

JPRS-TAC-89-002
19 JANUARY 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

19980716 047

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited



Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-89-002

CONTENTS

19 JANUARY 1989

EAST EUROPE

INTRABLOC

- Hungarian Envoy Sets Out Warsaw Pact Concepts on Talks with NATO in Vienna
[MTI 30 Dec 88] 1

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

- FRG SPD's Bahr on NATO Short-Range Missile Plans, Conventional Arms
[NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 8 Dec 88] 1
Bundeswehr 'Hostile Image' of East, NATO Strategy Assailed
["He." in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 22 Dec 88] 1
Commentary Lobbies Against FRG Replacing Lance Missiles [NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 3 Jan] 2
Defense Minister Kessler Alleges Lack of NATO Disarmament Concept [ADN 4 Jan] 3

POLAND

- Foreign Minister's Statement on Gorbachev UN Speech [PAP, 8 Dec 88] 3
Further Commentary on Gorbachev Troop Cut Announcement at UN 4
Called 'Great Chance' [Col Marian Moraczewski interview; PAP, 12 Dec 88] 4
Withdrawal Offer Hailed [Col Jerzy Markowski in ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI, 8 Dec 88] 4
Intellectuals on Speech [TRYBUNA LUDU, 10-11 Dec 88] 5
Polish Envoy Delivers Address at MBFR Session [PAP, 2 Dec 88] 6

YUGOSLAVIA

- Foreign Secretary Golob Calls Draft CSCE Document 'Generally Acceptable' [TANJUG 4 Jan] 6

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

INDIA

- India Sponsors Proposals on Nuclear Arms Freeze 8
Foreign Minister Presents Resolution at UN [THE TIMES OF INDIA, 15 Nov 88] 8
Gandhi Speaks at New Delhi Meeting [THE TIMES OF INDIA, 15 Nov 88] 9
World Court Role Urged [THE TIMES OF INDIA, 18 Nov 88] 9
Commentary on Missile Technology Control Regime
[Manoj Joshi; Madras THE HINDU, 3 Nov 88] 9

ISRAEL

- Libyan Plant Said To Provide CW Arms to Palestinian Terrorists [Tel Aviv HADASHOT 10 Jan] . 11

SOVIET UNION

- Journal Views Possible Steps to Demilitarized World
[Yu.B. Ulanovskiy, I.S. Shatilo; RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR, May-Jun 88] 12
U.S. Attitude toward South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Assailed
[Yu. Lugovskoy; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, Jul 88] 18
Mediterranean Urged as Zone of Peace [L. Medvedko; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, Aug 88] 21
Central Committee Official Assesses Benefits of Moscow Summit
[N.V. Shishlin interview; MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA,
Aug 88] 24

X-Ray Laser Weapon Data Alleged Falsified [S.N. Rodionov; <i>MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA</i> , Aug 88]	27
Rocket TEL Converted to Crane Chassis [A. Lapin, L. Gogolev; <i>AVTOTRANSPORT KAZAKHSTANA</i> , No 8, Aug 88]	33

WEST EUROPE

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Investigations of FRG Firms' Involvement in Libyan Plant	36
Swiss Investigation of Imhausen Subsidiary [Cologne Radio, 4 Jan]	36
Imhausen Again Denies Involvement [DPA, 4 Jan]	36
Genscher: 'No Proof' [DPA, 4 Jan]	36
Paper Says Iraqi Involved [DIE WELT 4 Jan]	37
Israeli Foreign Minister Charges FRG Role [DPA, 3 Jan]	38
Israel Denies Arens' Remarks [DPA, 3 Jan]	38
Investigations Continue Into CW Exports To Iraq [DPA, 3 Jan]	38
CDU-CSU's Ruehe on Libyan CW, NATO Deterrent Structure [DPA, 5 Jan]	38
Foreign Ministry: UK Document 'No Proof' of Illegal CW Exports [FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 7 Jan]	39
Commentary on Roots of U.S.-FRG Controversy over Libya, CW [BILD AM SONNTAG 8 Jan]	39
Bonn To Approve Stricter Laws Against Illegal Exports [SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 9 Jan]	40
Siemens Denies Involvement in Libyan Chemical Plant [FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 10 Jan]	41
Kohl Launches 'Reinforced' Inquiry into Libyan Chemical Affair [DPA 11 Jan]	41
CDU Figure Accuses U.S. of 'Subversive War' Against FRG on Libya [DIE PRESSE 11 Jan]	42
IBI, Construction Firms Said Involved in Libyan Chemical Plant [BILD 12 Jan]	42
'Informed Sources': Government Has 'No Proof' on Libyan Plant [DPA 12 Jan]	43
Kohl: Investigations of Chemical Sales to Libya in Progress [DPA 12 Jan]	43
Libyan UN Ambassador Denies FRG Involvement in Rabta Plant [DPA 12 Jan]	43
Belgian Arrested for Involvement in Libyan Chemical Deal [DPA 12 Jan]	44
Press Review for 12 January Views Libyan Chemical Plant Affair [Cologne Radio 12 Jan]	44
FRG Intelligence Confirms Libya To Produce CW Agents at Rabta [DPA 13 Jan]	44
Companies Confirm Parts Deliveries to Rabta, Libya [FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 13 Jan]	45
Press Review for 13 January Views Libyan Chemical Affair [Cologne Radio 13 Jan]	46
Genscher Calls for 'Significant' Conventional Arms Reduction [DPA, 21 Dec 88]	46
Genscher Decries Opposition to Negotiations To Ban Tactical Missiles [DPA, 22 Dec 88]	46
Genscher Urges Unilateral Soviet Cuts in Short-Range Missiles [DPA, 5 Jan]	46
Genscher Reiterates Support for CW Ban [DPA, 6 Jan]	47
Defense Minister: FRG To Modernize Short-Range Nuclear Missiles [DPA 11 Jan]	47

INTRABLOC

Hungarian Envoy Sets Out Warsaw Pact Concepts on Talks with NATO in Vienna

LD3012195588 Budapest MTI in English 1910 GMT
30 Dec 88

[Text] Vienna, December 30 (MTI)—On behalf of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty, Hungary's representative addressed the Friday session of the Vienna consultation of the 23 NATO and Warsaw Treaty member states.

The speaker comprehensively set forth the conceptions of the Warsaw Treaty member states on the solution of the open questions of the document, and their position on the procedural and organizational issues which need to be clarified until the opening of the planned Warsaw Treaty-NATO talks, hoped for the end of February. Thus he touched on, among other things, the problems surrounding the official name, object and territorial authority of the eventual negotiation forum, and the problems concerning what the relation should be between the talks of the two military alliances and the confidence-building conference to be held with the participation of all 35 states of the Helsinki process.

According to well-informed sources, the delegation of the NATO countries, reacting to the Hungarian contribution, pointed out the lack of time until the conclusion of the Vienna follow-up meeting, planned for January 17, and the importance of the issues that have not yet been decided on at consultations, but also expressed a readiness for more faster and practical work. Accordingly, they consented to hold the next consultation January 2.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

FRG SPD's Bahr on NATO Short-Range Missile Plans, Conventional Arms

AU1212155888 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 8 Dec 88 p 5

[Text] East Berlin (ADN)—Speaking to 350 scientists and students of Berlin's Humboldt University on Wednesday [7 December], Egon Bahr, director of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy of Hamburg University, emphatically warned against NATO's plans to undermine the historic INF Treaty under the camouflaged term of modernizing shorter-range nuclear missiles. Behind this is an intention to introduce new weapons that would create a new strategic situation and military options. The idea of compensation means the death of disarmament, the SPD Presidium member stressed. The FRG and the GDR must express their urgent interest in continuing nuclear disarmament. Bahr said that the nuclear overkill capacities of the superpowers correspond to the overkill capacities of tactical and short-range weapons in central Europe. They

have to be eliminated. It is not possible to negotiate seriously about conventional disarmament without including these nuclear weapons.

Bahr expressed the hope that the Vienna negotiations on conventional stability from the Atlantic to the Urals will finally start in spring 1989. The nuclear element must be neither forgotten nor placed at the end of the agenda. It must be the goal of the negotiations to put the state of common security of East and West into a treaty. Bahr called on NATO to respond constructively to the disarmament proposals of the Warsaw Pact states. These states have made far-reaching concessions to Western ideas with their offers.

Referring to the relations between the two German states, Egon Bahr stressed that even at a time of global tensions, by means of reason it has been possible to preserve a number of positive results of the previous policy of detente. "We will be able to pursue the ideological conflict only if we survive."

Bundeswehr 'Hostile Image' of East, NATO Strategy Assailed

AU2712111688 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 22 Dec 88 pp 2,4

["He." commentary: "Does the Bundeswehr Have a Hostile Image?"]

[Text] Yes, it does have a hostile image. In view of a number of positive changes in international relations, particularly following the introduction of disarmament, it is not mentioned in public so often now. FRG Defense Minister Scholz even claimed that the Bundeswehr "has never had a hostile image." But the same minister speaks incessantly about the "threat from the East," which must be countered with the strategy of "nuclear deterrence." When Rear Admiral Schmaehling was asked about his idea of a hostile image, he stated: "The Bundeswehr describes it as the threat from the Warsaw Pact."

Thus, the Bundeswehr does have a hostile image, and it continues to be linked with socialism, with the worker-peasant power. Is it not characteristic that NATO Secretary General Woerner spots a "unique opportunity" to bring about a "reorganization of Europe?" "We can no longer afford to view the process East - West developments within the framework of the current status quo (!). We must go further and initiate a dynamic process by means of which we will create a new political order in Europe," he pointed out. This is ultimately tantamount to taking into consideration a war against socialism.

And now let us compare a study with this "dynamic process" that was drafted by the NATO commander in chief for central Europe, Bundeswehr General von Sandt under file number Fue H III 1-31-05-00-VS-NfD for a new offensive strategy on the part of the Bundeswehr. This study calls for "cross-border fire and cross-border operations by the Air Force" as well as for

"fighting the enemy in depth" right at the beginning of a war. The Bundeswehr is to wage the war "in an aggressive manner (!), willing to achieve success." A nuclear strike should ensure victory.

The hostile image is one of the main motives for the Bundeswehr's and the political leadership's adherence to an absurd armament program. In contradiction to his previous statements that peace is to be brought about with fewer weapons, Chancellor Kohl again rejected a zero option in the sphere of short-range missiles a few days ago. He supports his defense minister who "sticks to a balanced concept of nuclear and conventional armed forces." Those who profit from the arms race and who do not like the borders that resulted from World War II and from postwar developments, apparently want increasingly more weapons.

NATO leaders and Bundeswehr generals loudly deplore the "gaps" that have been created through the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of intermediate-range missiles. They are trying to "compensate" for these types of weapons. A new "Lance" missile (range nearly 500 km, instead of 100), which is practically a new intermediate-range missile, is to be introduced, for example. And in addition to that, all existing systems are to be "modernized." This applies primarily to the short-range nuclear missiles, the modernization of which is already under way. This is the beginning of a new arms race.

The fact that the unilateral reduction of the USSR's Armed Forces by 500,000 soldiers, 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery systems, and 800 combat aircraft, announced by the Soviet Union, was only answered with a half-hearted yes by Bonn, is also significant. Does this mean that the Warsaw Pact should make more advance concessions before Bonn sees a "need for action?" Basically, this implies that NATO has not abandoned its efforts to strive for military superiority.

In this connection, it should be stressed that the majority of FRG citizens—between 75 and 94 percent, according to opinion polls—resolutely reject the armament plans. The reason is that, in view of the specific disarmament proposals of the Warsaw Pact states, in which no type of weapons is spared and which aim at an inability to attack in the sphere of conventional armed forces, people no longer believe the lie about the "threat." NATO and the Bundeswehr leadership also complain noisily about "insufficient acceptance" of their strategy of "deterrence," which in reality carries the risk of a nuclear inferno.

There is also another aspect: The truly anticommunist hostile image of the Bundeswehr is being nourished by reactionary traditions that continue to be alive in the "troop spirit" and the political-military targets. One needs only think of the names of barracks, air bases, and ports, such as the Hindenburg barracks in Neumuenster, the Tirpitz port in Kiel, the Tannenberg barracks in Braunschweig, the East Prussian barracks in Homburg, and the Pomerania barracks in Wolfhagen. One can is

easily see what arch-military models and targets are behind these names. To claim that the Bundeswehr does not have a hostile image is fraud and falsehood.

As far as we are concerned, our National People's Army [NVA] has a completely different tradition: a tradition of the people's struggle for liberation from exploitation and oppression, a tradition of the revolutionary workers movement and antifascist resistance, against militarism and war, for peace, freedom, and friendship among peoples.

The NVA understands its task in complete agreement with our peace and disarmament program. Its assignment derives from the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact states and the GDR military doctrine, whose character is purely defensive. Our guiding principles are: not to permit a war; never to start a war, neither with nuclear nor with conventional weapons; not to threaten anyone; not to regard any people or any state as an enemy; not to make territorial claims; to strive for a military balance at the lowest possible level.

The GDR defense minister, Army General Heinz Kessler, stated in an interview with the FRG weekly DIE ZEIT: "We consider those who attack our state and social system, the life or the freedom of our citizens or those who prepare such attacks directly and purposefully to be our enemies." It is those who want to change the status quo, the existing borders, the results of World War II, and postwar development, those who draw huge profits from the arms race, that is practically all those who, through their political and economic ambitions, conjure up the danger of a new war, and those who play fast and loose with the life and the future of the whole of mankind.

Our NVA, side by side with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal armies, is making a sizable contribution to ensuring security here at the sensitive dividing line between the two world systems. As a result, Europe has been living in peace for 43 years.

As Erich Honecker pointed out at the seventh Central Committee session, we do not overlook the fact "that those opposed to any kind of disarmament are increasing their activities. For this reason, the extent of our defense measures does not depend on our wishful thinking but is determined by the degree of the potential threat. We are shaping the GDR's national defense in the interest of its citizens and in accordance with our conditions, the topical requirements, and our obligations within the alliance."

Commentary Lobbies Against FRG Replacing Lance Missiles

AU0501114389 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 3 Jan 89 p 2

["W.M." article: "The Squaring of the Circle"]

[Text] Will the road that was followed—with the treaty on the elimination of USSR and U.S. intermediate-range missiles—be continued with further steps in 1989? The

question is justified in as much as there are powerful opposing forces at work that have by no means given up yet. What is clear to us is that all efforts have to be made in order to make the initiated positive change in international relations irreversible. The socialist countries, which are aiming at a world without nuclear and other mass destruction weapons, will resolutely advocate this. However, what is NATO going to do? Will it finally bring itself around to responding constructively to the proposals of the Warsaw Pact countries?

The influence of the socialist peace program means far-reaching problems for NATO, FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG lamented, and described any decision that aimed at replacing the Lance missiles with further-reaching weapons as "difficult even from a political point of view." Now this daily referred to the decisions that the FRG is facing in the military field as a challenge that is similar to that of the squaring of the circle. If, by deciding against any modernization of the missiles, the FRG Government responds to the desire of the FRG public, this will mean a shock for NATO, the paper continued. If the FRG were to come up to the expectations of its NATO partners, the parties in power would be threatened by losing votes in the approaching elections. There is an increasing desire among their supporters, too, to refrain from modernization, FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG noted.

FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, a daily, which if in doubt always supports armament instead of disarmament, puts the question wrongly. The government in Bonn is not at all facing a hopeless dilemma or a problem that could not be solved. Who would be shocked by a decision against modernizing the Lance missiles, and thus, against undermining the treaty on intermediate-range missiles? Nobody else but antiprogressive persons, people who are devoted to nuclear deterrence of an alleged threat from the East, people of the sort of NATO General Secretary Woerner. Not the peoples in the other NATO states.

Even less so the citizens in the FRG. Because, a majority of them are against any modernization of missiles. After all, they do not want to become the victims of those missiles, on which even prominent government politicians commented: The shorter their range the more dead the Germans. The solution of the alleged squaring of the circle is very simple. Further disarmament steps have to be agreed upon together with the Warsaw Pact member states, steps that provide more security for both sides. To make even NATO realize this, so that negotiations may be initiated, is a praiseworthy task.

Defense Minister Kessler Alleges Lack of NATO Disarmament Concept

LD0401214989 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1816 GMT 4 Jan 89

[Text] Dresden (ADN)—NATO has still not put its own disarmament concept on the table, Defense Minister

Army General Heinz Kessler stated Wednesday during a commemorative event for the 30-year anniversary of the Friedrich Engels Military Academy in Dresden.

"In the place of constructive responses to the Soviet Union's truly historic peace initiatives we only hear excuses and continually new preconditions, further and further-reaching demands on the USSR, the GDR, and the other Warsaw Pact states right up to massive attempts at intervention in their domestic policy and legislature."

The minister described military service under socialism as the responsible service of peace. At present a process is taking place to put into practice the tasks for national defense which arise out of the Warsaw Pact military doctrine. In view of this, the speaker affirmed the necessity of always safeguarding defense capability at the required level.

POLAND

Foreign Minister's Statement on Gorbachev UN Speech

LD0812190388 Warsaw PAP in English 1810 GMT 8 Dec 88

[Text] Warsaw, Dec 8—In connection with an address delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 43rd session of the U.N. General Assembly, Poland's Foreign Minister Tadeusz Olechowski has granted the following statement to the POLISH PRESS AGENCY:

Poland welcomed with immense interest and appreciation the bold and far-reaching decisions and proposals concerning the issues of peace, security, disarmament and international cooperation forwarded by Mikhail Gorbachev at the U.N. forum.

The Soviet Union's unilateral reduction in the manpower of its Armed Forces by half a million soldiers in the coming two years, withdrawal of a considerable number of military units with equipment and weapons from the territories of the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, the giving of the unequivocally defensive character to the structure of the units remaining there as well as the announced reductions in armed forces and arms in the European part of the Soviet Union will make an essential contribution to the process of weakening the threat of military confrontation on our continent, including in particular central Europe—the area to which the Jaruzelski Plan refers. This is of fundamental importance for our country's security.

I am deeply convinced that the Soviet decisions will give a very important stimulus to negotiations between 23 Warsaw Treaty and NATO states on reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, to start in Vienna shortly.

We also appreciate the willingness to continue dialogue with the United States in the spirit of realism and openness on all key international issues, as manifested by the Soviet leader.

We attach particular importance to proposals on further advancement of multilateral dialogue on the ways to solve the debt crisis, including consultations between heads of governments of debtor and creditor countries held under the U.N. auspices.

The fact that the U.N. General Assembly was chosen as the forum for the presentation of new decisions and initiatives convincingly proves the significance attributed by the Soviet Union to this organization as concerns solving the most important problems of contemporary world.

The essence of Gorbachev's address is another practical manifestation of the new thinking in the foreign policy pursued by the Soviet Union. The ideas of demilitarization of international relations, making relations between states less based on ideological foundations, philosophy of interdependence of the world and supremacy of common interests of humanity over narrow interests are in tune with the interests of the entire international community.

Poland will continue to spare no efforts so that these ideas could be ever more widely manifested in the practice of international life. They are in line with our vivid interests and the Polish reason of state. We will actively promote their full implementation.

Further Commentary on Gorbachev Troop Cut Announcement at UN

Called 'Great Chance'

*LD1212223688 Warsaw PAP in English 2151 GMT
12 Dec 88*

[Text] Warsaw, Dec. 12—Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on a unilateral reduction of troops and armaments and on withdrawing part of Soviet forces stationed on the territories of other countries was assessed from the military point of view by Colonel Marian Moraczewski.

The statement stems from the new philosophy of security and comes as a consequence of earlier policies aimed at a prospective liquidation of nuclear weapons, at bringing military potentials to the lowest possible level, and at giving armed forces a clearly defensive character, Colonel Moraczewski told PAP.

Gorbachev's statement, positively assessed in the West, should help overcome the deadlock in the Vienna talks which, as a matter of fact, have for fifteen years failed to bring about the reduction of at least one soldier or tank, whereas Gorbachev, motivated by an entirely new approach to, has at once greatly advanced on this road.

This is another great chance for the world towards the building of confidence. After all, also our state leadership is heading in this direction which can be proved by the Polish plan to reduce armaments and increase confidence in central Europe, and the decisions by the November meeting of the National Defence Committee.

In reply to a question why the decision to withdraw part of Soviet troops stationed on the territories of other Warsaw Treaty states does not apply to Poland Moraczewski said:

To withdraw Soviet troops temporarily stationed on the Polish territory would be of lesser significance as far as NATO is concerned for a few obvious reasons.

Poland does not lie next to the NATO-Warsaw Treaty divide, and so this would be a withdrawal from within, as it were, and not from the foremost periphery. Troop reductions are concordant with the Polish idea of creating zones with a rarefied concentration of arms characterized by features conducive to offensive moves. And finally, there are relatively small Soviet contingents stationed on the Polish territory, and so their withdrawal would to a lesser degree express the authenticity of the intention of the declared defensive doctrine.

One should also assume that the announced restructuring of Soviet forces with a view to giving them a clearly defensive character will also apply to those Soviet troops which are stationed in Poland.

Withdrawal Offer Hailed

*AU1212164788 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI
in Polish 8 Dec 88 p 3*

[Colonel Jerzy Markowski commentary: "After Nuclear—Conventional"]

[Text] It is no exaggeration at all to say that the world has waited for this speech with a feeling of tension, and not just because this was the first time in 28 years that a Soviet leader has addressed international society on the banks of the Hudson River. As we say in Poland, there was something important in the air, something important for Europe and the world. It could be felt, though no one knew exactly what it was. The truth was to be revealed on the UN rostrum. And it was.

In his speech, a very businesslike one, by the way, Mikhail Gorbachev tackled practically every single important problem of today, at the same time as which he presented the view from Moscow in the context of the new political thinking. One can say that this speech provided enlightenment and was a first-class lesson to anyone who did not know what this new political thinking was all about. The fact that this speech was made on the very eve of the first anniversary of the historic Treaty

on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles in Europe was not insignificant. In a way, this even served to emphasize the issue of controlling arms and disarmament.

I think the Soviet proposals are a milestone on the road to consolidating the disarmament process. Did anyone expect the Soviet Union to present international society with such a far-reaching unilateral reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments? Let us be honest with ourselves and say that we did not expect it.

"The Soviet Union has decided to reduce its armed forces," said M. Gorbachev. "Over the next 2 years, their numerical status will diminish by 500,000 men, and there will also be a major reduction in conventional weapons. These reductions will be carried out unilaterally, regardless of the Vienna talks." It is certain that not even the Americans expected to hear this. Withdrawing and disbanding six armored divisions from the GDR, CSSR, and Hungary, together with airborne storm units and pioneer units, has a distinct message. We are not going to quote the number of tanks, shells, and aircraft. They are known. Instead, let us consider what this means from a military point of view.

Someone will say that 500,000 men out of an army of millions is not a lot, and will alter nothing. Yet this is the size of the armed forces of one of the largest and most important members of NATO. It is the size of the Bundeswehr. If we divide this number among the other members of this alliance, it means sending home the entire armies of Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Luxembourg, Canada, Portugal, Denmark, and Greece together—half of NATO. Is that still not a lot?

The second, perhaps the more important side to this matter. Let us consider where these forces are going to be withdrawn from, and why. They are going to be withdrawn from the point of contact between the two largest military groups. What does this prove? It proves that disarmament consists not only of words, but also deeds. If the USSR says that it has no offensive plans against any country, but will purely implement its defense doctrine, then these words have now been confirmed by deeds, because the withdrawing of what are mainly armored resources and weapons systems, capable of making the adversary suspicious of hostile intentions and become mistrustful, fully confirms the declarations of the past. One cannot fail to notice this.

Furthermore, the announcement that accumulations of Soviet Armed Forces in the European and Asian part of the USSR, most of all in Mongolia, shows that Moscow accords the same serious treatment to peace as it does to international security. At the same time, it confirms the cardinal principle that the use of force or a threat to use force cannot be and need not be a tool of foreign policy in today's world. The realistic three-point proposal to finally settle the Afghan problem confirms this.

But getting back to the subject of arms and disarmament, one should underline a certain novelty indicated by the Soviet leader—the conversion of weapons production. The Soviet Union is ready to work out and present, on the basis of its own experience, plans for such a conversion, and let international society judge them. This literally means fashioning swords into plowshares. Is this not something which deserves the attention of today's governments? Can mankind not afford to expend its creative initiative in this direction?

The rule of global processes is such that both sides must give the casting vote. The Soviet Union did not look to the United States when presenting its far-reaching proposals. For the point is to provide new impetus to conventional disarmament, which is the most important priority after nuclear disarmament. A businesslike approach toward this issue is evident in the Soviet proposals. The USSR is not counting on immediate reciprocity. It expects, and has the right to expect, further reductions via mutual international talks. Of course, this involves Soviet-American relations. And here the USSR assured a continuation of dialogue in a spirit of realism, openness, and goodwill. Looking at these latest proposals, it is difficult to deny that one side has displayed these qualities.

Intellectuals on Speech

AU1312152388 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish
10-11 Dec 88 p 1

[Roundup of statements made to TRYBUNA LUDU by Polish intellectuals on the speech by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 43d Session of the United Nations Organization: "Polish Intellectuals on the USSR Disarmament Plans Announced at the United Nations"]

[Text] The speech made by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 43d session of the United Nations Organization with its profound humanist substance and the new vision that it contained of a world of universal consensus without violence and hackneyed stereotypes has aroused keen interest in Poland. This is what TRYBUNA LUDU was told on the subject of the speech by representatives of our intellectual life who took part in the memorable meeting between M. Gorbachev and Polish intellectuals at Warsaw Castle on 14 July 1988:

Bogdan Suchodolski: We humanists are not familiar with military technology and the strategy of using it to achieve peace, but what we do know is what peace means for people and for culture.

Mikhail Gorbachev's latest proposals are a continuation of his systematic efforts to achieve stability and bring about peace in the world.

Even before they can be realized, these proposals already comprise part of our awareness at both the social and the individual levels. They are even more important in that

they allay people's fears, fears that the world will be destroyed, that culture will be destroyed, and that the human race will be destroyed.

The proposals are a source of new elements in social awareness. They provide the long sought after psychological stability. They increase people's desire to live and to work.

Ryszard Wojna: The idea of the supremacy of universal humanism over what we call class, doctrinal truths actually permeates all of Mikhail Gorbachev's new thinking. Essentially, this represents a return to the roots and sense of socialism.

What Mikhail Gorbachev said at the United Nations Organization in New York was already present in the speech that he made at the 19th Extraordinary All-Union CPSU Conference. On this occasion, Gorbachev formulated concrete and universal principles for the coexistence of states and peoples within a new international situation.

Wojciech Zurkowski: Numbers are comparable, but it is not possible to compare various values that conceal different destructive capacities: It is not possible to convert missiles into tanks, aircraft into guns, but that is what was being done. This provided a great opportunity for drawing out bargaining and reproaching the Warsaw Pact for having more bayonets, for example. Of course, a bayonet symbolizes a soldier. These calculations, conversions have gone on for years...

With one proposal, Gorbachev has put a stop to all this haggling among experts. These are reductions in what is within reach, as it is usually put, because the arsenals away from the point of contact remain and ensure that each side has adequate security.

Why should these arsenals be constantly increased, when they can never be used? These weapons are becoming obsolete. They represent billions, and an enormous amount of intellectual and physical effort that is being wasted.

To my mind, Gorbachev's proposals represent a milestone on the road to ensuring that people can live in peace.

Polish Envoy Delivers Address at MBFR Session
LD0212095688 Warsaw PAP in English 0035 GMT
2 Dec 88

[Text] Vienna, Dec. 1—Addressing the concluding debate of the 46th round of negotiations of state members of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, chairman of the Polish delegation Ambassador Tadeusz Strulak said that in the situation when the preparing of the mandate for negotiations between 23 Warsaw Treaty

and NATO states on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe is in its final stage, Poland is deeply interested in the start of those negotiations as early as possible.

Poland is also interested in reaching the fastest possible agreement at this new forum of European negotiations in the conviction that this would enable Poland to participate in the process of vital reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, stressed the ambassador.

He also stressed the importance of the Jaruzelski Plan for the future negotiations of the 23 states, which without doubt will have to focus first on the middle stretch of central Europe, a region of biggest concentration of armed forces and armaments.

The 47th round of negotiations will start in February, 1989.

YUGOSLAVIA

Foreign Secretary Golob Calls Draft CSCE Document 'Generally Acceptable'
LD0401222389 Belgrade TANJUG in English
1939 GMT 4 Jan 89

[Text] Vienna, Jan 4 (TANJUG)—The draft final document of the Vienna Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), submitted by the neutral and nonaligned countries last night, contains a generally acceptable programme of topical meetings in the framework of European cooperation, in which cooperation and security have been affirmed as a "constant element of relations in Europe," Yugoslav Ambassador Ignac Golob stated at the resumption of the CSCE session in Vienna today.

Golob stressed that Europe needed such a document and its earliest possible implementation. He assessed that with the new document, the countries of Europe will strengthen mutual confidence and start more energetically on the road of closer cooperation, bridge bloc divisions and affirm the equality of all countries.

The CSCE will now study the draft final document and carry out consultations. The final document is very likely to be adopted within the next ten days, thus successfully winding up the CSCE conference convening for over two years.

The draft final document presented by the neutral and nonaligned countries contains proposals to continue after the Vienna conference negotiations on new confidence-strengthening measures and open talks between 23 countries on conventional disarmament in the framework of the CSCE process.

A conference on human rights is also planned, as well as gatherings on environmental protection, the Mediterranean, economic cooperation, the peaceful settlement of disputes, scientific forums, a symposium on cultural heritage, as well as a resumption of the CSCE.

Ambassador Golob stressed the importance of the realization that questions of security and disarmament concern all European states and that the voice of each one must be heard and their interests taken into account. He noted the importance of regular and firm links between the 23 countries, which are members of military blocs and participants in the conventional disarmament talks, and the

other CSCE member countries, in order to preserve the interest of the nonaligned and neutral countries.

Golob also cited the importance of meetings devoted to human rights, stressing that the promotion of these rights has become a "significant component of relations of trust in Europe." He also said that the document affirms and elaborates on questions concerning the rights of national minorities and the need for promoting the position of migrant workers. Golob emphasized Yugoslavia's considerable interest for the further successful deepening of dialogue in the framework of the CSCE.

INDIA

India Sponsors Proposals on Nuclear Arms Freeze

Foreign Minister Presents Resolution at UN
52500015a Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA in English
15 Nov 88 p 9

[Text] United Nations, 9 November (UNI)—India has introduced three proposals to freeze nuclear weapons production and ban their use, warning that unless wisely directed, new strides of science and technology might push mankind closer to a “deadlier” end.

“The genie should stay in the bottle lest it take us all hostage through our own folly,” India’s former external affairs minister Mr Atal Behari Vajpayee, told a United Nations panel last night.

Tabling the three draft resolution in the UN general assembly’s disarmament committee, Mr Vajpayee pointed out that new technologies will inevitably spawn new weapons systems as has happened throughout history.

The proposal called for a freeze on nuclear weapons, a convention of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, and assessing scientific and technological advances and their impact on international security.

The first draft, jointly tabled by India and Romania, sought a simultaneous and complete stoppage of nuclear weapons production and a cutoff in production of fissionable material for weapons.

The second draft, co-sponsored by Romania and a dozen non-aligned countries, including Yugoslavia and Bangladesh, sought a treaty banning the use of nuclear weapons.

India has been fielding both those drafts since 1982, when the second special U.N. session on disarmament was held, and each has received substantial majorities. The move for banning the use of nuclear weapons is also backed by two nuclear weapon powers. But the world body has made no headway in actually implementing them.

“It is a matter of considerable regret that despite so many years, the conference on disarmament has not registered any progress on this important resolution,” Mr Vajpayee said.

He said, “we are resubmitting our draft resolution to once again underline the importance of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons.

The third draft, co-sponsored by the Soviet bloc and Sri Lanka and Venezuela, called for “correctly” assessing the importance of current and potential developments in scientific and technological research for international security.

“We must give science and technology a human face,” the Indian delegate declared. “Science and technology cannot be allowed to become masters of war.”

Mr Vajpayee cited advances like graduated use of nuclear explosive power, miniaturisation and large-scale computing capabilities and fuel and laser technology which “will, have a cumulative impact on weapons development programme.”

“Some of these developments will propel us increasingly into an automated environment, where decisionmaking will become increasingly dependent on artificial intelligence.

“With weapons becoming more lethal, accurate and faster, the risk of war as a result of accident or misjudgment will become greater.

“New technologies will inevitably spawn new weapons system as has been the case throughout history. But these will be more subtle, deadlier and difficult to curb,” he warned.

Mr Vajpayee spoke in Hindi, as he had done as minister during the Janata rule in 1977-78. He had been criticised then as having “wasted” taxpayers’ money on a populist move, when the external affairs minister, Mr P.V. Narasimha Rao, addressed the assembly in Hindi a few weeks ago. Mr Vajpayee saw it as a vindication of his move.

PTI adds: India has called for a new treaty to replace the present “discriminatory” nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT) to legally commit nuclear weapon states to dismantle these weapons and ensure that other states did not cross the nuclear weapons threshold.

Mr Vajpayee, M.P., explained that with a cut-off in production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, all nuclear facilities will become peaceful and can be made subject to non-discriminatory international safeguards on a universal basis.

“Such a development would be a positive step towards the development of a new treaty that would give legal effect to the binding commitment of nuclear weapon states to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

Mr Vajpayee, however, regretted that the Geneva-based U.N. Conference on Disarmament had not been able to undertake negotiations on a convention prohibiting the use of these weapons. No reasons have been advanced as to why such a convention should not be negotiated, he said.

India, he said, was submitting the resolution to underline the importance of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons in the hope that the committee would be able to "bring the weight of its moral authority" to bear on the conference on disarmament to commence negotiations on the convention.

Mr Vajpayee, in introducing the resolution, noted that increasing amounts of resources, both human and material, are devoted to developing new weapons systems. "Such developments cause uncertainty and insecurity which in turn contributes to escalation of tension," he added.

Gandhi Speaks at New Delhi Meeting

52500015b *Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA in English*
15 Nov 88 p 9

[Text] New Delhi, 14 November (UNI)—The Prime Minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi, today called for the establishment of a non-violent and nuclear weapon-free world to ensure the survival of humankind.

The action plan presented to the United Nations by India aims at the establishment of a system of global security under the aegis of the United Nations and calls for changes in institutions, doctrines and modes of thought, Mr Gandhi said.

He was inaugurating the three-day conference here on "towards a nuclear weapon free and non-violent world," organised as part of the Jawaharlal Nehru centenary celebration.

The Disarmament process must be facilitated by progress in a number of collateral measures like an immediate ban on nuclear tests, prevention of the development of weapons for outer space and curtailment of military applications of further advances in science and technology, the Prime Minister said.

He said international mechanisms will be required to ensure that talents of scientists be harnessed to a joint endeavour for the fulfillment of human needs and not the extermination of humankind.

India's action plan aims at reducing conventional arms and forces to the minimum defensive level, Mr Gandhi said. Beyond a point, nuclear disarmament will come to a grinding halt unless there is commensurate progress in conventional disarmament, he added.

Unflinching political will of the international community would be required for this, and a united political will could only emerge from a truly democratic world order.

The remaining vestiges of colonialism and apartheid must go as democratic equality was essential for a common political will, he said.

The new world order must also incorporate agreed principles for national action and international cooperation in

preserving the inter dependent global environment, he said.

He warned that the costs of conservation must get built into the costs of development, or else the costs of degradation would eat away the benefits of development.

The Prime Minister said that though India does not claim original thinking for the action plan, it is the result of a long history of accumulated thought and wisdom. "We regard it as the only practical way of ensuring the survival of humankind after the dawning of this dreadful era of total destruction," he said.

World Court Role Urged

51500014 *Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA in English*
18 Nov 88 p 17

[Text] New Delhi, 17 November—An international conference on nuclear disarmament concluded here yesterday with a call for an early nuclear test ban treaty and endorsement of India's action plan submitted to the U.N. for a nuclear weapon-free and non-violent world order.

The three-day conference was organised to mark the celebrations of the birth centenary of Jawaharlal Nehru.

The conference also decided to move the international court of justice for seeking its opinion on the legality of nuclear weapons and to establish a non-governmental panel for monitoring, assessing and forecasting developments in new technologies which have potential military applications.

The conference expressed concern over the non-destruction of warheads under the INF treaty.

The conference decided to mobilise support for the early adoption of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

The participants will work for promoting a declaration to declare the 1990s as a decade for converting military industries to civilian use catering to the development needs of economies. The conference also decided to conduct quantitative studies on the relationship between disarmament and development.

Commentary on Missile Technology Control Regime

52500016 *Madras THE HINDU in English*
3 Nov 88 p 8

[Article by Manoj Joshi, Special Correspondent in New Delhi. First paragraph was boxed in in the article.]

[Text] Perturbed by the growing proliferation of missile technology among Third World countries, the advanced nations are trying to place controls on its export and use.

Although the West already has an agreement on the subject, now the two superpowers have got together and are discussing ways of keeping the technology at home. But the success of their effort is linked to their own disarmament.

That the U.S. and the USSR are trying to arrive at an arrangement to prevent the proliferation of missile technology is yet another example of superpower cooperation unleashed by the Reagan-Gorbachev meetings. The issue was reportedly discussed in the Moscow summit last year and since then in meetings between high officials of the two countries and an arrangement may be in the process of being hammered out. The "war of the cities" between Iran and Iraq last year and the use of chemical weapons in it have highlighted the problems of proliferation.

Currently the target countries for the U.S.-Soviet initiative are Argentina, Brazil and Egypt. The Argentinian Condor programme which is reported to be financed by Iraq and Egypt has been the focus of Western efforts. Efforts are also on to prevent the Chinese from exporting their missiles, especially the surface-to-surface missiles of the type they had sold to Saudi Arabia and the M-9, a 600 km range single-stage solid fuel missile, which they were reported to be trying to sell to Syria. There were also reports that the U.S. was trying to pressure India to join the club of countries capable of missile production.

Chinese missile sales

In his recent visit to Beijing, the U.S. Defence Secretary, Mr. Frank Carlucci, is reported to have taken up with the Chinese leadership the issue of missile sales to the Third World. The Chinese are reported to have rejected any formal understanding or discussions on the point, but assured the Americans that they would act in a "responsible way."

Interestingly enough, the announcement of seven Western countries that missile component export would be restricted came on 16 April 1987, two weeks before the announcement in Parliament that India had carried out the test-launch of a surface-to-air missile, Trishul. Since then India has flight tested a 250 km surface-to-surface missile, Prithvi, and soon it plans to test a "technology demonstrator" for an Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile, Agni.

MTCR's scope

As far back as November 1982, the U.S. President, Mr. Ronald Reagan, had signed the National security Decision Directive No. 70 seeking ways to stop the proliferation of missile technology. The Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) agreed upon by Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, the U.K. and the U.S. which emerged from this sought to restrict the technology of military ballistic missiles, civilian sounding rockets and space launch vehicles, and

unmanned air vehicles. The agreement covers unmanned capability to deliver 500 kg of 300 km regardless of the name—"space launch vehicles" "drones" or "remotely piloted vehicles" and both low and high tech areas will be covered, according to the proponents of the MTCR. "Projects, not nations, are targeted." The MTCR involves complete systems as well as subsystems—rocket stages, reentry vehicles, solid or liquid fuel engines, guidance sets (capable of giving a circular error probable at 300 km), thrust vector controls, warhead safing, arming, fusing, and firing mechanisms. It involves the production facilities for these and the technology for their design and production.

Fairly elaborate procedures also cover propulsion components, propellants and constituents, propellant production technology and equipment missile structural composites, production technology and equipment, pyrolytic deposition/densification technology and equipment, structural materials, flight instruments, inertial navigation and production, flight control systems, avionics equipment, launch/ground support equipment and facilities, missile computers, analog-to-digital converters, test facilities and equipment, software and related analog or hybrid computers, reduced observables technology, materials and devices, and nuclear effects protection.

Two categories

The guidelines identify two categories of countries: category I to whom no transfer of production facilities is permitted, and there is a strong presumption of denial of other transfers as well. If transfers are contemplated, there should be binding government-to-government assurances on end-use. The supplier would be responsible for all steps necessary to ensure end use. In category II there would be a case-by-case review and end-use and re-transfer assurances if the supplies could contribute to a nuclear capable missile. It is not clear under which category India falls, but in all likelihood, it would be in Category II along with China.

One of the U.S. leaders who has taken keen interest in the issue of ballistic missile proliferation is Mr. Dan Quayle, the Republican Vice-Presidential nominee. In June this year, before he came into the limelight, Mr. Quayle released a report prepared by him based on updates of earlier Congressional Research Service reports. According to him, there was a great degree of slackness on the part of the U.S. on the issue of implementing the MTCR. He said that as of June this year, despite a deadline of 1 February 1988, the Department of Defence had not filed a report to Congress detailing the personnel it would require to implement the regime.

Among the countries listed the most significant programmes are those of Argentina, Brazil, India, and Israel and the list does not include Libya, North and South Korea and Syria which are markets for the missiles. The Latin American countries have the most commercially oriented programmes with little to show on the ground as

yet. India and Israel have programmes that suit their own requirements, but in the future pressures may compel them to become exporters as well.

China is the clear frontrunner as a proliferator since its sensational sale to the Saudis, the first instance of an IRBM being sold in a commercial fashion. The Chinese of course have an ICBM capability but they have emerged as the most aggressive of the new exporters and they have upset the market by exporting systems which even the U.S. hesitates to give to any but its closest allies. The Chinese M-9 which is reported to be the next major system to find markets is a medium-range mobile missile like the Pershing or for that matter, the Prithvi. Another of the series, the M-11, is reported to have a range of 300 km with an 800 kg warload. The Chinese are also seeking to cooperate with the Indonesians to set up an equatorial launch facility. The deal will also enable the Chinese to assist the Indonesian missile programme.

The Condor series being made by Argentina is reported to have a ready market in several Arab countries and there are reports that the project has been coordinated by Egypt by funnelling Arab money to obtain a missile that will help them maintain strategic parity with Israel.

India's entry into club

With the data available, it would seem that only India is the new entrant to the exclusive club consisting of France, the USSR and the U.S. capable of producing a missile of the Prithvi class. It is easy to see how Prithvi and SLV technology can be linked to produce a missile of the IRBM or ICBM class.

The combination of missiles and nuclear weapons technology is the critical tie-up that worries the Western powers and presumably the Soviet Union as well. However the possibility of using missiles with chemical warheads which are more freely available opens up another area of concern. Countries like India insist that their programmes are for delivery of conventional warheads and their emphasis is on producing high-tech super accurate products for tactical and strategic use with conventional warheads. This can only be half the truth. However, the use of missiles in battlefield scenarios is something that Western doctrines are stressing.

The report of the U.S. Commission on Long-Term Strategy, "Discriminate Deterrence," speaks of the importance of accurate, long-range smart munitions. This bipartisan presidential commission has stressed that among the key technologies of the future war are those related to super accurate missiles with accuracies of one to three metres which "give us a high probability of destroying a wide variety of point and area targets with one or a few shots without using nuclear warheads." These, the report adds, make it possible to attack targets deep in adversary territory, airfields, fuel and maintenance facilities, command and control setups, bridges, SAM sites, intelligence facilities, railways, petroleum facilities, etc.

Three problems

In this situation, it is difficult to denounce Third World efforts as being inherently destabilising since if the arms race continues, such weapons will have to be acquired and if Western efforts at an MTCR continue, many countries will have to buy them off the shelf from the West or the USSR.

At one level the problem of technology driving the arms race is the one that needs to be tackled. This does seem to be a far cry for the present since the problem is to reduce the existing stockpiles and work out effective verification measures. After this comes the problem of the warheads—nuclear and chemical which are under various restrictive regimes and their control is yet to be achieved. Controlling technology which has so many faces is difficult.

At another level is the general move towards arresting and then building down the arms race. This also seems to be a distant dream though the last year has witnessed the first agreement that seeks to eliminate a class of weapons. However the period also witnessed the first major successful use of surface-to-surface missiles in war. In many ways the issues of proliferation, whether nuclear, chemical or missile, are linked to the whole issue of disarmament. The greater the seriousness with which the big powers approach the issue of their own disarmament, the greater will be the force of the steps that are taken to prevent proliferation.

ISRAEL

Libyan Plant Said To Provide CW Arms to Palestinian Terrorists

TA1001105089 Tel Aviv HADASHOT in Hebrew
10 Jan 89 p 1

[Report by Ilan Kfir]

[Text] During his meetings in Paris yesterday, Foreign Minister Moshe Arens disclosed that the Libyan chemical weapon plants were meant to serve Palestinian terrorist organizations in carrying out attacks against Israeli, U.S., and Western targets.

Arens and Deputy Foreign Minister Netanyahu revealed that Libya was planning the production of various new, lethal types of chemical weapons whose main target was civilian populations. Even though it was the United States that exposed the existence of the Libyan chemical weapons plant, the Israeli information was new and largely surprising.

Many Western foreign ministers congratulated Arens for his address yesterday at the conference on banning chemical weapons. U.S.-Israeli strategic and intelligence cooperation was manifested throughout the entire duration of the conference.

Journal Views Possible Steps to Demilitarized World

18070176e Moscow *RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR* in Russian No 3, May-Jun 88 (signed to press 30 May 88) pp 132-141

[Article by Yuriy Borisovich Ulanovskiy, candidate of philosophical sciences, assistant professor of the Department of Philosophy and Scientific Communism of the Textile and Light Industry All-Union Correspondence Institute (VZITLP), and Igor Stanislavovich Shatilo, candidate of philosophical sciences, assistant professor of the VZITLP Department of Philosophy and Scientific Communism: "Disarmament—Way to a Demilitarized World"]

[Text] The treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is seen in the world as an important victory for the new political thinking. A fair and profound evaluation! "The nucleus of the new thinking," M.S. Gorbachev emphasizes, "is recognition of the priority of human values and, even more precisely, the survival of mankind." (source 1) Having signed this treaty, the two biggest rival states realized the possibility of the achievement of intelligent compromise to the benefit of all mankind for the sake of its survival. For the first time in history two classes of American and Soviet nuclear arms will be eliminated, and this will be the practical start of nuclear disarmament. The measures adopted for monitoring compliance with the treaty mark an increased degree of trust between the two nuclear powers and stimulate the search for new, more important agreements. It is difficult to exaggerate the significance of the treaty for overcoming the cliches of the confrontational approach to international affairs and a strengthening of the belief that the gradual demilitarization of the world is a practicable task.

The practical changes which have come about in the struggle for disarmament demand of scientists new studies revealing the essence of the problem of the world's demilitarization and new facets of the concept of disarmament, which not only records the process of the reduction and limitation of weapons and military hardware and the reconversion of military industry but also presupposes a fundamental transformation and winding down of the armed organization of society—the system of official and public establishments and institutions earmarked for the preparation and realization of armed struggle.

Various forms of the armed organization of society exist—from standing armies which are particularly specialized in a military-technical respect through semi-military, militia organizations which acquire under peacetime conditions peaceful-creative (economic, socio-cultural) functions (source 2, 1984, No 3, p 40). It is expedient for the disarmament concept to encompass processes of the elimination of all military-specialized components without exception and the majority of other

components of the armed organization of society. But the nonmilitary activity of the militia (or police) structures which are earmarked for maintaining order should obviously be kept outside of the framework of this concept.

From the standpoints of pedantic theorizing fault could be found here: a world free of wars and armies would still come across relapses into armed violence. The disarmament concept will possibly have to be expanded in the future. But now it is important that we settle on the last word in modern science, which incorporates in the complete and general disarmament concept the elimination of standing armies and all other military-specialized forces, weapons and organizations and does not deny the need for the preservation at states' disposal of minimal militia (police) contingents sufficient for maintaining internal order. Advanced by Marxist-Leninist science, this understanding of complete and general disarmament is at the present time accepted by international law and the democratic consciousness, to which the results of the long discussion of these problems at UN forums, including the final documents of the two UN General Assembly special disarmament sessions, convincingly testify. (source 3)

The total abolition of all armed forces and arms is a task of the future. In any event, while recognizing the need for a gradual ("step by step") lowering of the levels of military confrontation, the present leaders of capitalist states consider the task of complete disarmament unrealistic. At the same time many of them share the idea advanced by the 27th CPSU Congress of a reduction in armed forces and arms "to the limits of a reasonable sufficiency" (source 4, p 74). The quantitative and qualitative parameters of these limits must be the subject of mutual coordination in each given historical period. The achievement of international consensus about the fact that the limits of reasonable sufficiency should correspond to the requirements of states' legitimate, just defense is now possible and highly probable. This idea is becoming widespread among participants in the peace movement in the capitalist world. It is being developed actively by representatives of a number of social democratic parties. In this connection A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said at a meeting with editors of the communist and democratic press: "A number of opposition social democratic parties of West Europe has in recent years been advancing a variety of 'nonoffensive defense' concepts. This is a search in a prudent direction. There is a subject for a comparison of views and exchanges of opinions here" (source 5, 5 May 1987).

People with profound knowledge and experience of work in the military sphere like the Generals for Peace and Disarmament group, for example, which includes a number of retired military leaders of Great Britain, the FRG, France, Italy, Portugal, Greece and other NATO countries, are involved in the development of the "nonoffensive defense" concept in the West. They

believe that the development of the armed forces and the growth of arms production in the NATO states are realized on the basis of the principles of offensive, and not defensive, strategy, and it is this which should be fundamentally reconsidered. A prudent alternative to the present direction of military organizational development, this group believes, is renunciation of the planning of any offensive operations, the abolition of all structures created for conducting such, elimination of the corresponding assault arms and the preservation of specially defensive forces and means of armed struggle. Thus the defense concept proposed by the West German general G. Bastian for the FRG contemplates a gradual reduction in the regular armed forces and transition to a militia defense system. "But the advantage of the new defense concept," G. Bastian writes, "is not confined to a reduction in the numbers of the regular armed forces. It emphasizes more distinctly than hitherto precisely the defensive nature of military efforts, insisting on the elimination of 'costly' types of armed forces and arms of an offensive nature and requiring maximum outlays." (source 6)

Similar ideas are being developed by disarmament experts in the United States. Highly interesting in this respect is the book by economics professor D. Fisher "Preventing War in the Nuclear Age" which was published in 1984 in the United States. The author suggests therein to the rival states military reforms which could limit appreciably the possibility of wars being unleashed even before all-embracing disarmament has been achieved. D. Fisher believes that all states should switch from the present military organizations equipped predominantly with offensive weapons to military systems armed only with defensive means of struggle. Such a transition, D. Fisher believes, would lead to the abolition of standing armies. He believes that each country could conduct a defensive war solely within the confines of its territory. D. Fisher calls for a closer look at nonaggressive defense systems, which already exist in Switzerland, Sweden and certain other countries, considering them a prototype of possible changes in the superpowers' military organizational development. The abolition of standing armies and the transition to militia defense systems would, in his opinion, contribute to the prevention of international wars. (source 7)

A most outstanding researcher of this problem was F. Engels. In a series of articles under the general title of "Can Europe Disarm?" written in 1893 F. Engels submitted for discussion by the international community a plan for general disarmament, the basis of which was the idea of the gradual replacement of standing armies by a militia defense system. In a preface written for an individual publication he formulated the meaning of his proposals thus: "I proceed in these articles from the following premise, which is increasingly winning general recognition: the system of standing armies throughout Europe has been taken to such an extreme that the

peoples will either be ruined by it economically, failing to withstand the burden of military spending, or it will inevitably lead to a general war of extermination unless the standing armies are opportunely transformed into a militia based on the people's general armament" (source 8, vol 22, p 385). Such a reform, F. Engels' estimated, would lead to a limitation of the military sphere of states' activity and would lessen the danger of aggressive wars being unleashed without weakening here the possibilities of just, legitimate defense: "for an army which is constituted by the people themselves is as unsuitable for foreign conquests as it is invincible in the defense of its native territory" (source 8, vol 21, p 355). The demand for the replacement of standing armies by a militia was even in Engels' lifetime included in the program documents of the majority of social democratic parties.

V.I. Lenin had repeatedly to oppose attempts to exclude the idea of the replacement of standing armies by a militia from the program documents of the international workers movement. One such attempt was made in 1915 by a group of young socialists who published in Switzerland the YOUTH INTERNATIONAL journal. At the height of WWI, when the unfolding of a revolutionary situation in a number of European countries had accelerated, they proposed replacement of the social democrats' former program demand for a "militia (armament of the people)" by a new one—"disarmament". The main argument in support of this program reorientation was the fact that the demand for complete disarmament was the most consistent condemnation of any militarism and any war. In response to this V.I. Lenin wrote that the endeavor of the young socialists to emphasize the need for a total end to militarism was "perfectly correct" (source 9, vol 30, p 227) from the viewpoint of the ultimate goals of the workers movement. But the adoption of this demand in an atmosphere of the approach of socialist revolution would blur the immediate goals and tasks of the working class, specifically, the need for the armament of the people's masses to counteract the punitive-repressive policy of the counterrevolutionary forces and fight just, defensive wars. V.I. Lenin linked the materialization of the idea of complete disarmament with the prospects of the socialist restructuring of society. As far as the more immediate future was concerned, on the other hand, he advocated the mobilization of the masses for struggle for practicable transformations in military organizational development which would contribute to a limitation of the militarist activity of the reactionary classes and lead to the abolition of standing armies—the main instrument of the waging of international wars.

The creation after the Great October Socialist Revolution of a regular army of the Soviet state did not lead to the withdrawal of the idea of the replacement of standing armies by a militia from the theoretical arsenal of the Lenin Party. On the contrary. This idea was developed with regard for the specific experience of the revolutionary breakup of the militarist military machine in Russia and the practice of the establishment and defense of the

new social system at the time of the civil war and the foreign military intervention. In those years Soviet defense development was prescribed by V.I. Lenin's brilliance a direction which, given the appropriate international conditions, could and should have led to the creation of a militia defense system. Its contours were outlined in works of V.I. Lenin and documents of the Eighth, Ninth and 10th party congresses. "The essence of the Soviet militia system," a party document of those years observed, "should be the utmost convergence of the army and the production process." (source 10) It was believed that a militia defense system was "not contraindicated" by the preservation of a certain part of the armed forces as a regular military force sufficient for the organization of nationwide resistance in the event of the invasion of an aggressor. It was emphasized here that a number of conditions was essential for the realization of a militia program of defense development in full. The main ones were a strengthening of the positions of socialism, the establishment in relations between different social systems of the principles of peaceful coexistence and progress in the sphere of a reduction in armed forces and arms based on general international agreements.

V.I. Lenin did much to end the cliched thinking which had taken shape among some communists in accordance with which the contradiction between capitalism and socialism would ultimately be resolved by way of war. He actively proved the necessity and possibility of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. In addition, in 1922, on the eve of the Genoa Conference, V.I. Lenin spoke of the existence of "a few opportunities for capitalism's peaceful evolution toward the new system, in which we, as communists, do not place that much belief but are agreeable to helping put to the test..." (source 9, vol 44, p 407). At the initiative of V.I. Lenin the Soviet Government proposed at the Genoa Conference the joint solution of a number of European problems, including the problem of a general arms reduction. Lenin's ideas imbued also the Soviet draft convention on complete and general disarmament submitted to the League of Nations in 1928, an integral part of which was a proposal concerning the abolition of standing armies and their replacement by a militia. The prominent Soviet diplomat M.M. Litvinov declared in this connection: "It may be considered absolutely indisputable that the proposal concerning complete and general disarmament, and in specific form, what is more, has been submitted to the League of Nations and the sphere of international relations generally for the first time, and the USSR will always be proud that this was its initiative." (source 11)

The S&T revolution which began in the mid-20th century led to the equipment of the armies of a number of states contending in the international arena with nuclear weapons and had forever, seemingly, canceled out the idea of the replacement of standing armies by a militia. But it was once again incorporated in the Soviet plan of general and complete disarmament submitted to the

United Nations on 18 September 1959. In the course of discussion of the Soviet proposals it was revealed that the idea of the replacement of standing armies by a militia enjoyed the possibility of extensive recognition. Whereas in the 1920s and 1930s it had been seen in the League of Nations as an incidental proposal, in the 1960's-1970's it has established itself in the United Nations as an integral part of all complete and general disarmament projects laying claim to a scientific approach. "In the light of the experience of negotiations on this issue which has been accumulated as of the present," O.V. Bogdanov writes, "the abolition of armies and their replacement by militia contingents may now be considered a most important and practically generally recognized part of the overall complete disarmament program." (source 12) Of course, it is as yet a question of the formation in the United Nations of a theoretical outline of advance toward a demilitarized world and not of the practical readiness of all states to consent to such transformations. However, even this is a fact of considerable significance confirming the wisdom of the well-known saying: no army can conquer an idea whose time has come.

The objective conditions for the transition of states with different social systems to general, gradual disarmament have as of the present time already taken shape. This is connected, first, with the strengthening of the positions of socialism, the elimination of the advantages of imperialist forces in arms and the stockpiling in the competing social systems of reserves of nuclear weapons which are more than sufficient for mutual extermination many times over. Victory in a world nuclear war is now impossible, and this is restraining the militarists from unleashing one. Second, not only a nuclear war but an arms race can now no longer be won. Nor do the socialist countries aspire to leadership here. Their military doctrine is "strictly defensive" (source 5, 30 May 1987) and proceeds from the need to maintain defense capability at a level precluding the military superiority of the imperialist states. The opposite party does not adhere to such a military doctrine as yet but any attempt on its part to break with military-strategic parity to its own advantage will be neutralized: the economic and S&T potential of socialism will permit an "antidote" to any military-technical system on which the imperialists might care to gamble to be found. Third, maintaining the balance of nuclear arms at its present level is becoming increasingly dangerous insofar as it is inordinately high. The current nuclear weapon stockpiles could cause tremendous disasters on the planet not only as a consequence of their conscious combat use but also as a result of technical accidents, malfunctions in the automated control systems and so forth. The reality of awesome hardware escaping man's control was confirmed by the accident at the Chernobyl AES and the loss of the American Challenger spacecraft. All these factors make urgent the task of an appreciable lowering of the level of military confrontation. The 15 January 1986 program of a gradual elimination of nuclear weapons and other types of weapon of mass extermination based over the next 15

years proposed by M.S. Gorbachev and approved by the 27th CPSU Congress takes account of this urgent, pressing necessity.

The economic interests of all countries and peoples demand disarmament. F. Engels' prediction that militarism could lead to the *exhaustion* of mankind's economic resources is now becoming a reality. The arms race is a heavy burden on the peoples, holding back their economic and social development. World military spending in the past 10 years has doubled and now constitutes approximately \$1 trillion. This is almost double the gross domestic product (GDP) of all of Africa, amounts to 83 percent of the GDP of Latin America and 72.5 percent of the GDP of the young Asian states and is almost 17 times more than total official aid to the developing countries (source 13, 1986, No 8, p 5). The arms race is not only depleting mankind's material and natural resources but divorcing from creative labor masses of the healthy able-bodied population. Some 100 million persons are currently employed in military preparations; 25 percent of professionally qualified scientists and engineers participates in military R&D. (source 13) And this at a time when the general mobilization of intellectual forces for the solution of most acute global socioeconomic problems (environmental and food, raw material and energy problems, and the problem of overcoming the underdevelopment of a number of countries and regions of the planet and others) is required. All these facts serve to confirm that the continuation of military spending at the present level could "bleed" the planet dry even without a thermonuclear war.

An alternative situation has taken shape in the modern world: either the continuation of military competition and the approach of general catastrophe or a renunciation of military methods of the solution of international disputes and a transition to constructive cooperation and disarmament for the sake of survival and creation. This situation is recognized in full measure by the CPSU, which has proposed to the world community a program of specific, joint actions aimed at an end to the arms race and disarmament. Having advanced as the ultimate goal of the antiwar struggle general and complete disarmament under strict, all-embracing international supervision, the CPSU outlined in the new version of its program the immediate goals of disarmament, including a limitation and narrowing of the sphere of military preparations; the gradual (before the end of the 20th century) complete elimination of nuclear weapons; an end to the production and the elimination of other types of weapon of mass annihilation; a reduction in the armed forces of states, primarily the permanent members of the UN Security Council and the countries associated with them by military agreements; a freeze of and reduction in forces and arms in the most explosive parts of the world, the elimination of military bases on other countries' territory and so forth (source 4, p 179). This action program is fully shared by the allied socialist countries, to which the results of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting in May 1987 in Berlin

testify. They expressed in the joint declaration "Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact States" a readiness to agree on the basis of general accords to the deepest cuts in armed forces and arms down to "a level whereat neither party has, while providing for his defense, the resources for a surprise attack on the other party and the development of offensive operations in general" (source 5, 30 May 1987).

The ruling circles of imperialist countries are encountering the growing resistance of their "own" peoples demanding disarmament. Politically progress in disarmament would mean for them an alleviation of the oppressive pressure on the part of the military-bureaucratic machine of the bourgeois state, and economically, an improvement in living and work conditions. In the time in office of President Reagan's administration a tremendous number of ordinary people have on the basis of their own experience been able to see for themselves that each new step in arms development is accompanied by a reduction in appropriations for programs which provided for food assistance to the needy, the payment of unemployment and disability benefits and the allocation of resources for medical services for persons with low incomes, elementary and secondary education and so forth. The national debt of \$2 trillion, the huge balance of trade deficit amounting to \$170 billion a year, 35 million Americans with incomes below the official poverty level, the 16-percent reduction in workers' earnings in the past 10 years—all these and other "achievements" of the United States in the sphere of social policy are linked in the minds of the masses with the reluctance of the present administration to take the path of limitation of the arms race (source 13, 1987, No 1, pp 3-6). The prospect of impoverishment and loss of the social gains made as a result of long struggle is raising the working people to a decisive encounter with militarism.

The ideologists of the military-industrial complex have labored hard, attempting to prove the "stimulating" role of military production in relation to the overall economic situation, solution of the unemployment problem and so forth. But fooling the peoples is becoming increasingly difficult. The number of conscientious studies conducted by parties of the left, trade union centers and representatives of bourgeois political economy even which demonstrate the pernicious influence of military preparations on material production and the position of the working class is multiplying in the capitalist countries. For example, the assertion that the development of military production is beneficial in respect of the creation of jobs is refuted by the data of the U.S. Government's Bureau of Statistics (sic) even. According to its estimates, an investment of \$1 billion means the creation of 187,000 new jobs in education, 139,000 in health care, 100,000 in construction, 86,000 in social services and 76,000 in military industry (source 13, 1987, No 1, pp 3-6). Even FORTUNE magazine, the organ of American big business, acknowledges: "Military-industrial policy is not distinguished by rationality. According to economists' calculations, the investment of equal resources in

the civil economy could create approximately 25 percent more jobs." (source 14) Whence it follows that a transfer of resources from the military to the civil sphere, and not the other way about, would contribute to the absorption of unemployment.

The masses' recognition of the danger of the nuclear arms race is imparting to the peace movement dimensions unprecedented in the history of the capitalist countries. The start of its current stage may be dated as of the frontier of the 1970s-1980s, when the NATO decision on the deployment in West Europe of cruise missiles and Pershing 2's brought about a storm of protest in all countries of the continent. The capitulation under White House pressure of certain governments of West European countries has not, as a whole, shaken the courage of the fighters for disarmament. Subsequent events have shown that this movement has become a stable and influential factor of international politics. Its forms are highly varied: the creation of public committees and associations advocating the elimination of nuclear weapons; the organization of marches and relay races, meetings and demonstrations, which is typical particularly of the FRG, Holland, Belgium, Denmark and Sweden; the creation of peace camps and the blocking of military bases (Great Britain, the United States, Greece, Italy); protests against calls of American warships carrying nuclear weapons at the ports of other countries (Japan, New Zealand, Australia); the collection of signatures to antiwar appeals, petitions calling for a ban on nuclear testing and so forth.

The distinguishing feature of the current stage of the peace movement is the sharp expansion of its social base. We may undoubtedly speak of the formation of a broad democratic front of struggle for disarmament. It encompasses all classes and strata of the population of capitalist countries, including representatives of privileged groups of bourgeois society: statesmen and businessmen, former diplomats and military personnel and well-known scientists and lawyers. They are being joined by increasingly new groups of people who had earlier remained aloof from political struggle. These include the youth and women, who, anxious for the fate of the younger generations, see the arms race as a direct threat to the life of the human race. The peacemaking activity of a certain section of ecclesiastical circles preaching the ideas of "salvation of the sacred gift of life from the nuclear danger," "the beating of swords into plowshares" and so forth is also contributing to a strengthening of the mass base of the movement for disarmament (source 13, 1987, No 10, p 51).

An antimilitarist trend is being revived and is strengthening in the activity of various groups of the professional classes, among which the traditions of struggle against fascism and the U.S. aggression in Vietnam are alive. Indicative in this respect is the protest of many of the West's scientists against the latest rearmament programs. Approximately 10,000 American scientists have announced a boycott of SDI and a refusal to take part in

the development of space-based assault arms. (source 15) A "vow of nonparticipation" in SDI has also been taken by representatives of those who took part in the past in the creation of the atomic bomb (the Manhattan Project) and those who, like P. Hagelstein, developed the basic ideas of the nuclear-pumped X-ray laser which have been made the basis of the "star wars" project (source 5, 16 September 1986). Another such example is the initiative of American physicians who in conjunction with Soviet medical personnel founded the "Physicians for Peace, To Prevent Nuclear War" international movement. Largely thanks to their activity in explaining the catastrophic consequences of nuclear war, more than 1,500 municipalities of Japan, West Europe, the United States and Australia have declared their cities nuclear-free zones (source 2, 1986, No 4, p 108).

The strength and dimensions of the disarmament movement are increasing in line with the incorporation therein of the working class and its political organizations. The most consistent antimilitarist position among them is adopted by the Marxist-Leninist parties. Their policy line on questions of war and peace has always been oriented toward the cohesion of the most diverse forces in a class and philosophical respect in a common bloc counterposed to imperialism. However, the unduly critical attitude toward bourgeois pacifism prevented some communist parties from capitalist countries in the past from occupying the vanguard positions in the movement for peace and disarmament. Now the approaches to an evaluation of bourgeois pacifism are changing. Whereas earlier the communists endeavored to impart to the peace movement an anticapitalist nature, they are not now linking the demand for disarmament directly with the call for the revolutionary rejection of the capitalist system. They are taking the peace movement as it is—multiclass and multiparty combining revolutionary and reformist demands—and directing its energy toward an enhancement of the purposiveness and effectiveness of the actions of all its streams.

A substantial contribution to the elaboration of the democratic concept of disarmament is being made by the socialist and social democratic parties. While remaining in practice reformist, they are effecting a change from "equidistance" in the ideological struggle on questions of war and peace toward criticism of imperialist militarism and a search for a new security concept. The results of the work of the Independent Disarmament and Security Commission, which was earlier headed by O. Palme, leader of Sweden's Social Democratic Party, and which is now continuing its work under the leadership of W. Brandt, for example, testify to this. The commission's report, "Security for All," which gained extensive international recognition, emphasized that in the nuclear age the growth of national military power cannot lead to guaranteed national security. It may be achieved not by military but political means and not at the expense of the other party but only with regard to the interests of all countries, that is, must be really mutual. (source 16) These ideas, which essentially coincide with the position

of the USSR and other socialist countries, were enshrined and developed in documents of the Socialist International Lima Congress (1986) and were confirmed during the visit to the Soviet Union of a delegation of the Socialist International Disarmament Consultative Council 1-2 June 1987 in Moscow (source 5, 18 August 1987).

The conclusions of the Socialist International Lima Congress that technology is incapable of delivering mankind from the nuclear danger and, consequently, that it is necessary to improve not the quality of weapons but the quality of policy are now being actively propagandized by the majority of social democratic, socialist and Labor parties. Highly interesting proposals and demands for reforms in military organizational development which would lower the level thereof and change its forms in the direction of the gradual elimination of standing armies and the enlistment of their forces and resources in the accomplishment of peaceful creative tasks, if the conditions for the complete dismantling of the military machine are not yet ripe, are coming from social democratic circles and those close to them. Thus taking as a basis the antiwar statutes of the Japanese Constitution, M. Ishibashi, prominent figure of the Japanese Socialist Party, has for a number of years been propagandizing the idea of the conversion of Japan's "Self-Defense Forces," which have long been a classical regular army, into a peaceful construction corps. "The purpose of the corps would with the aid of highly developed technology and on the basis of a plan for the country's transformation be to undertake the planning, construction and development of whole areas and also rescue and restoration work." (source 17) These ideas are undoubtedly contributing to the surmounting of the stereotypes of the traditional military thinking and a change in the attitude of the man in the street toward the bourgeois army, which is alienated from productive labor and is the main embezzler of national wealth.

The unions are joining actively in the struggle for disarmament. The results of the 11th World Trade Unions Congress (September 1986, Berlin), in which representatives of 433 national and international organizations participated, and also the Second World Trade Union Conference on the Social Aspects of Disarmament (May 1986, Dublin), at which unions of different persuasions from 47 countries were represented, reflected a fact of considerable significance: however different the political views of the 500 million members of the international union movement, they are united by a common endeavor to halt the arms race and turn it back (source 5, 17 September 1986). There is a growing understanding in the union movement of the inseparable connection between the difficulties of the working people's economic position and the continued military confrontation, and the possibilities of a rise in the living standard and progress in the disarmament sphere. This is why there was active support at the recent international trade union forums for the peace-loving Soviet disarmament initiatives and serious complaints addressed to the

United States on questions of a suspension of nuclear testing, prevention of the militarization of space and others. Accordingly, a highly detailed program of union joint action aimed at lifting the tremendous burden of arms from the shoulders of the working people and ensuring work and bread for all was proposed.

Positive changes in the activity of the reformist unions, even those which in the past occupied extremely conservative positions on international issues, have shown through. This tendency was manifested, for example, at the AFL-CIO congress in October 1985. The defense of peace was the main topic of discussion thereat. The association leadership's report to the congress expressed concern in connection with the United States' ruinous military spending and contained a call for the unity of all public forces to achieve a reduction in the military budget. Resolutions were passed in support of nuclear arms reductions and the ratification of the SALT II Treaty, as was a resolution calling for the economic restructuring of military industry and its switch to a peaceful track (source 13, 1986, No 8, p 56). For the first time in the history of the AFL-CIO the congress refused to make common cause with the United States' imperialist policy in Central America and Southern Africa. This contributed to stimulation of the peace struggle of the American working people and exerted a positive influence on many reformist union centers outside of the United States. M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with the leaders of the ICFTU on 9 October 1987 showed that they are displaying serious concern at the arms race and calling for the successful completion of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons (source 5, 10 October 1987).

Anxiously watching the strengthening of the democratic antiwar front, the enemies of peace are engaged in incessant subversive activity against it. The champions of peace and disarmament are being subjected to every conceivable persecution, repression and physical reprisals even. Reaction is endeavoring to disorganize the peace movement and infect it with the virus of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism. Bourgeois propaganda's lying stories about the "hand of Moscow" and the "Soviet military threat" or the so-called equal responsibility of the superpowers are being circulated. It should be noted in this connection that, according to the numerous attestations of the working people of capitalist countries themselves, nothing is influencing the enlightenment of the class, international consciousness of the working people and the surmounting of the cliches of bourgeois propaganda like the bold peacemaking efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The movement for peace and disarmament in capitalist countries could achieve big results precisely because it has a powerful ally outside of bourgeois society which rejects war as a means of solving international disputes, is setting an example of forbearance and a readiness for intelligent compromise and is calling for the mutually coordinated dismantling of the material machinery of war.

The tremendous significance of the disarmament proposals advanced by the Soviet Union and already partially embodied in specific Soviet-American agreements is revealed in this respect. The achievement of agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States on a global double zero for intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and progress in agreement on the question of a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms confirm the possibility of the further rapprochement of the USSR and the United States in a number of areas of disarmament problems. The results of the meeting of the top leaders of the USSR and the United States in Geneva (1985), Reykjavik (1986) and Washington (1987) showed that open obstruction of the cause of disarmament on the part of ruling circles of the capitalist world is becoming increasingly difficult. They are being compelled to search for solutions of the problems which have built up in this sphere by the objective logic of unfolding circumstances and the growing demands of all peoples, the American people included.

At the same time the obstacles being erected by reactionary forces in the way of mankind's progress toward a demilitarized world cannot be underestimated. In order to effect profound breakthroughs in the nuclear disarmament sphere it is necessary to block the interests of the imperialist military-industrial complex and overcome its resistance. The general mobilization of all peace-loving forces to combat its criminal activity is an indispensable condition for emergence from the critical situation in which mankind has found itself at the end of the 20th century. New efforts in the struggle for a restructuring of the world social consciousness and the establishment of new political thinking free of military-technocratic stereotypes are needed. The times demand not declarations but the decisive actions of all peace-loving forces. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, in its policy word and deed are not at odds.

Sources

1. M.S. Gorbachev, "Perestroika and New Thinking for Our Country and the World," Moscow, 1987, p 149.
 2. NAUCHNYY KOMMUNISM.
 3. O.V. Bogdanov, "Problems of Disarmament in International Law," Moscow, 1979, p 35; V.L. Israelyan, "The United Nations and Disarmament," Moscow, 1981, pp 53-54; V.F. Petrovskiy, "Disarmament: Concepts, Problems, Mechanism," Moscow, 1982, pp 38-39.
 4. "Material of the 27th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1986.
 5. PRAVDA.
 6. "Generals Against 'Retroarmament'," Moscow, 1985, p 122.
 7. Dietrich Fisher, "Preventing War in the Nuclear Age," Totowa-New Jersey, 1984, pp 44.
 8. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works".
 9. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works".
 10. "The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums," Moscow, 1970, vol 2, p 176.
 11. "Documents of the USSR's Foreign Policy," Moscow, 1966, vol 11, p 170.
 12. O.V. Bogdanov, "Problems of Disarmament in International Law," Moscow, 1979, p 35.
 13. PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTZIALIZMA.
 14. FORTUNE, 30 April 1984.
 15. VOPROSY FILOSOFII No 8, 1987, p 122.
 16. "Security for All. Disarmament Program. Report of the Independent Disarmament and Security Commission Chaired by Olaf Palme," Moscow, 1982, p 42.
 17. Mashashi Ishibashi, "Unarmed Neutrality," Moscow, 1984, p 117.
- COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1988
- U.S. Attitude toward South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Assailed**
18070010 Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 7, Jul 88 pp 2-4
- [Article by Yu. Lugovskoy under the rubric "South Pacific": "The Problem of the Nuclear-Free Zone"]
- [Text] The first naval commander to sail across the largest ocean on our planet, Ferdinand Magellan, named it the Pacific. The weather conditions in that far-off year of 1521 really were favorable. The ocean later displayed to the fullest its harsh disposition more than once, engulfing in the deep the ships of El Canho, Urdaneto, Mendana, La Perouse and many other brave explorers. But perhaps no storms and hurricanes can compare with the trials that have befallen the great ocean and the people living in the lands adjoining it with the onset of the era of military nuclear power.
- "Peace is our profession" is the inscription over the entrance to the American Anderson Air Force Base on Guam. But danger has taken on the wholly palpable image of the United States armed forces for the residents of Oceania. No one has ever caused greater harm to their living conditions than the American military. The monstrous symbol that was seared into the memory of

humanity by the hellish flame of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is reminiscent of this. This tragedy had a continuation as well. The United States carried out 66 test detonations on the Bikini and Eniwetok atolls, which were turned into nuclear testing grounds. The Pentagon has also buried radioactive wastes there. France has carried out over 80 nuclear tests on the Mururoa and Fangataufa atolls. Also not forgotten is the fact that in the 1950s and 1960s, England carried out its own nuclear tests in the Australian desert of Victoria. Their ruinous consequences are a permanent warning to the inhabitants of Oceania. Who would believe that these sinister preparations were dictated by a concern for peace? They are dangerous because they not only whipped up the arms race, but also created a most immediate threat to the inhabitants of many archipelagos.

As recently as the not-so-distant past, these people were colonial subjects without rights, and their sentiments did not have to be reckoned with in the capitals of the mother countries. But times have changed, and they are speaking up at the top of their voices. Today, when many independent island states have arisen in the Pacific Ocean that are actively involved in the solution of problems of international life, this extensive region has ceased to be a forgotten periphery. The states of Oceania differ appreciably from each other in social structure and political order, but there are factors that bring them closer together. The growth in the national self-awareness of the peoples inhabiting them, feelings of personal affiliation to the resolution of the most important problems on which the fate of war and peace depend, can be pointed out first and foremost. This was expressed in particular in the fact that in 1971 they created their own regional organization—the South Pacific Forum (SPF). It includes 11 states and two self-governing territories: Australia, New Zealand, Papua-New Guinea, the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Western Samoa. They have all come out in favor of declaring the southern part of the Pacific Ocean a nuclear-free zone.

A treaty on this score was devised and approved on 6 Aug 85 at a session of the SPF held in the capital of the Cook Islands—the city of Avarua on the island of Rarotonga. A year later, having gathered at the next session in Suva, the capital of Fiji, the participants in the forum discussed questions of the ultimate formulation of the nuclear-free zone. The Treaty of Rarotonga envisages the refusal of all of the members of SPF to develop, acquire or deploy nuclear explosive devices on their territory. It imposes a ban on holding any nuclear testing, as well as the burial of radioactive wastes, in the zone where the treaty is in effect. "We do not want our land to suffer the fate of Runit Atoll!" the forum participants declared, having in mind the island in Micronesia that was turned into a radioactive-waste dump.

The Rarotonga Treaty has been signed by eleven of the 13 member states of the SPF and ratified by nine of them. It made a large contribution to reviving the international

climate in this part of the world, stretching from Latin America to the Indian Ocean and from the equator to the 60th parallel of the southern hemisphere, when it went into effect at the end of 1986. Three protocols have been added to the treaty that stipulate the obligations of the nuclear powers to respect the status of the nuclear-free zone and not to employ weapons of mass destruction against the countries taking part in the treaty, as well as not to hold nuclear tests in the zone where it is in effect.

How have the nuclear powers reacted to the treaty? The Soviet Union signed protocols 2 and 3 of the Rarotonga Treaty, which stipulate the obligations of the nuclear powers to observe the nuclear-free status of the zone, without delay. Expressing a readiness to be a guarantor of the zone, the USSR proceeded from the fact that its creation in the South Pacific served as an important contribution to the formation of a reliable system of security in the whole Asian-Pacific region and would facilitate a reinforcement of international rules on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Favoring the creation of an all-encompassing system of security, the Soviet Union feels that the region of Asia and the Pacific Ocean should become an inalienable part of it.

Two years ago, speaking in Vladivostok, M.S. Gorbachev especially emphasized the necessity of erecting a barrier to the spread and accumulation of nuclear weapons in Asia and the Pacific. The start of negotiations on reducing the activeness of naval forces in the Pacific, first and foremost via limiting the operating regions of the vessels equipped with nuclear weapons as well as limiting rivalry in anti-submarine warfare, was proposed in this regard.

The PRC also signed the protocols to the Rarotonga Treaty. And what of the other nuclear powers?

Protocol 1 of the treaty calls upon the United States, England and France in particular to take on the obligation of ensuring the observance of the principles of the Rarotonga Treaty in relation to the territories controlled by those powers in the Pacific. This appeal was ignored, however, in the West in a most haughty and challenging form. It was officially declared in Washington that the United States refused to sign the protocols to the treaty; England also declined. As for Paris, they reacted not only negatively, but with overt hostility. France intentionally timed its next nuclear explosion on Mururoa Atoll, the 81st, for the day the Rarotonga Treaty went into effect, 11 Dec 86. And recently the commander-in-chief of French armed forces in the Pacific region, Vice Adm Pierre Tireau, declared that France would soon begin to use Fangataufa Atoll, about 40 kilometers from Mururoa, for testing again. This reaction worsened the confrontation that had earlier been revealed between the countries of the Pacific and the imperialist West.

It is true that certain differences in the treatment of the problems and ways of resolving them are observed among the SPF member countries. Some of them feel that the provisions of the treaty are insufficient, since

they do not envisage a ban on the transit of naval vessels and aircraft with nuclear weapons through the zone. The treaty also does not pose unconditional obstacles for the calling of such ships at the ports of the member states of the forum or the landing of aircraft at their airfields, but leaves the resolution of the issue to the discretion of the individual countries. Such a formulation was the result of a compromise achieved under the influence of Australian diplomacy, which did not want to sacrifice its obligations to the United States. It elicited considerable dispute. Taking this circumstance into account, such countries as Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands have as yet refrained from signing the treaty, feeling it to be insufficiently consistent, although they have declared their intention of observing it. As for Australia, that country, as opposed to New Zealand, has not closed off access to its territorial waters for ships with nuclear weapons or its airspace to aircraft carrying such weapons. Nonetheless, the treaty in its current form can serve as a solid platform for common actions aimed against the dangerous militaristic preparations of the West.

The Pentagon assigns an ever growing role to the Pacific Ocean in its strategic planning. The United States has created a broad-scale military infrastructure there that includes 160 bases. They have thrown together a "strategic triad" of Washington-Tokyo-Seoul for the purpose of developing it further, serving as the foundation for a broader Pacific alliance analogous to NATO as planned at American headquarters.

The second strongest strike force of the American armed forces outside the United States is concentrated in the Pacific region. Six aircraft-carrier groups and approximately 190 American naval vessels, 1,125 aircraft and about 180,000 servicemen are stationed there. According to the estimates of the foreign press, the Pentagon has roughly 10,000 nuclear warheads located at U.S. bases in the Philippines and Micronesia, on ships and in submarines. The Tomahawk cruise missiles, the electronic memories of which have hundreds of new Hiroshimas, have been arriving to arm the U.S. Pacific Fleet since 1984. The flight range of 2,500 kilometers transforms these missiles into strategic weapons for "limited nuclear war," for which the Pentagon has devised scenarios for the Pacific Ocean as well.

In the event of nuclear conflict in Europe, the United States intends to open a second front in the Far East immediately. This is the sense of the steps to "NATOize" Japan, this is the essence of Pentagon preparations in the Pacific. It is not for nothing that the Paris journal AFRIQUE-ASIE noted that "the Pacific Ocean conceals, beneath its image of tropical paradise and unconcern, one of the most militarized areas of the world."

The strategic role of the Pacific in the eyes of the American generals increases even more in connection with the development of different versions of "limited nuclear war" and preparations for "Star Wars." In recent

years the United States and some of its NATO allies, as well as Japan, have been holding the large-scale RimPac maneuvers in which major air force and naval formations are taking part. Various systems related to SDI are being tested in the Pacific. Minuteman missiles are launched from the Vandenberg Air Force Base in California which, covering about 7,700 kilometers in half an hour, reach targets in the lagoon of the Kwajalein Atoll. Altair stations for tracking space targets have been constructed on that atoll and on Saipan. The Pentagon is creating the far-flung Seaguard ocean radioelectronic listening system at bases in the Pacific and conducting tests of the ASAT anti-satellite system, which is a prelude to the Star Wars program.

Pentagon officials and other officials in Washington are mentioning some "new ocean strategy" in their appearances of late. Its parameters were recently outlined by the journal NUCLEAR TIMES, published in New York: "First of all, this strategy envisages waging a global war. In the past, United States doctrine proceeded from the fact that the main theater of military operations would be Europe. Today the Pentagon, and especially the Navy, is oriented both toward Europe and toward the Pacific Ocean. Second, having backed away from previous thinking, according to which any employment of nuclear weapons would quickly grow into a global war, the Pacific command has at its disposal the appropriate means and is prepared to wage a nuclear war limited to the Pacific theater of military operations. If war breaks out on the Korean peninsula, the land forces envisages, for example, a nuclear offensive limited to that region. If an exchange of nuclear strikes occurs in the northern part of the Pacific, the Navy feels that it can be limited to a battle at sea."

Taking these circumstances into account, the United States intends to consolidate its hold on "advance lines" in the Pacific, striving to set up new strong points here. The Pentagon is carrying out intensive military preparations in Hawaii. Easter Island, belonging to Chile, has fallen into the field of its steadfast attention, where American military specialists have modernized the Mataverí Airfield, now even able to receive space-shuttle type reusable space vehicles. The United States also has possible anchorages in Western Samoa, their colonial possession.

At the same time, Washington is applying strong pressure on a number of island nations to incline them toward collaboration with the Pentagon and threatening those of them that are displaying a lack of receptiveness to American military doctrines. The reaction of the United States to the decision of New Zealand not to allow any foreign vessels with nuclear power plants or weapons in their ports is instructive in this regard. They do not want to tolerate such "free thinking" in Washington. The United States declared in reply that they would "cease the fulfillment of their obligations in the sphere of security to New Zealand according to the ANZUS

treaty." Washington also put levers of economic pressure into effect, and they have them: over 15 percent of New Zealand exports go to the United States.

The United States was also clearly troubled by the fact that the example of the SPF member countries could create a precedent and prove to be attractive to the states of other regions of the Pacific and Asia as well. Say, the members of Association of States of Southeast Asia (ASEAN), upon which Washington assiduously foists its military and political protectorate, if not via inclusion in the planned "Pacific community," then on a bilateral basis. "Fear of the fact that the anti-nuclear infection will encompass the whole Pacific" is growing stronger in the United States, notes AFRIQUE-ASIE on this score.

It is appropriate to note here that the signing of the Soviet-American INF treaty has had a noticeable effect on the political mindset in the countries of the Asian-Pacific region. Overt mistrust of the concepts of nuclear restraint and confrontation that Washington justifies with the aid of an artificially created "face of the enemy," is expressed here more and more often, with preference given to steps to ensure overall security. Such a tendency reflects the appearance of a world view formulated on the basis of a new scale of moral values in politics based on the realities of the surrounding world.

The development of such political trends, entirely natural, can disrupt all of the Pentagon's plans. The movement against calls by U.S. vessels with nuclear death on board has, after all, taken on the broadest scale in the Pacific. It has obtained great sweep in Japan, where already half the population lives in cities and districts that have been made nuclear-free zones. The movement to eliminate the U.S. military bases at which nuclear weapons are located has taken on a new impetus in the Philippines. The support that the new constitution, which includes anti-nuclear articles, has received testifies to this as well. Vanuatu, the Solomon Islands, Fiji, Tuvalu and Papua-New Guinea, following the lead of New Zealand, have also refused to allow the American floating arsenals of nuclear weapons into their ports.

It should be noted that the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific is immediately contiguous with an analogous zone in Latin America as defined by the Tlatelolco Treaty signed by 23 states in 1967. There also exists a treaty on the Antarctic from 1959 that bans any military activity on that continent. Taken together, they could lead to the removal from the sphere of the arms race of enormous spaces south of the equator and to the creation of a nuclear-free belt embracing a large portion of the Southern Hemisphere.

As for the Soviet Union, it entirely supports the declaration of the South Pacific as a nuclear-free zone and calls upon all of the other nuclear powers to guarantee its status in either unilateral or multilateral fashion.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union, such a step would be a material contribution to the formation of a system of security in the Asian-Pacific region. The USSR, for its part, provides full guarantees that its will not be the first to employ nuclear weapons, the more so against states that do not possess nuclear weaponry and do not permit them on their territory. It is taken into account in Moscow herein that it is impossible to devise measures on which a rise in the level of security in the Asian-Pacific region immediately depends without the participation of the United States. Proceeding from this, the Soviet Union also favors holding concrete negotiations on reducing the activeness of military fleets, and first and foremost vessels equipped with nuclear weapons, in the Pacific Ocean. It has declared unambiguously its readiness to negotiate on the extension of confidence-building measures to this ocean region, especially to those regions where the most vital shipping routes run.

The timeliness of these measures cannot even be denied at American headquarters. The chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm Crowe, thus recently acknowledged that the idea of a dialogue on confidence-building measures in Asia and the Pacific merits attention.

Soviet initiatives in relation to the Asian-Pacific region are an important component of the overall program of activities of the Soviet Union in the international arena as developed by the 27th CPSU Congress. The projection of this program to Asia and the Pacific, developed so visibly and in such detail in Vladivostok two years ago, serves as a convincing example of how vital and effective the influence of the new thinking implicit in Soviet foreign policy is on international life.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1988 Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

Mediterranean Urged as Zone of Peace
18070009 Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 8, Aug 88 pp 11-13

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences L. Medvedko:
"Mediterranean Crossroads"]

[Text] Perhaps nowhere in the world do so many visible and invisible borders and boundaries come together and crisscross as in the Mediterranean. There is no other such sea that washes the shore of three continents at once—Europe, Asia and Africa—and almost twenty countries and several hundred islands.

The unique nature of the Mediterranean Sea, however, is not geographical alone. Here is where distinctive political boundaries run between East and West, as well as economic borders between North and South. This is a great crossroads of human history, the cradle of ancient civilizations and three monotheistic religions. The legacy of ancient Egypt, Phoenicia, ancient Greece and Rome have largely determined the look of the contemporary

culture of Europe, the Near East and North Africa. A particular "Mediterranean" character and way of thought with the inexhaustible optimism and unshakable faith in the possibilities of man and the interconnection and interdependence of the world characteristic of the residents of this part of the world was formed as a result.

The Mediterranean did not just give life to many civilizations. It was also the detonator for deadly wars and bloody conflicts. Both world wars, it could be said, were born right here. Whereas at first, however, the seats of war arose on the perimeters—Libya, the Balkans and Spain—after World War II the region itself proved to be at the epicenter of dangerous local conflicts. It has been transformed into an arena of confrontation on a global scale, and into a testing ground for trying out neocolonialist doctrines and methods.

The ancient name of the Mediterranean—the "Inner Sea"—has acquired a new meaning in the postwar period, when it has proven to be not only within three continents alone, but three "political worlds" as well—socialist, capitalist and the so-called Third World, represented by the developing countries. The region has to a certain extent become a unique mirror, or more precisely a chip of the contemporary world—multifaceted, contradictory and at the same time seized by common anxieties and concerns for the future of current and future generations and averting thermonuclear catastrophe.

The problem of security in the Mediterranean is a key one in joint efforts aimed at creating a nuclear-free and non-violent world. Various aspects of it are at the center of attention of many international forums and conferences—on Malta, on Cyprus, in Yugoslavia, Greece, Algeria, Italy, Libya and Syria. This problem was also discussed among other topical issues of a Near East settlement in the course of a broad dialogue among Soviet and Arab scholars and social and political figures that was held in Amman, Jordan in March of 1988.

"For us the Mediterranean is not a peripheral and distant region, it is close to our southern border, through which runs the natural maritime route linking our southern ports with world oceans. We naturally have a vested interest in having the routes of peace, and not the tracks of war, pass here," said M.S. Gorbachev during a visit to Yugoslavia. The CPSU Central Committee General Secretary came out with a new and important foreign-policy initiative there concerning the Mediterranean, the security of which is closely linked with security in Europe.

The security problems of the Mediterranean have been repeatedly discussed in the UN General Assembly. In 1986 it passed a special resolution in which the necessity of the withdrawal of foreign fleets and the departure of all occupation forces from the territory of others was pointed out. These problems occupied an important place in the meetings of the leaders of the USSR and the United States in Washington and Moscow.

At the Epicenter of Storms

The Mediterranean region became one of the chief arenas for the national-liberation movement almost immediately after World War II. The waves of the movement hurled the colonizers out of Lebanon and Syria, seized Palestine and Transjordan and flew past Tunisia and Morocco. Revolutions of liberation also occurred in Egypt and Libya. The Algerian people in the Maghreb, west of the Suez, had to wage an especially prolonged and bloody war for independence, costing the lives of about a million of its sons and daughters. In Mashriq, east of the Suez, where old and new colonizers have resorted and are resorting to various military and political maneuvers to preserve their presence there, the Near East conflict continues.

One can often encounter in academic literature the definition of neocolonialism as "colonialism without colonies" or as "economic colonialism." This seemingly emphasizes that neocolonialism relies chiefly on economic rather than military power. Objections are even sometimes expressed against the very term "military neocolonialism" in this regard, feeling that it contradicts logic in the strict academic sense.

The logic of life, however, is more convincing than the logic of abstract inferences. The practices of neocolonialism in the Mediterranean do not confirm the fixed stereotypes of political thinking. The facts upon which history is written testify to this as well. At least about half of the more than two hundred postwar regional conflicts have occurred or are occurring in the Mediterranean region or close by.

The Near East and other Mediterranean conflicts are distinctive chronic illnesses. They abate and then flare up anew, less and less subject to control and settlement. In the 1940s there were wars in Greece and Palestine, in the 1950s armed operations occurred first in the Sinai and at the Suez Canal, and then in Lebanon and North Africa. The aggression unleashed by Israel against the Arab countries in 1967 was accompanied by new outbursts of bloodshed—the war of 1973 and two prolonged crises in Lebanon and the Persian Gulf zone.

The roots of many conflicts often go back to the past. But it is namely military neocolonialism, inflaming national, ethnic, sectarian and other disputes and contradictions, that directly creates the many extensive "fields of tension" that are becoming the sources of regional conflicts. Take just the tragic schism of Cyprus, inspired by NATO circles. It is namely with the support of these circles that Ankara continues to ignore UN resolutions aimed at the just resolution of Cypriot problems. NATO is trying to transform the island into an unsinkable aircraft carrier. Great Britain has so-called "sovereign" military bases on its territory, the rights to which also extend to its allies in the North Atlantic bloc, and first

and foremost the United States. The transoceanic militarists have also been granted a series of privileges to the airport and maritime port of Larnaca. They have also created radio spy centers used in the interests of NATO and Israel.

The Arab-Israeli conflict and the Cyprus problem, as is well known, far from exhaust the "hot spots" of the Mediterranean. Long-suffering Chad has existed nearby in an atmosphere of war for over 20 years now. The Lebanese crisis has continued for over ten years. The West Saharan problem and Greek-Turkish disputes in the Aegean Sea also await their political resolution.

New and no less acute and dangerous conflicts are being added to the chronic ones—on the land and sea borders of Libya, on the borders of Iran and Iraq and in the Persian Gulf zone. And foreign troops or foreign military bases are everywhere under various pretexts. This is most often substantiated either with "ensuring security" (in the Persian Gulf zone), the protection of the "vital interests" of the United States and all of NATO (in Morocco, on Cyprus, in Turkey) or for "peacemaking aims" (in Lebanon, the Sinai or Chad). The tension from this is naturally not declining at all. At the same time, the Soviet-American agreement to eliminate various classes of missiles, as well as the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, may impart a dynamism to the process of breaking up the conflicts and ensuring security in the Mediterranean. Much depends on which trend gains the upper hand.

Testing Doctrines

It is difficult to designate the precise time line between the fading away of colonialism and the appearance of neocolonialism. The stage that laid the foundation for the expansion of American imperialism in the Mediterranean, replacing the "old" colonialism, can be wholly determined. The Truman Doctrine, proclaimed in March of 1947, signified the overt transition of the United States to the confrontation of force with the Soviet Union and violent methods of struggle against the liberation movement of the peoples of that part of the planet.

The changing Washington administrations have over subsequent years observed a certain continuity in their aggressive strategic doctrines aimed both against the USSR and against the liberated countries. And it is important to note that such doctrines have been tested primarily in the Mediterranean, where the United States has repeatedly used military force, more than once resorting to nuclear blackmail.

It is not without interest in this regard to recall one intentional "coincidence" connected with the proclamation of the Truman Doctrine. At the time, over 40 years ago, the Pentagon was transforming the U.S. Navy Mediterranean group into the 6th Fleet, which was changing from a "deterrent force" into a direct accomplice in many armed interventions against the freedom-loving countries of the region. An unprecedented concentration of naval

forces in this closed maritime space had begun. Today almost the whole Mediterranean is entangled in a thick web of American military bases. They are in Italy, Turkey and Greece and on Cyprus, as well as in other countries. And although the peoples of the Mediterranean countries are coming out more and more actively against this "cancerous tumor," the Pentagon literally has them by the teeth, hatching interventionist plans against the peace-loving Arab and African countries.

The Washington administration has been trying more and more persistently lately to involve its NATO allies in its aggressive plans. Some of them, first and foremost France and Italy, took part in the "multinational forces" operations in Lebanon and sent naval vessels into the Persian Gulf, at the same time agreeing to replace American soldiers in Europe with their own in the event that the former had to operate outside the borders of the "zone of responsibility" of the North Atlantic bloc. Many European countries of NATO have moreover begun the creation of their own "rapid deployment forces" at the behest of Washington.

Summarizing such instances, the journal AFRIQUE-ASIE wrote: "All of this cannot help but evoke legitimate apprehensions among the non-aligned countries of Africa and the Near East, the welfare of which is doomed to misfortune, since they possess natural riches or are located on important lines of communication that are regarded as some countries of the North as 'strategic'... The United States wants to lock up the Mediterranean Sea, creating an impermissible threat to the sovereignty, especially maritime, of such countries as Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Cyprus, Syria and even Egypt, who are far from being members of the Warsaw Pact and are guilty only of one thing—the fact that they are non-aligned countries."

The inclusion of their "strategic ally"—Israel—in the militarist plans of the United States is creating an even more explosive situation in the Mediterranean. Washington and Tel Aviv are waging covert and overt wars against the Arab states. Recall the criminal raids of the Israeli air pirates on Iraq and Turkey, American ones on Libya and American-Israeli-NATO intervention in Lebanon. The availability of nuclear weapons to the United States and Israel herein creates the danger of the escalation of regional conflicts into a global catastrophe.

The Imperatives of the New Thinking

In the West, as a rule, they approach problems of regional security, be it in the Mediterranean or the Persian Gulf, from the point of view of the disposition and correlation of forces, and not the observance of a balance of interests of the contiguous and nearby states. This is a manifestation of the old political thinking based on such categories as global confrontation and the struggle for spheres of influence and a disregard for the legitimate national interests of the Mediterranean countries themselves, as well as some others located in the immediate proximity.

The chief contradiction of the system of modern international relations is proving to have a great influence on the process of development of regional conflicts in the Mediterranean and breaking them up. The discussion concerns not so much the confrontation of the two blocs—NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries—as it does the broader global contradiction between militarism and the forces of peace. The difficulty of breaking up conflicts in our times is conditioned not least of all by the vitality of stereotypes of the deeply rooted old thinking.

Such stereotypes lie directly at the foundation of the strategic doctrines that the United States is to this day trying to bring to life in the Mediterranean. As a result, as the French journal *MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE* has written, "it has been transformed into a "dangerous lake" with a high degree of military confrontation not only among Mediterranean forces, but also those of the two great powers possessing nuclear weapons. These weapons could become deadly for all of the "three worlds" as well as for human civilization overall. It is thus difficult to overestimate the significance of the Soviet-American treaty on medium- and short-range missiles, which directly affects the interests of Mediterranean security. American missiles loaded with nuclear material, after all, are aimed not only at the USSR, but also have a sufficient operating radius to reach the territory of almost all the Mediterranean states.

It is obvious that the elimination of the causes of regional conflicts is essential for breaking them up. Under the conditions of the nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind, the peoples of the world are like a group of mountain climbers roped together on a mountainside. They can only proceed together to the summit together, or else fall together into the abyss. It is namely the impossibility of a military resolution for international contradictions that dictates the new dialectics of security.

The qualitatively new situation that has arisen in international relations since the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on medium- and short-range missiles has opened up real possibilities for the spread of those positive processes that are making their way on the European continent, and in the world overall, to the Mediterranean as well.

Guided by the new political thinking and with a sober regard for prevailing realities, the Soviet Union has advanced a constructive and concrete program for ensuring security in the Mediterranean. It envisages reducing the high level of nuclear confrontation that exists here, eliminating foreign military bases and the facilities of non-Mediterranean states, limiting the activeness and scope of the activity of naval forces and extending confidence-building measures in the spirit of the Stockholm agreements to this region. Our country wholly supported the set of positive proposals aimed at reviving the climate in the region that was adopted at the July 1987 meeting of non-aligned Mediterranean states on the Yugoslavian island of Brioni.

The new and constructive proposals that were presented for the consideration of international society by M.S. Gorbachev during his visit to Yugoslavia in March of this year have enormous significance for transforming the Mediterranean Sea into a region of peace and collaboration. Affirming the readiness of the USSR to withdraw its naval forces from the Mediterranean if the United States does the same, the Soviet leader proposed that this not be postponed forever and suggested as a first step a freeze on the number of ships and firepower of the fleets of both countries, and then the establishment of quantitative limits for them. The Soviet Union and the United States could inform each other in advance on the re-deployment of ships, as well as exercises, and invite observers to them in the spirit of the Stockholm agreements before the coordination of overall confidence-building measures.

The Soviet Union has also indicated that the development of principles and methods of ensuring peaceful navigation by Mediterranean and other interested powers has our full support. A specially convened conference of these states could collect, analyze and systematize all proposals made in the name of establishing peace and stability in the region for later realization.

The necessity of transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and collaboration was emphasized by the ministers of foreign affairs of the Warsaw Pact member states at its session in Sofia.

The commonality and interdependence of the fate of mankind and the integral nature of the contemporary world is perhaps nowhere felt with such force as in the Mediterranean. This lively crossroads of many countries and peoples, the cradle of ancient civilizations, can and should become a region of peaceful good-neighbor relations and collaboration, and not an arena for militarist confrontation.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1988 Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

Central Committee Official Assesses Benefits of Moscow Summit

18160001b Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 88 pp 5-9

[Interview with Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, journalist specializing in international affairs, executive of the CPSU Central Committee: "The Way to the Future Is Being Paved"]

[Text] **Question.** How, in your opinion, do our goals connected with the summit correspond to its results?

Answer. A good, notable step forward has been taken. Soviet-American relations, which were in the past based

on suspicion, mistrust and simply enmity, are being transferred to a realistic footing, where both parties are beginning to recognize clearly that both the Soviet Union and the United States and, objectively speaking, the whole world community are the losers from the glacial state of their relations.

Might more have been achieved? Probably, yes. In any event, the Soviet Union was prepared for this. I refer to our balanced proposal concerning a gradual lowering of the level of military confrontation in Europe incorporating an exchange of information on arms and armed forces, verification of this information, including on-site inspection, the elimination of the asymmetries and imbalances between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, a reduction in the numbers of the armed forces of both alliances by approximately 500,000 and then their subsequent build-down on the basis of the reasonable sufficiency principle. All this could be formulated in brief: the Soviet plan is a plan for elimination of the offensive potentials of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The American side was not ready to accept it, referring to the need to consult its bloc partners.

From the Soviet viewpoint it would be useful to record certain general principles of mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the United States—something like a code of behavior on the world scene. But the American side was not ready for this either.

Question. How would you describe the atmosphere of the meeting compared with the preceding negotiations of M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan? After all, some American political scientists are maintaining that top-level meetings are more of symbolic, even ceremonial, than real significance.

Answer. First, I do not accept this viewpoint. It would seem to me profoundly mistaken if only for three reasons. Each meeting is preceded by, without any exaggeration, a tremendous amount of political and diplomatic effort, in which all departments dealing with foreign policy matters are involved. In the course of the work positions are honed and the range of possible compromises and agreements is defined—in a word, a road to the future is paved.

Subsequently, in the course of the top-level meetings themselves, intensive negotiations are conducted at various levels, and the contours of what is possible frequently appear and pretty good "fantasies" are born in the discussions and arguments.

Finally, the meetings of the leaders themselves and their discussions are undoubtedly of key significance both by virtue of the responsibility borne by both leaders and by virtue of their authority. It does not have to be said that the very practice of the last four Soviet-American meetings has shown how important dialogue at the highest level is and how much it gives to both an understanding of the parties' positions and the finding of paths toward agreement.

As far as the atmosphere of the Moscow meeting is concerned, it was not simply businesslike but friendly. It would be wrong to regard the words of R. Reagan and his wife when taking their leave of their hospitable hosts to the effect that they regarded M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva as their friends and their request for friendly feelings to be conveyed to the Soviet people merely as an elementary tribute to courtesy. It was a solid sign of the good changes which are occurring in Soviet-American relations.

Question. Some people in the West are maintaining that the failure to sign a treaty on strategic offensive arms in Moscow "devalues" this meeting. What do you think about this? Was any progress made in examining the "five knots" of the problem of strategic offensive arms?

Answer. Who will argue that had a strategic offensive arms reduction treaty been signed in Moscow, the positive outcome of the meeting would have been supplemented by a document valuable in the highest degree. Nonetheless, it would seem to me that the term "devalues" is too strong. Moreover, it is simply inaccurate. Questions of a reduction in strategic offensive arms, as, equally, the need to comply with the conditions of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, were discussed in Moscow at CPSU Central Committee general secretary and U.S. president level, at foreign minister level and at expert level. These were necessary and productive discussions.

I believe that the Geneva negotiations on this question have today not their former—Geneva—but a Moscow reference point. This applies to mobile strategic missiles. It applies to air-launched cruise missiles. It applies to verification of compliance with a possible agreement. The biggest difficulties are caused, as you know, by the problem of monitoring sea-based cruise missiles, specifically, those deployed on submarines. There is talk on the American side about the fact that this whole problem should, perhaps, be removed from the framework of a possible agreement.

Such a position seems to me illogical. Sea-based cruise missiles are a component of strategic offensive arms, and such an exception would appear strange. The more so in that there is an opportunity to "exercise the imagination somewhat" on the subject of how to exercise verification of sea-based cruise missiles. Why, for example, not give thought to a version where the nuclear warhead is not mounted on the missile, is stored in a separate canister and affords an opportunity for verification, whether with technical facilities or by on-site inspection? This problem cannot be considered insoluble. It is soluble, but both imagination and the political will are required for this, of course.

The contours—sufficiently precise—of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms were drawn. As M.S. Gorbachev observed at a press conference in Moscow, "if the present administration, both parties act effectively, we can move toward a treaty."

Question. Why, in your opinion, did the U.S. President turn down the proposal for the insertion in the final statement of the formula of peaceful coexistence as the basis of Soviet-American relations.

Answer. This was not how it was. It was a question of something else. It was a question of a description of present-day political realities as a platform of intentions and political action, that is, of some common understanding of these realities. The Soviet text said approximately the following: with regard for the evolved realities in the modern world we (the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President) believe that no contentious problems should be solved militarily, that we regard peaceful coexistence as a universal principle of international relations and that the equality of all states, noninterference in internal affairs and freedom of socio-political choice should be recognized as inalienable rules binding for all.

As M.S. Gorbachev said, initially the President liked the text. But the President's entourage essentially rejected the proposed wording.

Why? The Americans provide no in any way comprehensive explanations in this connection, except, perhaps, saying that specific solutions or specific problems are preferable. But this is unconvincing. Determination of the method of approach to the settlement of contentious problems would of course be a valuable gain of the Soviet-American dialogue. But what happened is hardly worth dramatizing. The dialogue is continuing and becoming increasingly thorough and fruitful. Let us hope that life proves a good teacher not only for the USSR but for the United States also and that mutual understanding and trust in Soviet-American relations grow.

Question. If pronounced progress is not made in the coming months toward a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, we will have to work on the treaty with the next administration. What might the fate of the treaty be depending on the outcome of the presidential election, is there such a dependence? Are there guarantees that the next administration will endeavor to consolidate the positive changes in our relations?

Answer. Forecasts are generally a thankless business, but I believe that Soviet-American relations are today more predictable than 3-4 years ago.

Let us argue thus. Is there in the Soviet Union and the United States a broad understanding of the fact that the Soviet and American nuclear arsenals are simply monstrous and that they need to be unloaded? In my view, there is. It exists in the upper echelon of the Republican Party, it exists in the upper echelon of the Democrats, it exists among the American public at large. And this being the case, work on an strategic offensive arms reduction treaty will continue. In any event, no one has a right to doubt Moscow's approach and its readiness to tackle this problem.

Now concerning the dependence between the fate of the treaty and the outcome of the elections. There probably is such a dependence, but I would not exaggerate the extent of its influence on the fate of the treaty. Even if they do not reach the home stretch before the present administration's term expires, there will be no lengthy pause, I believe, in the Geneva negotiations. A reduction in strategic offensive arms today represents a key goal of the Soviet-American dialogue. As to guarantees that the next administration will endeavor to consolidate the positive changes in our relations, it may be said that these guarantees are created by both objective and subjective factors. Objectively both the United States and the USSR have an interest in an easing of tension and a lessening of confrontation and an interest in a steep reduction in strategic arms. Subjectively it is obvious that the Soviet Union will not slacken its efforts in the search for a compromise solution of this problem. Judging by the campaign speeches of the presidential candidates from the Republican and Democratic parties, they also are taking stock of the need to find a solution to all the questions which as yet prevent us bringing to a close the work of the Soviet and American negotiators in Geneva.

Question. In which of the principal directions of the Moscow negotiations was the parties' greatest and least understanding achieved, in your opinion? And why? Did the convergence of opinions on human rights continue? How did the start of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan influence the discussion of the problem of regional conflicts?

Answer. It seems to me somewhat artificial to divide the issues discussed into those on which the greatest understanding was reached and those on which there was no understanding. To keep to this approach, it would probably be simplest to say that there was the greatest understanding during the discussion of questions of bilateral relations. A package of bilateral agreements, albeit modest, nonetheless very useful, was signed. But are bilateral relations not influenced by the state of affairs in the field of disarmament? They are, of course. Something else is valuable also, namely, the fact that during the Moscow discussions the parties were to a lesser extent than ever before involved in mutual accusations and counteraccusations. The emphasis was put on the search for mutually acceptable solutions and mutually acceptable compromise. This applied to the entire Soviet-American political agenda.

As far as the "convergence of opinions on the human rights problem" is concerned, once again here it would be fairer to speak of some evaporation of the confrontational spirit than a convergence of opinions. Yes, both the Soviet Union and the United States understand the entire significance of the sure guarantee of human rights. Yes, both the Soviet Union and the United States recognize that this is a major international problem. But not only international. It is a national problem also. The United States has many critical thoughts concerning the

state of affairs in respect of human rights in the USSR, and the Soviet Union, by no means fewer critical thoughts concerning the guarantee of human rights in the United States.

But neither Moscow nor Washington intend equating socialist and bourgeois democracy. And, of course, it is absolutely unacceptable for the parties' relations at the time of discussion of this problem to be constructed as teacher-pupil or, even worse, prosecutor-defendant relations. And in fact, it is obligatory in our so diverse world, where there are so many different regimes and where the historical and national singularities of individual countries are so dissimilar, to take stock of both this diversity and these singularities. In the name, precisely, of the triumph of freedom and human rights.

As far as the start of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan and the influence of this decision on discussion of the problem of regional conflicts is concerned, it is undoubtedly great. The political settlement of the Afghanistan situation and the withdrawal of Soviet forces are of capital significance for international affairs. This is sensed and recognized by those to whom the "cold war," confrontation and enmity are dear. Whence the obstacles being created to the success of the policy of national reconciliation in the Republic of Afghanistan.

Might the Afghan settlement be mirrored in other regional conflicts? I believe not. But politically there are things to be learned, things to develop and things to use in practice here.

Question. R. Reagan raised the question of the rehabilitation of the work of A. Solzhenitsyn. What is your attitude?

Answer. I confess that I am not acquainted with R. Reagan the literary critic. I am not convinced that he has had the time to become familiar with the vast work of this writer. So his recommendations to us on this score seem to me odd, to put it mildly. This is a problem for Soviet publishers to decide, and them alone.

And in conclusion I would like to say the following.

The use of proverbs and sayings has now become fashionable when it is a question of Soviet-American relations. It seems to me appropriate to recall, in keeping with this fashion, the following embellishment: "The best is the enemy of the good". But there was "good" at the Moscow summit: progress was made on the entire range of problems discussed. It may be said, as a whole, that a kind of program for the future was formulated in Moscow in the great and necessary business of an improvement in Soviet-American relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".

"Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1988

X-Ray Laser Weapon Data Alleged Falsified
18160001g Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian
No 8, Aug 88 pp 75-80

[Article by Stanislav Nikolayevich Rodionov, candidate of physico-mathematical sciences, head of a department of the USSR Academy of Sciences Space Research Institute, member of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace, Against the Nuclear Danger: "The X-Ray Laser: Weapon or Bluff?"]

[Text] The Livermore National Laboratory (LNL)—one of two centers in the United States where nuclear and thermonuclear weapons are developed and manufactured—has come to be mentioned frequently in recent months in the American press in connection with several unusual circumstances. At the insistence of a group of congressmen headed by the Democrat George Brown, member of the House of Representatives from the state of California, a government investigation began at the LNL. The activity of the GAO inspectors was aimed primarily at ascertaining a delicate question: how far from the truth were the numerous reports on the state of affairs pertaining to the development of a nuclear-pumped X-ray laser which had been fed the administration, including the President himself, by two scientists—Edward Teller and Lowell Wood.

There is no need for a detailed portrayal of E. Teller—a founder of the laboratory who has reserved for himself the title of its honorary vice president. The mass media have firmly implanted in Americans' memory the idea of him as the "father of the hydrogen bomb". It is no secret that he has considerable influence on President R. Reagan on more than just purely scientific matters. As a spokesman of the White House staff declared, "Teller is part of the group of the President's scientific advisers, and this says it all."

L. Wood is a favorite of Teller's. At the LNL he is in charge of a special laboratory consisting of "young geniuses" developing the latest ideas, from optical computers through underwater laser communications.

These scientists are united on the one hand by a belief (outwardly, at least) in the extensive possibilities of the use of the nuclear-pumped X-ray laser for military purposes. On the one hand they are both prepared for the achievement of their life's goals to make use of all accessible methods and means, not spurning, where necessary, slander even. Thus on Teller's conscience is the punishment meted out to Robert Oppenheimer, following which his reputation in scientific circles sank very low and will hardly be restored. So big a campaign cannot yet be attributed to Wood, but his way of fighting his scientific opponents can in no way be called gentlemanly. There is a telling utterance from Nobel Prize winner Hans Bethe, who many years ago worked with Teller on the thermonuclear bomb project and is now

familiar with the LNL's work as a consultant: "These two—Teller and Wood—have always had a propensity for making unwarranted statements."¹

In recent years the very phrase "X-ray laser" has when served up by the most active SDI supporters become synonymous with a superweapon capable of deciding virtually single-handedly the fate of enemy missiles which dare to attack the territory of the United States. It has gradually dawned on the U.S. scientific community at large that it was Teller who exerted the decisive influence on Reagan, persuading him of the possibilities of the X-ray laser, after which the President delivered the speech of sorry renown in March 1983 in which he announced the plans to create a global antimissile shield.

Whereas the public at large, unfamiliar with the fundamentals of laser technology, may easily take on trust the evaluation of the "father of the hydrogen bomb," particularly when he is echoed by the President, specialists have from the very outset appeared suspicious of the unrestrained optimism of the SDI supporters in respect of the prospects of the creation of weapons based on a nuclear-pumped X-ray laser. The point being that from the viewpoint of physics the X-ray laser is nothing mysterious or unusual.²

Long and thin rods of certain metals (zinc is cited, for example) could, it is believed, be used as the active medium for the X-ray laser. Upon the explosion of a nuclear primer, these rods would in billionths of a second vaporize and become completely ionized, but their shape would not have had time to have in any way noticeably changed. The completely ionized plasma would in practice cease to be heated by the X-rays of the nuclear explosion and would gradually begin to cool. In the cooling process there would very quickly (also estimated at billionths of a second) emerge in the plasma rod a state of inverse population, which is an essential condition for the generation of laser radiation in the soft X-ray range. But more than this is required. It is further necessary to ensure the slight angular spread of the laser beam, without which achieving significant range of elimination is impossible. In optical-range conventional lasers this task is resolved with focusing optics. But for X-rays the task of shaping a narrow beam with the corresponding focusing systems would as yet seem exceptionally complex. In the meantime the natural way amounts to the active medium having the appearance of rods several meters long with a diameter of a size approximately 10,000-100,000 times less.

Following the clearly planned "leak" on the first successful testing of an X-ray laser with an underground nuclear explosion at the Nevada test range in 1981, the American public was also familiarized with the prototype of a space-based battle station based on an X-ray laser wherein a small nuclear charge (with a yield of no more than one-tenth of a kiloton) is surrounded by a multitude of rods directed at various points in space. Therefore given a concentrated missile launch, all the missiles

launched would be in the sights of one or several battle stations. Following detonation of the nuclear primer, the induced X-rays should destroy all the adversary's missiles. Just as in the old saying: "Seven slain at a stroke!"

When the physical mechanism of the action of the X-ray laser is known, it is possible without enlisting the design or technological details which, strictly speaking, are a secret to make simple assessments of the energy output and efficiency of such a device.

One of the first analyses conducted by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace, Against the Nuclear Danger³ showed that "the efficiency of a space-based ABM system based on X-ray lasers evokes serious doubts." In addition, as this report pointed out, the possibility of directing the rods and maintaining the set direction of orientation under the impact of the nuclear explosion is far from obvious. Misgivings were expressed also that the final development of an operational X-ray laser would almost certainly require tests to be conducted in outer space in violation of current international agreements and undertakings.

Subsequent studies conducted by Soviet and foreign scientists⁴ specified that to ensure a range of elimination of over 1,000 km the requisite yield of the nuclear primer would have to be sufficiently great (up to 1 megaton). Moreover, the "porcupine" concept (a battle station with a multitude of operational rods aimed in all directions may from a purely visual angle be compared to this animal) proves groundless since to eliminate a single target at a distance of several thousand kilometers it would be necessary to target against it an immense quantity of rods running to tens of thousands, that is, the station's entire combat resource.

The most competent analysis, perhaps, of the prospects of all the systems connected with the directed transfer of energy was conducted by a special group of the American Physics Society and published in 1987. This is what this analysis had to say: "The possibility of creating an X-ray laser pumped from a nuclear explosion has been demonstrated. This is a research program, in which a number of physical and engineering problems is still in the research phase. What has yet to be proven is the possibility of the creation of an X-ray laser which could be used for military purposes."⁵

Such doubts, as is now becoming known, began to be experienced by many of Teller and Wood's colleagues who had been enlisted in work on the creation of an X-ray laser at the LNL. A comparison of the actual picture of the progress of the work with the superoptimistic pronouncements which Teller and Wood were conveying to the President, his scientific adviser G. Keyworth (also from the LNL and a Teller protege), the defense secretary, the CIA director, the leader of the National Security Council, congressmen and so forth was the cause of a number of conflicts, which the

Livermore hawks resolved to damp down by their customary methods of suppression, taking advantage of the atmosphere of secrecy surrounding the work on the X-ray laser.

But dirty linen was washed in public, nonetheless. The culprit was Roy Woodruff, former leader of the nuclear weapons development programs at the LNL. How this turned out we will see a little later, but now let us attempt on the basis of facts which have already become known to chart the course of events.⁶

According to Woodruff, he was persuaded for the first time that false information about the work being carried out under his leadership was reaching the highest circles of the administration back in December 1983, having completely accidentally come across a copy of a letter which Teller had sent to Keyworth, the President's scientific adviser. The letter said that work on the X-ray laser had passed beyond the research phase and that the time had come to switch to testing and engineering efforts. This claim meant that all fundamental S&T problems had been solved and that it was time to embark on the creation of a prototype of the weapon. Naturally, the level of appropriations would have to be increased sharply. Woodruff immediately requested that LNL Director R. Batzel disavow this claim of Teller's, but was turned down. "You know," Batzel allegedly replied, "that no one believes Edward and Lowell." But we all knew, Woodruff observed, that of the laboratory staff only Teller had unimpeded access to the President.

The situation was repeated a year later, but on this occasion the letters went to P. Nitze, a leading administration arms control adviser, and R. McFarlane, chairman of the National Security Council. As has now become known, Teller promised to have created an X-ray laser weapon by 1990. And once again Woodruff was prohibited from making any amendments to these letters.

In the spring of 1985 Wood drew up an official memorandum for CIA Director W. Casey in which he maintained that the USSR-United States technology race to create an X-ray laser would decide the fate of the whole world. As Woodruff maintains, this memorandum deliberately falsified the results of underground tests of the nuclear-pumped X-ray laser.

Shortly after, Wood proposed to General Abrahamson, leader of the work on the SDI program, a demonstration test of the X-ray laser at the Nevada test range to show to the whole world the level of American technical superiority. Abrahamson turned for advice to experts from Los Alamos—the second nuclear weapons development center—but their response was sharply negative. Some time later Wood began to trouble Abrahamson once again; the latter resolved to learn Woodruff's viewpoint. It was ascertained that Woodruff was not familiar with Wood's material at all. This was the straw which broke the back of Woodruff's patience, and in October 1985 he resigned.

He had pointed out in his letter tendering his resignation that the LNL would begin to lose the trust of scientific circles because incorrect information was coming from it about the work on the X-ray laser. He observed also that if Lowell Wood retained the trust of the leaders of the administration and Congress with whom he was in contact, the situation would become far more serious.

Inasmuch as the LNL is formally under the jurisdiction of the University of California (although the appropriations are made by the Energy Department) Woodruff requested that the dean of the university look into the problem which had arisen. But the dean's office was manifestly reluctant to damage relations with the powerful forces behind Teller. Woodruff's complaint was forwarded to the Energy Department, which carried out a formal superficial audit of the work at the LNL and found nothing amiss in the activity of Teller and Wood. An assistant dean of the University of California recently explained his leadership's position in this conflict in highly original manner: "We were reluctant to infringe the legitimate rights of Teller and Wood, who, as university fellows, can say what they think necessary."⁷

As is customary in U.S. university circles, following his resignation, Woodruff went on annual leave. When he returned to the LNL, he discovered that he had been transferred to work which is usually given to beginners, at a sharply reduced salary. R. Batzel had allocated him a room without windows, which his colleagues immediately christened "the prison". Woodruff once again complained to David Gardner, dean of the university, but the latter refused even to see him.

And it is here that events begin which are still unclear. A copy of Woodruff's appeal to Gardner, which describes the entire foregoing situation in sufficient detail (but without mentioning secrets), turned up in the mail addressed to the leadership of the Federation of Scientists of Southern California—a public organization actively opposed to the SDI program. Woodruff himself categorically denies his involvement in this event, noting, *inter alia*, that in terms of his views he pertains more to this federation's opponents.

After some reflection, the leadership of the federation of Californian scientists decided to forward the material it had received to Congress. First, the members of the leadership believed, they were lifting the veil somewhat on the true reasons why and how the SDI program was being financed. Second, the federation leadership's decision was influenced by the description of Teller which clearly ensued from the submitted papers. As Robert Nelson, vice president of the Federation of Scientists of Southern California, declared, "a negative impression had been made on us formerly by President Reagan's speech following the failure of the Reykjavik negotiations, in which he referred to scientists' opinion concerning the possibility of the rapid deployment of a space-based ABM system. But only Teller could have advised him of this. For this reason we deemed it our civic duty to make public Woodruff's material."⁸

The papers were sent to G. Brown, member of the House of Representatives from California and a well-known opponent of the SDI. Events then developed rapidly. On 23 October 1987 Woodruff was giving evidence at closed sessions of congressional committees, and on 10 December G. Brown demanded that the GAO investigate the technical quality of the information which had been sent from the LNL to high-ranking members of the administration and Congress and also how the additional resources allocated for the X-ray laser program without congressional approval were being spent (it was known that after almost every Teller visit to Reagan the latter allocated the laboratory additional tens of millions of dollars). At the end of February the preliminary results of the investigation were to have been discussed at a closed joint session of the congressional committees dealing with LNL activity. According to TIME magazine, a full account of the results of the inspection will appear this year.⁹

At the very end of last year the leadership of the University of California, influenced by the scandal which had arisen, passed a decision on the unlawful nature of Woodruff's transfer to lower-paid work. He was thereupon offered the position, matching in importance his former position, of leader of the arms control agreement verification program with compensation for loss of income in the foregoing period.

So, what have we here? A "happy ending"? Yes, Woodruff was officially reinstated, but a multitude of other questions which had been raised remains.

The future of the X-ray laser program is at stake primarily. Following the decision on the GAO investigation, many LNL employees working on questions of the X-ray laser or who had worked in this field in previous years spoke out in support of Woodruff, adducing new instances of the deliberate falsification of the true picture of the progress of the work. Thus in 1985 even Woodruff's successor, George Miller, called attention to the fact that Wood was very much exaggerating the progress in the research efforts and fixing too short a timeframe for the fulfillment of individual stages of the work. When, in the fall of 1987, Wood maintained at congressional hearings that a single X-ray laser space station could wipe out almost all of an enemy's missiles, congressmen demanded confirmation from Miller. The latter replied evasively: "It is important to understand that the X-ray laser program at the LNL is as yet only of a research nature."¹⁰

A letter was addressed to Congressman G. Brown by LNL physicist Ray Kidder, who had begun work on this problem at Teller's invitation back in 1983. Within a year he had written a memo to Teller saying that creating weapons based on the X-ray laser would be very difficult, and, considering possible Soviet countermeasures, even if this were possible, they would be totally ineffective. A colleague of Kidder's, Albert (Letter), has now set up a defense technology consultative company. He has told

correspondents that it is not yet clear whether the X-ray laser will work at all, let alone whether its military use will be possible. The bulk of the doubts pertains to the target search and precision guidance support systems, without which it cannot be considered a weapon, (Letter) concluded.¹¹

Congressman G. Brown also received a call from Lowell Morgan, a laser physics specialist who had worked at LNL from 1981 through 1985. Morgan called attention to the fact that information obtained by computer had frequently been given out as the results of underground testing, but that the organizations to which reports on the work which had been done had been sent almost certainly did not know such details. Morgan added that the results of the tests which were being conducted were invariably disappointing, which had prompted him to switch to more interesting and promising work. "What disturbs me most," Morgan said in conclusion, "is the scantiness of the entire program, which manifestly does not correspond to the influence which the X-ray laser is still exerting on the disarmament negotiations. And, in addition, this program requires continued nuclear testing...."¹²

This also brings to mind the scandal which erupted following the test of an X-ray laser at the time of an underground nuclear explosion codenamed Super Excalibur in March 1985. Initially it had been clamorously announced that the brightness¹³ of the laser had been increased millions of times. But the LNL's eternal rivals—the physicists from Los Alamos—maintained that the calibration of the measuring equipment had been performed incorrectly, which had been the basis of this "success". Woodruff's successor, G. Miller, who had to disentangle this highly awkward situation, had prepared a report for the public which pointed out the objective difficulties of conducting precision measurements at the time of a nuclear explosion, but the LNL leadership prohibited the publication of this material. It later became known that Miller had in this document enumerated the tasks confronting the measuring equipment at the time of the underground test of the X-ray laser¹⁴:

- determination of the moment of commencement of generation;
- determination of total energy in the laser beam;
- determination of the radiation wave length;
- determination of the spread of the beam;
- measurement of the duration of the laser pulse.

The measurements are complicated by the fact that, first, they are made after the front of the primary X-ray from the explosion itself has passed through the equipment

and, second, by the fact that this primary X-radiation induces stray radiation in the very material of the recording equipment, which could be confused with the signal from the X-ray laser.

Steve Younger, who until 1986 headed at the LNL a group designing the X-ray laser, declared that "Wood made many statements which were incorrect—I know whereof I speak."¹⁵

Many of the new witnesses in the Woodruff affair are returning to Teller's letter to Keyworth (1983), which contains the affirmation that the research phase was over. The LNL's position, incidentally, now (5 years after this event) is that a further 5 years, at least, and approximately \$1 billion will be required to learn whether it will be possible for the X-ray laser to acquire military potential.

According to T. (Postol), a staff member of Stanford University and former scientific adviser of the Department of the Navy, it was clear to specialists back in 1982 that it was a question of "an insoluble engineering problem." (Postol) observed also that if it is, for all that, ever solved, the X-ray laser will be far more suitable not as a defensive but offensive weapon.¹⁶

A second problem, which remains at the center of attention, concerns the scientist's moral responsibility to society. As G. Brown observed in his speech in the Congress, a certain level of optimism is expected and permitted in any scientific undertaking, but what Teller and Wood had been reporting to the President and also members of his cabinet and the Congress were not simply optimistic forecasts but politically motivated exaggerations aimed at a mistaken orientation of national policy and the adoption of the wrong decisions on the financing of scientific research.¹⁷

The well-known journalist Flora Lewis was just as categorical in the NEW YORK TIMES: "There are many exceedingly complex issues on which scientific, and not political, counsel is needed for political decision-making. Distortions in this component can only harm national security in the future, regardless of advantages of the moment."¹⁸

The scientific community is paying more attention to the ethical side of the question connected, specifically, with the blow being struck at the reputation of the laboratory itself. "It is very sad when politically motivated exaggerations, distortions and simply deception substitute with impunity in a national science laboratory for scientific objectivity," many of the scientists who have spoken out subscribe to this statement by A. (Letter).

"I believe," Herbert York, the first director of the LNL observed, "that had the X-ray laser program at Livermore been conducted by Boeing or Lockheed, Teller and Wood would have been fired in disgrace long since."¹⁹

But in reality it has to be acknowledged that it is hardly the social position and reputation of E. Teller, who recently celebrated his 80th birthday, which will suffer from this business to any great extent. After all, ultimately all that Teller has done has been directed at the emergence and development of the SDI program, which the administration does not intend abandoning. In addition, Teller's powerful connections with the military-industrial complex and extreme-right political circles make his position practically invulnerable. It is with good reason that he is behaving as if nothing has happened, but continuing to speak in his interviews about the prospects of the X-ray laser as a defensive weapon.

L. Wood is a different proposition—he is keeping to the background, realizing full well that he could be a candidate for scapegoat if things come to this. The first casualty was LNL Director R. Batzel, who was retired in April 1988 after having held this important position for 16 years.²⁰ (Dzh. Naykols), for whose appointment Teller had fought fiercely, was appointed the new LNL director. Although (Naykols) advocates arms development and supports the SDI program, outside observers consider him a far more independent and stronger figure than Batzel. It is expected that he will not permit individual scientists (Teller himself even) to pass off their personal views as the viewpoint of the whole laboratory. As independent scientists see it, (Naykols) cannot be called an ideologue, and he will most likely show himself to be a leader capable of being sufficiently objective and realistic in the role of scientific adviser in the presence of the U.S. political leadership. Nothing bad has been said about Batzel, but pronouncements concerning (Naykols') possible behavior persuade us that Batzel was an obedient pawn in Teller's hands.

A third problem is connected with the atmosphere which engenders the possibility of disinformation incidents like those described above arising. In his speech in the Congress G. Brown cited several typical examples. Congress' Office of Scientific and Technology Assessment conducted a study authorized by the Congress of the part of the SDI program which is connected with software and the problem of survivability. The public summary report was to have appeared in August 1987. But the Defense Department adopted utterly absurd decisions on the classification of this report. And, furthermore, even the documents from which the department had lifted the stamp of secrecy for other studies reacquired this stamp in the report of the Office of Scientific and Technology Assessment. In addition, information obtained as the obvious consequence of certain physical laws and even information adduced at public hearings in Congress by federal employees was classified also. There can be only one explanation—the Defense Department is attempting to use the secrecy bogey to prevent open publication of material which could show the SDI program in an unfavorable light (which, evidently, corresponds to reality).

The picture was the same concerning the report of the Congressional Research Service on the problem of seismic monitoring of underground nuclear tests. This material, wholly based on unclassified information, was deemed secret by the Defense Department and cannot be released.

And, finally, the last problem ensuing directly from the foregoing: it is a question of human rights, which in an atmosphere of secrecy may be violated without hindrance. After all, what had Woodruff done that was so special? He was concerned primarily to restore his laboratory's good name. The law determines a whole set of mechanisms to monitor LNL activity, but none of them had worked to check out Woodruff's disquiet. Why for 2 years did leading figures of the University of California decline to see Woodruff? Why did the university's Scientific Advisory Committee ignore for several years the contradictory data on the progress of work on the X-ray laser? And the Energy Department also adopted a formal attitude toward verification of Woodruff's complaints and it has not, furthermore, published the report on this.

All because attempts had been made to deal with Woodruff without any fuss, with no waste of time and effort. Circumstances took shape in such a way that this did not happen. But the tendency to deal with dissidents has remained unchanged. One does not have to go far for examples, unfortunately. As the American newspapers report,²¹ a witchhunt has begun against one further LNL employee—Hugh De Witt—whose guilt is that he, first, is opposed to the X-ray laser program and, second, does not agree with the arguments that a continuation of nuclear testing is essential for monitoring the dependability of nuclear weapons. On one of his reports De Witt received very low marks for his scientific activity, which was protested by his political opponents even. The position of the leadership of the University of California remains contradictory on this question also. It had previously often used De Witt's name as an example of "academic freedom" at the LNL, but, as in the case of Woodruff, apparently, is unwilling to engage in any specific action. F. von Hippel, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists Foundation, sent a letter to University President D. Gardner in which he observed that if the latter "silences" De Witt, this will mean the end of any freedom of speech at the LNL.²²

But the main danger is that in an atmosphere of an absence of openness far from all scientists, who are called on to provide the political leadership with objective and impartial information, will be equal to this responsibility.

Footnotes

1. THE SACRAMENTO BEE, 4 December 1987.

2. See "Space Weapons: Dilemma of Security," Moscow, 1986, p 38.

3. "Prospects of the Creation of a U.S. Space-Based ABM System and its Likely Impact on the World Military-Political Situation," Report of the Committee of Soviet Scientists, October 1983.

4. See "Space Weapons: Dilemma of Security," p 42; NATURE, 6 August 1987, p 487.

5. "APS Study: Science and Technology of Directed Energy Weapons," REVIEWS OF MODERN PHYSICS, vol 59, No 3, 1987, p 6.

6. See LOS ANGELES TIMES, 21 October 1987; NEW YORK TIMES, 22 November 1987.

7. THE SACRAMENTO BEE, 4 December 1987.

8. NATURE, 29 October 1987, p 751.

9. See TIME, 18 January 1988, p 52.

10. NEW SCIENTIST, 29 October 1987, p 24.

11. See THE SACRAMENTO BEE, 3 February 1988.

12. VALLEY TIMES, 24 January 1988.

13. The brightness of a laser is defined as the energy emitted per unit of solid angle, in other words, it is the value of the energy released divided by the square of the beam's angle of divergence.

14. See SCIENCE, 20 June 1986, p 1495.

15. SAN JOSE MERCURY, 4 February 1988.

16. NEW SCIENTIST, 29 October 1987, p 24.

17. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol 133, No 196, 10 October 1987.

18. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 13 November 1987.

19. THE SACRAMENTO BEE, 4 December 1987.

20. See NATURE, 25 April 1988, p 645.

21. See THE SACRAMENTO BEE, 9 January 1988.

22. SAN JOSE MERCURY, 7 February 1988.

Rocket TEL Converted to Crane Chassis
18290028a Alma-Ata AVTOTRANSPORT
KAZAKHSTANA in Russian No 8, Aug 88 pp 36-38

[Article by A. Lapin and L. Gogolev under the "Motor Vehicle Enthusiast Club" rubric: "Yesterday Missiles, Tomorrow Cranes"]

[Text] The demolition was set for exactly 10 o'clock. So in a half hour all the approaches to the firing range will be cut off. And if one is going out to a place, it will be quickly!

In several minutes an orange "Pazik" [vehicle made by Pavlovo Bus Plant imeni A. A. Zhdanov], plunging from pothole to pothole, had taken our group of journalists over the poor roads in the steppe from Saryozek to where one of the conspicuous events in modern history was to take place.

The conditions on the firing range were routine and businesslike. The small valley surrounded by rocky hills looked like an ordinary part of the Kazakhstan steppe. The only thing which made it different from other areas was the concrete command post which had been dug into the ground on top of one of the hills.

Yesterday we met the persons who were preparing the missiles for the test demolitions. We watched the team led by Captain D. Gimadiyev remove the missile's brain—the instruments of its guidance and control system—from its steel interior with solemnity. They were well coordinated and worked efficiently.

And the missiles, frankly, were good-looking. Even laid out on the ground, their graceful lines and completeness of form, which usually distinguish a work of technical art, were striking. Flashes of sunlight were playing on their silvery metallic skin, and it seemed that the missiles were living things at such moments.

The hands of the clock were moving steadily toward 10 o'clock. A helicopter circled the surrounding hills and finally landed. High-ranking military officers had arrived.

Red warning flares are shot up one after the other. The first explosion is heard; it destroys six dummy items. But we are waiting impatiently for the second one, the main one.

It comes unexpectedly, all the same. A red tongue of flame rises suddenly in the center of the field and the rocket fuel detonates without a pause. The burning fragments of fuel rise high in the sky like fireworks. The pressure of a shock wave hits us in the face. The boom that accompanies it finally reaches us as well.

A white and yellow mushroom cloud swells over the field in a minute. It is drawn out more and more and slowly drifts with the wind. A helicopter appears in the blue sky from behind a hill and dives into the cloud. These are scientists taking an air sample. And we go back to the point of explosion again.

At first glance, the epicenter of the explosion resembled the site of a bonfire that had been extinguished where some giant had dispersed the coals. I pick up a small piece of the silvery metal from the hot earth that was scorched by the explosion and keep it as a memento.

Who knows, perhaps years will pass and man will put a monument on this field with an inscription such as this: "The first missiles were destroyed here at the end of the 20th century. Human reason firmly established itself over nuclear folly for the first time in history!"

Well, everything about the missiles is clear. They will be destroyed. But what about the equipment which transported them? The powerful eight-wheeled MAZ-543 [vehicle made by Minsk Motor Vehicle Plant], which we have become accustomed to seeing weighed down with OTR-22 [SS-12] operational-tactical missiles. The Soviet-American Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles determined the fate of this type of combat equipment. The powerful launcher chassis will still be serving the national economy. The skilled craftsmen of Odessa's January Uprising Production Association have begun mounting powerful cranes on the strong green bodies of the MAZ vehicles.

Another chassis—the 12-wheel chassis from the launcher-transporters (TPA) for RSD-10 [SS-20] intermediate-range missiles—also will be put to work. By the opening of the 19th Party Conference, the plant workers had mounted the first AK-80 vehicle-mounted crane, with a hoisting capacity of 80 tons, on the chassis. The telescopic crane boom is from 13 to 35 meters long. The rotating section turns at a speed of about 1.5 revolutions per minute; it has a 180-horsepower engine. The chassis has a 650-hp diesel engine. The transmission is hydro-mechanical. All wheels are drive wheels, and the front two pairs are steerable. The suspension is hydropneumatic. The crane has outstanding cross-country ability, not inferior to tracked vehicles. And it can travel at up to 60 kilometers per hour on a good road.

Converting the launcher chassis for a crane is a complicated task, of course. But the craftsmen of Odessa's January Uprising Production Association are not concerned about their skill. This is the basic producer of heavy-capacity cranes in our country today. One-third of the association's output goes for export. Our cranes are valued on all continents for their reliability, high productivity and maneuverability. We will say more about the types of cranes turned out by the association.

Let us begin with the diesel electric pneumatic-tire cranes with a hoisting capacity of 25 and 100 tons. They are distinguished by their high maneuverability even under cramped conditions, made possible by the collapsible boom. The crane can operate not only on its own engine, but from an external alternating current power supply (380 volts), which makes it possible to economize fuel.

Another of the association's products is a diesel-hydraulic crane mounted on a special motor vehicle chassis. These cranes are suited for operations where there are frequent moves from one site to another, especially where considerable distance is involved. The hydraulic drive of the crane machinery makes it possible to adjust operating speeds over a wide range.

These cranes have been manufactured by the January Uprising Association in collaboration with machine builders from the Polish People's Republic since 1975. Cranes with hoisting capacities of 25, 40, 63 and 100 tons are being turned out within the framework of this cooperation. The chassis are produced in Poland, and the turning section and end assembly are made in the USSR. The cranes with different capacities have a high degree of standardization. Altogether more than 800 cranes, basically the 40-ton and 25-ton models, are being turned out.

Work is being completed today on the second generation of Soviet-Polish cranes. The 25-ton and 40-ton models have already been developed. They have better operating features, they are 20 percent smaller, and they are more comfortable.

The association signed an agreement with the West German ("Libherr") firm (in the city of Eichingen). As a result, one of the first Soviet-West German mixed enterprises was established; it was given the name "Kranlod." Manufacture of this brand of self-propelled crane has been begun at the newly developed production base in Odessa. The first crane was built in April, and it is planned to manufacture 60 of them by the end of this year.

At present, 90 percent of the units and assemblies used for the cranes are manufactured in the FRG. However, the proportion of parts of Soviet manufacture will be increased later on. And after the enterprise reaches its planned capacity, the deliveries from abroad will be insignificant. By 1992, 700 cranes and 300 rotating platforms will be turned out every year in a crane manufacturing shop 50,000 square meters in area.

In the future it is planned to manufacture an entire range of cranes with a hoisting capacity of up to 160 tons. For the present, 50-ton and 60-ton cranes are being turned out today.

The "Kranlod LTM 1050-4" self-propelled hydraulic crane, with a hoisting capacity of 50 tons, is on a level with the best world models. It has high capacity, superior turning ability and excellent cross-country performance, which enables it to operate successfully where roads are poor.

The five-section telescoping boom has high rigidity. It is 38 meters at its longest, but when an extender is used, a load may be lifted up to 56 meters—a record distance for cranes of this class. The diesel-hydraulic drive is

equipped with a responsive control system, which provides for high accuracy in operation. The maximum load hoisting speed reaches 120 meters per minute, and the platform can rotate at 22 revolutions per minute.

The crane has a special eight-wheel chassis with an 8 by 6 wheel arrangement (the first, second and fourth axles are drive axles). All wheels are controllable. The suspension of the "Nivomatik" is hydropneumatic. An eight-cylinder liquid-cooled Daimler-Benz diesel engine, the OM 422A, is installed on the crane. It produces 330 horsepower. The Soviet FMZ-238F diesel, with the same horsepower, may be used as an alternative engine. The crane uses an automatic six-speed transmission and a two-speed transfer transmission.

Equipped, the LTM 1050-4 crane (with an extender and counterweight of 7.3 tons) weighs 44 tons. Its maximum transport speed on the highway is 75 kilometers per hour.

The designers devoted particular attention to the crane's operating convenience. The cabs for the operator and the driver are made of zinc-plated steel and are more comfortable. They are equipped with multiple-layer safety glass and a heating system which operates independently of the engine. Two self-centering control handles are built into the arm rests of the seat. The load moment is controlled with an electronic limiter. On the screen of this instrument, the crane operator sees the information necessary for operation in graphic form; and data such as the weight of the load being lifted (gross and net), the length of the boom and the height to which the load is being lifted appear digitally on the screen. A warning signal is given by the system if a dangerous situation is encountered.

Movement of the crane on a construction site and raising and lowering of the outrigger supports can be controlled from the operator's cab.

The January Uprising Production Association is also turning out a number of very powerful hydraulic cranes of domestic design. One of them is the KS-9471 self-propelled crane, which has a hoisting capacity of 160 tons. It is designed for installing blocks and building structures of considerable size.

The crane machinery is driven by axial-piston hydraulic engines or hydraulic cylinders fed by pumps. The latter are driven by the power plant for the rotating section. The boom is telescopic, in five sections, from 14 to 49.92 meters in length. The boom may be retracted or extended with a load on the hook. When necessary, a 10-meter extender and controllable guski [possibly: cables] 20, 30 and 40 meters in length are used. A load can be lifted at a maximum speed of 104 meters per minute.

It has a special 14-wheel vehicle-type chassis. Its maximum transport speed is 50 kilometers per hour. The crane's structural mass is 114 tons.

The KS-10471 hydraulic crane is even more powerful. It has a hoisting capacity of 250 tons. Its telescopic boom extends from 14.4 to 51.28 meters. The maximum speed at which a load can be raised and lowered is 2 meters per minute. The speed at which the rotating section turns is 0.5 revolutions per minute.

The crane's chassis has a unique design. It has eight axles (a 16 by 8 wheel arrangement). The frame is articulated, which provides for a high degree of maneuverability (the turning radius of the front wheel is 16 meters). In an operating position, the rear of the chassis is extended and utilized as rear support beams; this makes it possible to reduce the crane's mass.

A 240-horsepower engine operates the rotating section, and the diesel for the chassis is 525 horsepower. The transmission is hydromechanical. There are multiple backups for the brake system. The crane has a transport speed of up to 50 kilometers per hour and it has a structural mass of 142 tons.

It remains only to add that the Odessa workers are adding another two cranes to this broad range of machines—based on the former missile carriers. Yesterday missiles, and cranes today. Such are the urgent dictates of the time!

COPYRIGHT: "Avtotransport Kazakhstana", No 8, 1988

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Investigations of FRG Firms' Involvement in Libyan Plant

Swiss Investigation of Imhausen Subsidiary
*AU0401134289 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network
in German 1200 GMT 4 Jan 89*

[Rainer Burghardt report from Geneva]

[Text] Following rapid and comprehensive investigations, Swiss authorities have found out two front firms in Zurich which are apparently closely associated with the poison gas deal. As the spokesman of the Berne Foreign Ministry, (Michel Pache), expressly confirmed just now, one of these front firms is a subsidiary of the German Imhausen chemical company in Lahr. Its name is IMHICO AG, a combination of the firm's initials. The name of the second firm is IBI Engineering, with the abbreviation IBI standing for Ihsan Barbouti International. According to a DIE WELT report today, Ihsan Barbouti is an Iraqi with a Jordanian passport and chief of IBI the headquarters of which is in London. Judging by these findings, Barbouti is the key figure, so to speak, in the chemical deal with Libya.

According to the Swiss Foreign Ministry, the government has no knowledge of any direct involvement of the firms in material supplies to Libya. As the spokesman said laconically, financial transactions are by no means prohibited. However, it is impossible to investigate or give details in this respect, he added. So far, the German Imhausen chemical company has not made any statements to Swiss authorities. The Berne Foreign Ministry also says that it is virtually impossible to get hold of the front firms, because in most cases they are handled anonymously by attorneys or other third persons. In one case, only a secretary was found; investigations are continuing.

According to official information, the Swiss Government was informed by a U.S. delegation on the level of high officials—as they have been described—about suspicious facts several days before Christmas. The delegation had shown photos which did not, however, provide clear evidence or allow conclusions to be drawn regarding a Libyan plant, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said. At any rate, the United States obviously relied on intelligence material. There is no law in Switzerland banning technical aid in such projects. However, in the case of suspicious facts, efforts are always made to dissuade firms in talks from going ahead with such projects. However, it is impossible to talk to front firms, the spokesman said. In addition, Switzerland has joined the so-called Australian Group which has decreed export restrictions on roughly 30 chemical substances that could be used for the production of poison gas. Moreover, eight substances are contained in the list of weapons the export of which is prohibited.

Imhausen Again Denies Involvement

*LD0401115089 Hamburg DPA in German 1101 GMT
4 Jan 89*

[Excerpt] Lahr (DPA)—The chemical enterprise Imhausen-Chemie GMBH has once again emphatically denied all suggestions that it had a part in the construction of an alleged chemical weapons factory in Libya. "Neither Imhausen-Chemie nor any other enterprise in our group of firms has a direct or indirect part of any kind in the project to build a factory in Libya", said a statement issued on Wednesday by the company, which is based in Lahr in the Ortenau District of the Black Forest.

The company also said that it had "concluded contracts in connection with the chemical factory in Rabta, Libya neither with the state of Libya nor with the Libyan authorities nor with any other business partners". Such suspicions are "unfounded" and the "allegations being spread" are "untrue". The management of Imhausen-Chemie is "firmly convinced" that the present investigations by the authorities "will confirm the untenability of the allegations". [passage omitted]

Genscher: 'No Proof'

*LD0401145189 Hamburg DPA in German 1407 GMT
4 Jan 89*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—As yet, the FRG Government has no clues or proof of its own that German firms have supplied chemicals for alleged Libyan production of poison gas. Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said this to the press in Bonn today.

At the same time, the minister sent a clear message to Washington, but without explicitly mentioning the United States. He said: "In my speech to the Paris conference on a worldwide ban on chemical weapons next week, I will leave no doubt that all countries should take part in checks on suspect production."

Genscher reminded his audience of wide-ranging U.S. proposals on controls which Vice President Bush put forward in Geneva in 1984. These initiatives have not been followed up on since then. Washington has not responded to the offer by the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on 6 August 1987 for agreement on checks on suspect production.

The problem of uncertainty about Libyan chemical weapons capacity would not have arisen in the first place if there had been such checks, Genscher said. In reply to questions, the foreign minister said that the Americans foresaw problems under the privacy law if they had to subject private firms to national or international controls, and moreover by foreign inspectors. Of course, this problem does not exist in the Soviet Union with its state enterprises.

A German compromise proposal has been on the table at the UN disarmament conference in Geneva since 1985. It envisages the restriction of inspections to only those firms which annually receive more than one metric ton of key products for poison gas production.

Genscher stressed the great seriousness with which the Federal Government was investigating the allegations of German industrial aid for the production of Libyan chemical weapons. Without breaking an agreement on strict confidentiality on the nature of the supposedly only very vague hints, the foreign minister again said that 15 November, during Kohl's visit to Washington, was when the first news of this was given out by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. The Federal Security Council was convened in Bonn on 18 November. On 20 December, after the facts up till then had been examined in the Federal chancellor's office further examination of the legal consequences had been ordered.

Today Genscher indicated his support for criminal charges. The Federal minister of foreign affairs said that it had to be possible to punish German citizens if they delivered, constructed, or put into operation installations outside the Federal Republic forbidden by German or international law. Genscher made it clear that he did not only mean installations for the production of chemical weapons.

The Federal minister of foreign affairs will meet Shultz in Paris on Saturday in order to discuss the U.S. position. He contradicted reports of an alleged U.S. campaign against the Federal Republic. Genscher said that after the last official contacts with the Foreign Ministry in Washington, the U.S. Government had emphasized its satisfaction with the earnestness of the German inquiries.

The foreign minister expressly rejected reproaches directed at Washington, as he had also directed his call for control of the agreements "to all states," even if, according to the opinion of observers, this could only be understood as a clear message to the United States. However, the minister also gave the impression that he had considerably greater hopes for the new U.S. Government of George Bush.

The Paris chemical weapons conference, in which practically all the UN members are participating, ought not to become "an alibi event", said the Federal minister of foreign affairs. He was expecting concrete impetus for progress on the worldwide ban. He was already in agreement with the French Government on this.

The Libyan case should also dominate talks between Genscher and the new Israeli foreign minister, Moshe Arens. Yesterday, Arens denied some remarks about alleged solid evidence of German supplies. The denial was later also stated by telephone to the German ambassador in Tel Aviv.

In the last few weeks, the FRG Government on several occasions requested additional and supplementary material on alleged German supplies for Libyan chemical weapons production, deputy spokesman of the Foreign Office Hanns H. Schumacher announced on Wednesday, but no material had yet been received.

Schumacher was adding to an official statement from the Federal Government which expressed regret that no conclusive evidence had been submitted. Government spokespersons would not give the names or numbers of other firms apart from Imhausen-Chemie—which has been named again and again—which might be made the subject of investigation.

Paper Says Iraqi Involved

AU0401102289 Hamburg DIE WELT in German
4 Jan 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Wirepullers for Chemical Plant in London"]

[Text] London/Bonn—DIE WELT has obtained new information about the background to the building of a chemical plant in Libya. According to this information, the construction of this plant has been organized from London by an Iraqi named Ihsan Barbouti [spelling of name as published]. He is the chief of the London-based IBI (Ihsan Barbouti International) company. The Iraqi reportedly also has a Jordanian passport.

So far, owing in particular to statements from Washington, one had the impression that the German Imhausen company was the chief supplier of the plant in Libya. What speaks against this version is the additional information that, according to reliable information, the chemical plant in Libya has not yet started production, as well as the fact that, on the other hand, the plant was built on the basis of supplies by companies from at least six industrial countries. In this connection, an engineering plant in Tokyo, companies in South Korea and Austria, a firm in Vogtland, GDR, and a company in Switzerland have been mentioned. The financial transactions related to the building of the chemical plant have reportedly been handled through Switzerland. In addition, firms from the FRG have been mentioned.

It is not known to what extent the individual suppliers knew the real purpose of the plant in Libya. Nor is it clear whether the U.S. Administration informed the governments of the countries mentioned as well as the Federal Government about the suspicious facts. We have not been able to obtain official information in this respect in Bonn, London, or Washington. Asked why the United States has rejected the offer made by Libyan chief of state al-Qadhafi to send an international experts' commission to inspect the plant, experts say that such a measure would not for the time being throw any

light on actual production at a later time. Such a one-time-only inspection would give al-Qadhafi the advantage of eventually using the plant at will "with an international blessing."

It is to be expected that the international chemical weapons conference that is scheduled to begin in Paris on 7 January will deal with this problem in general and with the affair in Libya in particular. The Foreign Ministry in Bonn refused to confirm that the Federal Government would take the initiative in this matter. At the end of such deliberations, agreement should be reached that chemical plants are subject to verification, not only in individual cases but permanently. Only on that basis would a chemical weapons agreement make sense.

Israeli Foreign Minister Charges FRG Role

*LD0301174889 Hamburg DPA in German 1629 GMT
3 Jan 89*

[Excerpt] Jerusalem/Bonn (DPA)—Israel has, in the words of its new Foreign Minister Moshe Arens, "firm proof" that a German firm was involved in the building of a factory for chemical weapons in Libya. The minister told this to DPA in Jerusalem on Tuesday. Regarding German investigations which had so far produced no evidence of the involvement of German firms—claimed first by the United States—it was stated by U.S. Administration circles in Washington on Tuesday that the U.S. Government adhered to its assertions.

After his first meeting with the foreign press in Israel, Israeli Foreign Minister Arens, told DPA: "We have firm evidence of the involvement of a German firm in the building of a factory for gases in Libya." The Likud politician, who was formerly ambassador to Washington and later defense minister, refused to give names or details when questioned. "Let me save something for my speech in Paris," Arens said, referring to the international conference on banning chemical weapons in Paris over the weekend. Even after Arens' remarks, FRG security circles insisted that so far there were no indications or suspicious circumstances pointing to any involvement of German firms in the building of a poisonous gas factory in Libya. DPA was told in Bonn that the plant had not yet begun production. Informed sources pointed out that it was not known whether in fact chemical weapons or—as claimed by Libya—only pharmaceuticals are to be manufactured. The Libyans could however "quite easily" for example "change the function" of chemical plant for pesticides and fertilizers.

According to information from DIE WELT the building of the plant in Libya was organized from London by an Iraqi named Ihsan Barbouti. The Iraqi it said, was the head of the firm IBI (Ihsan Barbouti International) based in London. The construction of the factory had been carried out with supplies from firms in at least six industrial countries. An engineering factory in Tokyo, firms in South Korea and

Austria, a factory in the Vogtland in the GDR and a factory in Switzerland. Firms in the FRG were also named, the paper states [passage omitted].

Israel Denies Arens' Remarks

*LD0301201189 Hamburg DPA German 1859 GMT
3 Jan 89*

[Excerpt] Jerusalem/Bonn (DPA)—The Israeli Foreign Ministry today denied that new Foreign Minister Moshe Arens spoke of "firm proof" of the involvement of a German firm in the building of a chemical weapons factory in Libya. Earlier, Arens, following his first meeting with the foreign press in Israel, said to DPA's Jerusalem correspondent: "We have firm evidence of the involvement of a German firm in the building of a factory for gases in Libya." [passage omitted]

Investigations Continue Into CW Exports To Iraq

*LD0301190989 Hamburg DPA in German 1652 GMT
3 Jan 89*

[Excerpt] Bonn (DPA)—At present 38 individuals and persons in authority in firms are under investigation for suspected illegal exports of equipment for the production of chemical weapons in Iraq. This emerges from an interim report given to the Bundestag and published by the Federal Government in Bonn on Tuesday on the progress of the investigations by the public prosecutor's office. So far over 90 witnesses and others giving information had been heard or questioned. Searches had been carried out in the case of over fifty individuals and firms. Apart from the five firms under suspicion, investigations had also been extended to the suppliers to these firms.

The report adds that individual documents which had been seized bore out the suspicion that after the change in legal provisions the documents had been falsified to show that the exports had gone via firms in Austria or France to circumvent the approval procedure. Initial investigations of the designs of one of the firms under suspicion resulted in the conclusion that there was no certainty as to whether pesticides or poison gas had been manufactured from the delivered chemicals. The experts were of the unanimous opinion, however, that proof of this could still be produced in view of comprehensive evidence. [passage omitted]

CDU-CSU's Ruehe on Libyan CW, NATO Deterrent Structure

*LD0501140489 Hamburg DPA in German 1051 GMT
5 Jan 89*

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA)—Volker Ruehe, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, has urged the governments in Washington and Bonn to make clear the accusations made against German firms in connection with alleged poison gas production in Libya rapidly and ruthlessly. German foreign policy's ability to function must not be adversely affected.

Speaking to journalists in Bonn today, Ruehe appealed in particular to the United States "to name names," and to show the proof of supplies by German firms to Libya for the construction of a poison gas factory. Ruehe, who will be travelling to Washington this weekend for talks with U.S. Government representatives, said he is concerned about the discussions taking place in the United States at present. They could put a strain on German U.S. relations.

The "shrill tones" represent a "dangerous mixture" and typified "disturbing trends," which must be opposed. Ruehe said that the Federal Republic has a right to be protected by the United States against "unjustified attacks and campaigns" once everything has been done to achieve clarification. The present "cheap propaganda" must be stopped.

While in Washington, Ruehe wants to learn the main emphasis and features of the foreign and security policy of the future government. He named as subjects for his talks the Middle East situation, NATO's overall concept, and developments in southern Africa. He said that in February he will visit South Africa with a delegation of the International Democratic Union (IDU). The IDU is an international association of Christian-Democrat and Conservative parties.

Ruehe reaffirmed his view that NATO must decide on the future structure of the nuclear deterrent. In addition to defining the minimum amount of weapons, it is also a matter of restructuring in a direction away from short-range missiles and of further reduction. The West should also undertake a unilateral reduction of nuclear artillery.

Ruehe suggested that the allies react positively to developments in the Soviet Union under Mikhail Gorbachev. The NATO stance here is "too defensive." He appealed to the Soviets, in the wake of Gorbachev's disarmament announcements for the conventional sphere, to submit the East's concept for the negotiations in Vienna. Ruehe said that he expects decisive progress toward the implementation of a world-wide chemical weapons ban in 1989.

Foreign Ministry: UK Document 'No Proof' of Illegal CW Exports

AU0701164789 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
ALLGEMEINE in German 7 Jan 89 pp 1-2

["C. G." report: "Discord Between Bonn and Washington Because of U.S. Accusations"]

[Excerpt] Bonn, 6 January—[Passage omitted] On 21 December 1988 a British diplomat visited the FRG Foreign Ministry and handed over an unofficial message, in which London—following Washington's views—expresses concern that the Libyan plant might produce chemical weapons. Now the Foreign Ministry reports that in this document Great Britain did not present any evidence which might justify actions against German

companies. After it had been reported from London on Thursday [5 January] that Great Britain has its own evidence that chemical weapons might be manufactured in Libya, Bonn's Ambassador Von Richthofen called the British Foreign Office to ask for more details and was told that the matter was a misunderstanding. On Friday a spokesman of the Bonn Foreign Ministry said: "There are no findings from London; it must have been an error on the part of the British press spokesman." The FRG Government has repeatedly said that it does not have any information from its own sources about whether chemical weapons could be produced in Libya. The question of how credible Bonn considers U.S. reports to be remained unanswered.

According to the FRG Foreign Ministry, on Thursday the Libyan Foreign Ministry affirmed in a conversation with Bonn's ambassador to Tripoli, Hellner, that Libya has nothing against an international inspection of the plant if such inspections are generally binding for all states. A similar view was expressed by head of state Al-Qadhafi in a talk with Hellner on Tuesday [3 January]. Obviously, Libya calls for inspections in other states, too, in particular in Israel.

Commentary on Roots of U.S.-FRG Controversy over Libya, CW

AU0901142989 Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG
in German 8 Jan 89 p 2

[Herbert Kemp commentary: "Why Are the Americans, Our Friends, Suddenly Against Us?"]

[Text] There has not been such a clash between Bonn and Washington for a long time. In a rude manner, newspapers and television are accusing the FRG of helping the Libyans produce chemical weapons. To date, however, the U.S. Administration has not furnished a single piece of evidence.

"Auschwitz in the sand," a U.S. daily wrote. Chancellor Kohl was furious. The comparison between the FRG and the Nazi regime and its crimes is outrageous—much worse than the former description of Reagan as a "war-monger" by left-leaning German papers.

—The Germans are not as honorable as they pretend to be. Iraq is producing nerve gas at a factory, in the construction of which the FRG was involved, and which was to have produced pesticides. The case was uncovered in 1984 and has not been concluded to date. Iraq has meanwhile used the poison in its war against Iran.

—The international success of the German chemical industry is a thorn in the side of the United States. The allegations are (poisoned) weapons that are being used in the competition.

- The United States is also concerned about the German nuclear industry. Papers are claiming that the FRG has supplied materials (enriched uranium, heavy water) and parts of plants to Argentina, India, Israel, Pakistan, and South Africa, which can be used to produce the "Bomb." These examples are not far-fetched, as has been demonstrated by the most recent case of the NTG [New Technologies] company in Gellenhausen (the delivery of plant parts to Pakistan).
- However, there are also other causes for irritation on the part of the United States: Tensions are mounting within NATO because of low-altitude flights, troop status (remainders of the occupation laws and regulations), and because of resistance against the modernization of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe.
- The admiration for Gorbachev ("Gorbymania") in the FRG has aroused distrust among many Americans. Genscher is regarded as the "court propagandist" of the Kremlin leader because of his incessant publicity campaign for Gorbachev.
- In addition to that, a trade war has been triggered between the EC and the United States (because of hormone-treated meat). The atmosphere is gloomy. Money is at stake, and this is where the alliance partners get down to tough business.

Bonn To Approve Stricter Laws Against Illegal Exports

AU1001103989 Munich SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG
in German 9 Jan 89 p 1

["ub" report: "Bonn Announces Stricter Laws Against Illegal Exports"]

[Text] Bonn—The Cabinet intends to approve stricter foreign trade laws on Tuesday [10 January]. There are plans to introduce stricter controls concerning the export of nuclear and chemical plants, and to drastically increase fines for illegal exports. During a meeting on the sidelines of the Paris chemical weapons conference, Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and his U.S. counterpart George Shultz agreed to have the charges concerning the involvement of German companies in the construction of an alleged poison gas factory in Libya examined by a commission of experts from both countries.

In a public statement, Shultz stressed that the United States "fully trusts" Genscher and Chancellor Helmut Kohl. Bonn has announced that it will also amend the laws if this is necessary to prevent German participation in the spread of chemical weapons. Genscher subsequently stated that he is "convinced" that, with the clear statements by Shultz, the matter is now closed.

The chancellor and foreign minister made it clear in Paris and Bonn at the weekend that so far they have no information that the U.S. charges concerning German

participation are accurate. In an interview with Sueddeutscher Rundfunk [South German Radio], Kohl stressed that he still is not in a position to support the U.S. charges. It is inconceivable for him that "individuals in the FRG, or German companies, should participate, out of greed for profit, in projects that could in any way endanger peace in parts of the world." It is important now to leave the realm of suppositions and allegations. He will be the first to react on this matter with the full severity with which the state is capable of reacting. However, this is only possible if the accusations are proved in detail.

Economics Minister Helmut Haussmann, the cabinet member responsible for the foreign trade law, intends to suggest a number of measures to the cabinet on Tuesday. As the minister pointed out in a television interview on Sunday [8 January], the Office for Industry and Trade will be even more streamlined, its members will receive additional training, and the personnel will be increased to be able to examine "sensitive export permits." Applications have always been checked carefully by experts, he stressed. In the case of the Transnuclear company, which has allegedly exported nuclear facilities to Pakistan, no application has been received. It is now important to increase the capacities of the customs investigation authorities, which are basically an export police. Haussmann also wants to suggest the application of certain control mechanisms that have been developed for East Bloc countries to other countries as well that are currently under discussion.

Changes are planned regarding fines for illegal exports. The term of imprisonment, which has been 3 years up to now, should be extended to at least 5 years. In accordance with this, Haussmann also intends to suggest an increase in the fines. Care must be taken to ensure that not all companies which export important goods are subjected to tedious bureaucratic measures, Haussmann emphasized. What is important now is to concentrate examinations on the few sensitive products and the sensitive countries that receive the exports.

After the meeting with Shultz in Paris, Genscher pointed out that Bonn and Washington have the same aim of preventing the spread of chemical weapons. The FRG is the only country that has undertaken not to produce chemical weapons and to willingly submit to checks. Bonn is determined to prevent German firms from spreading such weapons. Any information about such matters will therefore be pursued "in all seriousness."

The German - U.S. discord over Libya will also be among the topics that CDU/CSU Group Chairman Volker Ruehe will discuss in the United States. He left for the United States on Sunday [8 January]. Ruehe will meet with, among others, Bent Scowcroft, the new security adviser of President-elect George Bush.

Siemens Denies Involvement in Libyan Chemical Plant

AU1001092589 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
ALLGEMEINE in German 10 Jan 89 p 2

["K.B." report: "Siemens Denies Involvement in Libya"]

[Text] Bonn, 9 January—At its session this Tuesday [10 January] the FRG Cabinet will decide on the composition of a delegation that will exchange information with U.S. experts in Washington this week on the suspicion that German companies have been involved in the construction of the chemical plant in Libya. Economics Minister Haussmann will report to the Cabinet about the new findings of the German authorities in their investigations into further companies.

Another interim result of the investigation of companies was announced by the Hamburg Higher Financial Directorate on Monday, which has concluded a foreign trade check on the branch office of the Hongkong Pen-Tsao-Materia-Medica Company. In connection with the U.S. accusations against the Imhausen-Chemie Company in Baden-Wuerttemberg, which has in the meantime been exonerated by the results of the official investigation, the Hamburg branch office had also come under suspicion. The Higher Financial Directorate announced that a check on all documents of the import and export deals of this company has not revealed any evidence that chemical equipment or design documents for the construction of the chemical plant have been sent to Al-Rabtah. The investigation of exports to other countries has not yet been concluded.

As regards television pictures which show a container labeled "Siemens" in front of the chemical plant, Siemens Company states that it has nothing to do with this plant. This container can come only from a building site where Siemens participated in the construction. It is no secret that Siemens has business connections with Libya; foreign trade regulations are, however, strictly observed.

Responding to the accusations that Siemens is involved in the deliveries of nuclear equipment to power plants in India and Pakistan, the company says that it observes the national and international regulations and conditions concerning such exports. It is confirmed that Siemens-Kraftwerksunion (KWU) delivered equipment for one reactor in India and one in Pakistan. This technical equipment serves the increased safety of the two power plants. Both Pakistan and India have voluntarily subjected themselves to inspections of their facilities for the peaceful use of nuclear energy by the IAEA in Vienna, even though the two countries have not signed the Nonproliferation Treaty.

Kohl Launches 'Reinforced' Inquiry into Libyan Chemical Affair

LD1101161289 Hamburg DPA in German 1323 GMT
11 Jan 89

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl has introduced a reinforced investigation into suspicions of the participation of German firms in the construction of a chemical factory in Libya which, according to the United States is meant to produce chemical weapons. [passage omitted]

Informed sources confirmed that customs has confiscated business documents belonging to the Frankfurt firm IBI Engineering, belonging to the exiled Iraqi Professor Ihsan Barbouti. According to press reports, and a report on the ZDF television program Heute Journal, Barbouti organized German deliveries for the chemical complex in Libya. His Frankfurt firm is in liquidation. He has disappeared. British authorities are investigating allegations that he has disappeared in Great Britain.

At the request of German officials, it was learned in Bonn, Belgian customs officers in Antwerp are now active. According to press reports, this is in connection with a transport contractor with two companies that sent transportation ships toward Libya, also for the German firm Imhausen in Lahr (Baden-Wuerttemberg State). One of the two firms contacted by DPA Wednesday refused to comment. According to the Belgian newspaper 'GAZET VAN ANTWERPEN', German Customs officers have been working in the city since Tuesday.

It is said that part of the chemical base products and the construction material for the Libyan chemical plant, with a Tripoli destination, in 1975-76 was loaded in Antwerp. In this connection, the 'Wulhelm Schulte,' sailing under a Cypriot flag, was named. This ship arrived from Hamburg and had an initial destination of Hong Kong. The newspaper says that the load was declared for Tripoli in Antwerp. [passage omitted]

According to 'STERN', construction managers and engineers for the desert chemical complex were hired via advertisements in the Viennese newspaper 'KURIER'. Their salaries were paid via an account at the Deutsche Bank in Frankfurt. German firms delivered a water desalination plant and moulds and lifting platforms. Steel construction supplies came from the GDR enterprise VEB Stahlbau Plauen.

In the ZDF program the owner of a metal construction company in Bensheim said he delivered 200 office windows for the medicinal and plant protection factory 'Pharma 150' in Libya. This is the factory where, according to U.S. sources, chemical weapons are to be produced. According to the owner of the firm, the financing and delivery was carried out through Barbouti.

**CDU Figure Accuses U.S. of 'Subversive War'
Against FRG on Libya**

AU1101202789 Vienna *DIE PRESSE* in German
11 Jan 89 p 4

[Interview with Hans Stercken (CDU), chairman of the FRG Bundestag Foreign Affairs Committee, by *DIE PRESSE* correspondent Ewald Koenig in Bonn: "This Will Stick to the Germans"—date not given]

[Text] *DIE PRESSE*: What is it that has irritated you about the way the United States has been acting toward Bonn in connection with the Libyan chemical weapons factory?

Stercken: The fact that last weekend in Paris U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz only made a formal public statement [Ehrenerklaerung] to the FRG Government does not exclude the possibility that law suits may be filed against some economic enterprises. After all, trusting the chancellor and foreign minister does not exclude that cooperation or a supply might have been effected, which would then be justifiably criticized.

My second argument has to do with the timing: These things have been a matter of public discussion for quite some time; editorials have been written with references to Auschwitz, and other similar things, but not a single FRG authority, no embassy or any other institution was told that such information did indeed exist. This cannot be the way of discovering the political truth. I was so annoyed because I simply do not think it is quite right to say that now, in the first place, the FRG has been exonerated. As FRG deputy I am not only a representative of the FRG Government but also of the FRG people, which also involves the FRG economy. If somebody says: "We will withdraw you from the hail of bombs, but the firing will continue, without mentioning any specific names, then this is a condition that is indeed completely unbearable. [quotation marks as published]

Now the U.S. secretary of state has agreed to FRG experts traveling to the United States in order to examine the accusations that have been raised. However, I am being quite frank when I say that I am most surprised. True, this is a diplomatic measure, which is to help reduce some pressure in a polite way. However, as far as settling such conflicts in a political way is concerned, I do not consider this to be a satisfactory solution. If a company from the FRG should indeed have managed to export sensitive goods to Libya—something that has happened hundreds of times in other countries—then it must be possible to provide concrete evidence of it, for this is very difficult to grasp.

Starting a subversive war through the media and subsequently issuing an exonerating document for the FRG Government is certainly not an adequate strategy. If somebody says: The Germans are involved in yet another holocaust, then this will somehow always stick to the Germans and the German economy.

I would like to spare us this, after all, this is what we have a gigantic foreign affairs service for. Why can those responsible not contact one another as friends and allies at the moment they find out about something? I think that eventually this is what alliances are for. If one quite rightly complains that a certain euphoria in Europe and especially in the FRG is at the same time making people regard defense readiness as no longer of prime importance, one must not be surprised when such cases of completely unnecessary indirect defamations are not exactly apt for promoting defense readiness.

DIE PRESSE: What must be done now?

Stercken: The Libyan problem cannot be solved without talks either. We have had this experience in the Middle East, in Africa, Indochina, and Central America: The problems cannot be solved through conflicts, therefore one has to try it through talks. Here is a daring idea, which I will present in 2 weeks time in the Bundestag: The fact that the superpowers and their allies will find proven and promising decisions increases the danger at the periphery, because the small countries do not feel that they are integrated in this process.

This has now become particularly obvious in the field of chemicals. Apart from the two superpowers, as it has turned out, another 18 countries have chemical weapons or have the potential to produce such weapons. A satisfying solution for this problem can be reached only if we manage to integrate these countries in agreements.

DIE PRESSE: Would you say that the FRG Government has acted correctly?

I have not been able to detect even the slightest trace of a development in which it had not acted completely correctly. I would have liked the U.S. side to lose no time and, in our era of mechanization and mass media, discuss any relevant information within the very first second after any such suspicion was aroused.

There is no doubt that the FRG produces certain chemicals, however, this is not prohibited. What matters is whether it exports them. Yet, there have not been any such exports. Therefore, one has to investigate more carefully if one turns to the public with certain information that has been provided by secret services or satellites.

**IBI, Construction Firms Said Involved in Libyan
Chemical Plant**

AU1201101989 Hamburg *BILD* in German 12 Jan 89
pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "Al-Qadhdhafi's Poison Plant: Germans Involved After All"]

[Excerpts] Bonn—Germans have reportedly been involved in the construction of Al-Qadhdhafi's poison gas plant after all. [passage omitted]

The string-puller of the Libyan deal was a Frankfurt firm, Ihsan Barbouti International Engineering. The owner, Iraqi engineer Barbouti, has reportedly removed himself to London. Tax consultant Harry P. Meyer dissolved Barbouti's company at his order. The incriminating documents were seized in Meyer's private apartment.

On the ZDF television network, Josef Sartorius, head of a metal construction company in Bensheim, stated that he delivered 200 windows to Libya. The engineering bureau Krebs and Kiefer in Darmstadt affirmed that it did the structural calculations for four factory halls (100 per 60 meters each) for Libya. John Zink Limited of Frankfurt delivered a ground burner for excess gas, Preussag of Hannover supplied a recycling plant for saliniferous desert ground water. The Huennebeck company in Ratingern sold moulds and lifting platforms.

It is unclear whether the firms knowingly participated in the construction of the poison gas plant. [passage omitted]

'Informed Sources': Government Has 'No Proof' on Libyan Plant

*LD1201151489 Hamburg DPA in German 1334 GMT
12 Jan 89*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—According to informed circles, the Federal Government does not yet possess sufficient proof that German firms made illegal deliveries for the construction of a chemical weapons factory in Libya. Reports stating that the Federal Government has proof were described as erroneous.

"So far there is no evidence to allow any clear statement that will stand up in court to the effect that goods have been delivered which should not have been exported under foreign trade legislation," it was stressed. It was, however, confirmed that specialists at the Cologne customs criminal investigations institute are pursuing a series of leads and following up tips.

They are drawing mainly on the wealth of material found in the business papers confiscated from the Frankfurt firm IBI Engineering, which is now in liquidation. Its owner, the Exiled Iraqi Ihsan Barbouti, who is apparently abroad, possibly in South America, has according to press reports organized the deliveries by German firms for the Libyan chemical project. [passage omitted]

Kohl: Investigations of Chemical Sales to Libya in Progress

*LD1201225589 Hamburg DPA in German 2213 GMT
12 Jan 89*

[Excerpt] Bonn/Washington (DPA)—According to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl there is evidence which is being "concretely followed up" in the investigation into

participation by German firms in the export of chemical equipment to Libya which could be used there for the production of chemical weapons.

This evidence, Kohl said during Thursday evening's Second German Television program "Journalists Ask, Politicians answer," relates to "specific documents, which may produce convincing proof."

In this connection, Kohl referred to a ministerial working group which has looked at material presented to it in the United States, and which, according to Kohl, is to be returned to the FRG tonight.

Speaking to the press in Washington on Thursday, Finance Minister Stoltenberg also confirmed that for some days the FRG government has had evidence indicating that companies based in the FRG may have been participating in exports to Libya via third countries. "This is being investigated with great vigor," Stoltenberg said.

Stoltenberg also said that he will raise the issue of the alleged involvement of German firms in the plant in Libya during his farewell visit tomorrow to U.S. Assistant Secretary of State John Whitehead. [passage omitted]

Libyan UN Ambassador Denies FRG Involvement in Rabta Plant

*LD1201175189 Hamburg DPA in German 1713 GMT
12 Jan 89*

[Text] New York (DPA)—'Ali al-Turayki, Libyan ambassador to the United Nations, denied Thursday an ambassador remark made in an interview for the U.S. television company CBS that German firms were involved in the construction of a chemical factory in the Libyan town of Al-Rabitah.

Al-Turayki told DPA: "We have wide-ranging cooperation with Germany and a lot of German companies have been involved in a lot of development projects in Libya."

Asked whether these had included the factory in Al-Rabitah, Al-Turayki said: "I have no information whatever about any sort of German project in connection with the pharmaceutical factory."

An agency report on the CBS interview quoted the ambassador as saying: "The West Germans have helped us not only with this factory (in Al-Rabitah) but also with other factories."

Asked whether he had made this statement, Al-Turayki said: "That's not true." The CBS press office has not yet been able to confirm the exact wording of Al-Turayki's remarks in the live interview.

Belgian Arrested for Involvement in Libyan Chemical Deal

*LD1201161089 Hamburg DPA in German 1537 GMT
12 Jan 89*

[Excerpts] Brussels/Bonn (DPA)—A Belgian shipping agent, Jozef Gedopt, has been arrested in connection with chemical exports to Libya. According to press reports, FRG firms accused of building the alleged chemical weapons factory in Libya are also involved in his transactions. Although the Federal Government officially has "no proof of use", it nevertheless does now have in its possession evidence of the possible involvement of German firms or persons with the chemical factory in Al-Rabtah, south of Tripoli. Government spokesman Friedhelm Ost confirmed in Bonn today. The relevant authorities have been asked to do everything to "pursue this evidence and any leads very intensively". [passage omitted]

The public prosecutor's office in Antwerp is investigating the arrested shipping agent Jozef Gedopt on suspicion of using false transportation documents and abuse of trust. The authority confirmed that the transport of chemical products to Tripoli is at issue. The director of the small shipping agency Cross Link in Antwerp was arrested on Wednesday evening at Brussels Airport on his return from Switzerland. According to the evidently well-informed Flemish paper GAZET VAN ANTWERPEN the offices of the group, to which small-sized firms belong, as well as the shipping agent's private home, have been searched. [passage omitted]

Press Review for 12 January Views Libyan Chemical Plant Affair

AU1201132389 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0605 GMT 12 Jan 89

[From the press review]

[Text] The FRG press today comments on charges concerning German participation in the construction of a chemical plant in Libya. SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG states: First, there was no evidence of the participation of German companies in the construction of the chemical plant in Al-Rabtah in Libya; there were only denials on the part of company owners and dismay on the part of Chancellor Kohl about allegations leveled by the U.S. press which are not helpful among friends. But then the cabinet made a surprise decision to tighten export controls and increase punishment for illegal supplies of sensitive goods. Maybe the charges were not completely unjustified after all. In the chancellor's view, this was not the case. Yesterday [11 January] he finally ordered increased efforts to investigate the allegations. Was it because he realized that the United States had not presented its evidence to allow the government to carry out its own investigations, thus sparing it the embarrassment of being compromised as an ally?

NEUE PRESSE, published in Frankfurt, writes: It was not pure wickedness, after all, that caused the United States to scold Bonn because of the chemical weapons plant in Libya. What is coming to light now confirms that the accused companies are not innocent at all. The politicians in Bonn and the journalists who think that they know the United States very well should have sensed that Washington would not intervene so massively against the German-Libyan connection without being in possession of evidence.

On the basis of the investigation results that have become public, WESTFALENBLATT, published in Bielefeld, supposes that the Imhausen company was involved in the construction of the plant in the Libyan desert. It points out: The suspicion that the number of persons involved will further increase does indeed seem plausible. As recently as 2 days ago, the Government in Bonn called on Washington to mention names. Names have now been specified, and things have turned out to be true which the chancellor had described as unacceptable: German companies are playing a major role in the production of chemical weapons, have made sizable profits and, in addition to that, have helped one of the leading terrorists in the world to gain possession of terrible weapons of mass destruction.

FRG Intelligence Confirms Libya To Produce CW Agents at Rabta

*LD1301120589 Hamburg DPA in German 1110 GMT
13 Jan 89*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The Federal German Intelligence Services have at their disposal indications which are "free from doubt" that the Libyans intend to produce chemical warfare agents in the Al-Rabtah chemicals factory. According to reliable sources in Bonn Friday, there has possibly already been a test run in the factory. However, production has not yet been started up, it was said. Government spokesman Friedhelm Ost confirmed to the press on Friday that Bonn had been informed by means of "our services" since the beginning of October through "reports which were to be taken seriously" about German participation in a poison gas factory in Libya. However, up to today, neither these nor the U.S. indications which followed 1 month later had been "evidence which was usable in court".

Ost disputed that the Federal Government had pretended to have received indications for the very first time after the Kohl visit to Washington on 15 November. But, said Ost, it was clear that "indications from the U.S. side" had been given "for the first time" in Washington. If it was possible to talk at all about "anger" on the part of the Federal chancellor concerning U.S. actions, this was only to the extent that the impression had been evoked in the U.S. press that the Germans were not pursuing their own and foreign intelligence with the utmost vigor.

The illustrated magazine 'BUNTE' had been reporting about the domestic German information since the middle of October 1988. According to the magazine, a high-ranking official in Bonn had stated to it: "Yes, the first indications from the Federal Intelligence Service were in existence several months ago".

In Bonn, according to the 'BUNTE', it is thought possible that this confidential information was "transferred" to the sphere of competence of Waldemar Schreckenberger, state secretary responsible for the secret services. Kohl is said to have had no advance knowledge when he was confronted with the suspicion about German firms during his U.S. visit in November by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and CIA head William Webster.

As 'BUNTE' continued its own version, the Imhausen-Chemie firm at Lahr in Baden, which is at the center of the investigations, has received some DM200 million in research funds from Bonn over the last 10 years. A total of 30 firms "have helped to stir the poison business with Libya". Included with these are firms from Japan, Denmark, and the GDR.

Companies Confirm Parts Deliveries to Rabta, Libya

AU1301095689 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 13 Jan 89 p 2

["bes." report: "German Companies Confirm Deliveries of Component Parts to Libya"]

[Text] Frankfurt, 12 January—In addition to foreign companies, numerous German firms were involved in the construction of the Libyan technology center at Al-Rabitah near Tripoli. The Frankfurt Public Prosecutor's Office confirmed that there is, however, no evidence of criminal actions on the part of the German companies which would justify investigations by the public prosecutor.

According to German businessmen, there are various industrial facilities at Al-Rabitah. If there is a chemical plant there, it is only a small part of the entire industrial complex. Iraqi businessman Ihsan Barbouti reportedly was the general agent for the construction of the complex. According to Frankfurt tax consultant Harry P. Meyer, on 15 August 1985 he founded the IBI Engineering company in Frankfurt. His managing director, Horst Koerbler, commissioned Meyer to carry out accounting and tax consultations. Every month Meyer received documents on the expenditures and income of IBI Frankfurt. Income consisted of fees that were transferred from IBI Zurich. According to Meyer, the construction orders for the facility at Al-Rabitah were arranged via this firm and IBI in Zug [Switzerland], but not via Frankfurt. Last June, Barbouti sold his shares in IBI Engineering GmbH to Husayn Musa, who then ordered Meyer to dissolve the company. Since then, IBI Frankfurt has been in the process of dissolution, leases have been canceled; Meyer last saw Barbouti in June 1988.

Barbouti is not unknown in the construction trade. Bischoff KG from Frankfurt used to have regular business contacts with IBI Frankfurt. According to its managing director, for years Bischoff KG had delivered cranes, loaders, fork stackers, tools—drills for instance—and spare parts to Al-Rabitah. Payments were made with letters of credit from IBI Zurich, sometimes also with a check from IBI Frankfurt. The orders were given by Barbouti. The orders were of normal scope, which absolutely fit in with the usual business of the construction machinery dealer. Until the beginning of 1988, Bischoff made deliveries to the technology center, and it was not the only one to do so, the management says. Numerous German construction machinery dealers regularly applied for the orders for Al-Rabitah. Since the plant at Al-Rabitah has been connected with the potential production of poison gas, Bischoff has not accepted any new orders, according to information from the company. According to the management of Bischoff, the Al-Rabitah plant is an industrial facility, which comprises—in addition to various production facilities—apartment houses and warehouses.

From 1985-87 several halls were constructed by the Krebs and Kiefer Engineering Consulting GmbH in Darmstadt. According to information from this firm, the engineering bureau checked the structural calculations of the steel constructions of the factory halls, made structural calculations for the foundations of the halls, and drew lining and reinforcement plans for the foundations and ground slabs. According to the bureau, these were special halls for metal industry, not halls for a chemical plant, since there were no corresponding special requirements. A forge, a metal processing facility and an assembly hall, rooms for precision mechanics, production of moulds, a repair shop, a casting facility, and warehouses were designed. A GDR company constructed and delivered the steel halls. The specially required equipment for the foundations of the machinery for the halls were delivered by a Japanese and a Danish company. All plans can be looked at in the office of Krebs and Kiefer. Krebs and Kiefer were commissioned by Barbouti, whom the engineering bureau considered as a sort of project manager. One of the bureau's employees went to Al-Rabitah three times to check on mistakes made during construction. At that time the facilities were only finished in rough, Krebs and Kiefer claims.

The scaffolding frames for the construction were reportedly delivered by Huennebeck GmbH in Ratingen near Duesseldorf. In 1986 and 1987 Huennebeck, too, delivered metal frames and lining equipment for concrete buildings on the order of IBI Frankfurt. The deliveries, however, went to Rotterdam. Huennebeck claims not to have known at that time that the equipment finally ended up in Libya.

Obviously, not all deliveries were sent directly to Libya. Thus, the Frankfurt firm Zink John GmbH, Combustion Technology, delivered a so-called ground burner for excess gas at the order of IBI Zurich. Zink specializes in

burning-off equipment for the chemical and petrochemical industries. The addressee of the excess gas burner was IBI Hong Kong. According to management, the Zink company was at no time able to realize that the facility was destined to Libya.

While the above-mentioned companies did not deny their deliveries to Libya, the management of Imhausen-Chemie GmbH continues to refuse to comment on the matter. Imhausen is suspected of having participated in furnishing the chemical plant allegedly contained in the technology center. According to the U.S. secret intelligence service, this part of the facility is allegedly suited to the production of combat gas.

Press Review for 13 January Views Libyan Chemical Affair

AU1301102789 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network
in German 0605 GMT 13 Jan 89

[From the press review]

[Text] NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG writes on the topic of Libya: Have German companies been involved after all in the construction of al-Qadhdhafi's controversial chemical plant? Only a short time ago, corresponding U.S. accusations were received with great skepticism by the FRG Government. Now the matter seems to have changed. In the end, it is unimportant whether additional information provided by the Americans or a German reevaluation of the already known facts are responsible for this. The decisive thing is that annoying misunderstandings between the FRG and the United States have been eliminated—and, finally, investigations are being carried out with all emphasis on the Libyan affair, NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG stresses.

SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG writes: Foreign Ministers Genscher and Shultz and the chancellor have made every effort—nevertheless, the quarrel among friends seems to be somehow exemplary, which should give Bonn food for thought. For the future one wishes that the Bonn government would react more calmly and with not so much conviction of having a clear conscience—as well as that investigators have more understanding of the matter than has been shown by the Freiburg Higher Financial Directorate concerning the firm Imhausen, SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG writes.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU stresses: Kohl and Genscher have made a courageous decision. Every FRG citizen is to be subjected to the severity of the Penal Code if he participates in the production of chemical weapons anywhere in the world. After disclosures about German participation in the construction of a Libyan chemical plant, which is probably intended to produce weapons, this was the only possibility of somehow limiting the damage to the reputation of the Republic, FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU underlines.

Genscher Calls for 'Significant' Conventional Arms Reduction

LD2112144288 Hamburg DPA in German 1340 GMT
21 Dec 88

[Text] Bonn/Wuppertal (DPA)—According to Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the West must also reduce “not only a little but significantly” its conventional arms. In a speech in Wuppertal today, Genscher said that this significant reduction of the West's armaments, on average three times lower than the East's anyway, has to take place in its own interest.

The fact that, in view of the joint upper limits being sought, the East will have to agree to much greater cuts was taken into account by Genscher in his speech prepared beforehand in Bonn. The federal minister expects that the East will come closer to the outlined Western ideas.

Once again Genscher stressed the great urgency for a specific negotiation task for NATO for shorter-range missiles, for which the joint upper limits are also to be negotiated at a lower level. This mandate has to become part of the still-awaited joint plan. The minister appealed in this connection to the allies to agree on the joint plan “by means of constructive cooperation.”

Genscher Decries Opposition to Negotiations To Ban Tactical Missiles

LD2212135688 Hamburg DPA in German 1320 GMT
22 Dec 88

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—In the view of Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, it is “very clear” that there is “still a lot of convincing to do” among the allies in the Western alliance in order to get tactical missiles incorporated into NATO's prospective overall disarmament proposals. Genscher, who in an interview on Hesse Radio today accused unnamed NATO partners of delaying tactics, stressed the binding nature of the NATO plans to provide for such a mandate to include tactical missiles. People should not be trying to “Erect bulwarks against disarmament,” as this is “contrary to reason and responsibility.”

In the Interview, Genscher stressed that it is particularly the FRG's responsibility to be a “country urging progress” in East/West relations and thus to develop a dynamic force in relations with the East and in disarmament.

Genscher Urges Unilateral Soviet Cuts in Short-Range Missiles

LD0501195189 Hamburg DPA in German 1949 GMT
5 Jan 89

[Excerpts] Bonn/Wiesbaden (DPA)—Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher proposed to the Soviet Union Thursday that the enormous stock of Soviet

22161

40

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103

BEVERLY FARRADAY

5285 FORT ROYAL RD

SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.