


JPRS-TAC-89-026
27 JUNE 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

19980716 044

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

**Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited**

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-89-026

CONTENTS

27 JUNE 1989

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

SOUTH AFRICA

- Arms Company Spokesman Comments on U.S. Reports of IRBM Tests
[Johannesburg TV 21 Jun] 1

EAST ASIA

COOK ISLANDS

- Premier Backs New Zealand Nonnuclear Policy [Melbourne Radio 15 Jun] 2

PHILIPPINES

- Further on Claims That U.S. Nuclear Missiles Are Based in Philippines 2
Military To Probe Issue [Tokyo KYODO 17 Jun] 2
Further Report [Hong Kong AFP 17 Jun] 2
Laurel Disputes Soviet Envoy's Denial [Baguio City Radio 17 Jun] 2
Officials Check Clark Air Force Base [PHILIPPINE DAILY GLOBE 20 Jun] 3
General: No Nuclear Weapons Found [THE MANILA CHRONICLE 23 Jun] 3
Aquino Favors Regular Base Checks [Manila Radio 23 Jun] 4
Envoy Claims Laurel Briefed on Soviet ICBM's [PHILIPPINE DAILY GLOBE 21 Jun] 4
Senator Alleges Proof of Nuclear Weapons [Quezon City Radio 23 Jun] 5

VIETNAM

- Official Backs Southeast Asia Peace Zone Proposal [Hong Kong AFP 18 Jun] 5

EAST EUROPE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

- Soviet Battalion Leaves for Belorussia [Prague Radio 20 Jun] 6
Defense Minister Vaclavik Interviewed on Military Cuts Policy 6
Scale of Cuts, Restructuring [CTK 19 Jun] 6
Further Comments [M. Vaclavik; RUDE PRAVO 20 Jun] 7

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

- Commentary Views New Round of U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Arms Talks
[NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 20 Jun] 9
SED's Herrmann Reports to Central Committee on Arms Issues [ADN 22 Jun] 9
Officials Discuss Arms Control Policies With Visitors 12
Krenz, Swedish Riksdag Delegation [ADN 19 Jun] 12
Fischer, Tunisian Foreign Minister [NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 16 Jun] 12
Tanks Prepared for Dismantling, Scrapping [ADN 21 Jun] 13

POLAND

- Soviet Truck Battalion Finishes Withdrawal [PAP 16 Jun] 13

ROMANIA

SCINTEIA Views START Talks, Urges Substantial Cuts [AGERPRES 22 Jun] 14

LATIN AMERICA

BRAZIL

Official Says No U.S. Sanctions Planned Over Missile Production [Brasilia Radio 19 Jun] 15

SOVIET UNION

U.S. Stance on Conventional Arms, SNF at NATO Summit Critiqued
[V. Pustov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 May] 16
Discussion of 'Peaceful Coexistence' as Form of Class Struggle
[A. Podberezkin; KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL Feb 89] 16

WEST EUROPE

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Defense Minister Stoltenberg Views Soviet Arms Control Policy [WELT AM SONNTAG 18 Jun] . 22
Foreign Minister Genscher on East-West Relations, Disarmament
[SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 21 Jun] 22
Government Praises U.S. Position in START Talks [DPA 19 Jun] 24
Bundestag Committee Investigates MBB Illegal Missile Exports [DER SPIEGEL 19 Jun] 24

FRANCE

Prime Minister Rocard Rejects Ending South Pacific Nuclear Tests [Paris Radio 18 Jun] 25

NORWAY

Broad Consensus Prevails on Security Policy [G. Salvesen; AFTENPOSTEN 18 May] 25

SWITZERLAND

Foreign Minister Felber Interviewed on Prospects for CFE/CSBM Talks
[DIE WELTWOCHEN 23 Mar] 26

SOUTH AFRICA

**Arms Company Spokesman Comments on U.S.
Reports of IRBM Tests**

*MB2106054489 Johannesburg Television Service in
English 0500 GMT 21 Jun 89*

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports that South Africa is soon to test launch a new intermediate-range ballistic missile [IRBM] with the help of Israel.

Quoting unnamed American intelligence officials, THE WASHINGTON POST said the missile was a modified version of the Israeli Jericho-II IRBM and had been detected by American intelligence agencies at Armiston, a test range on the Cape south coast. The report claimed

that the missile was said to be in its final stages of development and that the first test launch could take place over the Indian Ocean within the next few weeks.

In reaction, an Armscor [Armaments Corporation of South Africa] spokesman said it was well known that Armscor was developing a missile test range at Overberg. He said the range had been under development over the last 6 years and was, at present, being qualified. This meant that Armscor was firing missiles in order to test the performance of the range.

He said South Africa was strong in the missile field and had produced several missiles of repute. For obvious reasons, Armscor was not prepared to disclose any details of its qualification program and would therefore not comment on any speculation.

COOK ISLANDS

Premier Backs New Zealand Nonnuclear Policy *BK1506063289 Melbourne Overseas Service in English* 0500 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Text] The Cook Islands prime minister, Mr Geoffrey Henry, says his government has great respect for New Zealand's nonnuclear policy. The previous administration, headed initially by Sir Thomas Davis and then by Dr Pupuke Robati, had frowned on the stance, and Sir Thomas expressed personal concern that his country was no longer under the ANZUS Defense Treaty umbrella.

Mr Henry says he thinks the nonnuclear policy is impressive. He says he knows of many Pacific leaders who approved the stance taken by the New Zealand Government.

PHILIPPINES

Further on Claims That U.S. Nuclear Missiles Are Based in Philippines

Military To Probe Issue *OW1706105489 Tokyo KYODO in English* 1022 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Excerpt] Manila, June 17 KYODO—The Philippine military will investigate the reported presence of nuclear weapons in two American military bases here, Chief of Staff Gen. Renato de Villa said Saturday.

De Villa's announcement came four days after President Corazon Aquino ordered the Defense Department to check reports that former acting Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuriy Vorontsov told Vice President Salvador Laurel last year that Clark Air and Subic Naval Bases are targets of Soviet missiles.

He told a news conference "the Philippines will go ahead with the verification (of nuclear presence)" in spite of the standing worldwide U.S. policy to neither confirm nor deny presence of nuclear weapons in their military facilities.

De Villa did not discount the possibility that U.S. planes and warships capable of carrying nuclear weapons enter Philippine territory. Under the recently revised base accord, U.S. carriers loaded with nuclear weapons must seek permission from Philippine authorities before being allowed entry.

Air Force commanding general Maj. Gen. Jose de Leon and Navy chief Rear Adm. Carlito Cunanan, Filipino base commanders of Clark Air and Subic Naval Bases, respectively, will undertake the investigations, he said. He did not mention a specific date on when the probe will start. [passage omitted]

Further Report

BK1706130789 Hong Kong AFP in English
1143 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] Manila, June 17 (AFP)—The Philippine Armed Forces is to verify with U.S. authorities whether nuclear weapons are stored at two U.S. military bases in the country, the official PHILIPPINE NEWS AGENCY (PNA) said Saturday.

President Corazon Aquino on Tuesday ordered Defense Secretary Fidel Ramos to verify whether Soviet missiles were aimed at the Philippines and if Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base harbored this type of armament as well.

Armed Forces chief General Renato de Villa on Saturday noted that Washington has consistently refused to confirm or deny the presence of nuclear warheads at its facilities, "but the Philippines will go ahead with the verification," PNA quoted him as saying.

Air Force chief Major General Jose de Leon and Navy chief Rear Admiral Carlito Cunanan were instructed to complete the verification as soon as possible, PNA reported.

Foreign Undersecretary Jose Ingles said on Tuesday that "it's no secret that we have nuclear weapons here in the Philippines" and added: "We have known for a long time that there are Soviet missiles aimed at this direction."

(In Moscow, a Foreign Ministry spokesman said Saturday the Soviet Union "has never threatened, is not threatening and is not preparing to threaten" the Philippines.)

A U.S. Embassy spokesman said here on Tuesday that "the American Government has a policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence and placement of nuclear weapons to maintain our policy of deterrence worldwide."

The Philippine Constitution states that the country "adopts and pursues a policy of freedom from nuclear weapons in its territory."

Under an agreement signed in October, Washington promised to seek Manila's permission before storing or introducing any nuclear weapons at the bases.

Laurel Disputes Soviet Envoy's Denial *HK1706043789 Baguio City Mountain Province* *Broadcasting Co. in English 0330 GMT 17 Jun 89*

[Text] Vice President Salvador Laurel disputed yesterday Soviet Ambassador Oleg Sokolov's denial of Soviet missiles aimed at the two U.S. military bases in the country. Laurel disclosed that Sokolov was even present

at his meeting with then Acting Soviet Foreign Minister Yuriy Vorontsov when the missiles were discussed during his visit to the Soviet Union last year.

Meantime, Laurel called on President Aquino to convene the Council of State to examine the missiles issue, even as he said that there was no cause for alarm.

[Begin Laurel recording] They maintained that there are nuclear weapons in those two bases and therefore, as a consequence, as part of our effort to catch up and bring about a balance in that part of the world, we are forced also to defend, take a very defensive position, and we may be forced to also aim our nuclear weapons in self-defense. [end recording]

Officials Check Clark Air Force Base

HK2006030789 Manila PHILIPPINE DAILY GLOBE
in English 20 Jun 89 p 6

[Text] Clark Air Base, Pampanga—Following orders from AFP [Armed Forces of the Philippines] chief of staff Gen. Renato de Villa, Filipino base officials yesterday conducted an inspection tour of the installation's "sensitive areas," to check on the reported storage of nuclear weapons at the U.S. bases here.

Clark Air Base Command [Cabcom] spokesman Lt. Col. Diosdado Pili said the Filipino contingent—composed of deputy base commander Demetrio Camua, Cabcom chief of staff Lt. Col. Ildefonso Dulinayan and operations chief Lt. Col. Romy Benedicto—was accompanied by Maj. Gen. Donald Snyder, commander of the 13th U.S. Air Force stationed at Clark.

The tour was in response to an order issued by De Villa for base authorities to check on the reported storage of nuclear weapons at U.S. military facilities in the country. De Villa's instructions followed reports that the Soviet Union has intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed at the U.S. installations.

Details of the tour were not immediately available, but Pili said he was confident that U.S. officials at Clark would not deny them access to areas they deemed necessary within the base.

U.S. officials have so far kept mum on the presence of nuclear weapons in the country, giving neither confirmation nor denial.

In a related development, Filipino troops deployed around Clark were augmented recently by a fresh batch of soldiers from the 69th Army Infantry Battalion.

General: No Nuclear Weapons Found

HK2306032189 Manila THE MANILA CHRONICLE
in English 23 Jun 89 pp 1, 3

[By correspondent Elmer Cato with reports from Manny Mogato and Tess Villanueva]

[Text] A Filipino commander at Clark Air Base (CAB) said yesterday he did not find any nuclear weapons during an inspection of restricted areas inside the sprawling U.S. facility in Angeles City.

Brig. Gen. Demetrio Camua, CAB command (Cabcom) deputy chief, said he was convinced the base poses no threat to the country. Camua and two other Cabcom Filipino officials—Colonels Ildefonso Dulinayan and Romy Benedicto—inspected the Clark restricted areas last Monday.

"I am satisfied with what I have seen and I feel it should not be a cause for anxiety and alarm," Camua told reporters during a briefing in Angeles City yesterday.

The general said he was given access by the U.S. facility commander to inspect at least four highly classified areas inside the base for nuclear weapons.

Camua's inspection followed published reports that Soviet nuclear missiles were aimed at Clark and Subic naval bases where nuclear weapons were also reportedly being stored.

The inspection was ordered by armed Forces chief of staff Gen. Renato de Villa to check reports of alleged nuclear presence inside the base.

President Aquino earlier ordered Defense Secretary Fidel V. Ramos to check the reported existence of nuclear weapons in the U.S. military facilities in the country.

Camua, who claimed to have seen nuclear warheads during his two-year schooling and training in West Germany, said there were no indications that nuclear weapons like Silos [as published] and Pershing missiles were based at Clark. "I am confident I could spot one if I saw one," he added.

He said missile bases would be highly secured and there would be security and safety precautions against radiation and the like. Maintaining a nuclear base in the country, he said, would include enormous training and security for both American and Filipino personnel in the base to avoid any nuclear accident.

But he admitted that aircraft stationed at Clark like the F-4G and F-4E fighter-bomber jets have the capability to carry missiles fitted with nuclear warheads.

Aside from a larger and tighter security perimeter, Camua said it would be "very hard" for the Americans to hide nuclear weapons, especially missiles because they are big and bulky and would require platforms and launching pads.

He also said the aircraft target exercises and training conducted at the Crow Valley range indicated that the Americans were only practicing bombs and weapons using conventional warheads.

"I haven't seen any firing equipment like 203mm guns here that could fire nuclear warheads," he said, adding that the ammunition stored at the base ammo depots were for tactical and conventional use.

However, Camua said his three-man team did not bring technical equipment during the inspection that could immediately spot nuclear weapons. He said that "it is possible to have smaller tactical missiles but where are they gonna use them?"

Clark, the largest U.S. military base overseas, is widely believed to be a store house of both tactical and strategic nuclear weapons in the Pacific.

Camua did not give details on what other areas his group toured inside the base.

Among the areas inspected were the main U.S. communications facility known as the Elephant Cage, a huge building near the military airlift command terminal and the Lily Hill area.

Meanwhile, Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus said yesterday that talks about countries having missiles pointed to each other is "no news" so it was not necessary to inform President Aquino about a report submitted to the foreign office last year that Soviet long-range missiles are aimed at U.S. military bases in the country.

"This (targeting of nuclear missiles) is a reality that has been going on for 30 to 40 years, so I didn't think it was necessary to inform the President about the report," Manglapus told newsmen upon arrival at the Ninoy Aquino International Airport from a three-continent swing.

Aquino Favors Regular Base Checks
HK2306133589 Manila Radio Veritas in Tagalog
1300 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] President Corazon Aquino favors a regular military inspection of the U.S. military bases in the country to ensure that no nuclear weapons are stored in these facilities.

The deputy commander of the Armed Forces of the Philippines based in Clark said earlier that there were no nuclear weapons stored in the bases:

[Begin Aquino recording] I don't know if this will push to rest the rumors, but maybe...[changes thought] cause it is necessary we do this on a regular basis. Anyway, our generals can go there at anytime. So I suppose whenever the question arises, there may be [words indistinct] so that the people will know exactly whether the rumors are based on more solid evidence. [end recording]

Envoy Claims Laurel Briefed on Soviet ICBM's
HK2106041589 Manila PHILIPPINE DAILY GLOBE
in English 21 Jun 89 p 6

[By Julius Fortuna]

[Text] A top Soviet Official had told Vice President Salvador Laurel that in a war with the United States, it would take 15 to 30 minutes for Soviet nuclear missiles to reach U.S. bases in the Philippines, Ambassador Alejandro Melchor Jr. said yesterday, obviously referring to Clark and Subic and other American military facilities in Asia.

In a telex to Manila, Ambassador to Moscow Alejandro Melchor Jr. said Yuriy Vorontsov, Soviet deputy foreign minister, made this remark to Laurel in the presence of the Soviet ambassador to Manila and two other Soviet officials.

"These U.S. bases (in the Philippines) are targeted by Soviet ICBMs in case anything happens," Melchor said in the telex, recalling details of the meeting between Laurel and Vorontsov.

Melchor said the meeting was held in the Kremlin at 3:30 PM on July 12 last year when the Philippine official visited Moscow.

Melchor clarified that Vorontsov made no mention of Clark and Subic as specific targets of Soviet ICBMs in his discussion with Laurel, contrary to a June 12 report by a wire agency.

Earlier, Soviet Ambassador to Manila Oleg Sokolov told reporters Soviet military planners have deployed those Soviet missiles purely for defense.

Although "they are not intended against the Filipino people...it is important to crush these bases so as not to have additional source of attack against Soviet territory," Melchor said in the telex, quoting Vorontsov.

Melchor quoted Vorontsov as having said that the "aim of Soviet missiles is to counter any military threat to the USSR."

Soviet missiles poised against Asian targets, are "not stoppable, not even by SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative)," said Vorontsov, referring to the American Star Wars program.

"Defense against ICBMs is impossible since there is only between 15-30 minutes from the time the missile is launched until it hits its target," Vorontsov said, as quoted by Melchor.

Melchor said that before he filed his report to Manila on the Laurel-Vorontsov meeting, he had crosschecked his version of the meeting with several sources. He added that it can be further verified with Ambassador Sokolov.

Melchor, who was ordered to vacate his post last week, said that he has asked Acting Foreign Secretary Manuel Yan to give him sixty days to wind up his business in Moscow, but would proceed with his court action against the DFA [Department of Foreign Affairs].

Melchor also informed DFA that he will leave Moscow June 30 for medical treatment, and await for the decision of the Supreme Court.

He said that he will be out of Moscow during the visit of Foreign Affairs Secretary Rual S. Manglapus, scheduled on the third week of July.

Senator Alleges Proof of Nuclear Weapons

HK2306065189 Quezon City Radyo Ng Bayan in Tagalog 0600 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] Senator Wigberto Tanada, principal sponsor of the antinuclear bill filed in the Senate, presented eight documents today to prove that there are nuclear weapons stored in the U.S. military bases in the country. He said that there are many documents proving the presence of these weapons in the military bases. Here is Jojo Ismael for the details:

[Begin recording] Tanada was referring to a letter by former President Marcos which stated that U.S. Ambassador Sullivan allegedly told Marcos that there were nuclear weapons in the bases. He also mentioned a book written by (Charlie Prado) which claimed that former U.S. President Johnson sent a top secret message to Ambassador William Blair to tell Marcos about the storage of nuclear weapons in the U.S. bases here.

In this connection, Tanada urged the Senate Committee on National Security and Defense and the Foreign Relations Committee to carry out a joint investigation on the issue. He demanded that the committee members should have direct access to all facilities inside the bases in relation to the probe. [end recording]

VIETNAM

Official Backs Southeast Asia Peace Zone Proposal

*BK1806142089 Hong Kong AFP in English
1359 GMT 18 Jun 89*

[Text] Kuala Lumpur, June 18 (AFP)—A senior Vietnamese official Sunday endorsed a proposal by non-communist Southeast Asia to have the region declared a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality (ZOPFAN).

Tran Quang Co, Vietnam's vice-minister for foreign affairs, told an Asia-Pacific round table that big-power detente and moves to end the Cambodian conflict had generated the right conditions for realising ZOPFAN.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), formed in 1967, proposed ZOPFAN as a means of keeping superpower rivalries out of the region. The ASEAN groups Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand.

A committee of top ASEAN officials directed to look into the creation of the area as a ZOPFAN region believes that the neutralisation of Southeast Asia is not possible without big-power pledges to respect it and peace in Cambodia, diplomats said.

Mr Co said normalisation of ties between the big powers had generated a "growing sense of self-confidence among smaller countries in readjusting their foreign policy."

"This is an auspicious opportunity for the countries of Southeast Asia to turn their long-nurtured wish for a ZOPFAN...into a reality," he said.

Mr Co was among speakers at the third Asia-Pacific round table on security matters organised by the Malaysian Institute of Strategic and International Studies, which ended Sunday.

He said Vietnam and other non-communist Southeast Asian states should build mutual trust and take steps to promote regional exchanges and cooperation.

Vietnam realised that it formed "an integral part of Southeast Asia" and fully appreciated the significance of its relations and friendship with others in the region, Mr Co said.

Vietnam has announced plans to pull its troops out of Cambodia by the end of September, triggering a flurry of diplomatic moves for an accord between the Hanoi-back Phnom Penh government and the ASEAN-supported tripartite resistance.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Soviet Battalion Leaves for Belorussia

*LD2006105389 Prague Domestic Service in Czech
1000 GMT 20 Jun 89*

[Text] A battalion of Soviet Army engineers is leaving Olomouc today for the Soviet Union. Thus, last year's mutual agreement of Warsaw Pact member states on the reduction of number of troops and weapons in central Europe is being fulfilled. Editor Stanislav Benda reports on this event from Olomouc:

[Benda] Since about 0900, members of the Soviet battalion of engineers have been loading their technical equipment on a cargo train. The battalion, which will leave for their new post in Belorussia, consists of about 300 soldiers and 100 vehicles of engineering equipment. The first train will leave Olomouc today at 1600. Others will follow in the period up to 24 June.

At 0700 a meeting began in the barracks where the battalion of engineers served. Party and state representatives of the city, district, and region, officers of the Czechoslovak People's Army, citizens of Olomouc, and pioneers were there. Girls and boys prepared souvenirs for the soldiers to remember their stay here with pleasure and every soldier got flowers from them to say good-bye. Ladislav Brumek, secretary of the regional Czechoslovak Communist Party Committee, highly praised the task carried out by the Soviet engineers on our state's territory. He highlighted their combat and political training and discipline, which served as examples for our troops. By the way, this engineers' battalion was one of the best units of the whole central group of Soviet forces in our country. Comrade Brumek also recalled the long tradition of friendship between our countries, a friendship that is enduring.

This withdrawal of another Soviet unit from our territory clearly adds another positive impetus to disarmament and to strengthening confidence and security in Europe—something which is currently being discussed at Vienna. It is correct that the experts at those talks can see a specific step and our sincere endeavor to contribute our share to the firm foundations of the European home.

Defense Minister Vaclavik Interviewed on Military Cuts Policy

Scale of Cuts, Restructuring

*LD1906143189 Prague CTK in English
1252 GMT 19 Jun 89*

[Text] Prague June 19 (CTK)—The task of the Czechoslovak Army is to continuously ensure reliable defence of the country and of the socialist community. Czechoslovak Minister of Defence Army General Milan Vaclavik told CTK here today.

Dealing with the concrete realization of the declaration of the Council of State on defence, issued more than four months ago, he said that the planning of organizational changes for 1989-90 has been completed and that a complicated period of their realization is starting. The organizational changes will concern some 30,000 persons in more than 200 formations and facilities of the Czechoslovak People's Army. One-third of the changes will be carried out this year and two-thirds next year, Vaclavik stressed.

The dissolution of an air force regiment has already started and the number of other formations will be reduced during the summer months, he continued. Military building organizations will be created in 1989-1990, whose work will be subordinated to government tasks connected with the fulfilment of the ecological program, reconstruction works in the West Bohemian border regions and modernization of flats in certain localities. Railway engineers' units which are to reconstruct and maintain railways should be reinforced by 2,000 men. Some 3,000 soldiers were deployed in selected branches in May to help national economy, the Czechoslovak defence minister said, adding that all these measures reflect the efforts of Czechoslovakia at detente and strengthening of peace in Europe.

A detailed timetable for cutting the number of tanks by 850 and of armoured vehicles by 165 till the end of 1990 has been elaborated. Some of the tanks and armoured vehicles will be liquidated, aggregates and spare parts will be used in enterprises of the Czechoslovak People's Army and a certain number of the tanks will be used in various branches of national economy, Milan Vaclavik said, and underlined that the liquidation of tanks in series will be started in July 1989.

Answering the question which is being frequently discussed among young people if the military service in Czechoslovakia could be shortened, he said that the solution of this question is not in the competence of the Federal Ministry of Defence. One-sided steps have been done leading to the reduction of the number of persons and armament and in the reorganization of the Czechoslovak People's Army in the spirit of reasonable sufficiency. If there are no similar disarmament steps from the side of NATO, the shortening of military service can be hardly considered, he stressed, adding that various opinions and suggestions in connection with the shortening of the military service are being voiced by some people with the aim to impede civil responsibility. These opinions reflect other interests than the building and defence of socialism, the Czechoslovak minister of defence underlined.

According to the former practice soldiers were not allowed to perform military service in the region of their permanent residence or in neighbouring districts. This regulation has been changed so that soldiers are not permitted to perform military service only in the district of their permanent residence. There are some exceptions

concerning e.g. soldiers with serious family or social problems, railway engineers, top performance sportsmen and artists, Milan Vaclavik said.

Further Comments

AU2206112389 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech
20 Jun 89 p 6

[Interview with Milan Vaclavik, CSSR minister of national defense, by CTK correspondent Ivan Kytka: "Military Technology For the National Economy"; date and place not given]

[Text] Prague—More than 4 months ago, the State Defense Council issued the Proclamation on the Reduction of the Number of Persons, Armament, and Organizational Changes in the Czechoslovak People's Army [CSLA]. In this connection, CTK correspondent Ivan Kytka asked Milan Vaclavik, CSSR minister of national defense, for an interview.

[Kytka] Comrade Minister, what steps has the command of the CSLA undertaken to implement the aforementioned changes?

[Vaclavik] I would like to stress that we approach the organizational changes proclaimed by the State Defense Council with the awareness that the Army must, above all, ensure an uninterrupted reliable defense of our country and the socialist community in the international combat alliance with the Soviet Army and the other armies of the Warsaw Pact member states. Our troops stand in the first defense line of the Joint Armed Forces, a matter that places great demands on their combat preparedness and readiness, on the fulfillment of the tasks of combat and political training.

Regarding the concrete realization of the proclamation, we have concluded the planning of the organizational changes for 1989-90, and we are entering an incomparably more complex period of their realization. The organizational changes will apply to roughly 30,000 persons, of which 4,000 will be professional soldiers and 900 civilian employees. These changes will be carried out in more than 200 CSLA formations and facilities. The planned organizational changes are unusual in their extent and the briefness of the time in which they must be implemented. We will carry them out gradually in accordance with already worked out schedules, so as to minimize possible damage and losses and create prerequisites for servicing and storing the technology and material in central bases and warehouses. In terms of time, about one-third of the changes will be accomplished this year, and the remaining two-thirds next year.

We have begun disbanding one Air Force regiment. The number of additional formations will be reduced this summer. In the 1989-90 period military construction organizations will be established, the work of which will be subordinated to government tasks connected with the

implementation of an ecological program, reconstruction work in the West Bohemian border area, and with the modernization of the housing stock in determined localities. In addition, the existing formations of railroad troops for the repairs and maintenance of railroad lines will be beefed up by 2,000 men. I would like to say that as of last May roughly 3,000 troops in excess of the original plan have been deployed in selected branches for the good of the national economy.

These measures, with which we will ensure within the determined deadline the fulfillment of the tasks arising from the Proclamation of the State Defense Council of January 1989, are not only an organizational matter. We attach to them great political importance because they reflect our state's endeavor aimed at the relaxation of tension in international relations and the consolidation of peace in Europe.

The process of the organizational changes, which concern a considerable number of members of the Army, is connected with their relocation, retraining, creation of a new work environment, new collective relations and support [zazemi] for the family and social life of professional soldiers. When resolving complex issues of this unusual situation, we closely cooperate with territorial party and state bodies and rely on their support and assistance.

[Kytka] In your speech at the session of the Federal Assembly last March you said that the CSLA will offer the discarded military technology to the national economy. How do you proceed when doing this and how is the demand for an expedient and economic utilization of the technology taking hold?

[Vaclavik] A detailed timetable has been worked out to comply with the resolution of the State Defense Council—to exclude from the CSLA's armament 850 tanks and 165 armed personnel carriers by the end of 1990.

The discarding of the equipment will be carried out in several ways: It will be scrapped by the Kovosrot enterprise, the CSLA will use usable aggregates and spare parts in its repair facilities, and a certain number of tanks and armored personnel carriers—after technical adjustments—will be redeployed in some of the sectors of the national economy.

We are currently verifying technological procedures for dismantling tanks. The first 14 tanks for this purpose will be delivered in June. The tanks, from which some of the aggregates and spare parts will be taken out, will be delivered by combat units directly to the repair facility in Novy Jicin, where they will be expertly dismantled; and the bodies, turrets, and unusable spare part will be delivered to metallurgical plants. The large-scale scrapping of tanks will begin in June 1989.

In the past few months we have put up for sale the discarded tanks to be made use of in some sectors of the national economy. To date, for example, interest in the tanks has been expressed by the Construction Geology enterprise of Prague, the Trinec Iron Works, the Slovak Stone Industry of Levice, the Transportation Equipment Research Institute of Prague, the Labe River Basin [Povodi Labe] of Hradec Kralove, and others. All applications for tanks will be complied with, and few of the discarded tanks will be on standby in case they are needed to deal with the consequences of accidents and natural catastrophes. The scrapping of the armored personnel carriers will be done in the Military Repairs Enterprise in Trencin. After taking out usable spare parts, the bodies of the vehicles will be taken to metallurgical plants.

The implementation of the resolution of the State Defense Council is a complex and demanding task. A number of experts from various military and civilian fields were working on that task in the past period. The purpose was to make the maximum use of the equipment and an economic fulfillment of that task.

[Kytka] In connection with the organizational changes in the CSLA, views and contemplations have cropped up among the public, and especially among young people, whether it would not be possible to shorten the 2-year basic military service. What is your opinion on this?

[Vaclavik] This matter is outside the federal defense ministry's jurisdiction. The legal foundation for building the CSSR Armed Forces is the military law, which delineates their tasks, composition, organization, and the military duties of citizens.

We must proceed from the fact that the length of the basic service has not been set arbitrarily. It derives from the number of available recruits, from the numerical strength of the armed forces, their tasks connected with ensuring the state's defense-capability, and from the demands on the troops' training and preparedness. Should the length of the basic military service be cut and the external conditions of the threat to the country remain unchanged, then more recruits would have to be called up or the professionalization of the Army would have to be substantially increased, as is the case in a number of the capitalist countries. We have taken unilateral steps in reducing the number of persons, armaments in, and the reorganization of the CSLA in the spirit of reasonable sufficiency. Given the existing ratio of forces, as long as reciprocal disarmament steps from the NATO's side do not follow, it is difficult to contemplate a general shortening of the period for basic service. However, I would like to point out that not all young people serve 24 months in our Army. Graduates of military departments of institutes of higher learning serve only 12 months, and those who have serious social problems or are indispensable to various branches of the

national economy can do 5 months of duty in the so-called alternative service. We will make it possible to make a more frequent use of this option for family and social reasons.

One also has to see that various views and proposals to cut the basic military service are being put forward by certain groups and people with the intention of undermining civic responsibility, especially among young people. These views and proposals have nothing in common with caring about the ensurance of the country's defense-capability, and reflect an interest different from that of building and safeguarding socialism. There is an apparent effort to cast these values in doubt—and in what other way is this to be done but by weakening trust in the decisive power instrument of the socialist state—our People's Army.

[Kytka] An order of the chief of the CSLA General Staff, which makes it possible for recruits who have family or social difficulties to serve near their permanent residence, went into effect on 1 February this year. What does this concretely mean, and how this new order affect the April service-commencement date?

[Vaclavik] According to the practice to date, soldiers were not permitted to serve in the region of their permanent residence or in the district of another region if this district was adjacent to the district of their permanent residence. This order has been softened so that soldiers are only prohibited from serving in the district of their permanent residence. Thus already in April we met halfway [the wishes of] several hundred new members of the CSLA.

Even this order permits exceptions—for soldiers who have serious family or social reasons, or, for example, for railroad troops, top level athletes, or artists.

However, the possibilities of the territorial deployment of soldiers are limited by the objective needs and possibilities of the Army, and therefore there is no legal entitlement to them.

The federal defense ministry and I personally have been receiving numerous requests from parents or relatives of our soldiers to be permitted to serve in the place of their residence or nearby. To this I would like to add that all these issues connected with the request to serve in military formations in a territorial district are in the jurisdiction of district military administrations. Requests must be submitted at least 1 month prior to the commencement of the basic military service, later requests for transfer are to be presented to the commander of the pertinent formation.

However, cases also occur, where it is later ascertained that the applicant actually has no family or other social reason to be granted exception from the valid order. Also from this it is clear how necessary it is to be correctly

informed, and how necessary it is to educate people, above all young people, to be aware of the responsibility for the defense of the fatherland, peace, and socialism.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Commentary Views New Round of U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Arms Talks

AU2106143989 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 20 Jun 89 p 2

["ng" commentary: "New Beginning in Geneva"]

[Text] Talks on nuclear disarmament were resumed in Geneva yesterday [19 June]. After an initial meeting between the chief negotiators, the USSR and United States will start a new round of talks on strategic offensive and space weapons before the end of this week. Thus, the 7-month pause of reflection that the Bush administration had demanded has come to an end.

The peoples are expecting a great deal from the resumption of Soviet-U.S. negotiations. After all, the key problem of nuclear disarmament is under discussion here. Strategic offensive weapons include land-based ballistic missiles with a range of over 5,500 km, missiles with greater larger ranges that are stationed in submarines, and large bombers. All in all, these are nuclear weapons systems that can hit and destroy vital targets on the territory of the other side. They account for over nine-tenths of the nuclear potential of the two nuclear powers.

Following the USSR-U.S. summit in Reykjavik in October 1986, there is agreement in principle that the strategic offensive weapons should be reduced by 50 percent. Quite a number of questions have already been settled in this respect and have been stipulated in coordinated parts of a joint draft agreement. However, hopes for a corresponding treaty to be concluded before the end of 1988 were not fulfilled. Basically, two problems remained unresolved. One is linked with the observance of the ABM Treaty concluded in 1972, which bans the testing and stationing of weapons in space. Second, limits have not yet been agreed for sea-based cruise missiles of great range, a type of weapon that was newly introduced by the United States at the middle of the eighties.

When the Soviet and U.S. chief negotiators meet again, they do not have to start at zero. It must not be overlooked, however, that the United States is meanwhile developing new nuclear launchers, such as mobile land-based missiles, and radar-absorbing long-distance bombers, that it adheres to the SDI program, and that it has not adopted a definite stance on the ABM Treaty so far.

The negotiations will show whether the United States is really willing to drastically reduce strategic offensive weapons and to prevent an arms race in space.

SED's Herrmann Reports to Central Committee on Arms Issues

LD2206124289 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1013 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Excerpts] Berlin (ADN)—Joachim Herrmann, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee, in the Politburo report to the eighth meeting of the SED Central Committee in Berlin today said that the values of socialism are firm beliefs of the people of the GDR. "The unity of economic and social policy has been consistently implemented, which has triggered new initiatives from the workers. Under liberal minded conditions, we continue our socialist development as a historical process of far-reaching political, economic, social, and spiritual-cultural changes."

Through the harmony of word and deed, the SED has done justice to its leading role as the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class. In alliance with all parties and mass organizations united within the democratic bloc and in the National Front, it has implemented its policies for the well-being of the people, characterized by continuity and renewal. Solid foundations have been created toward preparing for the 12th party congress (May 1990).

In the period since the seventh meeting of the Central Committee, the assessment made by Erich Honecker has been confirmed that a series of positive changes can be discerned in international relations, and that a change from confrontation to detente is being introduced. "This process must be resolutely continued and rendered irreversible," Joachim Herrmann added. "All the more so in view of the intensified activities of those politicians in the West who persist with the position of "nuclear deterrence," while at the same time interfering more openly than ever in the internal affairs of the socialist countries.

Positive developments in the international situation, as expressed in the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the destruction of medium-range missiles, at the beginning of the Vienna negotiations on conventional disarmament, on confidence-and security-building measures in Europe, and toward settling regional conflicts through political means, are the result of the dynamic foreign policy path of the Soviet Union, the GDR, and the other socialist states, and of the activities of those countries and social forces in the world which are governed by reason and realism. Through the opposing efforts of influential forces within NATO for military superiority and confrontation, however, the international situation remains complicated and contradictory.

In order that there should be no interruption to the disarmament process, the Warsaw Pact countries have, throughout the period covered by the report, once again adopted diverse disarmament initiatives and made unprecedented prior concessions, Herrmann continued.

In connection with data published by the Warsaw Pact countries at the end of January on the numerical strength of the armed forces and armaments of the two military coalitions in Europe, and in the sea areas bordering Europe, readiness was once again stressed, in accordance with the defensive nature of our military doctrine, to work toward a speedy and considerable reduction of the military balance to a point where mutual attack is made impossible. The specific proposals brought to the Vienna negotiations by our alliance which provide for a radical reduction in the armaments and armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and of NATO to agreed equal upper limits, with consideration in particular to those categories which are especially suited to surprise attacks and territory-seizing offensive operations, are directed toward this objective.

Despite its exposed position in Europe, the GDR is ceaselessly making an active contribution to the disarmament process. The GDR's National Defense Council made a decision in January to reduce by 1990 the National People's Army by 10,000 men, 600 tanks, and 50 aircraft, unilaterally and independent of negotiations. The defense budget is to be cut by 10 percent. The National People's Army maintains an even stricter defensive character. This includes the disbanding of six tank regiments and a flying squadron. As early as April, the discharge of the first units of the 8th Tank Regiment took place in Goldberg, under observation from domestic and foreign media.

An important step is the decision to employ 11,500 army members, after brief military training, in important areas of the national economy for the duration of their active military service, thereby promoting the dynamic development of the GDR, while maintaining the defensive capacity of our country.

Our initiatives for the creation of a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons at the dividing line between NATO and the Warsaw Pact remain topical.

The proposal in April to NATO to begin separate negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe considerably enriched the negotiations and offers for the disarmament of all types of weapons, Herrmann stated. This significant socialist initiative, which was presented at the Berlin meeting of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee, began from the premise that the danger of a surprise attack or the triggering of a nuclear conflict cannot be eliminated as long as there are tactical nuclear weapons on European soil. Only the start—soon if possible—of negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, parallel to the Vienna negotiations on conventional armed forces, offers a realistic chance of considerably reducing all the weapons systems which are capable of triggering surprise attacks and large-scale offensive actions.

The GDR welcomes and supports the decision of the USSR this year to unilaterally withdraw 500 warheads from tactical nuclear weapons from the territory of the allied states onto its territory, and its readiness to withdraw all its nuclear munition from the territory of its allies by 1991, provided that an analogous step is taken by the United States.

The NATO summit meeting in Brussels at the end of May aimed at establishing unified action by the NATO states in face of disarmament initiatives taken by the Warsaw Pact, Herrmann added. It could be stated as a result of the resolution for a "joint concept for arms control and disarmament," NATO's striving for military superiority over the Warsaw Pact, the confirmation of a policy of "nuclear deterrence," and a whole cluster of measures for interference in the internal affairs of the socialist states are dominant.

The proposals made by U.S. President George Bush regarding the Vienna negotiations on conventional armed forces in Europe are a first answer to the disarmament offers made by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and are a sign of certain progress vis-a-vis its position in this sphere up to now. The readiness to include land-based fighter aircraft and combat helicopters in the negotiations is a positive step toward a rapprochement of the negotiation concepts of the two military alliances. At the same time, the start of negotiations on nuclear short-range missiles is dependent on a unified agreement in the Vienna negotiations, and no one knows when it will be achieved. This package is damaging to the disarmament process. In addition, the converting of the "Lance" missiles, declared as a "modernization," is only being postponed, in the fear that it could have negative effects on the next Bundestag elections in the FRG at the end of 1990. The Brussels decision expressly establishes that the United States will intensify its work on the research and development of the follow-up system for these missiles. It is known that these missiles will compensate for the potential threat which has been lost through the INF Treaty.

NATO's adherence to the obsolete military concept of "nuclear deterrence," which envisages the first use of nuclear weapons, again makes apparent the policy of military strength which forms the basis for a continued arms race with nuclear weapons, and indicates the persistence of old modes of thought. Also typical of this is the scenario of the "Wintex-Climex" staff exercise, in which the authorization of 30 nuclear weapons missions—with the involvement of all NATO states—is practiced.

"The priority tasks continue to be," Joachim Herrmann added, "the earliest possible signing of a treaty between the USSR and the United States on a 50-percent reduction of their strategic offensive weapons, under conditions of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, a comprehensive halt to nuclear weapons tests, and the signing of a convention on eliminating

chemical weapons. The GDR welcomes the fact that Soviet-U.S. negotiations on strategic and space weapons have been resumed in Geneva."

The Politburo adopted a statement from Mikhail Gorbachev on his official visit to the FRG. It welcomes the results of the visit as an important contribution to preserving and stabilizing peace in Europe. "The joint statement of the two countries signed in Bonn is a document on the application of the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems and alliance membership, and can assist measures on the path of European security and cooperation. Despite all ideological and political differences, concern for the survival of mankind must, as Mikhail Gorbachev stressed following the conclusion of the visit, be the focus of all policy. War must no longer be a means of policy, and one's own security must not be guaranteed at the cost of others.

In accordance with the policy which it itself pursues, the GDR supports the standpoints on the deepening and continuation of the disarmament process contained in the statement. It attaches particular importance to the commitment to respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and security of every state, the right of all states to freely choose their social system, and to respect the right to self-determination and the norms of international law. The GDR agrees with the position expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev, that the peoples of Europe in particular see their own best interests in a radical disarmament in the conventional sphere, of nuclear short-range systems, and of chemical weapons.

"The Politburo underlines its complete agreement with the official statement by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, which emphasizes the importance of the visit to relations between the USSR and the FRG, and moreover for the whole of Europe. These were an integral part of the construction of the common house of Europe," Herrmann stressed. "The official conclusion of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo that the joint statement 'develops further the ideas of the Moscow treaty under the new conditions, is based on a policy of holding tightly to the postwar order and to the inviolability of borders, and represents an important contribution to the modernization of European and international relations as a whole'—this conclusion is unequivocal and leaves no room for speculation of any kind, even in statements by the Bonn government."

It is consistent with the GDR's peace mission to do everything possible to ensure that war will never again emanate from German soil. This was also the guideline for the activities staged in memory of World War II, unleashed by the Hitler fascists 50 years ago. [passage omitted]

On the 25 May, Erich Honecker received SPD Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel for a further exchange of views on current developments in the international situation, and on questions of bilateral relations between the GDR and the FRG and relations between the SED and the SPD, Herrmann continued. "The yearly meeting, which is now traditional, between the representatives of the SED and the SPD, confirmed the firm resolve of both countries to continue further along the path of security partnership, dialogue, and cooperation between socialists and social democrats in the vital matters of humanity. According to Erich Honecker, the GDR will continue to strive to free German soil of ABC [atomic bacteriological, and chemical] weapons.

"Regarding the document drawn up by the SPD's basic values commission and the Academy of Social Sciences in the SED Central Committee, entitled 'The Conflict of Ideologies and Joint Security,' there have been many discussions by leading representatives of both parties on questions of security policy. The usefulness of objective debates on disarmament was emphasized, and it was also stressed that peaceful coexistence between countries can never mean ideological coexistence. The striving for civilized forms of conflict can never mean convergence of the two social systems, nor any blurring of their fundamental differences. According to certain speeches, such as that by Mr Eppler in the Bundestag, it is also necessary to clarify the fact that it can only be harmful to the disarmament and security policy, if all that is offered are old theories of rolling-back socialism, left over from the cold war period and presented in new packaging."

Egon Krenz's meetings with Oskar Lafontaine, deputy chairman of the SPD and minister-president of Saarland, as well as the talks which Guenter Mittag held in the FRG during his visit to the Hannover fair, his meetings with FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Federal Economics Minister Haussmann, FDP Chairman Otto Graf Lambsdorff, and Oskar Lafontaine, served the normalization of relations between the GDR and the FRG, Herrmann concluded. [passage omitted]

The common ground and collaboration in the struggle to safeguard peace and for disarmament has been the focal point of the exchange of views and experience with Communists and Social Democrats. The high points here were Erich Honecker's talks with the chairmen of the communist parties of Denmark and Luxembourg. [passage omitted]

"The NVA [National People's Army] has guaranteed the required defense capability under all conditions," Herrmann noted. "Political and military training takes place in accordance with the defense character of the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact participant states. No one is threatened by this." Watchfulness and defense readiness remain necessary. "The measure of our defense efforts is determined by the degree of potential threat. That corresponds to the interests of our citizens in peace." [passage omitted]

Officials Discuss Arms Control Policies With Visitors

Krenz, Swedish Riksdag Delegation

LD1906122589 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1023 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—The GDR is in favor of eliminating all nuclear weapons from the European Continent. In this spirit, it considers it necessary for negotiations on all tactical nuclear weapons in Europe to be conducted parallel to the Vienna negotiations on conventional disarmament, Egon Krenz, Socialist Unity Party of Germany Politburo member and deputy chairman of the GDR State Council, emphasized this in Berlin today during talks with a delegation of the defense committee of the Swedish Riksdag. The delegation is headed by the committee's chairman, Arne Andersson. The host emphasized the current significance of the proposal for a corridor in central Europe free of nuclear combat weapons, initiated by the Olof Palme, the former Swedish premier.

Egon Krenz focused on matters of European security, above all, the initiatives made by the Warsaw Pact states, which are directed at not permitting any break in the process of disarmament which has begun. He briefed the Swedish guests about the unilateral disarmament measures introduced by the GDR.

Egon Krenz and Arne Andersson reviewed the relations between the defense committees of the Swedish Riksdag and the GDR People's Chamber, which have existed for several years. They noted that mutual information and objective dialogue promote the building of trust.

Fischer, Tunisian Foreign Minister

AU1906172589 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 16 Jun 89 p 6

[Toast by GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer at a dinner given in honor of Tunisian Foreign Minister Abdelhamid Esheikh in Berlin on 15 June: "Fruitful Cooperation in the Interest of Peace and Security"]

[Excerpt] Esteemed Mr Minister, distinguished guests, dear comrades and friends:

It is a great pleasure for me to cordially welcome you, esteemed colleague, and your distinguished entourage once more.

I welcome you as the representative of a country whose advocacy of a fruitful international dialogue, of enforcing the principles of peaceful coexistence, and of a political solution to regional conflicts is recognized and appreciated in the world.

It fills me with satisfaction that the foreign ministers of the GDR and the Tunisian Republic meet regularly. Our time, the end of the 20th century, in which international developments occur at breathtaking speed, makes this quick and frequent exchange of views necessary.

While, at the beginning of this decade, we had to focus our talks on the seriousness of the international situation caused by confrontation and the arms buildup, and on the danger of a nuclear war that threatened mankind, today we note the signs of a change toward detente, understanding, and disarmament.

Disarmament Remains the Central Task of Mankind

This is shown by the promising start to nuclear disarmament made by the INF Treaty and the businesslike Vienna negotiations on disarmament of conventional troops and weapons, and on more far-reaching confidence- and security-building measures.

This is also shown by the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the FRG, which has just been concluded with important results that strengthen peace and stability in the center of Europe.

The initiated process of settling regional conflicts through political means, is contributing to a better international climate, even though it is burdened with disturbances.

Safeguarding peace through disarmament remains the central task of mankind.

For this purpose, the GDR and its allies have presented a wide range of disarmament proposals. Let me recall, in particular, the latest offers concerning the reduction of short-range nuclear systems, the elimination of the asymmetries of troops and their armament, and the radical reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces. All these proposals aim at maintaining both sides' defense capability, but drastically reducing their ability to attack. Above all, they are to defuse the "European powder-keg." The priority task remains the fastest possible conclusion of treaties on the halving of strategic offensive weapons, and the halting of nuclear tests, as well as of a convention on the elimination of chemical weapons.

Unilateral disarmament steps, the implementation of which has already been started, demonstrate the firm determination of the Warsaw Pact states, including the GDR, to disarm.

These advance moves, which are also militarily important, once more prove that word and deed concur in their foreign policy.

In the meantime, the United States, through its President, broke the long silence concerning the numerous peace initiatives of the Warsaw Pact, and presented negotiable proposals on a reduction of conventional weapons. If these proposals are negotiated in the spirit of equal and undiminished security for all, satisfactory results will probably not be far away. Such an active development pursued by the GDR and its allies, makes a speedy start to negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons all the more necessary.

We know that we are at one with your country, esteemed colleague, in the striving for peace and international security because, from the time of Carthage to World War II, military threat and destruction was carried from Europe to northern Africa and also to the territory of today's Tunisia. [passage omitted]

Tanks Prepared for Dismantling, Scrapping
*LD2106123289 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1011 GMT 21 Jun 89*

[Text] Dresden (ADN)—The GDR's unilateral disarmament steps, announced at the beginning of the year by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee and chairman of the GDR's Council of State, are being implemented according to plan. Today journalists from all over the world were able to see this for themselves in installations of the National People's Army [NVA], in the Goerlitz District, in Kreis-Bezirk, and in Dresden, with the dismantling and scrapping of tanks.

The combat technology of the type T-55A was withdrawn at the end of April from the six NVA tank regiments, which are to be disbanded by October this year. According to a resolution of the GDR National Defense Council, in addition to this the National People's Army will be reduced by 10,000 men, 600 tanks, and 50 aircraft; 1 air squadron will be disbanded and the expenditure on national defense will be reduced by 10 percent.

In the Goerlitz Town Hall, officers from the GDR Defense Ministry outlined details about scrapping the tanks or their utilization in the economy, to approximately 80 representatives from the press, news agencies, radio and television stations from 8 countries and West Berlin.

Lieutenant Colonel Uwe Hempel referred to the fact that at present 124 tanks from the regiments which are to be disbanded are on the Charlottenhof dismantling field. Space will soon be created here for an additional 192 tanks from these regiments, as well as 54 of the same type from other troop units. Since 16 May, 11 tanks have already been prepared for the blast furnaces. According to the current information, approximately 150 tanks are to be deployed in the economy, mainly in the lignite industry. The lieutenant colonel stressed the GDR's

desire for disarmament and the consistent implementation of its decision to reduce. "Over and above this, we view every step toward the radical reduction of the Armed Forces and conventional armaments in Europe as extremely responsive to the times", he said. "In this sense we are directing our hopes toward speedy results at the Vienna negotiations. The summit meeting of the North Atlantic Alliance and the proposals announced by U.S. President George Bush, are an immediate cause for this. A definite rapprochement to the positions of the Warsaw Pact member states is unmistakable." The henceforth stated readiness to also include fighter aircraft and helicopters in the negotiations will "from our point of view, enable first results of the negotiations to be achieved as soon as possible, with the good will of the two sides."

At the NVA Charlottenhof camp, where several railway transports from NVA tank regiment stations have ended in the past few weeks, the journalists saw numerous tracked vehicles which have already been disarmed. At other places lay the 100-mm cannons, which had been taken off the tank turrets, and also tank tracks, stabilizers, elevation and traversing mechanisms, optical equipment, carriages for antiaircraft machine guns and radio technology.

The next site was the NVA Ostritz equipment camp, to where the tank undercarriages were brought by flatbed transporter and where outside parts, engines, gears, tanks, seats, air vents and other components are being removed, and where what is left is being dismantled into pieces suitable for blast furnaces.

POLAND

Soviet Truck Battalion Finishes Withdrawal
*LD1706003289 Warsaw PAP in English
2331 GMT 16 Jun 89*

[Text] Warsaw, June 16—The last vehicle from the independent Soviet truck battalion of the northern group of the Soviet Army, temporarily stationed in Poland, left Poland tonight crossing the border bridge in the city of Terespol.

Soldiers of this unit were ceremoniously bidden farewell in Swidnica, the Walbrzych Voivodship, on June 15, where the battalion stationed for 26 years.

The battalion is the first unit of the northern group of the Soviet Army to be withdrawn from Poland in tune with the announcement of the withdrawal from Poland of some of the units of the Soviet Army.

ROMANIA

SCINTEIA Views START Talks, Urges Substantial Cuts

AU2206170989 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1545 GMT 22 Jun 89

["For a Substantial Reduction of Strategic Nuclear Arms"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES 22/6/1989—The Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on the 50 percent reduction of strategic nuclear arms are naturally followed with keen interest by the public opinion everywhere that supports their undelayed finalization—"SCINTEIA" writes in a commentary on the new round of talks. Stressing that the negotiations on halving strategic nuclear arms, started seven years ago, should end with positive results as people expect it, "SCINTEIA" writes: To reach an understanding in this respect in the shortest delay would be of utmost importance, would pave the way for undertaking more substantive measures to eliminate nuclear arsenals completely by the end of the millenium. All the more so as currently various "modernization" projects of certain militarist circles tend to annul the little progress made so far along the way of atomic disarmament or even to create extra forces.

Showing that the beginning made with the treaty on medium-range missiles should be continued and deepened President Nicolae Ceausescu stated: "Everything should be done for small steps—in our opinion—to continue with big strides, i.e., accords between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on halving strategic arms, first of all—and we would like such a treaty to be concluded in 1989."

Evincing the most destructive character of strategic offensive systems, the paper points out that such data stringently require drastic cuts in these weapons of mass destruction. Attempts to justify the proliferation of strategic nuclear arms under the discredited theory of "mutual deterrence" in starting a conflict, made by supporters of the old way of thinking, are nothing else but the expression of suicidal logics.

The Geneva negotiations, the commentary points out, intend to remove these arms at least in part. Recent statements (from American sources) on the priority to be

given now to negotiations on conventional arms, leaving aside talks on strategic nuclear arms for the time being, are groundless as the interests of peace demand a unitary approach and concomitant progress in all fields of disarmament.

Recalling that until now, it was agreed in Geneva that current levels be halved in the next seven years to reach a ceiling of 6,000 nuclear warheads and 1,600 vectors, on each either side, and other lower limits within these general figures, the paper writes: According to observers there are many outstanding issues which amount eventually to three major obstacles in the way of negotiations. First, it is the extension lately of long-range cruise missiles aboard submarines (mostly American ones).

Second, there are the mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles, which are more difficult to verify than those with fixed locations.

Third, there are the differences of interpretation on the ABM Treaty concluded in 1972, closely connected with the American Star Wars project; while the Americans support a more comprehensive interpretation of this treaty, which would allow the implementation of the first stage of this project, the Soviet side is for the strict observance of the treaty as it had been signed.

If not easy to settle, such like differences of opinion are neither irreconcilable and facts, including the Treaty on Medium-Range Nuclear Missiles, prove that when constructive, realistic attitudes prevail, the existing obstacles can be easily surpassed and mutually acceptable compromises can be reached to make a true step forward along the way of removing the specter of nuclear destruction.

Likewise, it is obvious that once the process started it cannot stop here. Opinions have it that a 50 percent cut in strategic arsenals would merely take us back seven years ago when START talks began. The elimination of the nightmare of a planetary catastrophe can never turn into a fact unless experiments with production and stockpiling of new nuclear arms are totally banned and the existing stockpiles are dismantled completely. It is the only way in which mankind can be freed of the greatest threat it has ever faced and Romania works tirelessly and consistently for the attainment of this aim alongside the broadest sociopolitical forces everywhere, "SCINTEIA" winds up.

BRAZIL

**Official Says No U.S. Sanctions Planned Over
Missile Production**

*PY2006014489 Brasilia Domestic Service in Portuguese
2200 GMT 19 Jun 89*

[By Gustavo Mariani]

[Text] Itamaraty Secretary General Paulo Tarso Flecha de Lima has said that Brazil's efforts in the scientific and technological field are not a threat to the United States. He emphasized that these efforts are aimed only at national development and that Brazil has always been a peaceful country and will never be a threat to its neighbors.

Regarding Brazilian military policies, Flecha de Lima said:

[Begin recording] Although Itamaraty's policy is not to comment on the sale of weapons abroad, I must insist again that Brazil is very conscientious regarding its sales of weapons abroad. We always take into consideration the political implications of the sales and of the purchasing country's strategic scenario. [end recording]

The Itamaraty spokesman said that the U.S. Government plans no economic sanctions or military actions against Brazil if the country develops a program to manufacture missiles. Rumors of such sanctions originated due to a study being carried out by a private company for the U.S. Library of Congress on the technological capacity of 16 countries, including Brazil.

U.S. Stance on Conventional Arms, SNF at NATO Summit Critiqued

18010697b Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (First Edition) in Russian 31 May 89 p 5

[Article by V. Pustov: "Taking the Spirit of the Times into Account?"]

[Text] The 2-day session of the NATO Council which took place in Brussels at the Head of State and Head of Government level was dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the bloc. And therefore, there was no shortage of solemn speeches. However, it was not the gala portion of the meeting that attracted the attention of observers. What kind of contribution will it make in overcoming the vestiges of the "Cold War" in Europe and in the world as a whole, in overcoming the maintained division of our continent into opposing military alliances—this is primarily what can and should determine its significance. Not all of the participants' speeches and not all decisions made have yet received sufficient press coverage. But what we already know allows us to make certain conclusions about the results of the current NATO forum.

European society quite reasonably expected a positive reaction from it to the constructive initiatives which the Warsaw Treaty Organization members proposed to the NATO member countries last week. We are talking, in particular, about armed forces reductions to levels sufficient for defense and that the disarmament process which ensures confidence building and must encompass all armed forces which relate to Europe. And this means not only ground and air forces (they are already included in the ongoing conventional arms negotiations in Vienna), but also naval forces too and, not only conventional means for conducting war, but nuclear and chemical, too.

The Brussels session showed that its participants could not bypass the important initiatives of the WTO [Warsaw Treaty Organization] States. The four point proposal on conventional arms and armed forces reductions in Europe set forth by the U.S. President are being assessed as evidence of this. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's readers are already acquainted with them. Some time will be required to closely study and comprehend this proposal. Only then will we be able answer the question with certainty of how much they meet the needs of our days. But even today we are struck that in a number of points it is proposed that the Soviet Union and its allies conduct quite a bit more of a reduction than the NATO countries. Not a word is said in the American proposal about the need for reducing naval forces in which, as you know, the NATO countries have enormous superiority.

In the U.S. itself, the initiatives set forth by the President are being connected with other very important issues. As the WASHINGTON POST points out, "administrative representatives are expressing the hope that the American proposal on ground forces in Europe will attract

quite a bit more international attention to the meeting in Brussels than the inability to resolve the missile problem which West German and other European politicians are so sensitive to."

However, neither this broadly applied overseas sensation nor the anniversary appeals to unity and solidarity helped to hide the sharp disagreements which have been manifesting themselves for a long time within NATO on the issue of the notorious modernization of American tactical nuclear weapons in Europe which Washington is stubbornly insisting on with the unconditional support of only London alone. The FRG as well as a host of other European States had decisively expressed their disagreement with this well in advance of the NATO Council session. They are advocating that negotiations be conducted with the USSR and the WTO on tactical nuclear weapons parallel with the talks in Vienna on conventional armed forces. The U.S. and Great Britain oppose this approach.

The participants at the Brussels session discussed these and other more quarrelsome issues behind closed doors. Information for the press was issued while taking the anniversary celebration into account, without allowing it to be overshadowed by other issues. But, as they say, the truth will out. And it was not by accident that while President G. Bush was still on his way to Europe, the proposal was stated that the contradictions indicated above were so acute that, in all likelihood, they would have to discuss them and seek compromises after the NATO meeting. Despite the formulations adopted at the meeting on final documents, it seems that this is how it is turning out.

Discussion of 'Peaceful Coexistence' as Form of Class Struggle

18070593 Moscow KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL in Russian No 4, Feb 89 pp 84-88

[Letter from a reader and comment by A. Podberezkin, leading scientific researcher with the World Economy and International Relations Institute, under "Contemporary World: Problems, Trends and Contradictions" rubric: "Peaceful Coexistence in the Light of the New Political Thinking: Letter from a Reader and Point of View of a Scientist"]

[Text] There was a time when an important thesis in our international publicist activity was the idea that the peaceful coexistence of states with different social orders is a specific form of class struggle. But subsequently this thesis was removed.

Books and articles at the end of the 1970's and beginning of the 1980's paid great attention to the fact that certain principles of peaceful coexistence extend only to relations between states and not to "relations of systems" and it turned out that there were two spheres of politics:

relations between states on the basis of peaceful coexistence and relations between socialism and capitalism. In the latter case, the class antagonism is not ceasing but is spreading to antagonism between the two systems.

It appears that this theory arose in the course of political antagonism with the West on the question of the nature of detente. The United States and several of its allies understood detente as the "rules of the game" regulating not only the bilateral relations of our countries but also their relations with states, parties and social forces. But was it not apparent here that the West desired to limit the ties of the socialist countries with the movements for social and national liberation? For the United States itself did not intend to reduce its support of proimperialist regimes and counterrevolutionary movements!

Political practice and especially the negotiations between Gorbachev and Reagan and their results show that flexibility in politics requires certain compromises and reciprocal concessions for the achievement of higher objectives—the lessening of tension, disarmament (the first step was the INF Treaty), and the resolution of the problem of regional conflicts. But then what is to become of the postulate on the class-antagonistic nature of the contradictions between socialism and capitalism?

This is when our theoreticians worked out the concept of the division of relations between states and relations between systems: detente and consequently compromises and concessions are possible only in the first area, whereas in the second there must be a continuation of the irreconcilable class (ideological) struggle. It seemed that this saved the position on the antagonism of the two systems. At the same time, there were demands not to allow the spread of the ideological conflicts between systems to relations between states.

In summary, our international publicist activity, criticizing in the 1970's the American idea of the "end of ideology," simultaneously criticized Reagan for "ideologizing" foreign policy. Apparently all of this theoretical confusion was influenced by the general state of our social sciences that had bogged down in a swamp of dogmatism, apologetics and conformism during the period of stagnation.

It is obvious that international relations are not equivalent to relations between states. But what we understand by "relations of systems" is embodied in the relations of specific states and their coalitions and organizations. This is perhaps especially apparent in the work of such "channels" of the ideological struggle as propaganda and the exchange of information. Thus, direct television broadcasting by satellite became an acute problem in relations between states.

As I see it, today it is necessary to seek common interests not only in relations between states but also in the area of the interaction between socialism and capitalism, that is, between systems. The unacceptability of mutual destruction is obvious and one cannot permanently live on the verge of war....

Let us recall the New Delhi Declaration on the Principles for a Nonviolent World free of Nuclear Weapons signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi (1986). It expresses a new understanding of the very idea of peaceful coexistence: "Peaceful coexistence must become the universal norm of international relations...." Faithfulness to these principles was also affirmed in the course of the December (1988) visit of the Soviet leader to India.

Thus, coexistence of two systems? And not for a short time but for an entire historical epoch. But this means that the systems must engage in continuous dialogue, adapt to each other, enrich one another and compete. Not to the detriment but to the benefit of the future!

We must now look at the Western world in a different way and free ourselves of stereotypes that demonize capitalism. I believe that this is very important at the present time, when we are taking the first steps in accordance with the principles of the New Delhi Declaration.

[signed] **Captain of the Reserves Yu. Darbovskiy, head of the department for computers and programming of the Ternopol Finance and Economic Institute and member of the party committee.**

FROM THE EDITOR'S OFFICE: In our view, the author of the letter stated interesting but not entirely undisputed opinions on the approaches and criteria for the assessment of contemporary international relations and expressed his own view of peaceful coexistence. But what do specialists in international affairs think about this? We asked A. Podberezkin, a top-level researcher at the World Economy and International Relations Institute, to respond to this letter. He is the author of numerous works on military-political problems and on contemporary international relations and a candidate of historical sciences.

The explosion of interest in theory and the quite professional approach of people who would seem to be outside international practical affairs is a characteristic feature of our time. This means that theory, including the theory of international relations, has ceased to be exclusively a matter for professionals. And the area of the foreign policy of the CPSU has ceased to be a "zone of silence" and has become accessible to critical examination.

Yes, all of this indicates an increased interest of the Soviet people in the foreign political activities of our state and in the overall democratization of the process of preparing and making the most important political decisions. The letter from Yu. Karbovskiy serves as an example of this. Without in any event claiming absolute correctness or the official statement of positions, I would like to express my opinion and, in some instances, argue with Yu. Karbovskiy, believing that this dispute may be useful to readers as well.

The author of the letter considers the thesis of peaceful coexistence to have disappeared without a trace. But it is not just that there have been and are disputes about this. They were reflected in party documents, including the materials of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Yu. Karbovskiy quite justifiably, in my view, noted the contradictory nature of the treatment of the thesis on peaceful coexistence as a specific form of class struggle. On the one hand, such treatment reduced relations between states to simple relations "without wars" and, on the other hand, it acknowledged the antagonistic character of such relations and the class nature of the struggle as applied to relations between social and political systems.

It is indeed difficult to hide the contradictory nature of such treatment, which, of course, did not remain a secret for foreign ideologists either. They skillfully took advantage of this contradiction and made extensive use of it in their ideological and political actions. The dialectical interrelationship between the contradictions of different systems and between states is obvious.

The application of the thesis on peaceful coexistence as a specific form of class struggle caused considerable confusion and objectively contributed to the undermining of belief in the humanism and antiwar nature of our foreign policy. All of this allowed E.A. Shevardnadze to declare with complete justification the erroneousness of this thesis and the fact that the "anti-Leninist principles on peaceful coexistence as a specific form of class struggle" had a negative influence on the ideas of the world public about the Soviet Union and its policies.

The priority of common human interests over class interests in the present day is a most important theoretical conclusion of our party and a specific manifestation of the new political thinking in theory. This is why the recognition of the erroneousness of this thesis is one of the key aspects in the understanding of the essence of the reassessment of priorities that took place in our country after the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and requires a more detailed examination.

It appears that the acknowledgement of peaceful coexistence as a specific form of class struggle is one of the dogmata of thought inherent in the period of stagnation. For this dogma essentially denied the evolution of forms of struggle that have quite definite differences in different periods of history.

Humanity in the last third of the 20th century is distinguished, and fundamentally so, from humanity at the beginning or even middle of our century. The acceleration of scientific-technical progress, the transition to an information society, the profound structural changes in the economy, integration and, finally—the main thing—the appearance and subsequent exacerbation of global problems are "acquisitions" of the current stage in the development of civilization. All of this indicates that

qualitative changes took place in humanity itself and in the nature of the stage of development being experienced, changes that do not permit the mechanical utilization of the criteria and concepts of past decades.

And today it seems wrong to think that the primary tendency in world development is the conflict of two social and economic systems and their struggle (even excluding the crudest and most direct forms of armed coercion).

From the "Noosphere" of Vernadskiy to New Thinking

It is becoming more and more clear that the interconnection and interdependence of the world, our house for all mankind, is now becoming paramount. Completely new circumstances are forming for the development not of some particular state or class but of all mankind.

As early as the first half of the 20th century, the great Russian scientist V.I. Vernadskiy put forth the concept of a "noosphere" (sphere of reason) as a concept for an interconnected and interdependent world. Under these conditions, in equating international relations with class struggle, it is difficult to reconcile this struggle with the acknowledgement of the possibility and inevitability of peaceful coexistence as the highest universal principle and mutually advantageous cooperation of states with different social and political orders.

An extremely dangerous situation arose in the world in the first half of the 1980's. Mankind had never before in its history faced a military threat of this qualitatively new and extremely dangerous scale and nature. There was an increasing need for the urgent resolution of the global problems facing humanity: ecological, economic, political, military, etc., the uncontrolled development of which began to threaten human civilization and life itself on earth.

The resolution of these problems, having been put off year after year, became an urgent necessity requiring the combined resources of all mankind and the implementation of a coordinated and long-term policy for a high degree of cooperation and mutual understanding. The "mere" absence of wars during a continuing arms race with dangerous technological consequences as well as the larger and larger scale of the arms trade has already become clearly inadequate for the effective escape from the existing situation.

In this way, individual states, peoples and continents found themselves not only interconnected but also interdependent. Their actions—whether they so desire or not—are determined to a considerable extent by objective reasons, including the reaction of public opinion in other states. The example of Chernobyl is just one, albeit very spectacular, event illustrating this conclusion.

The 27th CPSU Congress not merely drew the conclusion about the interrelated and interdependent world but also showed the specific directions for the elimination of obstacles in the way of the development of this tendency. And the scientific-technical revolution, which entered a new stage at the beginning of the 1980's, presented mankind with a large set of urgent problems.

In essence, the scientific-technical revolution is now developing "explosively," in a number of cases completely changing past notions on scientific-technical progress, the economy, information, and the social life of the society. The "computerized society" of the 1980's is in many ways a society completely different from, let us say, that of the 1960's. Unfortunately, progress in our country has not been as apparent as in the West, where the computer has become part of the everyday culture and ordinary life of the individual.

Precisely these processes, as was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress, "initiated a gigantic increase in the material and spiritual possibilities of man." But they also raised very acute problems, two of which I would like to point out: how to prevent the utilization of the latest achievements of the scientific-technical revolution to the detriment of mankind and—even more to the point—how can man get control over his development. For if the situation remains in its previous "uncontrolled" form, in a manner of speaking, then inevitably a catastrophe will occur.

The second problem is how to avoid being left off the main paths of development of the scientific-technical revolution, how not to lose time and therefore not be cast aside by history, and how not to become "technologically dependent" upon advanced countries. Both of these questions are so major that they have attained extremely great political importance. Today they have become top-priority political problems facing governments as well as the public of all states.

These trends coincided in time with the coming to power of conservative circles in a number of Western countries, circles that openly proclaimed that they were betting on "social revenge" in the world. It appears that such a coincidence was no accident. At the beginning of the 1980's, the political forces of the conservative (and sometimes rightwing) persuasion that had taken the helm of foreign policy in a number of Western countries formulated their ambitious and hegemonic objectives rather clearly. It is very important to remember that the goal of leaving socialism on the "rubbish heap of history" and of attaining the possibility of victory in a nuclear war was openly formulated by the administration of the United States.

Under R. Reagan, there was a search for new means and forms of utilizing military force as an instrument of foreign policy and as a means of putting pressure on the policies of the USSR and other states. There was an

increase in adventurism and hegemonism in Washington's political course throughout the world. All of this provided justification for the conclusion drawn at the 27th CPSU Congress that the leading circles in the United States are clearly losing touch with reality in this complex period of history.

The political aims of American leading circles and their striving to utilize the achievements of the new stage in the scientific-technical revolution led to the arms race entering into a qualitatively new stage of development. It encompassed all types and systems of weapons and military equipment and all forms of military activity. In other words, a qualitatively new process of mass overarmament began.

The new leadership of the CPSU quite precisely assessed this level of danger hanging over humanity, having declared at the party conference that never before in the postwar decades had the situation in the world been so explosive and therefore complex and unfavorable as in the first half of the 1980's.

This qualitatively new level of military danger also required a search for qualitatively new means of overcoming it. The previous traditional means and forms turned out to be ineffective. In my view, among such ineffective measures were military technical means of foreign policy, which in past years were given more attention than political means in a number of cases. The exceptional nature of the situation within our country and in the world as a whole required exceptional measures, nontraditional approaches and decisions.

The search for such effective and exceptional measures aimed at utilizing "even the smallest chance to stop the trend toward greater military danger before it is too late" required a rethinking of previous foreign policy concepts and approaches. And in the light of the new political thinking, it required recognition of the previous skewness (in a number of cases) in the direction of military technological means of guaranteeing national security.

Nontraditional Approaches

It was also natural to reconsider the thesis on peaceful coexistence as a specific form of class struggle. But the recognition of this in theory and in practice hardly means that the policies of states have ceased to be class policies and to be determined by the interests of the ruling classes, social strata and groups. And such an approach "does not repeal" the inherent laws on class struggle and the conflict of interests of states in the political arena. To think this way is knowingly to idealize the situation in the world and the policies of the ruling circles of the capitalist states.

No, the world has not turned into some kind of "paradise without conflicts," where complete harmony prevails and there is absolute conformity of interests! Today it is

essential to maintain balance in assessments and to watch the development of international events closely. And, as V.I. Lenin taught us, it is necessary always to be on the alert.

What is the meaning today of the incorrect recognition of the thesis on peaceful coexistence as a specific form of class struggle? The common human interest is put above all other interests (state, class, strata, groups, individuals, etc.). It has priority over class interest. In this way, peaceful coexistence became a universal need and a principle of international relations.

Many may not agree with me but I personally like the point of view of the well-known publicist and international specialist A.Ye. Bovin, who thinks that the principle of peaceful coexistence does not boil down to nonaggression and the nonuse of force but represents a complex political and legal structure, elements of which are the general democratic standards for relations between states.

Here I might add a high level of cooperation of states in the resolution of bilateral as well as international problems. But if one considers that peaceful coexistence (which integrates such general democratic norms as noninterference in internal affairs, respect for sovereignty, development of cooperation in many areas, including extensive contacts between citizens of states, etc.) is equivalent to a form of class struggle, then such an identification is quite contradictory.

In my view, then, the principle of peaceful coexistence is a universal common democratic and common human principle for the development of mutual relations between states with different social and political systems, and sometimes with different interests and objectives, in the achievement of which it is necessary to consider the priority of common human interests and objectives.

In touching on this problem at a meeting with representatives of the "Trilateral Commission" in January 1989, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized: "We need to approach the very idea of peaceful coexistence in a different way, taking into account the current formidable risks as well as the circumstance that all of us have become substantially more dependent upon each other. The attempts to overcome conflicts between systems by way of the arms race and the preparation for war turned out to be unrealistic and extremely dangerous. There is only one way out: let each system show its capability to adapt to new realities and processes, whereas differences need to be viewed as an incentive for exchange and interaction and as a beneficial source for both sides."

The principle of peaceful coexistence now meets the main foreign policy objective of the USSR and other states of the Warsaw Pact. This is the provision, primarily through political means, of peaceful and favorable conditions for the successful development of socialism in

fraternal countries. Hence the appearance of a phenomenon such as the new political thinking. It required a drastic renewal of our foreign policy and a mechanism for its implementation.

The essence of such renewal is to see and find new possibilities for opposing the policy of force on a broader, more democratic and more humane political basis than before. This thought expressed at the 19th All-Union Party Conference is extremely important. It develops, as it were, the theme of the 27th CPSU Congress that the security of states cannot be guaranteed through military technical means alone. Yes, we recognize that the bias in the direction of military technical means of ensuring national security that has taken place in our policies was not only erroneous but also hopeless. The focus of efforts in guaranteeing national security in our time is shifting in the direction of political means.

In my view, this tendency will continue to develop with the humanization of international relations, their demilitarization, and the increased importance of moral standards, legal guarantees and the influence of public opinion and international organizations.

Defense Policy: Priority of Qualitative Parameters

How can the principle of peaceful coexistence be viewed from the position of the recently announced defensive character of Warsaw Pact doctrine? Obviously international relations must develop in the direction of the maximum optimization of defensive measures. But in practice they must be developed and realized taking into consideration the main requirement—the prevention of war and the lowering of the level of military confrontation.

At the same time, the priority of political measures does not at all mean that military technical means have completely lost their importance. The emphasis on military force by the United States and NATO requires from the Soviet Union and its allies constant readiness to defend themselves through military means as well.

The question of what means and how they should be employed became one of the central questions. An answer was given to it at the 19th Party Conference from the positions of the new political thinking.

Today, as never before, the capability of the armed forces to be effective in carrying out the set tasks does not depend upon the number of systems for armed combat but upon their quality. Quality, as you know, is determined by the level of the technological, scientific-technical and economic development of the state. And the very concept of "state power" is increasingly being determined not by the criteria of its military might but by the level of the technological and economic development and moral-political potential of the society.

The concept of reasonable sufficiency, or sufficiency for defense, has become an integral part of the military doctrine of the USSR and Warsaw Pact. From the point of view of international relations, it is called upon to dispel fears still existing in the West with respect to the intentions of the USSR and its allies in the military area. So this concept serves to establish a more favorable political and psychological climate on the planet.

The major initiatives of the USSR for the reduction of armed forces and arms declared on a unilateral basis by the Soviet leadership in December 1988 as well as analogous initiatives of our allies in the Warsaw Pact serve the cause of strengthening peace, security and trust. And do the data that we published at the end of January 1989 on the strength of the armies and arms of the Warsaw Pact member states not help strengthen the climate of trust?

Today it is no longer possible to resolve a huge number of increasingly acute common human problems under the conditions of hostility and increasing confrontation. Ideological and political disagreements must not become the focus for the formation of international relations of a new type and the interrelations of countries and peoples.

Such disagreements are not a subject for dispute with the help of military force but the subject for political discussions and the search for nonmilitary means of resolving conflicts.

Just as before, of course, we see the depth of the differences between the two social forces but this is no reason for a power confrontation and confrontation of states.

In this way, the principle of peaceful coexistence concentrates an entire complex of positions of a common democratic and common human nature. The policies of new thinking, which have guided Soviet leaders in recent years, not only recognized the erroneousness of its treatment as a "specific form of class struggle" but also saturated it with essentially new political content.

This is why, in returning to the letter from the reader, one can generally agree with his treatment of peaceful coexistence and with his conclusion that the systems must remain in continual dialogue, adapt to one another, and enrich each other and compete, not to the detriment but to the benefit of the future.

COPYRIGHT: "Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil", 1989.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Defense Minister Stoltenberg Views Soviet Arms Control Policy

AU1906134089 Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG in German 18 Jun 89 p 27

[Interview with Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg by Siegmund Schelling in Bonn: "Russia's Economic Crisis Accelerates Disarmament"; date of interview not given]

[Text] WELT AM SONNTAG: What is for you the most important result of Gorbachev's visit in the field of defense policy?

Stoltenberg: The most important result is certainly the joint declaration, which defines a wide field of constructive cooperation. This includes the intention of both sides to achieve concrete results in arms control and disarmament negotiations. The chancellor fully included in his formulations the decisions of the NATO summit and the alliance's joint policy.

WELT AM SONNTAG: You held detailed talks with Sergey Akhromeyev, former Soviet chief of staff and now Gorbachev's close military adviser. Did you also discuss the results of the summit, and are there new findings?

Stoltenberg: Yes. I also referred to the position of the NATO summit on our arms control concept. It is significant that the Soviets affirmed their intention to give up their present superiority in Europe. We had a good, very personal talk, in which I gained more insight into the changing military concepts of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

WELT AM SONNTAG: Can we therefore hope that one of the most important problems will be solved in the foreseeable future—that is, reducing the Warsaw Pact's ability to attack?

Stoltenberg: This hope exists. Of course, it must become more concrete in the Vienna negotiations. Above all, it is important that General Secretary Gorbachev confirmed U.S. President Bush's assessment that concrete results can be reached in Vienna more quickly than previously expected. I am emphasizing this because this assessment by the U.S. President has been considerably called into doubt by the public.

WELT AM SONNTAG: Can we expect a shorter timetable for success in Vienna?

Stoltenberg: This has become very probable, particularly since General Secretary Gorbachev and my partners in the talks explicitly stressed this. In my opinion, the economic and financial crisis, which is being described in increasingly open terms by the Soviet leadership,

clearly points to this. The Soviet leadership has a chance to improve the very serious economic and social situation within an acceptable period only if excessive armament costs are reduced.

However, we will intensify the military contacts step by step, by means of concerted actions. For example, a visit before the end of the year by a Federal Navy ship to the Soviet Union is planned. However, we cannot make any additional private initiative the subject of our own planning.

WELT AM SONNTAG: How do the NATO allies assess the visit?

Stoltenberg: We remain firmly rooted in the Western alliance. This fact is even a prerequisite for our expected success in far-reaching cooperation, especially concerning arms control negotiations with the Warsaw Pact. The political statement of Brussels, to which, in my opinion, far too little attention has been paid, stresses that this is a joint concept of the alliance. Therefore, the results and talks of Gorbachev's visit will not reduce the confidence within the Western camp.

WELT AM SONNTAG: Why did Gorbachev repeatedly emphasize that better German-Soviet relations cannot arouse anyone's distrust?

Stoltenberg: These statements are in line with a very realistic assessment of the FRG's basic orientation. This is important and positive. However, the parliamentary opposition parties in the Bundestag and the opposition forces outside parliament must adopt a clearer and more unambiguous attitude in these issues. Precisely in this respect, many concerns have been voiced by the public in our Western partner countries.

Foreign Minister Genscher on East-West Relations, Disarmament

AU2106141589 Munich SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 21 Jun 89 p 10

[Interview with FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher by Dieter Schroeder: "The Division of Europe Is Obsolete"; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] SZ: After the visits by Bush and Gorbachev and after the NATO summit in Brussels, the FRG has received a new role. What are we going to do with this new role?

Genscher: I would not call it a new role, but the FRG's weight and its role in the Western alliance, in the EC, and as a country that is working for a rapprochement between West and East, has become clearer. The obvious handwriting of German policy in the political statement of the Western alliance shows this. It is also demonstrated by the speech by President Bush in Mainz, and

we have good reason to say that the guiding German-Soviet statement is not only important for the German-Soviet relationship, but for Europe's prospects today. The FRG thus lives up to the task that the mothers and fathers of the Basic Law set for us—that is, to establish a peaceful Europe and embed German politics and German interests in the fate of Europe.

SZ: Is there something like a special German interest in good relations with the Soviet Union?

Genscher: I would rather speak of a special responsibility of the Germans that results from our history, our geographic location, and our weight in the center of Europe. Paul Claudel, the great Frenchman, told us at the end of World War II that it is not the task of the Germans to divide the peoples but to bring them together. This is a noble task. We are facing this responsibility, but we do this within the framework of a European policy. We do not follow any special paths to achieve or enforce alleged special interests; we are acting with the awareness that no people's fate is determined so much by the fate of Europe as that of us Germans. Therefore, we must be interested in overcoming the division of Europe in our own interest.

SZ: If overcoming the division of Europe is successful, would this not revitalize the German question?

Genscher: I think that by attaching our fate to the fate of Europe everything necessary has already been said. Everything that brings the Europeans closer together also brings the Germans closer together. Erhard Eppler explained this in the German Bundestag on 17 June in his both thoughtful and important speech. No one has ever said more clearly how obsolete the division of Europe is and how appropriate it would be to overcome this division than my Soviet colleague Shevardnadze in his statement in Vienna, where he noted that the Iron curtain, the rusty Iron Curtain, is starting to decay. This is not a utopia, here we see real prospects.

SZ: But does this really work as smoothly. Gorbachev's visit again aroused fears among our neighbors, and even more so among the Americans, of our unreliability. You yourself are often cited as an example of this. How do you want to counter this?

Genscher: I have not heard the voices of responsible personalities on this topic. There are people in our country who would, perhaps, like this to be so, but it is not the case.

SZ: There are, perhaps, no direct statements by responsible politicians, but in the media, for instance....

Genscher: Of course, there are various opinions on every question among the Western public. However, such fears would be completely foolish. Nevertheless, there are people who see this differently, and in our country there are people who are echoing them.

SZ: The joint statement is considered a document of historic significance. At the moment it mainly consists of declarations of intent. Is there a vision behind it? Could you explain this vision in detail?

Genscher: It is the vision of a European peace system from the Atlantic to the Urals, as it was formulated by the Western alliance in 1967—of a Europe in which the United States and Canada have their place. If I see this correctly, it is the very first document since World War II in which a Western state and the Soviet Union have noted that the United States and Canada have their place in the European peace system or in the common European home.

SZ: Now Gorbachev again said that this concept does not include the presence of foreign troops on foreign territories.

Genscher: If we look at the situation as it is today and as it can be predicted for the future, there will be alliances, and within the framework of these alliances there will also be armed forces in Europe, but it would certainly be wrong to say that the role of the United States and Canada is only a military or security-policy role. Basically, events in these two countries are determined so much by European history and culture, they belong so much to our cultural sphere, and, like ourselves, they are characterized so much by common values and convictions that they belong to Europe in this sense—even though not geographically—and are European states. [passage omitted]

SZ: We are certainly right in saying that the reform process in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe is also in our interest. How can we support or strengthen it politically or economically, or both?

Genscher: I think that a constructive approach to this policy of opening up is important and necessary. This applies, for instance, to courageously taking up all opportunities of disarmament, which also contributes to freeing resources that are currently being used to maintain the arms potentials. However, it also applies to economic, ecological, and cultural cooperation. It is necessary to achieve a network of interests in Europe and to create dependencies in a positive sense, which make sure that no one can get out of such a network and such cooperation without violating his own most vital interests. Everything that is done in this process makes the reform processes and the new policy between West and East more and more irreversible.

SZ: Of course, one might mention that the network—one of Kissinger's ideas—did not work during the first stage of detente, and in China's case it obviously did not work either.

Genscher: There is an obvious difference between the Chinese policy of reforms and the Soviet one. The Chinese policy of reforms was deliberately intended to

be limited to economic reforms, but not touch upon the other structures and processes. The resulting tension was the reason for the conflicts in Tiananmen Square and all other developments in the PRC. There is a basic difference in the approach to reforms between Moscow and Beijing. The second difference is the fact that during the first stage of the policy of detente, which was made possible through the policy of the FRG with the Moscow Treaty and the ensuing Warsaw Treaty, the treaty with the CSSR, the Basic Treaty, the 4-power agreement, and then, ultimately, the Helsinki Final Act, it was not possible to supplement the process of rapprochement with a successful disarmament policy. The time was obviously not ripe for this, because a successful disarmament policy presupposed everything that is contained in the German-Soviet statement today.

SZ: At his press conference in Bonn, Gorbachev did not consider NATO's offer in Brussels to be such a great breakthrough. It is still influenced by the philosophy of the cold war, he said. Can speedy results be expected in Vienna in view of the Soviet reservations? When will the Vienna negotiations start seriously—only in September with the presentation of Western proposals?

Genscher: Already today, one can adjust to the presentation of Western proposals. I also think that Gorbachev's remarks referred not so much to the concrete Western disarmament proposals but to the overall concept, which naturally is characterized by the views and interests of NATO, to which the Soviet Union does not belong, as is known. However, it is obvious that the Soviet Union does not contend the constructive character of the new proposals on the basis of the Bush proposals, but, on the contrary, that it is interested in our achieving results quickly. I continue to consider President Bush's schedule of 6 to 12 months as realistic, given goodwill on all sides. I think that the Soviet Union does not lack goodwill either, because disarmament in the conventional area means for it a reduction of its superiority on the one hand, but also the saving of resources on the other. It urgently needs resources if it wants to solve the pressing economic problems, which have to lead to the setting of new priorities in the Soviet economy.

SZ: Your attitude toward short-range missiles gives the impression that you expect the disarmament process to develop its own dynamism, which may lead to a third zero-option. Is this impression correct?

Genscher: First of all, I expect the disarmament process to develop its own dynamism. It is in everyone's very own interest not to stop at a certain point of this process. It would also be completely incomprehensible if a certain kind of weapons, namely short-range missiles, were to be excluded from the disarmament process. There will probably be no one who thinks that disarmament can be carried out in all fields, but that short-range missiles can be left like a few lunar rocks in the disarmament landscape. The question of whether there will be a new and completely different follow-up system after 1996, the

date when the Lance missiles are to be taken out of service, will be answered in line with the security policy development that will be seen in 1992, the year when NATO will again deal with this issue. Of course, we will do everything in our power to change the security policy situation in such a way that the decision on a follow-up system will be unnecessary. [passage omitted]

SZ: In view of the postponed decision about modernization of the short-range missiles, at the moment security policy is neither a contentious issue in the coalition nor the reason for a change in the coalition. There do not seem to be any other major conflicts, either. Is this good for the FDP or bad?

Genscher: Well, first of all I would not speak of a postponed decision and of modernization. A new weapons system is involved. A good climate in the government coalition benefits all partners in the government coalition. I personally do not at all like the idea that quarrels help one or the other—that which is called "gaining profile" in modern jargon. I think that harmony in a coalition benefits everyone in the coalition. Of course, one must not sacrifice one's own identity to this. [passage omitted]

Government Praises U.S. Position in START Talks

*LD1906150489 Hamburg DPA in German
1413 GMT 19 Jun 89*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—On Monday the federal government emphasized its support for the U.S. disarmament objectives at the 11th round of negotiations with the USSR which were resumed on Monday in Geneva. Bonn fully supports the U.S. proposal for a 50 percent reduction in intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and heavy bombers of the two superpowers. Government spokesman Hans Klein underlined Bonn's confidence in further solutions and recalled the "important progress" already achieved.

Agreement has already been achieved for the upper limits of 1,600 carrier systems and 6,000 warheads. There was progress toward agreement on difficult verification questions, Klein said. In this regard, the exchange of data, on-site inspections called at short notice, as well as permanent observer posts have been agreed to.

Bundestag Committee Investigates MBB Illegal Missile Exports

*AU1906091989 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German
19 Jun 89 p 17*

[Text] The suspicion of the FRG Government that the MBB arms company was involved in illegal missile exports to Iraq, Egypt, and Argentina either directly or via its subsidiaries is being corroborated. Last Wednesday [14 June] at the session of the Bundestag Foreign Affairs Committee, Harald Schaefer, state minister in

the Foreign Ministry, confidentially reported on numerous indications of illegal arms deals by the company from Ottobrunn. The anger about these machinations by MBB is also increasing in the Economics Ministry. In the meantime, the Economics Ministry is almost sure that MBB promised the Bonn authorities to withdraw from the sensitive deal, but fulfilled this promise only after secretly completing the incriminating deals. Therefore, some officials call for MBB to be deprived of its status of "reliability" which the Military Materiel Control Law requires of arms producers. However, this blow would not mean the end for the missile producers: As in the nuclear industry, the state's trust in the "reliability" of the company could quickly be reestablished if some leading managers were sacked.

FRANCE

Prime Minister Rocard Rejects Ending South Pacific Nuclear Tests

*LD1806131589 Paris International Service in French
1200 GMT 18 Jun 89*

[Text] Michel Rocard has said in an interview granted in Paris and broadcast by Australian television on the occasion of the visit to France by Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke that France does not intend to end its program of nuclear tests in the South Pacific. The head of government however made it clear that the number of the tests may be reduced. According to Michel Rocard, France is still convinced that nuclear weapons are the best possible deterrent to war, but he added that he will not let differences over the nuclear issue ruin his talks with Mr Hawke.

NORWAY

Broad Consensus Prevails on Security Policy

*36390076a Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian
18 May 89 p 6*

[Article by Geir Salvesen: "Broad Agreement on Security"; first paragraph is AFTENPOSTEN introduction]

[Text] A broad compromise on security policy that includes the Labor Party, the middle parties and the Conservatives. That is the result of the Foreign Affairs Committee's latest report on security and arms reduction.

The missile controversy from the early 1980's seems to be a thing of the past in the report that has now been issued. It is true that there has been a tug of war between Conservative and Labor members of the committee over the text on modernizing the American short-range missiles in West Germany, which is currently the hottest question facing the NATO alliance. West Germany opposes the United States and Great Britain on this point but a number of other NATO countries support its desire to negotiate with the Soviet Union.

Interpretation

There was some suspense beforehand about which side the Foreign Affairs Committee would back and whether disagreements on security policy would surface again. There were no disagreements but at the same time committee members concede that the text of the report is open to interpretation on a number of central points. The Conservative spokesman on this issue, Jan Petersen, told AFTENPOSTEN that the committee did not end up in either the West German or the American camp. Other committee sources told AFTENPOSTEN that the report clearly leans toward the West German position. This is a passage from the report:

"The committee refers to the fact that the NATO alliance governments are now evaluating a study of nuclear weapons in Europe that was prepared by the alliance's commander in chief in Europe. Thus the committee considers it improper to make any decisions on updating such weapons at this time."

Soviet Superiority

The committee (including the Socialist Left Party [SV]) notes that the Soviet Union currently has a conventional superiority in Europe and a very large excess of nuclear short-range missile launchers. It refers to the Vienna talks on reducing conventional forces in Europe and says:

"The committee is of the opinion that no weapon category should be left out of the overall negotiation picture. This also applies to short-range nuclear weapons. The committee assumes the talks will not lead to a situation in which all nuclear missiles are removed and the Soviet Union retains its conventional superiority."

The Socialist Left Party takes this further and rejects any modernization of short-range nuclear missiles. The party charges that the plans to deploy a new Lance missile involve a real arms escalation on NATO's part.

Both Types

NATO needs both conventional and nuclear forces in the defense of Europe as the situation now stands, the rest of the Foreign Affairs Committee minus SV maintains. Reducing the role of nuclear weapons is one objective and strengthening conventional defense can help achieve it. But a potential aggressor must never be able to predict with certainty what type of defense will be used to combat an attack on a NATO area.

"This means he will have to assume that an attack against alliance territory could elicit a nuclear response. But no weapons will be used except as a response to armed aggression."

Nothing is happening on the political level at the moment with regard to the question of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. The committee points out that a group of senior officials is working on the matter and further discussions of the zone concept are expected when the results of this work are available.

SWITZERLAND

Foreign Minister Felber Interviewed on Prospects for CFE/CSBM Talks

36200142 Zurich DIE WELTWOCHTE in German
23 Mar 89 pp 41-43

[Interview with Confederation Council Member Rene Felber by Marcel H. Keiser and Andreas Heller: "Increasing Pressure From Abroad"; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] Neuenburg Social Democrat Rene Felber has been in charge of the Department of Foreign Affairs since January 1988. The change of style, compared to his unlucky predecessor Pierre Aubert, is striking. The spastic and hectic atmosphere has been replaced with nonchalance; problems are being examined according to Cartesian logic and are then solved in a pragmatic fashion. Felber, 56, who used to be a teacher, came up with definite and undiplomatically open statements in the exclusive interview he gave WELTWOCHTE. [passage omitted]

WELTWOCHTE: What are your hopes regarding the Vienna negotiations?

Felber: I am going into this round of talks with lots of caution. Naturally, as I see it, the negotiations are extremely valuable. But the prior conference, the MBFR, did not arrive at any results even though it went on for 15 years because they did not get beyond the reciprocal projection of force ratios. The new round of talks is extraordinarily important in the context of the CSCE because political relations between the power blocs today are better than ever before and a radical change appears to be emerging.

If the Vienna talks are to be successful, it is of course necessary to make sure that a consensus is found on an asymmetrical reduction of conventional forces: If they again start counting peanuts on both sides, then this would mean that the conference would end without any result. From my angle—the viewpoint of a cautious realist—there is some hope that the internal conditions and economic facts of life of the two superpowers will force a useful result. From our viewpoint, the decisive

thing is that relations between the 23 countries that are directly committed in Vienna and the other 12 signatory states of the CSCE Act of Helsinki remain on a realistic basis.

WELTWOCHTE: It is especially also in connection with the Vienna talks that social democratic circles in Switzerland are discussing the possibility of perhaps launching an initiative to freeze the military expenditures of the Confederation. Is our country to make a signal in this respect?

Felber: Such a step would not have any influence at all on the Vienna conference. In my capacity as foreign minister, I must represent the position of the country's government, something that causes no trouble for me because I fully subscribe to that position. As for the Social Democratic Party, it is my opinion that one could then also discuss proposals touching Switzerland if there are specific results from the Vienna negotiations. At some later date I have an absolutely open mind for a discussion on disarmament also in Switzerland but not simply for the exercise. Proposals that would commit only Switzerland and that are not a part of the development of the international situation would undoubtedly be premature: Any possible Swiss steps toward disarmament must necessarily be coincident with the general determination to reduce weapon arsenals. A reduction in defense-oriented armies could be discussed only during a second phase.

WELTWOCHTE: Is there any guarantee that the neutral and nonaligned countries, which for the time being are just observers, will not only be adequately informed in Vienna but will perhaps also actually be contacted?

Felber: It is a ticklish job to make sure of that but our compelling duty—actually, it was Switzerland that came out with the corresponding request in Vienna. For example, contrary to the desire of the United States who declared that the group should be confined to the 23 directly involved countries. We asked for two things: First of all, the conference would have to take place in the context of the CSCE and, second, the other 12 countries should be contacted and informed.

The group of nonaligned countries is firmly determined not to accept any cuts. If we are not consulted, then there is a risk that the 23 countries participating in the conference might adopt measures for all of the 35 signatory countries of the CSCE Final Act which we then cannot go along with. The resolution calling for a general 10-percent cut would be beyond discussion for Switzerland even if such a cut were to affect only defense expenditures or the personnel strength of mobilizable troops. Such a measure would be completely unbalanced because it would not consider the differences between offensive and defensive armies. [passage omitted]

22161

40

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103

5285 PORT 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.