.

Dobrynin Meets U.S. Scientists

LD182051 Moscow TASS in English 2018 GMT 18 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 18 TASS -- Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin met today with prominent American scientists, professor of Princeton University, noted physicist Frank Von Hippel and senior staff scientist with the Natural Resources Defence Council of the USA Thomas Cochran, head of the U.S. delegation in the joint Soviet-American project for perfecting seismic methods of verifying non-holding of nuclear tests. Both scientists participated in the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity".

The American scientists spoke with satisfaction about the work of the forum, emphasising particularly the speech delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev.

An exchange of opinions on concrete problems of nuclear arms limitation, above all those connected with an urgent task of ending nuclear testing, was held during the conversation.

Anatoliy Dobrynin emphasised that by its extended moratorium on nuclear testing the Soviet Union showed that refraining from testing is a realistic matter, given political will, and the Soviet Union has such will. Regrettably, the U.S. Government continues holding a strictly negative stand in this matter.

The American interlocutors pay much attention to the implementation in perspective of the joint Soviet-American project in accordance with the agreement concluded by the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the Natural Resources Defence Council, research organisation of the USA on May 28, 1986. The draft project shows the reliability of the existing measures of verification of the observance of general and complete ban on nuclear weapons tests.

The conversation passed in a constructive businesslike atmosphere.

Dobrynin Meets U.S. Businessmen

LD172037 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 17 TASS -- Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin had conversations with prominent American businessmen and public figures, chairman of the Board of the Occidental Petroleum Corporation Armand Hammer and Chairman of Pepsico Incorporated Donald Kendall who had taken part in the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity."

New approaches to the development of Soviet-American commercial and economic ties were discussed during the conversations. Armand Hammer and Donald Kendall noted that the recent measures of the Soviet Government aimed at the widening of many-faceted cooperation between Soviet and foreign organisations and firms already brought the first concrete results in the form of new deals between U.S. companies and Soviet foreign trade organisations. However, legislation in the USA discriminatory with regard to the USSR still remains a major brake to the development along this road of mutual advantage.

The interlocutors talked with satisfaction about the work of the forum and, particularly, about Mikhail Gorbachev's speech addressed to the forum.

The conversations passed in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere.

News Conference

LD162253 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 16 Feb 87

[Report by commentator Vitaliy Sobolev from the press center of the forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival" on the news conference on the results of the forum's work: passages in quotation marks recorded]

[Text] [Sobolev] The news conference was opened by Karen Khachaturov, head of the forum press center. He said that about 1,000 Soviet and 500 foreign journalists

participated in covering this international meeting. A considerable section of this large detachment of these men of the pen, the microphone, and the television camera filled the hall of the press center. The participants in the news conference, Academician Velikhov, Chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace; the American professors Von Hippel, Galbraith and Lown, cochairmen of the International Movement of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War; Ossola president of the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce; Ustinov, the British writer, film director and actor; and Metropolitan Yuvenaliy were presented.

The floor was then passed to Academician Velikhov.

[Velikhov] "I would not like to give an appraisal of the forum; this should be done, firstly, later on, and, secondly, by many of you and by those who will be discussing it subsequently. I would still like to say that, in my opinion, this has been an historic event. Firstly, there were approximately 1,000 participants at the forum. These participants worked in eight sections according to their professional interests. This enabled each section to have a high professional level. For example, in the scientific section we had two seminars; one devoted to questions of the verification [proverka] of nuclear tests, and the second seminar was devoted to the very acute questions of today -- how to maintain the ABM Treaty in conditions of the development [sozdaniye] of new types of space weapons and new technologies.

"There was then a session of the forum where questions of disarmament and about how to move toward a nuclear-free world were discussed; questions connected with European security, questions connected with space weapons and the correlation of defense and means of offence; and, finally, questions connected with ending nuclear tests.

"Many, various opinions were voiced, and I will not sum them up. It seems to me many very important and interesting opinions were voiced. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, the Soviet Government will closely study everything proposed at the forum. We did not have any long official reports, but all the proposals have been recorded or will appear in written form, and the Soviet Government will closely study these proposals.

"I believe there were interesting debates at other forums, too. We tried not to put them together, but made them in camera on the decision of the promotions group. It was not any kind of Soviet decision. It is a promotions group of scientists. The idea was to try to ensure that at the forums there would be no statements or speeches but a truly free exchange of opinions. I believe this is what happened. Finally, on instructions of the promotions groups, in the course of over 1 hour today -- 1 hour and 20 minutes -- some results were summed up by those present here, and by those who were absent, of the elected promotions group and representatives of the forum.

"Finally, you heard the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev which, it seems to me, is of very profound importance, conceptual importance, since there were very many important ideas in it. I will not try to interpret them here, I think you yourselves will refer to this speech many times. Lastly, I would just like to point out that in the beginning, when the first press conference was held, there were a lot of questions. Then we assembled together figures of various types, of various, so to speak, fields, representing various types of spiritual activity, as it were.

"It seems to me that, in the beginning, we had a number of ideas -- this came about spontaneously -- so we simply couldn't resist this. There arose a spontaneous desire to discuss such acute issues as the question of mankind's survival on this planet. At the same time I think this still indicated a very important trend today toward an

amalgamation of human culture which has been split into various niches and various groups, and, as I have already said, from what it unites and it destroys. [as heard]

"So I think this forum is a very interesting, new phenomenon. It is very important precisely because both during and after the forum we all the time passed on all the proposals to the government, and after the forum -- you know, everything was listened to attentively -- there was a reception for 2, 2 and 1/2 hours when members of the Politburo and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev chatted to the forum delegates. This was a free and open conversation at which all the issues at the forum were discussed in a dialogue. Therefore, I believe this was a very interesting event, and reflects the tradition of the Soviet Union where there really is a desire and a need by the government to listen to the opinions of scientists, to hear the opinions of all representatives of the intelligentsia and of those who represent all aspects of public opinion. We have endeavored to ensure that a broad spectrum was presented. Of course, we didn't succeed in this all the time, but there were simply -- the U.S. State Department recommended that a number of organizations in Western countries should not attend this forum. The Energy Department put out a memorandum in which its employees were not allowed to attend the forum. It should be said that our forum -- you have probably noticed -- was not held during working time. Partly from these considerations no one could accuse the participants of wasting working time on a public matter.

"One scientist arrived from the Livermore Laboratory -- we were unable to get enough opponents, I would say, owing to a number of technical problems. So we decided that the material of the forum would be sent to the laboratory -- the American laboratory at Los Alamos, Livermore, for their comments, and then we would acquaint our government and all interested governments of other countries with them."

[Sobolev] Among the numerous questions, one was asked by a U.S. journalist, who did not give his name. He asked Professor Galbraith what parts of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech to the participants in the forum seemed to him the most important for the U.S. people. This is what Professor Galbraith replied.

[Galbraith, in English with superimposed Russian] "This morning, the U.S. professor said, I listened to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech with great attention. From time to time I have had occasion to prepare public statements and I, as a specialist, can assess the logical balance of the Soviet leader's speech.

I was struck by the profound adherence to peace and peaceful coexistence which was expressed in his words. These feelings and moods are shared by all. Listening to the speech, I experienced a feeling of deep inspiration and hope that we will be able to counter this terrible threat which stands over people. It is this inspiration caused by the Soviet leader's words which I would like to emphasize. Attention is also drawn by the attitude in the speech to polemics. For all of us -- both in the capitalist and the socialist world -- the main enemy is a nuclear war. So one may even say that in the face of this common threat we are, as it were, on the same side of the conference table. I have already had occasion to say that, following a nuclear war, the most zealous ideologists would not be able to tell the difference between the ashes of capitalism and the ashes of socialism."

[Sobolev] During the press conference Ossola, president of the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, was asked the question: "How do you see the prospects of setting up in the Soviet Union mixed enterprises with the participation of foreign companies?"

[Ossola, in English with superimposed Russian] "The leader of the Chamber of Commerce says various problems arise from the creation of mixed enterprises, but these problems

can be overcome if flexibility is shown, in other words if each individual case is examined in accordance with specific circumstances. In any case, talks are already underway with Italian businessmen on the creation of one, or possibly several such mixed enterprises, and we may soon be seeing the results."

[Sobolev] A number of questions were put at the press conference to Metropolitan Yuvenaliy, the representative of the Russian Orthodox Church. He received one of them in written form and read it aloud.

Yuvenaliy] "This is the question: The final document of the section of religious figures at the forum 'A Call for Joint Action' speaks of the need for specific actions toward the creation of a basis of common security today. What specific actions are proposed to be taken in this context by those religious organizations whose representatives took part in the work of the forum?

"We believe the experience of our work within the framework of the whole forum is a new step in cooperation by religious figures with all people of good will because it is not enough for us in our confined circle to work in defense of peace. We are reminded of this by our emblem which depicts the globe as seen through the porthole of a spaceship. I was literally struck today by the fact that we, as it were, are on the same wavelength as what we heard today from the lips of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. I made note of this because religious figures should consider this. His figurative expression that a second Noah's Ark will not survive a nuclear deluge has something in common with our emblem.

"What can we do? We have formulated this very briefly in our appeal, to promote unity between peoples, to expand contacts, overcoming the frontiers of division, to improve the spiritual and religious lives of communities on earth, to help to eliminate preconceived images of an enemy, and to step up education in the spirit of peace. We would like, tomorrow and the day after, to turn to the embassies of the nuclear powers in Moscow to acquaint them with our ideas and with the results of our reform, and to present them with our appeal."

[Sobolev] Replies to other journalists' questions were also given at the press conference.

IZVESTIYA Cites Velikhov Speech

PM180909 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 February 1987 Morning Edition carries on pages 2 and 3 a TASS report, entitled "Learning the Art of Living in Peace," on M.S. Gorbachev's 16 February Kremlin meeting with the participants of the "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival" forum. The report opens with an account of the speech by Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, chairman of the committee of Soviet scientists in defense of peace and against the nuclear threat, who opened the meeting:

"We have assembled in Moscow on the initiative of the group of scientists who organized the previous forum last July. The scientists were backed by writers, artists, musicians, doctors, political scientists, representatives of the business world and of various religious communities. We are united by our common anxiety for the fate of mankind and of our planet in the nuclear age. We are also united by a sense of responsibility to the billions of people living in the world today, to past and future

generations. For the first time in history we have in our hands the link that can unite or break the chain of the development of human civilization. It would be no exaggeration to say we can all see one solution -- the destruction of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the triumph of the new political thinking.

"As for the scientists, I am basing myself on the document signed in Rome at the meeting of 36 of the world's academies of sciences. I think all the forum participants were unanimous in this belief. Therefore we support the plan you put forward, Mikhail Sergeyevich, on 15 January 1986 for the stage-by-stage destruction of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the next millennium. We see this as our generation's chief task. We are worried about the fact that the process of the implementation of this plan, which began so dynamically in Reykjavik, has slowed down. We have discussed the problems associated with this at the forum in an atmosphere of an open and frank and sometimes heated exchange of opinions. Our proposals will be set out for you by representatives of eight independent groups which have discussed them from various viewpoints.

"We see this forum as yet another sign of the times, as a sign of the need to unite human culture. The disintegration of it into separate, unconnected groups threatens to impoverish and destroy it. Of the forum's 3 days we will only spend today together. Certainly this is not enough, and I believe we scientists have already been criticized for this decision by the writers. This decision has enabled us, while discussing complex problems, in general to refrain from speeches and statements and maintain a businesslike and profound, committed, and professional atmosphere.

"The forum is attended by more than 1,000 people from more than 80 countries. We tried to invite everyone irrespective of their political views. I would also like, with the utmost respect, to say a few words about our colleague, U.S. astrophysicist Doctor Hyder who has been on hunger strike for more than 120 days to get governments to pledge to really destroy nuclear weapons by the year 2000. His friend, Doctor Teller, a participant in our forum and a famous U.S. designer of nuclear weapons, who has concluded that they must be destroyed, conveys to you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, an expression of support for the 15 January idea. Doctor Teller proposes the forum participants sign a message from us, the forum participants, to Doctor Hyder. Those who wish to do so can obtain the message in the foyer.

At the end of the forum we discussed the idea of open laboratories. That is, setting up a scientific sector not bound by military or commercial secrecy, that undertakes universal human problems and lends itself to the broadest international cooperation. We believe this sector will grow as disarmament takes place and the international situation improves.

"One would like to hope the whole of science will be involved by the year 2000. The idea has met with broad support among scientists. We have decided to set up a special foundation to promote the development of this sector, especially at the initial stage of the projects. Professor (Vayzner) from the United States, Professor Fushimi from Japan, Professor (Salam) from Pakistan, Professor Duerr and Professor Richter from the FRG, Academician Likhachev, the writer Chingiz Aytmatov, Metropolitan Pitirim and Academician Arbatov from the Soviet Union have been invited to join the organizational group. Representatives of a number of existing foundations have kindly agreed to advise us during its creation. The development of the projects requires state backing, of course. So we welcome Italy's initiative and we are prepared to participate in a world laboratory in accordance with these principles. The forum was attended by two vice presidents of the world laboratory, Nobel prize winners Professor Ting from the United States and Professor (Salam) from Pakistan.

"The projects under discussion include projects geared to improving education and medical assistance in the world, forecasting earthquakes, and pushing back the frontiers of human knowledge. We expect these projects to be supplemented with humanitarian and social projects."

There follow brief accounts of speeches by other participants, all summarized in the first item.

Forum Message to Hyder

LD161214 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 16 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 16 TASS -- Participants in the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity" today signed an appeal to Dr. Charles Hyder, which says:

"We understand that your decision to continue your fast is conditioned on commitments to the worldwide elimination of all nuclear weapons and the rejection of offensive military operations as an option in international relations. We are hopeful that the new creative energies that are stirring in both East and West will soon result in dramatic progress towards these goals and, if you decide to stop your fast, would welcome your active contributions to this longer-term effort."

Demichev Meets Religious Leaders

LD171324 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 17 TASS -- Petr Demichev, first vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today received in the Kremlin the religious leaders who participated in the international forum "For Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity."

Petr Demichev and the religious leaders exchanged views in an atmosphere of frankness that was characteristic of the forum on ways of lessening the war threat and achieving world peace.

The sides spoke highly of the results of the meetings and discussions in Moscow. They expressed the confidence that the forum would contribute to the rallying of the countries and peoples in peace efforts and give a fresh impetus to the anti-war movement, in which religious people play an active role.

Sharing their impressions of a meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the religious leaders said that his words, addressed to all people of goodwill, encouraged the clergymen and urged them to contribute even more energetically to the assertion of the spirit of trust, unity and cooperation.

Religious Leaders Adopt Appeal

LD161745 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 16 Feb 87

[Quotation Marks as received]

[Text] Moscow February 16 TASS -- Follows the full text of the "appeal to joint efforts" adopted by religious figures, participants in the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free-Weapon World, for the Survival of Humanity" which was held in Moscow on February 14-16:

"Unified in heart and mind, we, leaders of Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, and Shintoist communities in Africa, North and South America, Asia, the Caribbean, Eastern and Western Europe, and the Middle East, appeal to people of faith around the world, to all people of good will, to the leaders of the nations: For God's sake and for the survival and dignity of humanity, lay aside your prejudices, your enmities, your arms and lift up together the banner of peace with justice for all.

We, 215 persons of faith, have come together across the barriers of race, creed, and ideology from 56 nations to consider the tragic and urgent plight of our globe. Together, we are reminded of how small and fragile is this beautiful world entrusted to our care. We shed tears to see it at the brink of possible nuclear destruction, to see so many of its inhabitants suffering the man-made plagues of war, famine and pestilence. We share a common anxiety about its fate.

The decision of the United Nations to declare 1986 the International Year of Peace awakened new hopes. Only two months before, the leaders of the USSR and the USA had agreed that there could be no winners in a nuclear war and to begin new negotiations to curb the nuclear arms race. At the same time, more and more people have committed themselves to the cause of peace, often out of religious convictions. Hopeful proposals have been made, setting out new modes of political thinking and new principles of relations between states in a nuclear age which give priority to universally accepted human values. Sweeping new proposals have been made to eliminate nuclear weapons altogether. At Reykjavik, near agreement was reached to reduce drastically current stockpiles and nuclear missile deployment.

Yes all these hopes have been dashed. The nuclear arms race threatens more imminently to spread into space, and conventional weapons traders grow ever richer by feeding the flames of war in several terribly destructive regional conflicts. New nuclear disasters have reminded us that human beings have created a technology that can exceed their ability to control it. The arms race continues, both in quality and in scope, with disastrous consequences, especially for the poor whose meagre resources it drains at an increasing pace.

And yet we do not despair. We continue to believe in the power of prayer, and together we trust that God will lead humanity out of this wilderness. We believe in wise actions guided by the sages. It is not too late to replace the threat or use of armed force with dialogue. It is not too late to return to the policy of detente and cooperation and to develop new confidence and trust among peoples divided by irrational hatred and enmity. It is not too late to develop a shared notion of common security among the inescapably interdependent nations of the world. The time has come for concrete actions before it does become too late. People of religion have special roles to play, among them:

- promoting unity among the peoples;
- increasing contacts across lines of division;
- improving the spiritual and devotional life of human communities;
- helping to eliminate prejudicial enemy images; and
- intensifying education for peace.

Many of us have been meeting together in peace gatherings for decades building bonds of trust and confidence among ourselves. Our experience is a hopeful one. We call upon the policy makers and leaders of the nations to commit themselves as well to continuing dialogue. Urgent steps are necessary now to end the arms race. But a commitment to stay the course is essential if the shared aspirations of humankind for the elimination of all nuclear weapons is ultimately to be realized.

We appeal especially to the leaders of the principal nuclear nations to:

- declare once and for all that the alternative of nuclear war is immoral and humanly unacceptable;
- renounce the doctrines of nuclear deterrence and mutually assured destruction;
- respect without question existing nuclear weapons treaties such as the ABM Treaty;
- proceed immediately to conclude new treaties in consonance with the hope for a nuclear-free world rekindled in Reykjavik.

While we have not come here to align ourselves with the policies of any particular nation we applaud on its merits and unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing as a confidence-building measure of the highest order. [sentence as received] It deserves a positive response. All nuclear states should enter into a common moratorium calling a halt now to all nuclear testing. We also believe the goal of ridding the world of nuclear weapons, by mutually-agreed stages, by the year 2000 is necessary, urgent and achievable. But for either of these things to happen, all the peoples of the world, especially the citizens of the major nuclear powers, must engage in renewed massive efforts. The unilateral actions taken already by some states to reduce their military forces and budgets are welcome and encouraging.

We appeal to all to commit themselves unilaterally to this task of building the basis for common security today. Time has come for us to ask the ancient questions: If not me, who? If not now, when?

May God make us faithful stewards of this world which we hold in trust for future generations, and guide us all in the blessed paths of peace."

Forum Ends; Pozner Comments

LD171754 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Excerpts] And now a word from Vladimir Pozner:

'Pozner] Thank you and hello. Today was the final day of an international forum that brought together some 1,000 participants from over 80 countries.

Nuclear physicists and top artists; writers and ecologists; experts in the political sciences and religious leaders; medical doctors and businessmen; retired generals; people of different political, social, religious outlooks -- all came to Moscow to concentrate on one cardinal issue: how to make this a nuclear-free world and guarantee the survival of humanity. No, they did not come up with a onestep foolproof solution, but they openly and candidly exchanged ideas, argued, and debated. They strove to overcome their differences so as to achieve their goal, and in that area they made significant progress. [passage omitted]

I say this and think about the reports this forum has been getting in the western press. Propaganda, Soviet ploy -- those billings have figured widely, or no billings at all, as if nothing was happening in Moscow or, if something was newsworthy, it certainly wasn't the forum. I wonder why, and I think to myself, what if the United States opened its doors to an international forum where all kinds of people would be invited regardless of their views, to brainstorm on what to do with the threat of nuclear war that hangs over all of us. And what if, after that, the President of the United States invited all of these people to the White House and spoke to them on how much the United States appreciates their efforts, their contribution to achieve, one day, a world where nuclear weapons will have been outlawed.

Would that be newsworthy? Would Western media carry stories about it? I think so. But I also think no such forum would be invited to the United States capital, at least by the present administration, the reason for that being its absence of interest in mobilizing public opinion against nuclear weapons. And since that's the case and since the Soviet Union clearly takes the opposite view, that opposite view reflected, for instance, in an international forum, has to be written off as propaganda. That's what I call good, objective journalism.

Roundtable Assesses Results

LD191324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Program entitled "On the Results of the International Forum 'For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity'," presented by All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin; with Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations; and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades. As you know, our program is devoted to the outcome of the forum for a non-nuclear world and human survival. The very fact the forum has been convened is unprecedented; it illustrates the process of expansion of the world forces' potential, of the broadening of representation of social groups joining in the effort to resolve the vital task facing humanity, that of ensuring lasting peace.

[Primakov] I will begin by saying the forum was distinguished not even as much by the fact that wider and wider circles are being drawn into the struggle for peace, as by the fact that it is a principally new format, which had been shaped in the following way.

It was usual for us to meet people who shared our views, to have talks with them; the talks were largely joined by those who were with us in the majority of areas, so to speak, by those who sided with our policies. Now a new idea has come into being: let us turn in general to those who have mastered their subjects, who are experts in their fields -- I mean above all scientists who are involved with nuclear issues, of course, and political scientists. Myself, I was precisely in the political science group. We turned to them, by far not all of whom share our views on the ways of normalizing the international situation. Moreover, I will say the majority of those who came, they a priori, so to speak, opposed our position.

A working group was formed -- by political scientists, for example -- and I was included in that group. We invited our colleagues one by one, those whom we know, who had made good names for themselves, who influence public opinion in a certain way -- we invited them to come to Moscow. A similar situation emerged with others as well: with natural scientists, with religious and cultural figures, and so forth. Several roundtables were held at the same time. Very original conversations, or debates, were conducted at those roundtables. I will cite the example of our roundtable. The point was we had no reports, no speeches were written beforehand at all.

I opened the session of that roundtable by posing a few questions: How should we proceed further from Reykjavik? What could be done to stabilize the international

situation? What do the issues of global and regional stabilization have in common? and so forth. The questions were formulated in that way, quite neutrally as you see. I invited everybody to take part in discussion on those issues, and discussion was very interesting: each participant had an opportunity to speak, all spoke specifically, in response to speeches by other colleagues, and made no lengthy speeches. A certain opinion was thrashed out; I would not say it was a consensus, it was a clash of different views. What was it that all were unanimous about? All agreed specific steps and some sort of specific measures should be found and outlined, to help the international situation become stabilized and prevent the world from falling into a yawning abyss which has opened and threatens to swallow mankind.

[Levin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, in this connection I would like to seize the occasion and emphasize the fact that it is indeed easy to come to terms with like-minded people, and it is more difficult to talk to those who see the problems facing mankind in a different light. Perhaps we would not be able to resolve the problems we find in our way without such dialogue, without attempts to achieve mutual understanding.

[Primakov] You are right, there is another point which is also of great significance. You know, I was astounded that quite a few participants in the discussion, who are rather well-known in their fields, who deal professionally with many issues associated with security and disarmament, have no detailed knowledge of our stand. For example, it was news for many that the Soviet Union had offered -- even now, in conditions when as is known, the United States has not joined the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing -- to embark on talks on a nuclear test ban, and that the first phase of those talks would deal with three issues: first, on the ceiling, that is on the size of conducted nuclear explosions; second, on the number of those nuclear explosions; and third, on issues associated with any, so to speak, monitoring measures, to resolve these three issues as early as in the first phase; incidentally, these are very close to what the House of Representatives is demanding at the moment. The U.S. Administration, as is known, would not do that. Many experts are not aware of all the ins and outs of our stand, of the constructive nature of our stand, of some sort of additional measures that we take in the search for a compromise.

[Levin] It seems to me the religious leaders who assembled for this forum were better informed. I base my judgment on the appeal adopted by those 215 believers from 56 countries of the world who met in Moscow. They write: We have arrived here not to tie ourselves to policies of a single country, but we appreciate the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing which was declared as a measure of trust of a higher order, for its worth. It deserves a positive response.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, here, of course, it was not only religious figures who came to be in accord with the Soviet activities...

[Levin interrupts] I should hope so.

[Shishlin] ... on stopping nuclear testing, that's a fact. Yevgeniy Maksimovich is absolutely right when he says that all in all, national points of view were often prominent in the framework of the Moscow forum, and naturally, every person viewed the interests of both his own country, world politics, and the destinies of the international security from his corner. On the whole, it became clear, of course, that the forum on its own provided proof of the fact that we really live in an interdependent world, in an interlinked and an increasingly integral world.

That fact dramatically singles out three problems: First is naturally the problem of human survival, the problem of curbing, curtailing the arms race, and above all the

nuclear arms race; the second is regional conflicts which cast a deep shadow on international relations; and the third is the exacerbation of the so-called global problems, the resolution of which through national efforts is just inconceivable. These are ecology, food problems, space exploration, assimilation of the world ocean and use of its resources, and many other global problems which as a matter of fact persistently require their immediate solution at the present stage and thus require joint effort by states, nations and people. From this point of view, I believe, the speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his very significant thesis which was put forward in his speech, namely the thesis of the need to humanize international relations, to give priority to common human values, priority to common interests of human kind, was to an extent the crux of the forum.

[Primakov] Incidentally, this position was born at the dawn, I would say, or in any event at the initial stage of the development of Marxist-Leninist thought. Indeed, Lenin said directly that if the interests of the working class are regarded in relation to its individual parts, then the interests of the working class as a whole must prevail. If the interests of society are regarded in relation to the interests of the working class, then the interests of society and social development must prevail. How, the interests of the development of society prevail, because the question has been posed, the questions have been focused: Is mankind to be or not to be? What you said about the dominant factor -- say, of our forum -- being the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, that is correct, and it seems to me this underscores once again the unique nature of the event that has just taken place in Moscow. Indeed, it is not always, and far from everywhere, that the king of participants that came to Moscow can hear the view of the Soviet Union from the most authoritative source. That's the first thing. Second, I attended the reception. Everyone was stressing how unaccustomed this was for them, and they connected this, naturally, to the democratization which is now being implemented as the mainstream of our development, that all our leaders were surrounded by guests and were answering questions, having unrestrained conversations with them and, naturally, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was surrounded by a dense circle; he was asked many questions, and he answered all -- literally all -- of them. In this regard, I would simply like to say: You know, one of my U.S. colleagues, I don't want to give his name, but, believe me, he is a most important figure, one of the most important economists.

[Levin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, once you say just a bit more, you won't need to say the name...

[Primakov] No, I won't say it, I don't want to create any kind of difficulties for him, if that might be the case. He just said to me: You know, there quite simply could not be anything like this in our country. Imagine the situation, if we had people gathering around who unrestrainedly discussed matters of new approaches to the international situation, matters of peace and security, and they were addressed by Reagan, and he talked to them and answered their questions, and so on. This is simply not feasible in the United States. I would like to stress one other aspect also in this regard. Indeed, many participants in the forum said that before coming, they thought this would be a propaganda event. So many of them vacillated, to go or not to go? One more thing: Both the State Department and the other Ministries of Foreign Affairs in NATO countries exerted pressure, that is known for sure, on their fellow citizens so they should not go to Moscow. And so it happened they came from the free world, so to speak, to a country renowned as closed. Here people communicated freely with them, conversed freely with them, here they had access to any member of the forum, including Academician Sakharov, if you please, who had conversations with them and over there, there, in the so-called free society, they were being persuaded against going to Moscow. They were told, for example, in no event to meet the press. So that's an interesting illustration for you.

[Shishlin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, there's one more material detail, it seems to me, which is that now, in pondering upon what led our foreign guests to Moscow, it seems important to me to see not only anxiety at the state of international affairs, not only an interest in actually elaborating and finding some kind of good human quality, curiosity, came into play. They are extraordinarily interested in just what is happening in the Soviet Union, and how such concepts as openness, restructuring, and acceleration are materializing.

That is, they had an absolutely burning interest and, of course, this organic link between domestic policy, which I would call the policy of the April plenum of the Central Committee, the 27th party congress and the January Central Committee plenum, and both the foreign policy designed by the 15 January statement and our unilateral moratorium, which the United States is doing everything to ensure is not extended -- and here, naturally, conditions have changed materially as a result of the two U.S. nuclear tests this year -- was present invisibly, but throughout the whole fabric of the work of the forum and made itself felt.

[Primakov] It has already ended, this link...

[Shishlin] Yes. It is also policy, of course, mapped out by Reykjavik, undoubtedly.

[Levin] Naturally, we all listened yesterday with great attention to the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, as it was relayed direct from the Kremlin, and we have read it through once again. It is a very interesting speech. It is interesting precisely because it sets out in a concentrated form our philosophy and approach to international affairs, and this speech at this forum was probably the most impressive event from the viewpoint of setting out our principles, setting out the aims with which we approach international affairs. There you have the thesis mentioned by you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, already, of the need to humanize international relations, indeed, to tell the truth. It is all brilliantly simple, indeed, it seems to be so simple, but at the same time just how complex, just how difficult it is to achieve these aims. The speech was permeated entirely with the spirit of humanization of international relations, the humanization of these relations. It also contained very much that which is specific, specific regarding how the Soviet Union, in its philosophical view of the world, translates its practical policy into reality. Our recent initiatives, which can be enumerated in the form of spaces of time at slight intervals, is most, most important. These include the proposal of the 27th party congress on the creation of a universal security system, the 15 January 1986 statement on the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century, and of chemical weapons, the proposal of the socialist countries for a considerable limitation of conventional weapons, and so on. It is also important to note what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed: We make no claim to monopoly on truth, we also support other proposals serving the cause of peace, we welcome ideas submitted by other sides, and this was specifically shown very clearly in the Delhi declaration, where the view of India and the entire Nonaligned Movement was taken into account.

[Primakov] There is one more aspect I would like to bring to your attention. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech pointed not only to the moral implication of restraint through nuclear weapons, but pointed in out in this way: the continuation of this over time might have catastrophic results. I would say this is a new aspect, and is a very important turn, because there are quite a few people who think well, all right, there has not been war for 40 years, that means that restraint is based in the existence of nuclear weapons. So Mikhail Sergeyevich indicated point by point in his speech how, should this situation now continue, there is a nuclear weapons buildup, they are displayed, there is a show of strength, and how this escalates into a universal danger of the blast. This very mechanism of restraint is transformed into a mechanism that could detonate everything on earth.

[Shishlin] That is an absolutely correct idea, to the extent that it was exposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich when he noted that parity in terms of the potential for destroying each other many times over is absurd, is madness.

That really is so. Indeed, this logic that, say, nuclear bombs are evil, but a necessary evil for preventing a worse evil, that is, war, is in itself faulty. It also happens the limits of nuclear weapons as restraining factors are increasingly disappearing, receding, through progress in military technology and through the fact decisions are being increasingly handed over to machines -- the possibility of an irreparable failure increases even without any malicious intent.

[Levin] By all accounts, of course, mankind has found itself in a situation where it is living virtually in an embrace with the nuclear bomb; this is an exceptionally dangerous proximity. The fact that this was indicated so impressively and convincingly in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech is a very important factor, all the more important in that as far as one can judge the results of the forum of natural scientists that have become known, the natural scientists reached similar conclusions. Specifically, Professor Von Hippel of Princeton University in the United States, said that they drew three principle conclusions. At least, this is my recollection of his speech at the forum: First, there is no absolutely reliable defensive system -- you cannot build such a system -- that is, it is a direct instruction to those advocating SDI, to hope that it will be a reliable defensive system is groundless. Moreover, the natural scientists state directly the line between defensive and offensive is a very fine one, very fine and one that exacerbates the danger. Further, the natural scientists came to the conclusion that the most destabilizing situation now is the multiple reentry vehicles, missiles that are both ground-based and on submarines.

The U.S. Administration, proceeding from the imbalance in the triad of strategic weapons that has historically developed between the United States and the USSR, says that the most destabilizing factor is the intercontinental ballistic missile, ground-based missiles. The scientists say, no, you are wrong Mr President, it is the missiles on submarines that are destabilizing. It is true the U.S. scientists, and other scientists too, as I understand it, have probably not made any direct counter argument to President Reagan, but this concealed meaning is tangible and is making itself felt.

The conclusion that the Soviet and U.S. experts could well ensure the reliable verification of adherence to the accord, does it not strike one's eye? That has been our position for a long time, a position which is being disputed by none other than representatives of the U.S. Administration. Here the opinion of scientists carries much weight. Mikhail Sergeyevich in his speech said, that our government, our leadership would thoroughly examine everything that was said at the forum and the proposals put forward by natural scientists, and political scientists, and physicians, and businessmen. Incidentally, the forum of business circles was so representative -- I know it from the example of the Federal Republic of Germany; Christiansen, chairman of the board of Deutsche Bank, one of the country's largest banks; managers of such concerns as Salzgitter, Krupp,...

[Primakov interrupts] Von Amerongen.

[Levin] That is the boss of the DJHT, the Chambers of Trade and Industry of the FRG -- so to speak, the chief of staff of West German industry Wolff von Amerongen.

[Primakov] In general, that was a very representative forum.

[Levin] Very representative.

[Primakov] It seems there has never been such a representative forum anywhere, I believe, anywhere, not only in Moscow.

[Levin] The fact that our opinions can coincide is, naturally, a very gratifying and a very significant point.

[Primakov] You know what they say about SDI, that there is generally no such defensive system which could reliably protect this or that country, that fact is also of great philosophical significance for working out our approaches to the issue of security. That is, what did Reagan say? Reagan has always been maintaining -- well, not always, but from the moment he started advertising the SDI -- that the presently existing balance will be replaced by a different system, a system based on defensive means. It was clear from the very outset that that system is incapable of averting a strike from the opposing side and of destroying all missiles that are homing on a target: According to different estimates, 10 to 30 percent of the missiles will get through.

[Shishlin] That would be only in case of an efficient system.

[Primakov] But of course. Could you imagine what they mean, those 10 to 30 percent? They would destroy any country and the world as a whole. Then, each side, if the other opposing side will be creating such a quote defensive unquote system, will seek to increase the potential of those 10 to 30 percent. Naturally, in those conditions, any cuts in weapons would be completely out of the question. The fact that the scientists arrive at the conclusion that this is a wrong way to act, that the level of the existing balance should be reduced -- [changes thought] and a very significant point in this connection in the speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev boils down to the following: At a sufficient level, proceeding from sufficiency, in other words, not to inflate that military overkill potential, for destroying the opposing side many times over, but having a sufficient amount of means to prevent an aggressor from attacking us -- that is the way of formulating the issue.

[Shishlin] Right, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I also believe that not only social but political circles in the West as well, have paid attention to some practical ideas voiced by both participants of the forum and in the aforementioned speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich: When he was assessing Reykjavik, he said that one ought to take Reykjavik as a starting point, and when he voiced the opinion that the task of disarmament taken alone cannot, naturally, be achieved by some kind of one-time measures. It is natural that there are certain phases in curtailing the arms race and reducing the level of military confrontation, and he mentioned the objectives which appeared to have been met with understanding in Reykjavik, by both the Soviet and the U.S. side. Incidentally, I had a brief look at the initial response: Naturally, the speech has made a profound impression, as has the entire work of the forum, on the foreign public. The commentaries stress the fact -- apart from what Viktor Nikolayevich said, that it was a detailed picture of new political thinking on the part of the Soviet Union -- that there are, after all, very important arguments with regard to ways of finding solutions to precisely those burning issues which burden international relations. These are intermediary objectives, outlined in Reykjavik, and methods, ways and forms of a just settlement of regional conflicts, and these are indeed the needs of bringing people together, of bringing various forces together to embark on the resolution of global issues facing the world.

[Levin] This problem, to judge by all events, will be a hard nut to crack for us. My attention was drawn to the fact that a large section of the West's press, without taking the trouble to look into what happened at the forum, what conclusions the participants at the forum arrived at, and without taking the trouble to examine Mikhail

Sergeyevich's speech carefully, immediately began another campaign of anti-Soviet slander. Slander indeed, the aims of which was to show -- as they said -- that this is all words. What is needed is deeds, but the Soviet Union has no deeds and -- they said -- the arms race is inevitable, there is no getting away from it, that lies hidden in their thinking.

[Primakov] I would like to disagree with you somewhat in this respect. Recently I was in Vienna. This was several weeks before the forum. I would say that changes in the situation show through clearly even in the countermeasures used against us now. What does this consist of? There are fewer frontal attacks on the Soviet Union. Yes, more refined propaganda is used against us, but on the frontal level, it is just words, there are no actions, and this might be parts in the overall choir.

[Levin] You know, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, unfortunately I read that in the newspaper GENERAL ANZEIGER, a West German newspaper. It is a major newspaper, and the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG occupies approximately the same position. In this regard my attention was attracted by an article in THE GUARDIAN newspaper which sums up the results of a public opinion poll in four West European countries on the problems of the modern world. This poll was conducted by a British public opinion institute and gave, I would say, mixed results. On the one hand it emerges that 66 percent of FRG citizens oppose the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons on European territory.

In France, 60 percent reject U.S. nuclear warheads on European territory. In Britain it is 56 percent and in Italy it is 78 percent. That is more. But the FRG and Italy also happen to have been transformed, to a greater extent, by the United States into bases for their missiles.

I was most intrigued by the fact that, in the view of a very great number of citizens of the West European countries, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States want disarmament. Here there is virtually an identical percentage: Say, 68 percent think the United States does not seriously intend to pursue a policy of disarmament, and 69 percent think the Soviet Union holds the same position., Here there are many reasons, but you mentioned that the politicians do not always know our proposals -- they are in the grip of delusion, and the public even more so. This tells us there is much work to be done, but, going back to the Moscow forum, to the Forum For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity, one might say this work is taking on, as you noted quite correctly Yevgeniy Maksimovich, a new quality and, of course, in the final analysis this work is very promising.

[Primakov] The forum has ended its work, but work to improve the international atmosphere itself continues, and from this viewpoint I think we have to see the Moscow forum not simply as a very big and important event in international relations, but as a start to a new, broad and worldwide effort to resolve key problems awaiting a solution. Many ideas were expressed. Specifically, we have not mentioned the idea for creating a special fund that would encourage discussion and research on the burning problems of modern times, that would elaborate some draft solutions for global problems and study conflict situations.

[Shishlin] The creation of laboratories.

[Primakov] The creation of laboratories.

[Shishlin] Open ones.

[Primakov] That is, there were very many specific and interesting ideas, but the main thing, to tell the truth, is that a strong and energetic impetus has been given to the world public that it might get involved in solving the task of tasks: Saving the world from the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

[Levin] Esteemed Comrades! Our program time has run out. Thank you for your attention and all the best.

Zholkver On Forum Reaction

LD172222 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Commentary by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Along with numerous positive reactions to the work of the Moscow forum -- and you have heard a few of them -- other voices are heard elsewhere, too. I particularly have in mind Western radio voices broadcasting to our country. For instance, the BBC expresses disappointment over the fact that new proposals on the disarmament issue did not follow from Moscow.

It is permissible to ask, however; should new proposals be tabled when the previous ones to this day unfortunately have not yet been implemented? In his address to the participants of the forum, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev recalled the fact that on the basis of the concept, which was set out at the 27th CPSU Congress, we have worked out a concrete political platform for a comprehensive system of international security. It consists of our program for nuclear disarmament, a preparedness for the full elimination of chemical weapons, and large-scale steps for a reduction of conventional weapons in Europe. As is known, our country did not limit itself just to well wishes, but it turned to such a unilateral act of good will as the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which was extended more than once.

The idea of the meeting in Reykjavik, where we brought such initiatives, which -- if the other side had responded to them -- would have meant a fundamental turn toward disarmament and the elimination of nuclear danger, belongs to the Soviet Union, too.

, who is able to demand from us more new disarmament proposals? In short, in the countless discussions with the participants of the Moscow forum that I held these days, no one put forward such demands. On the other hand, very many of them said that the United States and other NATO countries should at long last provide a positive answer to the USSR's peace initiatives.

This is where the problem lies, that someone is clearly not interested in achieving accord on the problem of disarmament, notably that of nuclear disarmament. What is the point, if any, of the last commentary by DEUTSCHE WELLE, where, as before, the doctrine of a nuclear threat, which allegedly ensures lasting peace, is being extolled in all possible ways? Is it not clear the idea of nuclear protection is not without danger and not timeless? It is capable of imposing a death sentence on mankind at any moment. Many scientists and politicians warn: Spreading nuclear weapons on earth, not to mention putting them in outer space, increases the danger of destroying all that is living on the planet.

The Moscow forum has with full authority and full voice spoken about this threat and together with this, it showed the possibilities of overcoming it. In this lies its historical significance irrespective of all the disappointments of those who did not wish it well.

Primakov, Falin View Forum

LD150210 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1930 GMT 19 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 14 Feb (TASS) -- How is one to utilize the results of the meeting in Reykjavik for further progress in matters of limiting and reducing armaments? How is one to secure strategic stability in the world? What kind of correlation should there be between interim measures and the ultimate aim of nuclear disarmament? These and other questions were discussed today in the course of a "roundtable" discussion by political scientists organized within the framework of the international forum, "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival which began today. This was said by Academician Yevgeniy Primakov. He spoke today at a briefing for journalists.

The questions that arose gave rise to various interpretations during the discussion. Critical comments with respect to the Soviet Union were also heard. There were differing points of view, for example, regarding the interpretation of the ABM Treaty and also as to whether it was now necessary to preserve the Reykjavik package.

On the other hand, positions where views coincided were determined. "Time works against the interests of peace if it is utilized with insufficient effectiveness for bringing the sides together," said Valentin Falin, chairman of the board of the NOVOSTI agency. "The prospects for achieving an accord depend not on resolving the details but on the central issues which relate above all to the arms race.

These prospects may be defined not only through the efforts of the USSR and the United States but also through the contributions by other countries to the struggle for peace," Falin stressed. Finally, unanimity was expressed with regard to the fact that a new way of thinking was necessary for all the participants in the talks.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1312

RELATED ISSUES

DISARMAMENT, EAST-WEST RELATIONS DISCUSSED IN MUNICH

CSU's Strauss on Options

LD010241 Hamburg DPA in German 1127 GMT 1 Feb 87

[Text] Munich [no date as received] (DPA) — Because of what he called the "stifling superiority" of the Soviet Union in short-range nuclear missiles, Bavarian Minister President and CSU Chairman Franz Josef Strauss has once again called for a linkage between disarmament in this sector and the strived for zero solution in intermediate-range missiles. Without such a linkage the West would, in the event of the realization of a zero solution, be in exactly the situation it was prior to counterarming, as the Soviet short-range missiles with a range of 1,000 to 1,200 km could reach large parts of Western Europe, Strauss warned today at the 24th International Military Studies meeting in Munich.

A pure zero solution, Strauss said, would lead in the West to the disintegration of the strategic alliance and was not for the foreseeable future a desirable goal. Instead an intermediate goal of a balance of forces of around 100 to 100 [as received] intermediate-range missiles should be considered. This partial disarmament would be gratifying progress, he said. The Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev was also interested in an interim breathing spell. After the Reykjavik summit, which was not a disaster but a very useful intermediate stage, the Soviets were apparently ready "to abandon their linkage with SDI," even if this still took some time.

Strauss rejected all "talk" about reaching a balance between East and West in the conventional sphere, as this would cost much too much. From this point of view too, SDI was a possibility for stemming the nuclear threat. Regarding Gorbachev's position, Strauss said that his real opportunities for negotiation were very limited because of internal Soviet factors. Despite a certain change of style, no turning away by Moscow from its past position was yet to be noted.

Woerner on Balance of Forces

LD311301 Hamburg DPA in German 0832 GMT 31 Jan 87

[Text] Bonn [no date as received] (DPA — Federal Defense Minister Manfred Woerner (CDU) has warned against a deterioration of the West's military situation. At the start of the 24th defense studies meeting in Munich today Woerner said Soviet conventional and nuclear forces are growing steadily. The readiness and ability of the western alliance to maintain nuclear deterrence is by contrast decreasing. Moreover, the reinforcement of the conventional defenses of the Western countries falls short of what is necessary.

Woerner said he regrets the population's diminishing awareness of existing threats. All this results in a "continuous deterioration" in the balance of military power in favor of the Warsaw Pact. "This is where the real security policy threat to the West lies in the coming years." It is exacerbated by a trend in the United States to reduce expenditure on defense and the presence of U.S. troops in Europe. The defense minister demanded that the nuclear components of the West be "kept at an effective level," that the conventional defense component in Europe and in the United States be increased and that the "defense readiness in our peoples be continuously maintained."

Woerner said that this and the cohesion of the alliance are the most important preconditions for an offensive and promising arms control policy by the West. The states of Western Europe owe it both to their own security and independence in the face of the close and massive Soviet military power and to their joint defense to raise the necessary resources and provide the troop strengths, reserves, and trained soldiers needed to maintain an approximate, stable balance of forces to the Warsaw Pact.

In Woerner's view the central task of the next few years is to press on energetically with military and security policy cooperation in West Europe. The linchpin remains the close French-German cooperation. "The West Europeans must optimize their military defense contributions in order to preserve the basis of joint defense and the participation of U.S. forces in it." Even if they do intensify their efforts, the West European states will be unable to balance the military strength of the Warsaw Pact with their own forces. "Not even a roughly stable balance of forces can be achieved without a large U.S. contribution to troops and weapons in Europe and to reinforcement troops for Europe."

Woerner expressed the hope that this year "may offer the chance of viable arms control agreements." Certain signs, whose importance are not yet however clear, indicate changes "in the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the West and a possible revision of the Soviet definition of its interests in relation to arms and the amassing of military power." If Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev is prepared for economic and domestic policy reasons to reduce investment in weapons for a redistribution of resources "then this could improve prospects for a process of limited and reducing arms."

SPD's Bahr on Proposed Corridor

LD311623 Hamburg DPA in German 1310 GMT 31 Jan 87

[Text] Munich [no date as received][DPA] — SPD disarmament expert Egon Bahr has extended a demand for a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons. According to this concept, submitted by Bahr for the first time publicly at the 24th international defense studies meeting in Munich today, a 300-km wide corridor should be set up in the heart of Europe on either side of the intra-German border, from which all heavy equipment including tanks and helicopters should be withdrawn.

It proposes that there only be lightly armed units in the region which are not capable of attack for this reason. The SPD politician said: "The feared danger of invasion would disappear; the present advance warning of 48 hours would be extended to 1 week." Deployment with the aim of a surprise attack would be impossible. Central Europe would become a region of structural nonaggression capability," he said. Neither would any manoeuvres with the related warfare take place.

He would not expand on the idea that with 150 km on either side of the inner German border "only a relatively narrow strip would be left in the GDR, to which these units would have to be withdrawn." A situation of this nature would have to lead to a change of mentality in the Warsaw Pact. The mentality of strategic offense would have to be changed to a strategy of defense. In the SPD politician's view, such a corridor without equipment capable of attack could be "negotiated relatively quickly and be easy to control."

The SPD disarmament expert also proposed that Western Europe should itself assume conventional responsibility for its security. Western Europe is in a position to do so both in terms of the size of its population and its economic strength. France would however have to be prepared to pool its conventional capability with that of its European neighbors. The key to establishing a European pillar in the alliance with corresponding conventional capability and a resulting leadership role for France rests with Paris alone. There would not however be any Europeanization of the French and British nuclear weapons.

Bahr also urged that as "potentially the first to be affected," the European states should be included in negotiations on nuclear weapons in the future. The injustice of nuclear states' determining the fate of nonnuclear states must be halted. While the nonnuclear states would never have access to the button, they should at least sit at the negotiating table as well. Bahr said: "The abstention from nuclear negotiations must at any rate come to an end." All weapons with a range of under 150 km, whether nuclear or conventional, must be discussed at the European table, with equal participation, "maybe even with the Europeans taking a leading role."

Papers Comment on Meeting

DW021130 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0605 GMT 2 Feb 87

[From the Press Review]

[Text] Editorials today deal with the military studies meeting that took place this weekend in Munich.

Stuttgarter Zeitung writes: Fortunately, there are private meetings where diplomats and politicians can say what they really think. The international military studies meeting is one of them, and it has a good reputation. This weekend in Munich the usual statements about unity were quickly revealed to be what they usually are: Masterful pieces of diplomatic language acrobatics. People here talk turkey: Richard Perle accused the Europeans of pussyfooting, U.S. senators complained about frustration, and Manfred Woerner admitted that he is sometimes frustrated by the Americans. The Europeans pointed out once again the importance of a two-way street in arms deals, and the Americans extended it immediately to cover trade as a whole. What oppresses Americans and Europeans in the NATO alliance was clearly stated.

The Muenster *Westfaelische Nachrichten* points out: The Americans have once again been talking frankly to Europeans. Increasing defense expenditures, the weakness of the dollar, and a series of more or less tempting disarmament offers from the East — which have put pressure on the United States to make a move — seem to have accumulated a level of frustrations. The irritation spilled out in the military studies meeting in an internal quarrel, which culminated with the threat to withdraw almost one-third of U.S. troops stationed in Europe. The transatlantic quarrels about a just share in defense expenditures are as old as the alliance itself. What is new, however, is the way in which the problem has recently been linked to economic issues, the way armament and agricultural products are being thrown together to produce an unappetizing dish.

The Konstanz *Suedkurier* is of the following opinion: It is good that one speaks frankly among friends, no doubt about it. However, if frank language is used, one must say most definitely that Americans and Europeans — the free West — really form a mutually dependent community. If U.S. troops in Europe are necessary as a counterbalance to Soviet superiority, which threatens peace, they must stay here regardless of the dollar's exchange rate. However, excessively loud tones do not promote insight — they cause the opposite

Augsburger Allgemeine notes: In view of empty cashboxes and poor economic data, the United States is doubtlessly correct in demanding some stronger commitment by Europeans to their own defense. Despite all the understanding for the Americans' concern, Washington must accept the criticism that its budget problems are caused only in small part by the fact that the United States is fulfilling its role as the leading political and military power of the western alliance. Most of the problems have resulted from the wrong economic policy pursued by the men around President Reagan.

The Freiburg *Badische Zeitung* maintains: The Munich meeting indicates how deeply the Americans are irritated by the allies although one must add for the sake of justice that not everything that was said loudly in Munich is part of Washington's policy. However, it was shown that U.S. economic and financial problems are becoming an additional burden to the alliance.

Editorial Denounces Perle's Statement

DW031227 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 3 Feb 87 p 3

[Werner Holzer editorial: "The Wrong Tone"]

[Text] The soft brown eyes are misleading. Richard Perle, a high-ranking Pentagon official, is the sharp tongue of his chief, Caspar Weinberger. No one in the Reagan government can match Perle's implacability to friend and foe. Wherever that bull appears he leaves broken china behind, and he is convinced that it is the china's fault, not the tone of his voice. Not even his boss fights so doggedly for more and more weapons and against the soft Western Europeans.

At the 24th international defense forum in Munich, Perle abandoned the last vestige of normal manners. In the tone of a Roman tribune, he barked at the assembled European politicians, military representatives, scientists, and journalists as if they were auxiliary troops of his imperium. The words "babbler" and "coward" were not part of his vocabulary, but he left no doubt that he would have considered such words as apt descriptions of the European NATO allies.

Mr Perle does not like the Europeans wanting to avoid controversy, not wanting always to stand before the Soviet Union with a threatening first, and daring occasionally to have an opinion different from his. That European politicians take the liberty occasionally to listen to the opinion of the people or that of "editorialists" is, according to Perle, obsequiousness.

It is hard to recall anyone ever having used such arrogant and impertinent tones in the western alliance. It would have been understandable if some of those he abused had walked out of the forum. But how did Richard Perle put it? In conferences Europeans tend to use "diplomatically blurred formulations" and false politeness. He was right in that respect for once.

The European NATO partners should learn from Perle and tell the U.S. Government that in the future they will not accept such a man anymore as an official discussion partner. Granted, Perle obviously seems obsessed by the idea that he is the only one who knows anything about politics and strategy, but there is, after all, still something like European self-respect. We hope!

The time has come when our American friends must be told that they are not doing themselves any favor if such people set the tone of the alliance. It becomes increasingly more difficult to explain to Europeans that this was not the opinion of a European expert and not public opinion in the United States. Mr Perle may consider us Europeans stupid, babblers, and cowards. However, we do not have to listen to that politely.

Intimidation is inappropriate as a means of alliance policy. In contrast to Richard Perle and his friends, there are only a few people in Europe who close their ears out of the belief that they know everything already. Western European policy gives cause for criticism too. But if East-West relations and the situation in the Soviet Union must be analyzed, Europe does not need any lecturing from Washington. Europe continues to bear its part of the joint defense burden, because people in the capitals on this side of the Atlantic know how to differentiate between Moscow's words and deeds.

The Reagan government's method of depicting the Soviet Union as a "threatening superiority" and simultaneously as being "ripe for inner collapse" is senseless.

The man from the Pentagon was not the only American in Munich who put aside diplomacy. Washington's highest diplomat in the FRG, Ambassador Richard Burt, even used the word "retaliation" at the defense forum, if the Europeans did not eventually give in over the trade conflict with the United States. It was certainly not a time for kid gloves or subtle distinctions. And not a time for those U.S. senators who tried again in Munich to use the "troops withdrawal" issue as a thumbscrew.

European-U.S. relations have weathered many a storm because it is an alliance of independent countries. If, during the last 2 years of President Reagan's term of office, the conviction should arise in Washington that Europeans should follow every whistle obediently, it would be a bad sign for the alliance. Western Europe must say that jointly and plainly. Richard Perle and his kind require some response.