

302184

JPRS-TAC-85-031

16 September 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980722 126

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10
125
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

16 September 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Text of Gorbachev Reply to Union of Concerned Scientists (Mikhail Gorbachev; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 29, Jul 85)	1
USSR: Reaction to U.S. Announcement of ASAT Test (Various sources, various dates)	4
Violates Space Treaty	4
Offensive Goals Seen	4
'Wave of Criticism' in U.S.	5
'Irresponsible' Policy	6
'Foul Deed', by Vitaliy Kobyshev	8
'Explicit Answer' on Arms Race	9
GAO Report Cited	10
U.S. 'Inconsistency', 'Cynicism'	10
Will 'Hamper' Geneva Talks, by Aleksandr Zholkver	11
U.S. 'Logic' Ridiculed	12
Kobyshev: 'Preposterous Logic'	13
Paul Warnke Cited	14
U.S. Press, Politicians' Criticism Noted	14
'Clear Challenge to World Community', by V. Chernyshev	15
'Premeditated Sabotage', by Valentin Zorin	17
First Strike, SDI Tie Seen, by Aleksandr Bovin	18
'Dangerous Frontier'	19
USSR Ready for Radical Resolution	20
Violates 'Spirit' of Geneva Talks	21
TASS Statement on Geneva Impact	24
PRAVDA Weekly Review: Test Moratorium, SDI (Yuriy Kharlanov; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Aug 85)	25
Weekly Moscow Roundtable on Test Moratorium, Space Issues (Moscow Domestic Service, 25 Aug 85)	28
Nuclear Moratorium	28
Peaceful Uses of Space	29
U.S. Antisatellite Test	30

TASS Raps U.S. Spokesmen on SDI (Various sources, various dates)	32
Perle Remarks to Adenauer Foundation	32
Adelman Speech	32
Weinberger Interview	33
USSR: Gerard Smith Critique of U.S. Stance Cited (Moscow TRUD, 17 Aug 85)	35
PRAVDA Rebuts McFarlane on Soviet Space Arms Programs (V. Sukhoy; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Aug 85)	36
TASS Analyst Examines U.S. Nuclear Policy (Moscow TASS, 12 Aug 85)	37
Moscow Commentator Notes Growing U.S. Opposition to SDI (Valentin Zorin; Moscow in English to North America, 24 Aug 84)	39
USSR: Army Paper Assails Justification for SDI (Editorial; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 20 Aug 85)	41
Moscow on U.S. SDI Plans for Micronesia (Moscow World Service, 25 Aug 85)	44
Soviet Space Proposal Sent to UN for Study (Various sources, various dates)	45
Shevardnadze Letter to UN	45
Draft UN Resolution	46
IZVESTIYA on Basic Guidelines	47
Radio Commentary in English	50
Need for World Space Agency, by Aleksandr Zholkver	51
U.S. Stance Criticized	52
Proposal Termed 'Star Peace'	53
Soviet Geneva Conference Delegate Denounces SDI (Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 15 Jul 85)	54
Moscow on 'Inter-Relatedness' of Space, Other Geneva Issues (Aleksandr Druzhinin; Moscow Domestic Service, 3 Aug 85)	55
USSR's Chervov Details Soviet View of SDI, Responses (Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov Interview; Vienna Television Service, 13 Aug 85)	57
TASS Commentator on U.S. Space Arms, Test Moratorium (Prague Domestic Service, 27 Aug 85)	59

Soviet Journal Editor on Summit, SDI, Test Moratorium (Valentin Berezhkov; Budapest Domestic Service, 23 Aug 85)	61
Polish Commentary on SDI From Different Perspectives (Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA, 6-7 Jul 85; Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU, 13-14 Jul 85)	65
Bush Tours West Europe To Tout SDI	65
SDI Hit at SIPRI Conference, by Tomasz Walat	66
'Backstairs' Deal on SDI Collaboration, by Ryszard Drecki	66
Briefs	
PRAVDA: U.S. To Deploy ASAT Weapons at Base in Japan	68
U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
Poles Rate U.S. Leaders, Impact on Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Warsaw FAKTY I KOMENTARZE, No 28, 14 Jul 85)	69
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT	
USSR's Israelyan Sums Up Summer Session (Moscow TASS, 30 Aug 85)	72
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
TASS Attacks U.S. 'Chemical Rearmament' Program (Moscow TASS, 2 Sep 85)	74
USSR's Falin on U.S. Chemical Weapons Program (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 29 Aug 85; Moscow World Service, 29 Aug 85)	76
Valentin Falin Commentary	76
U.S. Policy 'Dangerous'	78
Moscow: U.S. Chemical Warfare Preparations Obstruct Ban (Moscow World Service, 24 Aug 85; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 Aug 85)	79
Yuriy Soltan Commentary	79
U.S. Navy Tactics Criticized, by A. Kieselev	80
USSR: Further Criticism of U.S. Binary Arms Program (Various sources, various dates)	83
Description by Military Officer, by O. Mironov	83
'Compromise' in Congress	84

FRG Still Possible Site	85
FRG Opposition to Storage	86
U.S. 'Need' Refuted	87
Dangerous' U.S. Policy	87
TASS Raps Adelman Remarks on Soviet, U.S. Chemical Arms (Moscow TASS, 19 Aug 85)	89
TASS Analyst Denies USSR Biological Weapons Program (Moscow TASS, 12 Aug 85)	90
Moscow Rebuts CIA Report on USSR Genetic Weapons (Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 19 Aug 85)	91
TASS Raps FRG Official's Call for Soviet Agreement to Ban (Moscow TASS International Service, 11 Aug 85)	93
Moscow: U.S. Plans To Site Chemical Weapons in FRG (Aleksandr Zholkver; Moscow Television Service, 12 Aug 85)	95
PRAVDA: European Socialists Condemn U.S. Chemical Weapons (Moscow PRAVDA, 15 Aug 85)	96
IZVESTIYA Denies Use of 'Yellow Rain' in Southeast Asia (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 13 Aug 85)	97
Briefs	
TASS Cites NEW YORK TIMES	98

GENERAL

Gorbachev, PCF's Marchais Issue Joint Communiqué (Moscow TASS, 3 Sep 85)	99
PRAVDA Editorial Article on U.S. Response to Soviet Initiatives (Moscow TASS, 23 Aug 85)	102
Moscow Weekly Roundtable on Arms Issues (Moscow Domestic Service, 18 Aug 85)	106
Nuclear Test Moratorium	106
U.S. Arms Buildup, SDI	110
South Pacific NFZ	111
Moscow Weekly Talk Show Views Test Moratorium, CDE (Moscow Domestic Service, 23 Aug 85)	113
Nuclear Moratorium	113
Stockholm Conference	114

USSR's Burlatskiy Examines U.S. Nuclear Control System
(Fedor Burlatskiy; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 28 Aug 85) 116

Briefs

Belorussian UN Statement

118

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TEXT OF GORBACHEV REPLY TO UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 29, Jul 85 p 4

["Outer Space for Peace Alone! Mikhail Gorbachev's Reply to the Union of Concerned Scientists"]

[Text] Dear Mr Kendall,

I have received the message sent by you on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists calling for a ban on space weapons. I want to say that I deeply respect the opinion of prominent scientists who are more keenly aware than many others of what dangerous consequences for mankind the spreading of the arms race to outer space and the conversion of space into an arena of military rivalry could have.

The Union of Concerned Scientists has every grounds to demand that a clear and irrevocable political decision be made which would prevent militarization of outer space and leave it free for peaceful cooperation. This issue indeed requires a bold approach. The standards of yesterday, narrow, moreover illusory notions, of one-sided benefits and advantages are not applicable here. What is needed now as never before is a farsighted policy based on understanding of the realities and the dangers which we shall inevitably encounter tomorrow, if today those who can and must make the only correct decision evade the responsibility that rests with them.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership I want to make it quite clear that the Soviet Union will not be the first to step into space with weapons. We shall make every effort to convince other countries, and above all the United States of America, not to take such a fatal step which would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and spark off an uncontrolled arms race in all areas.

Proceeding from this goal, the Soviet Union, as you evidently know, has submitted a radical proposal to the United Nations Organization--a draft treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in space and from space against earth. If the United States joined the vast majority of states that have supported this initiative, the issue of space weapons could be closed once and for all.

At the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva we are trying to reach agreement on a full ban on the development, testing and deployment of space strike systems. Such a ban would make it possible to preserve space for peaceful development, research and scientific discoveries, and, moreover, to start the process of sharply reducing and ultimately scrapping nuclear weapons.

We have also repeatedly taken unilateral steps intended to set a good example to the United States. For two years now the moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union on the placement of anti-satellite weapons in outer space has been operative and it will continue to remain in force as long as other states do likewise. Lying on the table in Washington is our proposal that both sides terminate completely all work on the development of new anti-satellite systems and that such systems as the U.S.S.R. and the United States already possess (including those still undergoing tests) be eliminated. The actions of the American side in the near future will show which decision the U.S. Administration will prefer.

Strategic stability and trust would clearly be strengthened if the United States agreed with the U.S.S.R. to reaffirm in binding form its commitment to the provisions of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, a treaty of unlimited duration. The Soviet Union is not developing strike space weapons or a large-scale ABM system. Nor is it laying the foundation for such a defence. It strictly abides by its obligations under the treaty as a whole and in its particular aspects and unswervingly observes the spirit and the letter of that highly important document. We invite the American leaders to join us in this and to renounce plans for space militarization now in the making, plans that would inevitably lead to the negation of that document, which is the key link in the entire process of nuclear arms limitation.

The U.S.S.R. proceeds from the premise that the practical fulfilment of the task of preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth is possible given the political will and a sincere desire by both sides to work towards this historic goal. The Soviet Union has that desire and that will.

I wish the Union of Concerned Scientists and all its members success in the noble work it is doing for the good of peace and progress.

Respectfully yours,

Mikhail Gorbachev

The popular American organization the Union of Concerned Scientists which unites several hundred prominent scientists, members of the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S.A., recently addressed an appeal to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Mikhail Gorbachev, and to the U.S. President, Ronald Reagan, urging the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. to

agree on a complete ban on the development and testing of space weapons and, in the meantime, to introduce a mutual moratorium on further tests of anti-satellite weapons and reaffirm their adherence to the 1972 Treaty of the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems.

CSO: 5200/1379

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: REACTION TO U.S. ANNOUNCEMENT OF ASAT TEST

Violates Space Treaty

LD210354 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 21 Aug 85

[Text] The United States is to conduct in the nearest future a combat testing of an anti-satellite strikeweapon in close to earth space. This has been announced by a White House spokesman, Larry Speakes, in Santa Barbara, California, where President Reagan is resting. According to news agencies the missile will be launched from an F-15 fighter-bomber and targeted at an orbiting satellite. The decision of the U.S. Administration to conduct such testings marks the beginning of the practical implementation of the American "star wars" program. It runs counter to an international treaty on the principles of using space, a treaty signed by the United States. The decision of the Reagan administration also runs counter to the Soviet-American treaty on limiting anti-missile defense systems.

Offensive Goals Seen

LD211235 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 21 Aug 85

[Text] Washington has announced the United State's decision to begin combat tests of anti-satellite weapons in space very soon. Over to our political observer Aleksandr Druzhinin:

Thus the practical implementation of the so-called "star wars" program proclaimed by President Reagan in March last year begins. Hitherto, representatives of Reagan's administration, patently attempting to mislead the public, have presented the matter as if this program were restricted to harmless and completely safe scientific research developmental work. The White House was even indignant at the words "star wars," and asserted that a certain Strategic Defense Initiative was what was intended.

Now, when the Pentagon is on the point of launching anti-satellite weapons for strike purposes into space, it must finally be clear to all that Washington is thinking not about defense, but about turning space into a sort of bridgehead for delivering a first strike on other countries. One cannot fail to turn attention to the fact that the United States has announced the decision to start combat testing of weapons in space literally 3 days after the Soviet Union submitted to the United Nations a proposal to examine a complex of measures and principles of international cooperation in the peaceful development of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization, at the forthcoming UN General Assembly session. The implementation of these measures would preclude

the transformation of space into a military testing range and would create the necessary conditions so that space would be put to the service of peace, security, economic, and social progress; and not that of militarism.

However, the United States has once again shown that such a path is not to its liking, having responded to the Soviet program for the peaceful use of space with practical steps to realize Reagan's "star wars" program.

What could the consequences of these steps by Washington be? It is clear that, having started testing anti-satellite strike weapons, the Pentagon will increase the scale and pace of tests. Appetite, as they say, comes during eating. Thus completely real threats arise of space being transformed into the arena for a new twist in the arms race spiral. The preconditions arise for a further intensification of international tension. However, if one thinks about the immediate, tactical -- so to speak -- aims of the United States, then surely it would be logical to suppose that the decision to start combat testing of weapons in space is evidently timed to coincide with the third round of the Soviet-U.S. talks which are to begin in September in Geneva.

The impression is created that certain circles of the Washington administration are counting on conducting these talks from a position of strength and using them as a screen for hiding U.S. military preparations. However, if such an aim really is being set, then someone in Washington should remember and seriously give thought to the words of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev about the fact that the program for militarization of space, which the United States is implementing, is like a blank wall barring the way to the achievement of an accord in Geneva.

'Wave of Criticism' In U.S.

LD211113 Moscow TASS in English 1106 GMT 21 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, August 21 TASS -- The U.S. Administration's decision to test an antisatellite weapon against targets in outer space has been a new challenge to the world public, which demands that the arms race on earth be ended and its spread to outer space be prevented. President Reagan has informed Congress that the tests are to begin soon. A "device" is to be launched from a high-altitude F-15 aircraft to destroy an obsolete American satellite. Then an antisatellite weapon will be launched against a specially designed space craft with instruments on board launched into a near-earth orbit. The instruments are to send back to earth data about the results of the contact of the strike weapon with that craft.

Addressing a press conference held after the report was issued about the notification by the President of the Congress about the upcoming tests, White House deputy press secretary stressed that apart from the tests named by the President, additional ones were to be held this year.

The President motivated by the "national security interests of the USA" his decision marking the start of a practical implementation of the large-scale programme for a militarisation of outer space, which was announced earlier and dubbed the "star wars" programme. Representatives of the administration made recourse also to other false justifications in an attempt to impress on the U.S. public that the antisatellite weapon tests will contribute towards progress of Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, which the USA, as it stated, is determined to carry on.

The Reagan administration's decision to conduct the first antisatellite weapon test in outer space has touched off a wave of criticism in the country.

Why this test is being held precisely now that talks on arms control are under way and both countries are preparing for the summit meeting, the CBS television company inquires. In its opinion, the tests will meet with growing opposition in Congress. The Reagan administration has passed this decision despite the USSR's call for a ban on such tests, the NBC stresses.

The obvious irrelevance of the administration's arguments that anti-satellite weapon tests are necessary to eliminate the so-called lag of the USA from the Soviet Union in that field, is pointed out by the newspaper WASHINGTON POST. The newspaper stresses that the USA was the first to start developing and deploying this type of weapon. Way back in the fifties, the U.S. Air Force department implemented the "saint" programme to investigate into methods of interception and destruction of satellites. In the early sixties, the USA deployed anti-satellite weapons on Kwajalein and Johnston Islands in the Pacific, using Nine, Zeus and Thor rockets as boosters.

It is incredible that the U.S. Administration can attest that it is negotiating in good faith at the Soviet-American talks on arms control while it explicitly asserts that it is opposed to a ban on the testing and deployment of space weapons, said S. Keeny, executive director of the Arms Control Association. The decision on conducting anti-satellite systems signals the start of an escalation of the space weapon race, he stressed.

Local observers stressed that the U.S. Administration announced its decision to launch a space weapons race right after the USSR proposed that the question of "international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarisation" be included into the agenda of the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

'Irresponsible' Policy

LD211448 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1414 GMT 21 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, 21 Aug (TASS) -- Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS military observer, writes:

R. Reagan, U.S. President, has officially announced the decision to carry out combat tests of antisatellite weapons, targeted on objects in space. Thus, Washington is taking yet another practical step along the path of preparing a wide-scale militarization of space.

The antimissile defense system with space-based elements as contemplated by Washington, and antisatellite weapons, are to become the material basis for the concept of "star wars" which, in its turn, is an integral part of the American strategy of first nuclear strike.

The irresponsible nature of such policy is particularly glaring if contrasted with the USSR's peace initiatives.

The introduction by the USSR on 6 August this year of the moratorium on nuclear testing met with positive reaction throughout the world. Washington hastened to react to this concrete, tangible measure, which is to serve the cause of slowing down and subsequent halting of the nuclear arms race, true to fashion, by carrying out a new series of nuclear explosions.

The Soviet unilateral moratorium on being the first to take antisatellite weapons into space has been in force since 1983. The USSR has just proposed that question "On International Cooperation in the Peaceful Assimilation of Space under Conditions of its Nonmilitarization," be included on the agenda of the 40th UN General Assembly session. And again the "answer" sounded from Washington -- we are urgently starting military experiments in space.

The realistic, commonsense assessment of such "answers" is clear: All these practical actions being carried out by Washington are an open challenge to the world community, a deliberate demonstration of the American leadership's utter disinclination to embark on curtailing the arms race and eliminating the threat of a nuclear war, and a confirmation of its warlike plans, which threaten humanity.

At the same time, it is amazing and astounding that someone in Washington apparently thinks that the rest of the world is composed of simpletons capable of swallowing and digesting any propagandistic soup prepared according to White House recipes.

At whom is aimed, for example, the "passage" stating that supposedly the United States "is honestly making efforts" at the Geneva talks to conclude an agreement on "severe limitations on antisatellite weapons"? First, as is known, the United States is making absolutely no such efforts. Second, it should, in general, not simply be "restrictions," even though "severe," but a total ban on such weapons and destruction of those already in existence. This is exactly what is being proposed by the Soviet Union, proceeding from the interests of the whole of humanity.

In the words of the White House representative, the United States "needs an anti-satellite potential." What for? It turns out "for rebuffing the Soviet threat." But in more specific terms it is for the destruction of Soviet satellites, which carry no threat at all, but are intended to warn of a nuclear missile attack on the Soviet Union. Where is the logic here? There is none, of course. It is the simplest card sharp's trick.

Right from the start of the space era, the United States has had ambitions for near-earth space, dreaming of turning it into a bridgehead for aggressive wars. It began working on ideas for the use of anti-satellite systems as long ago as 1956. Since then, large-scale work has been carried out on the "Bambi" and "Saint" plans for the creation of interceptor satellites. Anti-satellite complexes have been deployed on the islands of Kwajalein and Johnston in the Pacific. Numerous rockets have been launched to intercept target satellites.

Seven years of work has gone into the ASAT anti-satellite system now being tested. Last year, the system was tested twice against imaginary targets in space. And now Washington intends to start using it to hit real targets in near-earth space -- to begin with, a redundant U.S. satellite -- and then, specially designed spacecraft which will transmit to earth information about the results of the test.

It is noteworthy that these special pieces of equipment are capable of changing their temperature, imitating various types of Soviet satellites. How cynical can one get to assert that all this is being done in order to avert "damage to the U.S. national security," and even to "facilitate progress" at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Apparently, the U.S. Administration ought to be reminded that the unilateral Soviet moratorium on being the first to put anti-satellite weapons in space remains in force for as long as other states, the United States included, refrain from introducing into space any type of anti-satellite weapons. The peoples will place responsibility for the start of an arms race in space on those who are ready to commence dangerous experiments in near-earth space.

'Foul Deed'

LD211852 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Aug 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; commentary by writer-journalist Vitaliy Kobysh]

[Text] The U.S. Administration has announced a decision to commence combat tests of strike antisatellite weapons in outer space in the near future. This decision marks the beginning of the practical implementation of Reagan's "star wars" program. Over to the writer-journalist Vitaliy Kobysh.

[Kobysh] Hello, comrades! We have learned today about yet another U.S. militaristic act. The news came from Santa Barbara, California, where the White House has now moved camp.

I recall the Soviet Union announced a moratorium on antisatellite weapons tests in 1983. It was stated that the moratorium would be in force for as long as other states, first and foremost the United States, refrained from testing such weapons. I also recall that our country introduced a proposal in the United Nations just a few days ago "On International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space Under Conditions of Its Nonmilitarization."

And now comes the news from Santa Barbara, almost as if they were giving a prompt response to the Soviet peace initiative, and responding in such a way that the world public is left in doubt whether the United States is preparing to deploy the nuclear arms race into outer space. As usual, they want to use propaganda ruses to paint over the true nature of their foul deed, such ruses that you never know if they are joking or being serious about such things.

For example, how does one respond to words like these from the statement made in Santa Barbara: The test launch against targets in space will be implemented with the aid of a nonnuclear, miniature antisatellite system, which is now being developed? A system, as you can see, which is nonnuclear and miniature, but by no means innocent and inoffensive. But what comes next? Today, nonnuclear and miniature; tomorrow they will start testing nuclear ones and colossal ones at that. Once you start down that road....

Why is it that the American authorities have chosen this particular time for wide-scale combat tests of antisatellite weapons? In a note to Congress, the U.S. President explained it as follows. The tests are an incentive toward concluding an agreement with the Soviet Union on this and other questions in Geneva.

It has always been thought up to now that there is only one logic; now it appears there are two. The Soviet Union announced a moratorium in the beginning on antisatellite weapons tests, and then, on any nuclear tests. We believed, and continue to believe, that this is the only way to put an end to the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and in particular, to help the Geneva talks to succeed. The American authorities, immediately after the Soviet Union's announcement of a moratorium on all nuclear tests, carried out a nuclear explosion at the Nevada proving ground. If one wants precise figures, the explosion, with a capacity of under 20 kilotons, was carried out 120 km northwest of Las Vegas at a depth of 330 meters. The national means of control are working well, as you can see.

We have learned today of the preparations for a test of an American antisatellite weapon. And this is in order, as has been explained, to provide an incentive to concluding an agreement at Geneva. Magic? No, you still can't have two logics. The one and only logic says that by openly throwing down a challenge to world public opinion, the U.S. authorities have embarked on a course of expanding the arms race in all directions.

'Explicit Answer' on Arms Race

LD211846 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 21 Aug 85

[Excerpts] The White House announced on Tuesday [20 August] that the United States would proceed with its third test of a new antisatellite weapon. The date of the test has not been disclosed. It will be the first test against an object in space. Now here are some details from our observer.

In August 1983, the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on the launching into space of all kinds of anti-satellite weapons and it still holds. Under the Reagan administration work on new systems has been sped up. The one that is being tested now is based on an F-15 fighter armed with a two-stage solid fuel missile, launched against objects in space from the outer fringes of the atmosphere. This ASAT system would require billions of dollars and is meant to enter service by 1987. When deployed it will become an ingredient of a weapons system in space being developed within the framework of the "star wars" program.

American experts say that the current ASAT system is meant to give the United States an obvious advantage over the Soviet Union but administration officials talk about potential benefits for arms control once weapons in space are developed and deployed. While the peace-loving Reagan administration continues with its multi-billion dollar military buildup, those Soviets accused of very mortal sin have introduced unilateral moratoriums on launching anti-satellite weapons and on all nuclear explosions. Those advocates of control and verification in Washington are building weapons that defy them. To make the problem easier, Moscow suggests that new weapons systems be not built.

Announcing the coming test against an object in space, White House spokesman Larry Speakes said we have to test and we have to test now. Those who ask themselves if there is ever going to be an end to the arms race have got a very explicit answer.

GAO Report Cited

LD220658 Moscow TASS in English 0632 GMT 22 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, August 22 TASS -- The Pentagon intends to carry out at least 12 flight tests of an anti-satellite (ASAT) system the cost of the creation of which will amount to 4,100 million dollars. This is stated in a report circulated today by the General Accounting Office of the U.S. Congress. The first two tests are known to have already been carried out in January and November last year. The report points out that this time a missile which is to be launched from a F-15 fighter plane will be for the first time used against a space target. This third test can be carried out shortly. According to the authors of the report, the U.S. Air Force on June 4 stated preparedness to effect the test.

U.S. 'Inconsistency', 'Cynicism'

LD221148 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 22 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, Aug 22 (TASS) -- The White House officially announced that U.S. President Ronald Reagan had notified Congress of the decision to start in the coming few weeks the testing of a new U.S. combat system of anti-satellite weapons to be launched at targets in outer space.

White House Deputy Press Secretary Speakes who informed newsmen of that decision at Reagan's California residence said that the President had taken that decision in order "to restore the balance" between the USSR and the U.S. in anti-satellite weapons. He also said that in taking the decision the President was trying to provide an "incentive" to the Soviet Union to negotiate space issues seriously with the U.S. at Geneva.

The cynicism of such assertions is obvious. It is the United States that is engaged in an active space militarization effort and intensifying the arms race, while the USSR unilaterally pledged not to place any types of anti-satellite weapons in outer space.

White House Deputy Press Secretary Speakes informed newsmen about some of the details of the planned test of the new weapon. The target chosen for the first firing is an out-of-service American satellite at which a missile with an autonomous homing device will be launched from an F-15 fighter plane. Speakes said that a second test would be staged shortly. In the second firing, it is planned to intercept a special target vehicle equipped with instruments to report back on the performance of the autonomous unit of the new anti-satellite weapon.

Correspondents present at the news conference posed numerous questions to the White House spokesman. Specifically, he was asked directly why the administration, using standard explanations, failed to see that such a rapid striving to acquire an attack anti-satellite weapon, based on the latest technology, and especially in the conditions of the Soviet Moratorium on the emplacement of such weapons in space, in effect for two years now, could not be regarded any other way than an attempt to gain an advantage over the USSR and would only lead to the unwinding of a race in space arms.

Speakes tried to avoid answering this direct question and alleged that the administration, when taking a decision to this effect, took into account all the factors related to the problem. The spokesman of the White House repeated over and over again that the purpose of taking the decision was to let the Soviet side know at the Geneva talks that the U.S. was full of resolve to deploy this or that weapon system. The journalists reacted vigorously to this approach from the position of strength. Specifically, they asked Speakes why there was such a hurry with the taking of the decision on the anti-satellite program. The President did not even wait for the Congress to resume its work in September in order to inform Congress of it. Speakes made it clear that the U.S. programs in the militarization of outer space was something inviolable, something which the U.S. would not like to discuss with the Soviet Union.

Those American public circles which still hoped that the White House would display certain restraint in dealing with these problems did not conceal their disenchantment with the decision of the U.S. Administration. George Brown, a Democrat, one of the congressmen who favour the banning of anti-satellite weapons said that the decision of the White House was actually a departure from any possibility of talks on space weapons. The step taken by the administration proves that it just does not want such talks to take place, he pointed out.

Senator John Kerry described the decision of the U.S. Administration as another step towards the spreading of the arms race to outer space. In other words, the White House does not aim to conclude a mutual and verifiable agreement with the Soviet Union which would set strict limitations to the anti-satellite weapons, he stressed in an interview with BOSTON GLOBE.

John Steinbrunner, director of foreign policy studies at Brookings Institution, pointed out the inconsistency of the stand of the U.S. Administration. Trying to reduce all the talks on arms reduction to the discussion of the reliable measures of verification of the observance of agreements in this sphere, the U.S. at the same time creates new types of weapons intended to destroy satellites which are one of the means of verification, he said.

Will 'Hamper' Geneva Talks

OW221345 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1115 GMT 22 Aug 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Indeed, the White House has just announced that the United States has decided to carry out combat tests of antisatellite weapons soon. A fighter will launch a missile-like device to hit an out-of-service satellite in near-earth orbit.

The Pentagon has officially announced that at least 12 test flights of the ASAT antisatellite system are planned. It also states that the cost of creating [sozdaniye] this system will exceed \$4 billion. There you have the answer to the question of who is interested in creating space weapons. It is major American concerns, who are counting on gaining new and fatter profits.

As for the other motives with which President Reagan is now trying to justify anti-satellite weapons tests -- for instance, his declaration that these tests will supposedly be an incentive to concluding a treaty with the Soviet Union in Geneva on these and other issues -- they are all, as they say, needlessly complicating matters [ot lukavago]. It is quite clear to everyone that such actions by the American side not only cannot facilitate the success of the talks in Geneva, but on the contrary will only hamper [zatrudnyat] these talks.

Incidentally, the Americans themselves admit this. For instance, Senator John Kerry frankly declared that the Reagan administration's decision to conduct tests of anti-satellite strike weapons is another step in extending the arms race to space. The senator said in an interview with the newspaper THE BOSTON GLOBE: The President's decision means that the administration's goals do not include concluding a treaty with the Soviet Union. I will add to this that an official White House spokesman has just confirmed the administration's intention to strive at all costs for the implementation of the plan to deploy 100 MX ICBM's.

U.S. 'Logic' Ridiculed

LD222149 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 22 Aug 85

[Excerpts] In the nearest future the United States is to carry out combat testing of antisatellite weaponry. A missile resembling what is described as a miniature device will be launched from a fighter plane to hit a nonfunctioning satellite currently in orbit. A White House spokesman said that President Reagan informed the United States Congress that the testing represents a stimulus for concluding a treaty with the Soviet Union on this and other issues in Geneva. Actually it is amazing the way Washington has learned to pass black off for white and stand things on their heads. The testing of a new type of combat weaponry is called a stimulus for its banning. To assert this one has to be at loggerheads with elementary logic. As is known at the Soviet-United States talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, the Soviet Union seeks to reach an agreement on totally banning the creation, testing and deployment of strike space systems.

However Washington's logic is, as we can see, of a different sort. Attempts are being made there to assure that combat testing of antisatellite weaponry will promote a successful course at the Geneva talks. Do not try to understand how space arms testing will help nonmilitarization of space which the Soviet Union and the United States had agreed on prior to the Geneva talks. Do not even try, as it is simply inconceivable.

We believe that such a step on the part of the United States, whatever it calls it -- a stimulus or anything else of the kind -- not only frustrates any success at the Geneva talks but is aimed at obstructing the talks as well and that is precisely what is being suggested by elementary logics.

Kobysh: 'Preposterous Logic'

OW230553 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 22 Aug 85

[Excerpt] In its recent announcement, the U.S. Government formally disclosed its intention to conduct combat tests of anti-satellite weapons. Soviet Commentator Vitaliy Kobysh described this decision as a new U.S. militarist action. Mr Vitaliy Kobysh made the following remarks in an All-Union Central Television program:

In 1983, the Soviet Union declared a moratorium on the tests of anti-satellite weapons. At that time, the Soviet Union stated that the moratorium would continue to be in effect as long as other countries--particularly the United States--did not carry out tests of the same kind of weapons. Several days ago the Soviet Union also submitted to the United Nations a proposal concerning international cooperation in developing outer space for peaceful purposes through creation of conditions for the nonmilitarization of outer space.

The United States made the above announcement in return for these peace initiatives by the Soviet Union. This U.S. response has led the people of the world to realize that there is no question about the United States preparing for a nuclear arms race in outer space.

Why have the U.S. authorities chosen now as a time for large-scale combat tests of anti-satellite weapons? In his message to the Congress, the U.S. President explained that the tests would just serve as a stimulus to concluding agreements on this and other issues with the Soviet Union in Geneva.

Commentator Kobysh goes on to say:

This explanation represents preposterous logic. The Soviet Union first declared a moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite weapons. It then declared a halt to all nuclear tests. The Soviet Union believed--and still believes--that this is the only way to end the arms race, which involves nuclear arms, and bring the Geneva negotiations to a successful end.

However, the U.S. authorities conducted nuclear tests at an experimental site in Nevada State immediately after the Soviet declaration that it would halt nuclear tests. And they are now preparing to test anti-satellite weapons, saying that the preparation is aimed at expediting the conclusion of agreements in Geneva. Only a miracle could justify this logic. There cannot be two right logics in this regard. There is only one right logic. The U.S. authorities have taken the road of expanding the arms race in all fields by openly issuing their challenge to the world's public opinion.

Commentator Vitaliy Kobysh made the above remarks.

Paul Warnke Cited

LD230438 Moscow TASS in English 0425 GMT 23 Aug 85

[Text] New York, 23 Aug TASS--The decision of the Reagan administration to start tests of a new U.S. combat anti-satellite weapon system against objects in space in the next few weeks demonstrates that the dominating role in elaborating the policy in the field of arms control in the Reagan administration is played precisely by those who oppose control over armaments, Paul Warnke, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said in the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR interview. Many U.S. specialists in arms control, the newspaper stresses in this connection, regard as insolvent the administration's attempts to justify this step with references to a certain Soviet edge in this field.

U.S. Press, Politicians' Criticism Noted

LD231629 Moscow TASS in English 1604 GMT 23 Aug 85

[Text] Washington 23 August TASS--The U.S. public and mass media continue to discuss the White House's decision to begin field tests of a new U.S. battle ASAT system on a space target. The press is virtually unanimous that Deputy White House Press Secretary Larry Speakes cited in his statement on the matter numerous "points and arguments," with which the administration tried to explain to the Congress the "urgent need" for such tests, that are just thought-up. Observers directly point out, in particular, that allegations of any U.S. lag behind the USSR in anti-satellite weapons, repeated by Speakes times out of number, are absurd if only because the development of these weapons was initiated by the United States, which was the first to deploy two effective anti-satellite systems in the early 1960s.

The press says that the attack space system which the administration would like to deploy by all means is far superior in its tactical and technical characteristics to the existing systems. Attention is drawn to the fact that the new systems incorporate advanced military technology and that the United States is actually violating the ABM limitation accords.

It is also noted that, trying to justify the need "to catch up with the USSR," Speakes was never able to tell the journalists comprehensively if the Soviet Union had ever tested its system on a space target. Many American arms control specialists, the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR says in this context, think the administration's attempts to justify its latest action by references to Soviet "superiority" in that field to be untenable.

They believe, newspapers say, that the continuation of anti-satellite weapon tests by the United States will only spur on the arms race and help to spread it into space.

The press is outrightly ironic about the administration's allegation that the destruction of a space target by the Pentagon, planned during the announced tests, will prompt the USSR to begin serious talks with the USA in Geneva. These tests--and observers are unanimous about it--are bound to force the Soviet Union to take counter-measures in that field and, which is especially important, to reduce the chance to achieve accords on anti-satellite weapons. Democratic Congressman Edward Markey has made a statement in this connection, stressing that this decision obviously demonstrates the administration's utmost hostility towards anti-satellite weapons control.

According to him, only a moratorium on anti-satellite weapon tests will provide the basis for drafting at the talks an accord to ban those weapons. Republican Senator Charles Mathias has accused the administration of putting up arguments in favor of the tests that stand no criticism. The White House, he said, is trying to make the Congress believe the impossible, namely, that the administration is conducting in good faith the talks to draw up accords on anti-satellite weapons.

Neither do observers overlook the fact that Speakes failed at the press conference to prove to the journalists that the United States was actively involved in the process of talks with the Soviet Union on anti-satellite weapons--and that was one of the demands on which the Congress made the beginning of U.S. anti-satellite weapon tests conditional.

The White House's refusal to follow the Soviet Union's example and refrain from putting such weapons into space is viewed as open U.S. unwillingness to seek solutions in that field through negotiations. The announced tests, Paul Warnke, a former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said in a CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR interview, are demonstrating the fact that it is those who are opposed to arms control that dominate in the administration policy-making on arms control.

The timing of the tests is viewed by the press as an attempt to avoid debates on U.S. military-space policy because the congress is adjourned. At the same time the White House's haste is linked here to the administration's intention to distract public attention from the latest Soviet initiatives in arms control by the stereotype allegations that the Soviet Union is engaged in large-scale military buildup efforts, including in space.

'Clear Challenge to World Community'

PM231500 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

[Military Observer V. Chernyshev article under the rubric "TASS: Commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA": "Demonstrative Challenge"]

[Text] U.S. President R. Reagan has officially announced the decision to conduct combat tests of anti-satellite weapons against targets in space. Thus yet another practical step is being taken down the road of preparing for the large-scale militarization of space.

The ABM defense system with space-based elements planned by Washington and anti-satellite means are to be the material basis for the "star wars" concept, which in turn is an integral element in the U.S. nuclear first strike strategy. According to the Pentagon strategists' scheme, during the delivery of a first strike anti-satellite means are to destroy Soviet space systems for warning of a nuclear missile attack and control and communications systems, that is, "blind" the side under attack and deprive it of the ability to control its means of striking back. "For the United States the creation of anti-satellite forces would be pointless if there were no plan to carry out a first strike and start a nuclear war," U.S. specialists in the field of military space programs state. All this testifies to the immense danger for the cause of peace linked with the new White House decision.

The irresponsible nature of this policy is particularly glaring if it is contrasted with the USSR's peace initiatives. Three years ago the Soviet Union made a unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and called on the United States to follow suit. The U.S. Government did not respond with a single good-will gesture. At the start of this year the USSR proposed introducing a moratorium on the creation (including scientific research work), testing, and deployment of space strike arms and a freeze on strategic offensive arms for the duration of the Geneva talks. Moreover, the Soviet Union unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and halted the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe. What about the United States? It continues to build up its nuclear arsenals at an accelerated rate and is intensifying work on the "star wars" program.

Another Soviet initiative--the introduction of a moratorium on nuclear explosions effective 6 August this year--also met with a positive response worldwide. Washington immediately responded in its own way to this concrete, tangible measure called upon to serve the cause of slowing down and subsequently halting the nuclear arms race--it held a new series of nuclear explosions.

A unilateral Soviet moratorium on being the first to put anti-satellite weapons into space has been in force since 1983. The USSR has just proposed that the question "on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space under conditions of its nonmilitarization" be included on the agenda of the 40th UN General Assembly session. And the "response" from Washington was again heard--we are urgently initiating new military experiments in space.

All these actions by Washington are a clear challenge to the world community, a deliberate demonstration of the U.S. leadership's total reluctance to embark upon the path of curbing the arms race and removing the threat of nuclear war, and confirmation of its belligerent schemes, which threaten mankind.

At the same time it is surprising and striking that some people in Washington clearly assume that the rest of the world is made up of simpletons capable of swallowing and stomaching any propaganda soup prepared according to White House recipes. For whom, for instance, is the "passage" stating that the United States is "making honest efforts" at the Geneva talks to conclude an agreement on anti-satellite weapons intended? First, as is well known, the United States is making absolutely no "efforts" over there. And second, it should not be a question of "restrictions"--even if "severe"--but of the complete prohibition of these weapons and the destruction of already existing means. That is precisely what the Soviet Union is proposing.

In the words of a White House spokesman, the United States "needs an anti-satellite potential." What for? To "rebuff the Soviet threat." More specifically, to destroy Soviet satellites, which pose no threat and are intended to warn of a nuclear missile attack on the Soviet Union. Where is the logic there? Of course, there is none, it is just a cardsharp's trick.

The ASAT anti-satellite system has been under development for 7 years now. The system was twice tested last year against imaginary targets in space. And now Washington intends to use it to start downing real targets in near-earth space--at first an obsolete U.S. satellite, and then specially constructed space equipment which is to transmit data on the results of the strike to earth. It is worth nothing that this equipment can change temperature, imitating various types of Soviet satellites. To what level of cynicism has one to stoop to claim that all this is being done with a view to averting "damage to U.S. national security" and even to "promote progress" at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms.

Evidently, the U.S. administration ought to remember that the Soviet unilateral moratorium on being the first to put anti-satellite weapons into space will remain in force [only] as long as other states, including the United States, refrain from putting any type of anti-satellite weapon into space. The peoples will place the responsibility for starting the race in space arms on those who are prepared to initiate dangerous experiments in near-earth space.

'Premediated Sabotage'

LD241827 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Aug 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast, commentary by political observer Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpt] The decision by President Reagan to embark in the near future on the testing of a new U.S. antisatellite weapon system against a target in space has given rise to sharp reaction by international public opinion. At the microphone is Soviet television political observer Valentin Zorin:

Hello, comrades! The world reaction to the hastily-announced decision by President Reagan is extremely negative. I say hastily, because this step, which is of such importance and so fraught with far-reaching consequences, was announced at the President's private ranch in California while he was recovering from a serious operation, and also at a time when the U.S. Congress was on its holiday recess.

Moreover, it is not simply a matter of yet another measure by the Washington administration, but of interconnected acts taken over the past few days aimed at sharply escalating the arms race. These actions hinder, in the most substantial way, the achievement of accords on the whole range of issues connected with ending the buildup in nuclear arsenals and preventing space from being used for military purposes.

First, in response to the decision by the USSR to end all nuclear explosions and its appeal for the United States to follow its example, Washington, not limiting itself to a refusal in words, carried out a deliberately provocative test on a nuclear device at a test area in Nevada. Now, a new challenge is being thrown down to world public opinion with the Washington administration announcing steps which mean nothing other than a practical start to the implementation of a program for the militarization of space.

One cannot but note the moment chosen by Washington for making such decisions. Our country has just proposed the question of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization be included in the agenda at the 40th session of the UN General Assembly which opens in the middle of next month. A resumption of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva is forthcoming. And precisely at this moment arrangements are being made for a series of tests of U.S. antisatellite combat systems. How, other than as premeditated sabotage and the artificial piling up of obstacles on to the path of solving the most fundamental problems of today, can one view these latest acts by the U.S. leadership?

What lies behind all this? What is Washington striving for? What aims is it pursuing? What political backdrop is it creating for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting this autumn? These questions cannot be of interest to Soviet public opinion.

First Strike, SDI Tie Seen

LD251543 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Aug 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] A few words about a most alarming report which arrived this week. President Reagan informed the U.S. Congress about his decision to begin testing a weapons system designed to destroy satellites. The Americans have long been busy producing such weapons. The U.S. President's directives on the national space policy state with precision: The United States will continue to develop the potential of antisatellite systems with the aim of depriving any adversary of the possibility of making use of space-based systems designed to render support to armed forces.

The ASAT system, due to undergo tests, looks like this, approximately: The F-15 jet fighter-aircraft almost vertically lifts off towards the higher, upper layers of the atmosphere and launches a two-stage missile. The missile has a miniature homing device. It separates itself from the missile with the aid of infra-red sensors, homes in on the satellite and rams it. That is to say, the satellite under attack is destroyed, put out of action, by means of a simple blow, without an explosion.

As ever, the Americans talk of defense. However, the significance of the antisatellite system is quite different.

The significance is as follows: it ensures the possibility of survival for the aggressor, after it has delivered the first blow. One American specialist, Carris, attests that the development of antisatellite weapons would not have made any sense for the United States, if it were not for plans to deliver the first strike, to start a nuclear war.

Incidentally, this makes it completely justifiable to view the development of antisatellite systems within the framework of the work concerning the "star wars" program.

The Soviet Union proceeds from this: That security, that the ensuring of safety for the satellites of all states and each state serve, in the present conditions, as one of the elements of the general military-strategic stability in the world. As a good example and as far back as August 1983, the Soviet Union announced a moratorium on all launching and testing of such weapons.

Unfortunately, as we have repeatedly heard, Washington said no. Well, a very strange way, I would say, of preparing oneself for the Geneva summit meeting.

'Dangerous Frontier'

LD252321 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 25 Aug 85

[Text] The White House informed the Congress a few days ago that a [word indistinct] test of anti-satellite weapons will be conducted shortly. A missile launched from a high altitude from an F-15 fighter aircraft will strike on an old American satellite in orbit around the earth.

The White House made the assurance in announcing this that the coming test is allegedly part of an honest effort to reach agreement on strict limitations of anti-satellite weapons. But several days before that, U.S. administration declared that the nuclear explosion conducted in the state of Nevada was supposedly a display of the sincere desire to reach a comprehensive and universal ban on nuclear arms test.

To follow through this fantastic logic, were the U.S. leaders to put out a fire, they would pour napalm or gasoline, and would call that and would an honest effort and a sincere desire. Washington is apparently defying common sense when it deals with the problems of war and peace, especially when it has to give an answer to Soviet initiatives aimed at preventing an arms race in space and at stopping in on earth. The Soviet Union has set a good example

on a whole number of issues. It has unilaterally stopped all nuclear explosions, it has announced a moratorium on taking anti-satellite weapons into space, it has suspended action on the siting of missiles in Europe and pledged not to use nuclear weapons first.

However, the U.S. administration has failed to support any of these initiatives. It is apparently losing all sense of proportion in its drive for military superiority. If one is to believe Washington, the path to disarmament lies through rearmament of the United States and through wrecking the existing treaties on limiting anti-missile systems, about the principles of activities of states in outer space, about a ban nuclear in outer space, about a ban on nuclear arms tests in the three media and some other treaties. Because of such an approach, not a single new agreement was signed in recent years to limit and reduce armaments.

The world has approached a dangerous frontier. The United States leaders should look back and soberly assess what disastrous consequences for the world and for the American people could have a continued line to get military superiority and to step up confrontation, to turn back to relaxation of tension, cooperation, and stronger peace, a serious and honest dialogue is necessary between states. It is essential to look for practical ways to stop the arms race, to give up attempts at gaining one-sided military advantages and to strictly observe the existing agreements. These are the principles that guided the Soviet Union.

Were the United States for its part to observe the principles that would make it possible to turn the world into a safer place for all the nation it would enable people to regard the future with greater confidence.

USSR Ready for Radical Resolution

LD261621 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 26 Aug 85

[All quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, August 26 TASS -- TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

The Reagan administration has again produced for the world public opinion a sample of absurd logic, which has recently ruthlessly forced every sign of common sense out of the public statements of the White House on questions of war and peace.

If one is to believe that logic, it turns out that the States has decided to resume anti-satellite weapons testing, this time hitting concrete targets in outer space, guided by the..."sincere wish" to reach a negotiated settlement on the same outer space systems.

Larry Speakes, U.S. deputy White House press secretary, even said that the American testing of the means of destruction of satellites would create an incentive for the Soviet Union to conduct serious talks with the USA in Geneva on outer space issues." The official statement by the White House said that the resumption of testing is part of "honest efforts" by the United States to reach agreement with the Soviet Union.

American journalist Michael Kramer once sarcastically wrote in the NEW YORK magazine that President Reagan was too close to reiterating the statement once made by the German kaiser in 1918, who said, "If the enemy does not wish peace, we should bring peace to the whole world by destroying with mailed fist and red hot sword those who do not wish peace."

People begin to fear that if the Reagan administration decided to take "honest efforts" to put out fires, its representatives would, probably, following the White House logic, give orders to pour napalm into the flames.

Washington's obstructionist stand on the fair and open initiative of the Soviet Union on anti-satellite systems has aroused protests from all unbiased people on earth. In 1983, the USSR committed itself not to be the first to launch any types of anti-satellite weapons into outer space, imposed a moratorium on such launchings as long as other states, including the USA, refrain from launching anti-satellite weapons of any type into outer space.

Washington's arguments to the effect that the Soviet Union was allegedly the first to start an anti-satellite weapons race and has now "ensured considerable superiority" over the USA in that field hold no water. In 1963 the Pentagon deployed on Kwajalein Atoll and Johnson Island in the Pacific missiles designed for the destruction of satellites. The U.S. press has recently said that these anti-satellite systems of the United States were fitted out with powerful nuclear warheads.

The Soviet Union is ready for a radical resolution of the problem of anti-satellite weapons -- reaching agreement on repudiation of the testing of such systems, banning the creation of new and scrapping the anti-satellite weapons, which the sides already have, and banning the testing and use with military aims, including with anti-satellite aims, of manned spaceships.

Now it is for Washington to act.

Violates 'Spirit' of Geneva Talks

PM291418 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Aug 85 First Edition p 1

[Lev Semeyko "International Review": "Washington's Strong-Arm Method"]

[Text] The world is now faced with a task that is not only vitally important but also urgent: to prevent the creation, testing, and deployment of space strike arms. The prevention of the militarization of space is a key issue at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. Its resolution is important in many aspects: A space arms race would bring about the intensification of the arms race in all directions and make nuclear disarmament practically impossible. Prevention would strengthen strategic stability and states' confidence in their security. In other words, it would reduce the risk of a nuclear catastrophe.

In light of this, the danger of the American Administration's latest militarist decision, to begin a series of antisatellite weapons tests in the very near future, becomes obvious. A nonfunctioning satellite circling in a low orbit (up to 1,000 km) will be

selected as the target for a missile launched from an F-15 aircraft in the first test. This will be followed by a second and a third launch. In all, it is planned to conduct 12 tests, concluding them in 1987

Washington is clearly in a hurry to present the world with the fact of the deployment of a new combat system or, at least, the capacity to deploy it without delay. Here, by all accounts, it is not so much the question of a desire to keep to the planned schedule as one of political aims: to erect a further obstacle in the way of reaching an accord on a space arms ban. For, after all, it was possible to at least postpone the tests if there was insufficient resolve to abandon them altogether. It was also possible to follow the example of the Soviet Union, which announced a moratorium on the first launch of any kinds of antisatellite weapons into space.

This moratorium remains in force as long as other states, including the United States, refrain from putting antisatellite weapons of any kind into space. Such a moratorium, if announced by the United States also, would make it possible to halt programs for the creation of not only the latest antisatellite systems but also antimissile systems; for common military-technical components can be used in them. A bilateral moratorium would make it easier to resolve interrelated space and nuclear problems in Geneva.

But the point is, Washington is not interested in such a solution. Its chief aim is to ensure military superiority over the USSR by adding a strategic space strike potential to the strategic offensive potential. In this space strike potential the chief role, according to the designs of the American leadership, is allocated to a large-scale and multilayer ABM system with space-based elements; an antimissile shield behind which they reckon on hiding from nuclear retribution. The American President's notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" is aimed at creating such a shield.

But the United States is also counting on another element of space strike arms, anti-satellite weapons. We are talking of typical offensive weapons designed to "blind" the other side's system of state and strategic control at a preselected moment. To "blind" it by putting satellites out of action; which would make it possible to suddenly inflict a nuclear first strike. But, even an attempt to put the other side's satellites out of action could be regarded as a first step toward starting a nuclear conflict. Therefore, the deployment of antisatellite arms potentially increases the risk of war.

Taking into consideration the fact that the United States is frankly oriented toward inflicting a nuclear first strike, not just the deployment of a new antisatellite system, but even the start of practical tests is an aggressive action. By embarking on such tests, the United States is reckoning on also using them to help resolve certain important technical problems of ABM defense in space. Resolving them, Washington believes, means acquiring one more argument in favor of SDI, which is very important politically. This is all the more tempting because, formally, the testing and deployment of anti-satellite systems do not run counter to the ABM limitation treaty. But only formally. In fact, such tests are a preparatory stage for tests for ABM purposes and this is categorically prohibited by the treaty.

In the long term, antisatellite systems and space ABM systems will draw increasingly close to each other, particularly if you take into account the Pentagon's plans to create a fundamentally new antisatellite system in the future which would use laser guns. And lasers, according to the designs of Washington strategists, are the basis of a space ABM system designed to intercept nuclear warheads.

The total U.S. disregard for Soviet steps in the matter of ending the arms race is noteworthy. A nuclear device was tested in Nevada on 17 August in spite of the Soviet Union's announcement of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions! A few days later, the world learned of new American antisatellite weapons tests despite the fact that for 2 years now the USSR has continued to adhere to its moratorium on such tests. Where, then, is practical confirmation of the American leadership's numerous declarations of its desire to curb the arms race?

U.S. testing of nuclear and antisatellite weapons runs counter to the spirit of the January accord between the USSR and the United States on the subject of the Geneva talks. This consists of a package of questions relating to space and nuclear arms, strategic and medium-range, which must be examined and resolved on an interconnected basis. The sides proclaimed the aim of these talks to be the elaboration of effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and strengthening strategic stability.

However, the recent U.S. militarist actions in no way help to achieve this aim. They are aimed at further building up nuclear potentials and destabilizing the strategic situation. The testing of antisatellite weapons also contradicts the ideas just advanced by the Soviet Union of cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization.

Allegations by certain American figures that the testing of nuclear and antisatellite weapons could improve prospects for the Geneva talks, since they will succeed in putting pressure on the USSR, are absurd.

Attempts to secure any concessions from the USSR by strong-arm methods, including the testing of the latest arms, are a hopeless cause. These attempts are just as groundless as efforts to prove the USSR's mythical advantages in the development of antisatellite systems. It is not out of place to remind people that the USSR proposes to the United States and other states not only the establishment of a moratorium on tests of antisatellite weapons, but also a total ban on them including the liquidation of those that already exist.

Antisatellite weapons are "star wars" weapons. But war in space must be ruled out in all variants if we want to protect the world from nuclear destruction. Any "star war" is just as inadmissible as any nuclear war; limited or universal, brief or protracted. An effective defense against nuclear weapons cannot be found in space. A one hundred percent defense lies in the total destruction of nuclear arsenals. It is from precisely these positions that the USSR approaches the resolution of the space and nuclear arms problem. This is exactly why its proposal that both sides introduce for the entire duration of the Geneva talks a moratorium on the creation (including scientific research work), testing, and deployment of space strike arms and freeze their nuclear arsenals is so topical.

Washington still has time to reconsider its dangerous new decision. It runs counter to the hopes which the whole world pins on Geneva, where Soviet-American talks are being held and where the Soviet and U.S. leaders are to meet in November. It runs counter to mankind's hopes of safeguarding the world and space against nuclear, laser, and other strong-arm skirmishes.

TASS Statement on Geneva Impact

LD041706 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 4 Sep 85

["TASS Statement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 4 TASS -- The intent to hold shortly tests of the ASAT anti-satellite system aiming it at a real target in outer space has been officially announced in Washington. This decision of the American Administration is nothing but an action directly leading to the commencement of the deployment of a new class of dangerous armaments -- strike space weapons.

Washington is taking yet another step to escalate the arms race and spread it to outer space. And this step is being taken despite the fact that the Soviet Union's unilateral commitment not to place anti-satellite systems in space has been in force for already two years.

This step is being made by the American Administration in conditions when the far-reaching Soviet proposal on the full prohibition of strike space weapons, including anti-satellite systems, and the liquidation of the existing such systems, is lying on the negotiating table in Geneva.

In other words, to our restraint in practical actions, to our constructive proposals at the talks, the American side is responding with a demonstration of its unwillingness to reach agreements, to display mutual restraint.

In an attempt to delude the public at large and its own legislative bodies the American Administration contends that at the Geneva talks it supposedly is pressing for strict limitations on anti-satellite weapons.

In reality both at the Geneva talks and during the course of the exchange through diplomatic channels the United States has flatly refused and continues doing so to study any whatsoever measures of banning and limiting anti-satellite weapons and presents matters in such a way as though it is impossible to solve this task. Thereby it deliberately creates an artificial impasse in this question.

There is nothing chance in this stand taken by the United States. It obviously counts not only on acquiring weapons for anti-satellite warfare in the near future but also on developing, under the guise of testing anti-satellite systems, anti-missile systems of air and other basing that are prohibited by the ABM treaty. This shows once again Washington's genuine attitude to the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva. This shows the absence of readiness and desire on its part to reach agreements on real steps to prevent an arms race in outer space and to stop it on earth.

Late in August the Soviet side again called on the American Administration to weigh the inevitable negative consequences of its planned tests of anti-satellite arms for political and military stability in the world and the prospects of the Geneva talks. In this call the United States Administration was warned once again that the unilateral Soviet moratorium on anti-satellite systems can remain in force only for as long as other countries, including the United States, act likewise.

TASS is authorised to state that if the United States holds tests of anti-satellite weapons against a target in outer space the Soviet Union will consider itself free of its unilateral commitment not to place anti-satellite systems in space. The entire responsibility for the further development of events will rest entirely on the American side.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW: TEST MORATORIUM, SDI

PM241736 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Aug 85 First Edition p 4

[Yuriy Kharlanov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Time for Action

This week the USSR Parliamentary Group appealed to the members of the parliament of the world's countries to take active action to halt the further buildup and improvement of nuclear arsenals. "Remembering the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedy," the message states, "parliamentarians must pool their efforts to ensure that atomic dust never again settles on our planet." The appeal stresses the importance of the USSR's decision to unilaterally halt any nuclear explosions as of 6 August. If the United States acted likewise this would serve as an example to the other nuclear powers, and the nuclear arms race would thereby be retarded and would then become completely impossible.

The Soviet parliamentarians' appeal is meeting with a broad response in the world. "What the Soviet Union is proposing," Indian parliament deputy V.P. Shiv stated, "is a real opportunity to halt the further buildup of nuclear arsenals, reduce, and ultimately eliminate them."

Many public figures, parliamentarians, scientists, and all people of goodwill realize that the time has come for action. They are inspired by the example of our country, which does not limit itself to appeals to the leading figures of the world's states to join in the struggle against the arms race, but also takes concrete unilateral steps along this path. A graphic new example of this is the moratorium on nuclear explosions declared by our country. "I personally, like many Americans," prominent American public figure Marilyn Bechtel, chief editor of the NEW WORLD REVIEW, "was particularly impressed by the fact that, in taking the decision to introduce the moratorium, the Soviet leadership interrupted the nuclear test program before it was completed. At the same time, the U.S. Administration's refusal to respond to the important Soviet initiative in a positive spirit is causing legitimate indignation."

The moratorium on nuclear explosions is by no means the only specific step by the Land of the Soviets demonstrating its genuine love of peace. Some 3 years ago the USSR assumed a unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and urged the United States to follow this example. A Soviet moratorium on putting antisatellite weapons into space has been in operation since 1983. The Soviet leadership has stated

quite definitely that our country will not be the first to take weapons into space. The USSR unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe and on the implementation of other countermeasures linked with the placement of American first-strike weapons -- Pershing II and cruise missiles -- on the European Continent.

At the beginning of this year the Soviet Union proposed the introduction, for the duration of the Geneva talks, of a moratorium on the development [sozdaniye] (including scientific research work), testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space strike weapons and the freezing of strategic offensive arms. The Soviet proposals just submitted to the United Nations on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space under conditions of its nonmilitarization constitute a new concrete program aimed at preventing the arms race from moving into space.

Everybody who holds peace on earth dear highly assessed this contribution by the Soviet Union to the cause of ending the nuclear missile arms race.

"The Soviet initiatives," the Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO writes, "are aimed at preserving and strengthening peace and developing cooperation among states with different social systems." "In the present tense international situation," Sayed A. Kazmi, general secretary of the British Association of Progressive Writers, has stated, "the Soviet Union has once again demonstrated its unswerving aspiration to safeguard peace not only for the people of its own country but for the whole of mankind."

The world's peoples can see increasingly clearly the difference between the Soviet policy aimed at averting a nuclear missile catastrophe and the overtly militarist line in Washington, where there is still an aspiration to achieve military superiority over the USSR; enormous resources are being thrown into the crucible of the arms race for this purpose.

Lies Don't Get You Very Far

Who in the United States dreamed up the laughable fairytale that sinister agents are sprinkling American diplomats in Moscow with some kind of chemical powder to make it easier to observe them, and why? AFP confidently replies: a special group under the U.S. President headed by National Security Assistant R. McFarlane and White House Chief of Staff D. Regan. And it explains why it was necessary: "Compelled to react in some way to M.S. Gorbachev's initiatives (the most recent being the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, rejected by Washington), Reagan's aides decided to seize the initiative."

So that's the way it is! We propose that the reduction of nuclear missiles be tackled in earnest and in response they, evading concrete dialogue, attempt to fill people's minds with fabrication which do not hold water in any way. And they consider that they are "seizing the initiative."

Washington manifestly needed this diversionary maneuver to quell the wave of growing condemnation, including in the United States itself, of the course aimed at cranking up the nuclear arms race, examples of which the White House has been demonstrating in recent days.

The world public has interpreted as an overt challenge the program for testing new types of weapons of mass destruction which the Pentagon began a few days ago with a nuclear explosion in the state of Nevada. As is reported, the first explosion will be followed by a whole series of tests whose purpose is being kept secret. The mayor of Hiroshima -- the city which experienced a devastating nuclear strike 40 years ago -- stated in a cable to the U.S. Embassy: "The American tests demonstrate that Washington is flouting the wishes of the world's peoples, who want the nuclear threat eliminated."

The world press has also reacted to yet another aspect of the series of nuclear explosions that has begun. Just before they started, statements appeared in the United States that the Pentagon needs the tests to develop [razrabotka] individual elements of the "star wars" program. This was primarily a reference to a combat laser device being developed in the United States which destroys a target with the aid of powerful rays. These rays are to be produced with the aid of a nuclear explosion on a device to put into space. The Japanese newspaper YOMIURI writes that back under President Carter a special tunnel was built at a Nevada nuclear test site to carry out such experiments, which are being continued under the present administration. As THE NEW YORK TIMES Magazine reports, other types of a "new generation of nuclear arms" are being developed at the Livermore radiation laboratory.

So what, then, about Reagan's promise that his space militarization program has the objective of eliminating nuclear missile weapons?

In fact, as we can see, it is not a question of "eliminating" them but of developing and placing in space new and even more threatening types of nuclear arms.

And not only nuclear arms, although they are not becoming any less dangerous as a result. It has just been announced by the White House that the United States plans to carry out tests of a strike antisatellite weapon in the very near future. It is planned to use a high-altitude F-15 aircraft to launch a two-stage missile which is to hit an American satellite which is no longer needed. A special instrument-carrying satellite will then be put into orbit and will also be hit so that the instruments can transmit data on the new weapon's contact with a space object.

There can be no two opinions about the purpose for which antisatellite weapons of this type are being developed and tested. Their task at the moment of delivering a first nuclear missile strike is to destroy Soviet satellite warning and communications systems and deprive the USSR of the possibility of controlling its counterstrike means. That is, the current tests are among the initial links in the entire "star wars" system, whose insane objective is to attempt to inflict a nuclear missile strike on the Soviet Union with impunity.

As has become the White House custom, these plans, which are of the greatest danger for the cause of peace, are sprinkled with empty assurances that the new tests allegedly do not violate the ABM Treaty and will supposedly promote the success of the Geneva talks. The stupidity of assurances of this kind is obvious. Only people who have either completely lost any conception of logical thinking or are engaged in deliberate deception can develop and test space weapons and assert that they will promote the prevention of the militarization of space.

But, as is known, lies don't get you very far.

CSO: 5200/1383

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

WEEKLY MOSCOW ROUNDTABLE ON TEST MORATORIUM, SPACE ISSUES

LD251804 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 25 Aug 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, all-Union Radio foreign policy commentator, with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, KOMMUNIST international observer]

Nuclear Moratorium

[Excerpt][Andrianov] Good day, comrades. Today, in our roundtable meeting, Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, an international observer for KOMMUNIST, are taking part. Already 20 days have passed since the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts, declared by the Soviet Union, came into force. One can say with confidence that the Soviet moratorium has become a major factor of world politics. Confirmation of this is the enormous impact which the Soviet initiative made on the mind and mood of the international public. Edward Luck, president of America's UN association, said the Soviet moratorium was the beginning of a new Soviet peace offensive. He pointed out that the Washington administration should have suggested a similar initiative a long time ago. The unwillingness of the United States to follow the Soviet Union's example, according to Edward Luck, again showed who is leading in the struggle for arms restriction and disarmament.

The authoritative opinion of this prominent American public figure is shared by representatives of the widest circles abroad. The public forces see in this new step by the Soviet Union the real possibility of coming to a quick agreement to stop all nuclear tests, which in practice will bring the world closer to nuclear disarmament, because our country declared clearly that it is ready to extend the time of the moratorium if this action finds a positive response in Washington. The Soviet Union is ready to go much further, because our aim, underlined Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev when answering the questions of a TASS correspondent, is the complete and universal ending of nuclear weapons testing, and not some sort of respite between blasts. The idea is simple -- in order to reverse, it is necessary at first to stop. Because of this, in the comments on the Soviet initiative, the hope is being expressed that a moratorium on testing will become the turning point in the further destiny of nuclear arms.

However, official Washington has refused to take up the Soviet initiative. In connection with this, THE NEW YORK TIMES notes that strategists of Reagan's administration do not wish to stop. In the White House they refer to the imaginary lagging behind by

the United States in the field of nuclear arms, which dictates the necessity to complete the American testing program. The groundlessness of arguments of this sort is being revealed by Greenberg, the famous American specialist in questions of disarmament, the editor of the magazine SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT REPORT, who notes that from the beginning of the nuclear age up to 1984, the United States has conducted 200 nuclear tests more than the Soviet Union. He points out that the arguments of the opponents of the introduction of a ban are absolutely groundless.

Peaceful Uses of Space

[Nekrasov] Comrades, I would like to draw your attention to the paragraph of a recently published news report about the regular meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the paragraph where questions connected with the forthcoming 40th UN General Assembly session are reported.

Being the 40th session, it is a jubilee meeting. The 40th anniversary of the United Nations is one more vivid reminder of the very close link between the results of the Second World War, the results of the great victory of the Soviet people, and our affairs today and international life in general. Because of this, the paragraph contained in the report of the Politburo meeting is of principled importance. It has been confirmed that the Soviet Union attaches great significance to the United Nations as the effective tool of peace. The USSR will continue to aim to secure implementation in practice of the just, democratic principles in international relations on which the United Nations was founded 40 years ago. This, as you know, is not simply a declaration of good intentions. During the past few years, literally since the first session of the General Assembly, since the first meetings of the Security Council, the Soviet Union, by deeds, by its numerous proposals -- the majority of which in one form or another have been turned into UN decisions -- actively and purposefully assisted in the implementation of the organization's mission.

The Soviet Union is going to the 40th session with a new, important, and very interesting initiative. It concerns the proposals put forward by our country, which have been called the main directions and principles of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space in conditions of its nonmilitarization. The Soviet Union is putting forward a proposal to implement a set of concrete measures which would assist to unite the efforts of the states in the peaceful exploration of space and the use of space technology for the good of all peoples. It is proposed, in particular, to carry out in the near future, a special international conference dedicated to these questions. Already today these proposals have attracted great attention and many positive comments all over the world. Such a response comes not only from specialists, scientists who could immediately estimate the full significance of the Soviet idea; they are also supported by the broad public. This is clear. The matter of the conquest of the near-earth space is moving out of the field of experiments and preliminary research into the plane of practical actions. Next year, for example, is a year of joint actions by a whole range of countries, in the first ranks of which is our country, aimed at studying the approaching Halley's Comet.

[Andrianov] I will add that in the proposals of the Soviet Union, mentioned by you, it is noted that already today mankind is getting the power to implement such a long-term objective as the industrialization of near-earth space, in the sense of merging space complexes for different purposes with the earth-bound economy of the states, the creation of orbital factories and plants for the production of new materials and industrial

output. In connection with this, Peter Marsh, the author of the book "Business in Space," recently published in Britain, writes: Science and industry are preparing now to go outside the boundaries of the earth's atmosphere. Goods manufactured in space factories will, he thinks, be delivered to people as early as the nineties. Among them will be very valuable medicinal preparations. In this field, Marsh writes, the Soviet Union is ahead of everyone.

[Nekrasov] Breath-taking possibilities, so to say, really are being opened up. But, and this is a very big but, to implement them for the welfare of mankind it is necessary to prevent the militarization of space, to which so many efforts are now being dedicated on the other side of Atlantic. Because of this the Soviet Union is proposing that the UN General Assembly should again, with all determination, appeal to all states, especially those which have a large potential in the space field, to immediately reach an agreement about effective measures aimed at the prevention of a space arms race. This is our position of principle. I think it is important to note that it is not at all new, that it has not been prompted by some latest events, that does not follow from considerations, connected for example with Washington's plans for "star wars."

Already in 1958, soon after the first artificial earth satellite was launched by the Soviet Union, Moscow, as is known, put forward to the UN a proposal envisaging the prohibition of the use of space for military purposes.

[Volskiy] It is interesting, Vadim Nikolayevich, how the new proposals of the Soviet Union concerning cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space were regarded in official Washington circles, and how, in principle, the possibilities of such cooperation are being looked upon over there.

[Nekrasov] Well, when talking generally about the Soviet-American cooperation in the matter of space exploration, I would like to remind you that in its time, the Reagan administration did not want to renew the bilateral agreement with us on this question, the term of which expired 3 years ago. Talking concretely about the present proposals, the deputy press secretary of the White House, Speakes, answering journalists' questions, declared: If the Soviet Union has serious proposals connected with nonmilitarization of space, then it must put them forward during the talks, started with the agreement of both sides, in Geneva. As you understand yourself, this is not an answer but an attempt to avoid giving an answer, or at least to avoid serious discussion. Of course, it is possible to discuss the questions of major importance raised by the Soviet Union not only at the General Assembly, but also in the other places. The main thing, however, is not this: The main thing is the principled approach, and here everything looks different with the Americans.

U.S. Antisatellite Test

[Volskiy] You evidently mean President Reagan's recent message to Congress, in which he announced the forthcoming test launching of an antisatellite system; as the President called it, a non-nuclear miniature antisatellite system.

[Nekrasov] Quite right. Well, let's leave the words "miniature system" to the conscience of those who have used them. What are we in fact dealing with in concrete terms? It's fairly clear from the reports which have appeared in the U.S. press. It is an extremely ingenious mechanism which, in their own jargon, the American military have nicknamed the "flying can." It is a small vehicle, flying in space -- indeed, up to half a meter in length -- which has to be launched from a high-altitude F-15 fighter.

This projectile is equipped with infra-red telescopes which, by scanning space, have to detect a source of heat radiation, that is to say, a satellite. Then the computer on board this projectile has to calculate the distance to the satellite, its relative speed of movement, and switch on the maneuvering rocket motors which are on the projectile; this will direct the projectile to the target so that it can blow itself up along with it. As you see, so much equipment has been tacked on to the so-called miniature system that the nickname of the flying can is justified -- a thoroughly poisonous and lethal can.

But that is the technical side of the matter, so to say. As far as the military-political side is concerned, I would like to recall the fact that the Soviet Union declared a unilateral moratorium on putting antisatellite devices into orbit 2 years ago, that is to say in 1983, and it did so in its desire to prevent a dangerous development of the situation. As we now see this act of good will on our part, this very important step intended to forestall a race in space weapons, did not meet with understanding on that side of the ocean.

In Washington they are now resorting to the most varied attempts to conceal the significance of this militant new step.

For example, they are stating that the forthcoming tests will not, allegedly, represent an irreversible step. The argument -- a truly ridiculous one -- that the tests will supposedly encourage success at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, has been set in motion. In actual fact things are precisely the other way around. By its actions Washington is putting a new spoke, a new huge truncheon, I would say, into the wheels of the Geneva talks.

[Andrianov] William Plante, a correspondent of the American CBS television company, said a few days ago while commenting on Washington's decision, that the question arises: Why are these tests being held at this particular time, when talks are taking place in Geneva and when both sides are preparing to hold a summit meeting? The correspondent does not answer his own question, but the answer is nevertheless clear: It is a question of the U.S. military's intention to press on regardless, despite whatever obstacles there may be of a foreign policy character.

[Nekrasov] A question similar to the one asked by Plante was put directly to a White House spokesman at a news conference. He was asked: Surely the administration can see that this irrepressible desire to acquire an antisatellite strike weapon, and to do so under conditions of a unilateral moratorium by the USSR that has been in operation for 2 years already, cannot be viewed other than as an attempt to obtain superiority over the Soviet Union? That this decision can lead only to the extension of the space weapons race? And what did the White House spokesman have to say? He tried in every way to avoid giving direct answers, though eventually he was obliged to state that Washington has no desire to conduct any talks with Moscow about the substance of space militarization issues.

[Volskiy] Eventually American Senator Kerry was more open than the White House spokesman. Using plain terms he described the decision on the tests -- and I quote -- as yet another step in the direction of extending the arms race into space.

[Nekrasov] What's more, it's a step which is of itself extremely dangerous.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS RAPS U.S. SPOKESMEN ON SDI

Perle Remarks to Adenauer Foundation

PM080950 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Aug 85 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Lies and Slander"]

[Text] Bonn, 6 Aug -- Setting its sights on achieving military superiority over the USSR by transferring the arms race to space, the U.S. Administration stoops to overt lies, slander, and juggling with the facts. Graphic evidence of that is the speech by R. Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, to a rally of West German conservatives from the K. Adenauer Political Education Foundation held in Bonn the other day.

Perle devoted much of his speech to the "star wars" program. Trumpeting this extremely dangerous administration venture, the high-ranking Pentagon man repeated official Washington's usual "arguments" about its alleged "defensive nature." Perle hinted that Washington is pleased with the pace at which the U.S. military-industrial complex has embarked on the implementation of these plans.

Immense progress has already been made in implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative," he said. In Perle's words, "technical obstacles which seemed insuperable just a few months ago are falling one after another."

Shifting the blame onto others, he talked about so-called Soviet "violations" of arms limitation agreements. Perle did not hide his annoyance when he spoke of the Soviet Union's new peace initiative in renouncing the staging of any nuclear explosions. His speech showed graphically once again that the United States does not want to join the USSR in introducing a moratorium on nuclear tests.

Adelman Speech

LD121223 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 12 Aug 85

[Text] Washington Aug 12 TASS--The audience in Baltimore viewed rather sceptically the attempts by Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, to justify Reagan's "Star wars" before the local council on international relations.

Mr Jenkins, columnist of the BALTIMORE SUN newspaper, asked the opinion of the participants in the meeting and, as he writes, there proved to be no

buyers of Reagan's program. Pointing out that in the final analysis the plans aimed at creating a new space-based anti-missile defense system cannot but lead to a breach of the arms limitation agreements and, in particular, of the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, the author emphasises that this means that military-purpose satellites will be launched into space and that beam and directed-energy weapons will be tested in the near-earth space.

Even Adelman himself in his speech had to admit that the implementation of the "star wars" program will at some moment require a revision of the arms control treaties or a U.S. unilateral renunciation of them. Mr Jenkins is of the opinion that in point of fact Washington is already now preparing ground for such a step and with this end in view comes forward with overtly slanderous charges of so-called "violation" of the arms limitation treaties by the USSR.

Mr Jenkins disproves the administration's thesis about the ostensibly "defensive" character of the "star wars", stressing that the space militarization plans increase the threat of nuclear war. The columnist recalls that most American scientists and specialists oppose the "star wars." Mr Jenkins in his commentary asks this just question: If the USA really wants to get rid of nuclear arms, is not it more simple to give them up?

The same idea is emphasized in the WASHINGTON POST newspaper by another prominent U.S. columnist, Joseph Kraft. Mentioning the causes of the negative reaction of the White House to the new Soviet initiative, he points out that the development of so-called x-ray lasers powered by the energy of a nuclear explosion is part and parcel of the administration's "star wars" program. He writes that the United States wants to carry out a test of such a device whereas the introduction of a moratorium would prevent such an attempt. Mr Kraft notes that administration spokesmen are trying to pass over in silence such [words indistinct] tests of nuclear weapons and the "star wars" program. He underlines that the cause of it is that recognition of such fact would vividly show the mendacity of the administration's assertions that the "star wars" program ostensibly can in prospect do away with nuclear weapons forever. This is why the advocates of the program do not like the idea of introducing a moratorium on all nuclear tests.

Weinberger Interview

PM131347 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 10 Aug 85 p 4

[TASS dispatch under general heading "Growing Opposition"]

[Text] Washington, 9 Aug--The rising wave of opposition to plans for the militarization of space in the United States has enraged members of the Reagan administration. Thus, in an interview for a number of journalists Secretary of Defense, C. Weinberger has expressed irritation with the stance

adopted by many U.S. scientists who condemn the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. He claimed that the scientists' movement against the militarization of space is "insignificant," that it comprises only "a few people who play around with computers," and that some critics of the "star wars" program are guided by ideological considerations rather than scientific data. This movement, Weinberger trumpeted, is causing me no "concern."

However, the very fact that the Pentagon chief deemed it necessary to make this kind of statement testifies that this phenomenon is causing serious alarm in the White House. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the experts' movement against the adventurist plans of the White House and the Pentagon to deploy strike systems in space is rapidly gaining ground. Thus an overwhelming majority of professors and students at the University of Illinois have signed a petition which describes the "star wars" program as "politically unwise, profoundly erroneous, dangerous, and extremely expensive."

In turn, R. Jastrow, one of the leaders of the organization for implementing the Reagan "initiative," stated in the journal AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE that the United States is to have a "very effective" ABM defense system as early as the beginning of the next decade. It will consist of 100 satellites each of which will be equipped with 150 homing missiles. A further 10-15 satellites will be needed for tactical control, communications, and reconnaissance. In addition, R. Jastrow believes, an earth-based ABM defense system should also be deployed. A Pentagon spokesman has said that technology for the creation of powerful lasers, beam weapons, electromagnetic guns and other weapons systems including space-based elements can be available as early as the mid-nineties.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: GERARD SMITH CRITIQUE OF U.S. STANCE CITED

PM201310 Moscow TRUD in Russian 17 Aug 85 p 3

[TASS report: "The Cause of the Impasse"]

[Text] New York, 16 Aug--Reagan's "star wars" program is the main cause of the impasse at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. This is the conclusion drawn by Gerard Smith, former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-American SALT talks, analyzing the results of the second round of the Geneva talks.

President Reagan, he writes in the periodical BUSINESS WEEK, considers this program to be "the strongest incentive" for arms control. In actual fact, however, it is a question of a choice between "star wars" and arms control. The large-scale ABM system with space-based elements whose creation is envisaged by this program will threaten the Soviet nuclear forces and will only push the USSR into taking countermeasures. The author notes that the United States would react in exactly the same way.

"In the joint statement published following the January meeting between G. Shultz and A.A. Gromyko in Geneva," the article says, "the United States and the USSR drew the conclusion that the objective of the new Geneva talks would be to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on Earth." Despite this agreement, the administration refuses to discuss the limitation of the "star wars" program in Geneva and is therefore sacrificing progress in the sphere of nuclear forces reduction.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA REBUTS MCFARLANE ON SOVIET SPACE ARMS PROGRAMS

PM241618 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Aug 85 First Edition p 5

[V. Sukhoy "Rejoinder": "Alas, Nothing New"]

[Text] R. McFarlane, the U.S. President's national security assistant, delivered a speech entitled with deliberate meaningfulness [mnogoznachitelnost] "American-Soviet Relations at the End of the 20th Century" to a club in Santa Barbara (California).

White House spokesmen are currently insisting that the speaker's aim was to address the Soviet Union directly, not the American audience.

What was the crux of what people on the banks of the Potomac are calling a "special, purposeful, and detailed message to Moscow?" Alas everything is as antiquated as a jackboot on the deck of a modern American aircraft carrier. McFarlane falsely accused the USSR of carrying out work in the field of space weapons. He ascribed to the Soviet Union "actions to build up chemical weapons" and medium-range missiles in Europe; indicted our country for supporting the national liberation movement; and, of course, did not omit to mention the "dish of the day," those notorious "human rights." In this kind of situation, McFarlane stated innocently, the United States has no option but to take countermeasures.

What is the point of this entire propaganda show staged in a California resort town? If the high-ranking administration spokesman wanted to say that the United States is going to continue development of the "star wars" program, the chemical arms race, and the "crusade" against socialist policy, this could have been done without the false meaningfulness or the false accusations against our country. For who, if not the U.S. President's national security assistant, should know very well that the Soviet Union has not violated and is not violating the ABM treaty or the salt II treaty and that it is not us, but the United States that intends to unleash an arms race in space and achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. Incidentally, the United States makes no secret of this in either word or action. Just one example is the recent White House announcement of plans to carry out the first test of an antisatellite weapon in space.

So, who was McFarlane trying to convince, and of what? The Soviet Union needs no convincing of anything. Evidence of this is provided by our recent peace initiatives, which are being broadly welcomed by the peace-loving public; but they meet with no understanding in Washington.

At the end of his speech, R. McFarlane noted that as the Soviet-American summit meeting approaches there is no need for the Soviet Union and the United States "to be eternally locked in enmity" and that a period of "flexibility and self-analysis" has allegedly now arrived. It is impossible to disagree with these words. The only thing, in our view, is that it is Washington that lacks "flexibility and self-analysis," and without this it will be very difficult to mend [ozdorovit] relations between the USSR and the United States.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS ANALYST EXAMINES U.S. NUCLEAR POLICY

LD121615 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 12 Aug 85

["Outer Space Should Be Free of Nuclear Arms" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, August 12 TASS -- TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

In 1980 the United States Administration unilaterally suspended talks with the USSR and Britain on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and since then comes out as a fierce opponent of terminating nuclear blasts. The American plans of militarising outer space, announced by President Reagan in 1983, have only further toughened Washington's stand on this issue.

Washington's recent refusal to follow the USSR's example and introduce a moratorium on nuclear explosions is largely due to the fact that a termination of testing of nuclear weapons intended for use in outer space would seriously obstruct the fulfilment of the American plans of preparation for "star wars".

Contrary to statements by the present U.S. Administration about its desire to make nuclear arms senseless and useless by way of creating a large-scale ABM system, Washington is preparing to deploy in near-terrestrial space a whole series of attack nuclear systems capable of striking targets in outer space and on earth.

Post-war history abounds in examples of practical actions taken by the United States in preparation for war in outer space with the use of nuclear arms. On June 9, 1962 the United States exploded a powerful hydrogen bomb in outer space. In 1963 the Pentagon deployed missiles intended for destroying satellites in outer space on Kwajalein Atoll and Johnson Island in the Pacific. As recently reported by the American press, these missiles were tipped with powerful nuclear warheads. A special tunnel was built at the testing range in the American State of Nevada to test nuclear arms that could be used in powerful ABM laser systems in outer space. The testing of space nuclear systems is continuing in Nevada to this day.

It is openly stated in the Directive 172 adopted by the American National Security Council in May 1985 that the United States will further study the promising concept providing for the use of nuclear energy to trigger devices capable of destroying ballistic missiles.

John Rather, a laser specialist and an apologist of Reagan's "star wars" plan, stated that a country possessing laser weapons in space will possess the longest stick in history, that is the ability to control outer space and consequently establish its dominance on earth.

In January 1985 a representative of the United States put his signature under the joint Soviet-American statement to the effect that the purpose of the two countries at the Geneva talks would be to prevent the arms race in outer space and stop it on earth. However, at the talks that started on March 12, this year, the American side set its course for the revision of these objectives: It asserted that through the deployment by the U.S. of space-based anti-ballistic missile systems it was possible to achieve universal and complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

However, what the present U.S. Administration is really going to do, judging by the actions of Washington, is to start the deployment of nuclear weapons in outer space and to step up the nuclear arms race on earth.

The U.S., joining in the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, as well as the complete and universal banning of nuclear tests would be a truly effective step on the way towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, Washington seems to be furthering other aims which have nothing to do with the interests of security on our planet.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW COMMENTATOR NOTES GROWING U.S. OPPOSITION TO SDI

LD250345 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 24 Aug 85

[Valentin Zorin presents "Moscow Viewpoint"]

[Text] [Zorin] When interviewed recently for THE WASHINGTON POST, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger declared that the most important means of maintaining peace were nuclear weapons. Here, in the Soviet Union, people believe that to save mankind it is necessary to outlaw nuclear weapons, pledge never to use them, and remove them from arsenals. In Washington, on the other hand, nuclear weapons are seen not as a Damoclean sword pointed at the human race but as its anchor of salvation. However, there is a growing mood among the American people that doesn't suit the White House. More and more Americans are beginning to realize the terrible consequences that a continuation and escalation of the nuclear arms race would have.

A recent public opinion poll revealed that a majority of Americans, 53 percent, are against the Strategic Defense Initiative, better known as the Star Wars program. You can imagine how dissatisfied the Reagan administration is with this turn of events since only quite recently the picture provided by polls was quite different. However, soberminded Americans are coming to understand that spreading the arms race to outer space, far from protecting the United States from the nuclear menace, will only make it worse. But, in that case, what is to be done by those who have already put down in their bookkeeping ledgers the enormous profits they expect to make in the years ahead by developing new types of space-based military hardware? The Pentagon's contractors, those darlings of fate, have already grown accustomed to a golden shower, especially under the Reagan presidency. Just the 10 leading Pentagon contractors last year locked away in their vaults net profits totalling 3.6 billion dollars. The net profits of just the Boeing Corporation, specializing in aerospace and rocketry technologies, amounted to 787 million dollars. Over half a billion was pocketed by Lockheed and almost as much by Rockwell International.

But, as they say, the appetite comes with the eating. The owners of those and other concerns count on extracting more hundreds of millions of dollars from the pockets of taxpayers in the years ahead. And their plans

are largely associated with the Reagan Star Wars program. In these circumstances, public doubts as to whether the program is well-founded and expedient cannot but arouse their misgivings. By throwing its weight behind the arms race, the White House is making it clear it is on their side. Not that the ever-growing antiwar movements in the country and the mood of the majority refusing to support Star Wars are in no way reflected in the Administration's activities. It acts as if there were no protests against Star Wars in the country, as if the program had the backing of the majority of Americans. A strange interpretation of democracy. The interests of a few hundred military-industrial corporation tycoons outweigh the opinion of the majority of Americans.

While disregarding the opinion of Americans, the Washington policymakers at the same time do everything to mislead sufficiently gullible people. In this effort, Washington evidently considers that all is fair and Henry Kissinger, too, has served his purpose. Nevertheless, his attempts to prove that nuclear weapons are an instrument of peace clearly betray warped thinking.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: ARMY PAPER ASSAILS JUSTIFICATION FOR SDI

PM211135 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Aug 85 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Preventing the Militarization of Space"]

[Text] The Soviet Union stanchly, consistently, and persistently translates its Leninist peace-loving foreign policy into reality. The large-scale peace initiatives of the USSR, which has unilaterally suspended all nuclear explosions and proposed that the question of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space be included on the agenda of the 40th session of the UN General Assembly, continue to attract the attention of the international public and to gain its increasingly broad support and approval.

The Soviet proposals refer to specific, tangible measures. Sober-minded people the world over perceive the moratorium on nuclear tests as a hopeful sign that it will prove possible to slow down, and eventually to end, the nuclear arms race. They regard the prevention of the militarization of space and the preservation of space for peaceful activity as the only sensible option worthy of civilized mankind.

Indeed, mankind now faces a choice: Either space will bear increasingly tangible fruit to help improve the living conditions of the inhabitants of our planet, or it will be transformed into another source of lethal danger to them. This question has now assumed utmost urgency. It must be resolved before weapons have penetrated into space.

Strenuous efforts are being made to present the plans currently being elaborated by the U.S. ruling circles to extend the arms race to space to ill-informed people in various attractive wrappings. The authors of these plans refer to them as the "Strategic Defense Initiative," a "humane task," "banking on scientific and technical progress," or a "means of delivering mankind from the nuclear threat." But it is necessary to look truth in the face. The practical implementation of these plans would lead to the appearance in space of weapons in the strictest sense of the word. Specific work is already under way to develop space strike means of destruction. If this process is not halted, the arms race in all spheres will assume even greater dimensions and intensity, swallowing up additional new

material and intellectual resources and creating insurmountable obstacles in the path of states' joint peaceful activity in space. And Soviet-American accords in the sphere of maintaining strategic stability will be definitively eliminated.

In its efforts to gain decisive military superiority over the socialist countries Washington has set itself the aim of securing a U.S. ability to deliver a first nuclear strike with impunity and to deprive the USSR of the possibility of delivering a retaliatory strike, that is, to disarm the Soviet Union. The fact that the U.S. "star wars" program objectively recognizes and admits the possible use of nuclear weapons and the delivery of a first nuclear strike and claims that victory in nuclear war is possible creates a real threat to all mankind.

In these conditions the problem of preventing the militarization of space calls for a bold and decisive approach. A far-sighted policy is now needed more than ever before, a policy based on an understanding of the realities and dangers which will inevitably confront all the world's peoples tomorrow if the people who can and must adopt the only correct decision today sidestep their responsibility.

The Soviet Union displays precisely this kind of far-sighted policy. It has proposed a simple, radical, and effective solution, namely refraining from starting the arms race in space, banning the entire class of space strike weapons, and establishing without delay a moratorium on their development, testing, and deployment. This would accord with the interests of the USSR and the United States and the interests and aspirations of all the world's states and peoples. The Soviet approach to the nonmilitarization of space was reflected in the Soviet-American accord on the topic and objectives of the talks on nuclear and space weapons currently under way in Geneva.

Now the Soviet Union has proposed that the UN General Assembly again and with utmost resoluteness call on all states, and especially those which possess a large potential in the space sphere, to agree without delay on effective measures to prevent an arms race in space. The USSR proposes that a package of specific measures be implemented to promote a pooling of states' efforts in the peaceful exploration of space and utilization of space technology to benefit all states, including all-around assistance to developing countries in this sphere. Motivated by the desire to promote the swiftest progress in the cause of ensuring the peaceful exploration of space, the Soviet Union has submitted a document "the Main Avenues and Principles of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Space in Conditions of its Nonmilitarization (the USSR'S Proposals)," and also the UN General Assembly draft resolution "on International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Space in conditions of its Nonmilitarization" for discussion at the next, 40th session of the UN General Assembly.

These documents emphasize that the Soviet Union is a resolute opponent of arms race in any sphere, including space. Space as mankind's common asset must be placed in the service of peace and security and the economic and social progress of all peoples, rather than in the service of war. In the spirit of good will and aware of its responsibility for the fate of the planet, the Soviet Union appeals to all countries and peoples to jointly embark on the resolution of this historic task.

Coming out with this new initiative, the USSR cannot fail to take into account the whole complexity of the current situation and the dangers created by the militarist U.S. course. "If the preparations for 'star wars' continue," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted, "we will have no option but to adopt countermeasures including, of course, the buildup and improvement of offensive nuclear arms." Our measures will be equivalent to the threat which this can create to the Soviet Union and its allies.

The policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet State, which accords with the aspirations of all the world's honest people and with the interests of all the planet's nations, has the boundless support of the Soviet people. It is ardently approved also by the servicemen of the USSR Armed Forces. They are tirelessly strengthening their beloved fatherland's might and defense capability by their selfless military labor and vigilantly guarding the great revolutionary gains of our country's working people, and peace and the security of the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and of all mankind.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ON U.S. SDI PLANS FOR MICRONESIA

LD252055 Moscow World Service in English 1431 GMT 25 Aug 85

[Excerpt] The forum of countries of the South Pacific has held its annual session on the Cook Islands. More on the subject from our observer Mikhail Aleksandrov, and this is what he writes:

At present, Washington is trying to turn Pacific islands and waters into a bridgehead for the delivery of a nuclear first strike at the socialist countries. Airfields for strategic aircraft B-52 and (D-1) and anchorage sites for ships with cruise missiles aboard are under construction on Micronesia's islands. This threatens to get the region involved in U.S. nuclear adventures. This is all the more so because the Pentagon has already taken concrete measures in the Pacific Ocean to realize its aggressive military doctrine, known under the name of the program of "star wars".

On Kwajalein Island, reports say, the Pentagon has already built a radar station for guiding in antisatellite weapons, and on Easter Island it is building a landing facility for its spacecraft in the shuttle series, launched from the Vandenberg cosmodrome.

The above-said makes it obvious that not only the presence of U.S. military bases, but also the sailing of U.S. military ships in the waters of the Pacific countries and the flights of U.S. aircraft in their airspace tends to turn them into potential targets of a retaliatory nuclear strike. As the past session of the forum of countries of the South Pacific shows, their people refuse to become hostages of Washington's nuclear strategy. It has also reflected the determination of those countries to contribute to the strengthening of general peace.

The establishment of a nuclear free zone in the southern part of the Pacific will seriously obstruct measures on the part of Washington to carry out its destabilizing strategic plans in Southeast Asia. It is a known fact that the Pentagon's bases in the countries of ASEAN and the Oceania are links of a single complex of forward-based nuclear first strike weapons and their delivery vehicles. For that matter, the Pentagon does not conceal that, with a view to a balanced dispersion, the U.S. military presence should be extended evenly through the Pacific. In addition, official Washington fears that the appearance of a nuclear free zone in the South Pacific, will stimulate the antiwar and antinuclear movement in the ASEAN countries.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET SPACE PROPOSAL SENT TO UN FOR STUDY

Shevardnadze Letter to UN

PM161536 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 4

["Letter From the USSR Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary General" -- IZVESTIYA headline; item is carried under general headline: "For the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space"]

[Text] Esteemed Mr Secretary General,

The Soviet Union proposes that the question "On International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space Under Conditions of its Nonmilitarization" be included on the agenda of the 40th UN General Assembly session.

In putting forward this proposal, the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that mankind is now faced with a choice: Either space will yield increasingly tangible fruits for the improvement of the living conditions of our planet's inhabitants, or else it will be transformed into the source of a lethal new danger for them. The only sensible choice worthy of the space era by the people of earth can and must be made in favor of preventing the militarization of space and preserving it for peaceful activity.

This question has become urgent. It must be resolved before weapons penetrate space. And this danger is intensifying with each day. Specific studies with a view to creating offensive means of destruction in space are already under way. Unless this process is stopped, the arms race in all directions will acquire still greater dimensions and intensity; additionally absorbing new material and intellectual resources and creating insurmountable obstacles to joint peaceful space activity by states.

The Soviet Union proposes that the UN General Assembly with the utmost resolve again call on all states, particularly those possessing a large potential in the field of space, to reach immediate agreement on effective measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, which would create the conditions for broad international cooperation in the study [issledovaniye] and utilization of space for peaceful purposes.

The Soviet Union proposes implementing a set of specific measures promoting the pooling of states' efforts in the peaceful study of space and the utilization of space technology to the benefit of all states, including the provision of all-around assistance in this sphere to the developing countries. It is obvious that the successful solution of this common human task will become possible if accords effectively ensuring the nonmilitarization of outer space are reached.

Motivated by a desire to promote the speediest progress in ensuring the peaceful exploration of space, the Soviet Union submits for consideration by the General Assembly session the document "Basic Guidelines and Principles of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space Under Conditions of its Nonmilitarization (USSR's proposals)."

Please, Mr Secretary General, regard the present letter as the explanatory note envisaged by the UN General Assembly's rules of procedure and circulate it with the attached document "Basic Guidelines and Principles of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space Under Conditions of its Nonmilitarization (USSR's Proposals)" and the draft resolution as official documents of the UN General Assembly.

E. Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister

Draft UN Resolution

PM161550 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 4

["UN General Assembly Draft Resolution 'On International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space Under Conditions of its Nonmilitarization'" -- IZVESTIYA headline -- capitalized phrases published in boldface; item is carried under general headline "for the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space"]

[Text] THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

FULLY RESOLVED to ensure that the exploration and utilization of outer space are fields of extensive, equal, and mutually advantageous international cooperation under peaceful conditions;

RECOGNIZING the urgent need to avert before it is too late an arms race in outer space which would lead to a sharp intensification of the danger of nuclear war, undermine the prospects for arms limitation and reduction as a whole, and create insuperable obstacles to the development of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space;

GUIDED BY THE DESIRE to ensure that the exploration and utilization of outer space should serve as effectively as possible the scientific, technical, economic, and social progress of all peoples and the resolution of the global problems facing mankind, including the tasks of development and surmounting economic backwardness;

1. CALLS on all states, especially those which have a major potential in the field of space, to do everything for the adoption of effective measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, which would create conditions for extensive international cooperation in the exploration and utilization of space for peaceful purposes;

2. EXPRESSES THE CONVICTION that under the conditions of an effective safeguarding of the nonmilitarization of space, the creation of a world space organization to collate, coordinate, and pool states' efforts in peaceful space activity, including giving help in this field to developing countries, as well as helping to implement the necessary monitoring of the observance of agreements already concluded or to be concluded with a view to preventing an arms race in space would be a major practical step in the cause of peaceful space exploration and the development of international cooperation in this sphere;

3. RESOLVES to convene not later than 1987 an international conference comprised of states with major space potential and other interested countries to comprehensively [vovsey npolnote] examine the question of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and utilization of outer space under conditions of its nonmilitarization and to coordinate the basic guidelines and principles of such cooperation. The conference would also examine the question of creating a world space organization, bearing in mind that the practical creation of such an organization could only be embarked upon when accords effectively guaranteeing the nonmilitarization of outer space have been reached;
4. INSTITUTES an open [otkrytovo sostava] preparatory committee made up of states with major potential in the field of space in order to convene the international conference;
5. INSTRUCTS the preparatory committee to present a report on the work done and relevant recommendations to the GENERAL ASSEMBLY at its 41st session.
6. INVITES all states to report to the secretary general not later than 1 March 1986 so that any opinions and suggestions concerning the convening of the international conference may be passed to the committee;
7. RESOLVES to include in the preliminary agenda for its 41st session an item headed "On International Cooperation in the Nonmilitarization and Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space."

IZVESTIYA on Basic Guidelines

PM161621 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 4

["Basic Guidelines and Principles of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space Under Conditions of its Nonmilitarization (USSR Proposals)" -- IZVESTIYA headline; item is carried under general heading: "For the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space"]

[Text] The breakthrough into space and the transition to the practical use of this infinite expanse is one of mankind's outstanding scientific-technical achievements.

In the historically brief period which has elapsed since the Soviet Union launched the world's first artificial earth satellite in 1957 and launched the Vostok spaceship manned by Yuriy Gagarin, the world's first cosmonaut, in 1961, a gigantic leap forward has been taken in the peaceful exploration of space.

Mankind has essentially begun to inhabit near-earth space. Hundreds of satellites are now in orbit and stations where collectives, including international collectives, of scientific and technical specialists succeed each other and work for months are in constant operation. Interplanetary scientific stations are plying the depths of the solar system. With the aid of spacecraft, the Moon, Venus, and Mars are being studied systematically. Man's space horizons are becoming increasingly wide and imposing.

But, right now there is a growing possibility that space may be turned into the source of a terrible danger of war. Plans are being announced and actions are being taken aimed at creating and deploying space offensive weapons to destroy targets in space and from space, in the air, and on earth, including creating a wide-scale ABM system with space-based elements.

The implementation of plans to militarize space would lead to a sharp intensification of the nuclear threat and would deprive the peoples of any hope of the day coming when nuclear weapons would vanish from the face of the earth. Moreover, the arms race would acquire a qualitatively new, even more dangerous, dimension on all salients. Colossal additional resources which could serve the interests of man's peaceful development and the solution of the urgent problems facing mankind would be hurled into its furnace.

Militarization as a grave, incurable ill would affect all areas of space activity and would create insuperable obstacles to the development of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

The peoples and governments of all countries are called on to recognize the dimensions of the task facing mankind and the full extent of their historical responsibility for its implementation.

It is a case of the point in civilization's development when either an era of large-scale exploration and use of space for the benefit of mankind will begin or space will become the source of a mortal threat to mankind.

2. The application of the results of space research, experiments, and the use of space technology in areas such as biology; medicine; materials technology; weather forecasting; the study of climate and the environment; global satellite communications systems; the solution of questions of remote-control sounding of the earth to obtain data for geology, agriculture, and oceanic exploration; and assistance in searching for, locating and rescuing people in distress at sea and in the air.

3. Creation and utilization of space technology, including large international scientific orbital stations and manned spacecraft of various types.

Third: Peaceful exploration of outer space should be accompanied by unswerving observance of previous treaties aimed at preventing an arms race in space and also based on the following general principles arising out of the UN Charter;

Nonuse of force or the threat of force and the solution of disputes by peaceful means alone;

Equality, respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in states' internal affairs;

Conscientious cooperation and mutual assistance and due consideration of other states' interests.

Fourth: A world space organization for international cooperation in the peaceful study and use of space under conditions of nonmilitarization could be created to organize and implement cooperation among states.

Such an organization would be called on:

To ensure, under conditions of mutual advantage, access for all states on a non-discriminatory basis to the results of scientific and technical achievements connected with the study and peaceful exploration of outer space;

To implement international projects connected with pooling efforts and resources in the cause of scientific research into outer space and the use of space technology;

To provide comprehensive assistance to developing countries to join the study and use of outer space and to utilize the practical results of such activity to accelerate the economic and social development of those countries in accordance with their needs and without any conditions limiting their sovereignty;

To coordinate on an international scale the activity of other international organizations in the sphere of the peaceful use of outer space;

To assist, if necessary, the exercise of control over the observation of agreements which have already been concluded or will be concluded with a view to averting an arms race in space.

Fifth: The USSR proposes convening a representative international conference, in which, among others, states with a major space potential would take part, to fully examine the question of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space under conditions of nonmilitarization and to coordinate the basic guidelines and principles of such cooperation.

The Soviet Union is a resolute opponent of rivalry in the race for any armaments, including space armaments. The efforts which it is making right now to prevent the militarization of outer space are a continuation of its consistent, purposeful policy to ensure that space is used for the benefit of mankind. Blazing the first trails into space, back in 1958 the USSR submitted to the United Nations a proposal providing for the prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes.

Although it was not possible to fundamentally resolve the problem of nonmilitarization of space at that time, important treaties were concluded during the sixties and seventies which considerably limited the possibility of its military use. They included multilateral treaties banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater (1963), on principles governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies (1967), the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of ABM systems (1972), and a number of other agreements.

These documents created favorable conditions for the first steps toward establishing mutually beneficial cooperation among states in outer space. Now, too, if a reliable barrier is placed in the way of the path of weapons in space, states would have an opportunity to pool their efforts and resources to ensure that the results of all states' activity in space served creation and the prosperity of all peoples inhabiting our planet rather than destruction.

The USSR advocates such cooperation and proposes that all countries and peoples do everything to prevent an arms race in space and work jointly on its peaceful study and exploration for the good of all mankind.

First: The nonmilitarization of space -- that is, states' rejection of the creation (including scientific research work), testing, and deployment of space offensive armaments -- and the pooling of states' efforts for peaceful activity in space would help broaden mutual understanding and cooperation among them and make efficient use of mankind's material and intellectual resources. New impetus would thereby be given to scientific and technical development and truly boundless prospects would be opened up for using achievements in space to promote the peoples' economic and social progress and to resolve the global problems facing mankind, including such urgent ones as eliminating hunger and disease and overcoming the economic backwardness of developing countries, including by giving assistance to them.

Peaceful global cooperation in space research would be organized and would develop on a scale ranging from the exchange of scientific and technical information and simple forms of collaboration to pooling states' available potential for solving major space exploration tasks.

In this event mankind would be capable of implementing the long-term aim of the industrialization of near-earth space in the sense of linking space complexes of various types with states' economies on earth and operating orbital factories and plants set up to produce new materials and industrial products under conditions of high vacuum and weightlessness. People would have the use of inexhaustible storehouses of space, including the resources of heavenly bodies and the energy of the sun.

Second: International cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space could, the USSR believes, be implemented in the following basic directions?

1. Fundamental scientific peace research, including study of the moon and other heavenly bodies and the launching of interplanetary spacecraft for that purpose.

The conference would also examine the question of creating a world space organization for international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, bearing in mind that it will be possible to proceed with the practical creation of such an organization only when accords have been reached that effectively ensure the non-militarization of outer space.

The peaceful exploration of outer space, as people already know from experience, is able to contribute much to the development and improvement of life on earth. The Soviet Union is convinced that outer space, the common property of mankind, must be put to the service of peace, security, and the economic and social progress of all the peoples rather than war. The path to this lies in joint collective efforts by all the states of our planet.

It is in a spirit of goodwill and awareness of its responsibility for the destiny of our planet that the Soviet Union calls on all countries and all the peoples to jointly set about resolving this historic task. Seeking to make its own contribution to the common cause, it submits for examination by the United Nations these proposals on the basis guidelines and principles of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space under the conditions of its nonmilitarization.

Radio Commentary in English

LD171554 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 17 Aug 85

[Text] The Soviet Union has called for international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in the conditions of its nonmilitarization. This country has proposed that the coming session of the UN General Assembly discuss this issue. Our observer, Yuriy Solton, has the following commentary: this is what he writes:

The problem the Soviet Union suggests for discussion is very urgent. The further exploration of space can be abundantly beneficial for humanity. But space can also become the source of new threat of destruction for mankind if weapons are deployed there, and such a threat does exist.

In March of 1983 Washington officially proclaimed the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, in fact it's a program to prepare for star wars. Concrete developments of strike space weapons are underway to enable the United States to strike at any point in the world. The appearance of space weapons will inevitably increase the risk of nuclear war and will give fresh impetus to the arms race in all directions. The militarization of space would adversely affect all spheres of the space activities of states and would create insurmountable obstacles in the way of cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

Only a few months after it had launched its first space satellite, back in October of 1957, the Soviet Union proposed banning all forms of military uses of outer space without exception. This stand has remained unchanged. The Soviet Union suggests a drastic solution: not to start an arms race in space, prohibit the entire class of strike space weapons, and immediately declare a moratorium in their creation, testing and deployment. At the same time this country favors a package of concrete moves that would help to combine international efforts in a peaceful study of space and in the use of space technology for the benefit of all, including all-round aid in the field to the developing nations.

The measures are explained in detail in a Soviet document sent to the United Nations. It's called The Basic Guidelines and Principles of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in the Conditions of its Nonmilitarization. A draft resolution supplementing the document calls for setting up a world space organization to coordinate such cooperation. The draft suggests convening an international conference not later than 1987. Taking part could be the states possessing a huge space potential and the other countries interested in examining the issue on cooperation in the peaceful studies and uses of space in the conditions of its nonmilitarization.

The issues of whether space be peaceful or not should be settled without delay, and in this matter the United Nations should use all its influence.

Need for World Space Agency

LD191413 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 19 Aug 85

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] As already reported, the USSR has proposed that the forthcoming UN General Assembly session discuss the question of international cooperation in the peaceful mastering of space in conditions of its nonmilitarization. Here is our political observer, Aleksandr Zholkver:

It seems to me to be unnecessary to prove the need for international cooperation in using the very rich opportunities which are opened up by mastering space. As you know, space research in the recent period -- from the creation of a worldwide communications service and weather forecasting, to obtaining important information from space for geology, agriculture, and mastering the world's oceans -- shows that space can bring ever more tangible fruits for improving living conditions for the world's population.

At the same time, everyone understands that space research is a complex and very expensive affair. It is all the more important to unite the material and intellectual resources of all states. Positive experience in this direction already exists; the flights of international crews on Soviet spacecraft, the link-up of Soviet and American spaceships, and the recent creation of an international system for detecting, from space, ships and aircraft in distress. To arrange even broader cooperation among states the Soviet Union proposes the creation of a worldwide space organization, with a full examination of this question at an international conference to be convened no later than 1987.

So all this is not fantasy, but a truly concrete reality. But it must be stressed that to bring about these global projects, truly common to all mankind, one more very important condition is essential: the militarization of space must not be allowed. And this is not fantasy either; unfortunately it is a very real threat. Concrete work is already being carried out with the aim of creating space offensive weapons. If this process is not halted, the arms race in all spheres will acquire an even greater scale, creating insuperable obstacles on the road to joint peaceful space activity.

It must be said that this danger is seen particularly clearly by scientists. It is not by chance that 12 U.S. universities are collecting signatures for petitions calling for the scrapping of the American "star wars" program. And the Soviet Union proposes that the forthcoming session of the UN General Assembly should call on all states, especially those having a major potential in the sphere of space, to do everything to effectively prevent an arms race in space. This would create conditions for broad international cooperation in using space for peaceful purposes.

U.S. Stance Criticized

LD201139 Moscow TASS in English 1126 GMT 20 Aug 85

[Text] New York, August 20 TASS - Preventing an arms race in outer space occupies a central place in the Soviet Union's foreign policy, Vladimir Shustov, deputy permanent representative of the USSR to the United Nations, has told a press conference here.

The USSR's proposal that the agenda of the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly include the item on "International Cooperation in Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in the Conditions of its Non-Militarization" continues and develops this peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Arms-free space alone paves the way for stronger security of states and broad international cooperation in space exploration. he said.

The Soviet representative recalled that 150 nations voted at the 39th session of the U.N. General Assembly in favour of the resolution "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space", tabled at Soviet initiative. The U.S. delegation, however, refused to back the resolution by abstaining during the vote.

If the American delegation continues to stick to its present stance, this can only undermine the implementation of the U.S. General Assembly's decisions directed at preventing an arms race in outer space, he pointed out.

Proposal Termed 'Star Peace'

LD221043 Moscow TASS in English 0949 GMT 22 Aug 85

[Text] Geneva, Aug 22 (TASS) -- The Soviet Government's proposal to include in the agenda of the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly the question "International Cooperation in Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in Conditions of its Non-Militarization" has evoked much interest at the Disarmament Conference. At the request of the Soviet delegation materials connected with this new initiative have been distributed as a document of the conference which, along with other key issues, is studying the question of averting an arms race in outer space.

When making this proposal, it was stated by the head of the Soviet delegation Viktor Israelyan, my country proceeded from the premise that mankind faces the following choice: either outer space will bear ever more tangible fruit for improving the living conditions of the inhabitants of the planet earth, or it will turn into a source of lethal danger to them. The only reasonable conclusion can and must be drawn in favour of preventing the militarization of outer space, preserving it for peaceful activity and extensive international cooperation.

The Soviet Union counters the "star wars" plans with a programme of "star peace" in which all states of our planet can take part, it was stressed in the Soviet representative's statement. Each state would make its contribution to this programme and benefit from it.

The delegations of socialist countries draw the attention of conference participants to the fact that this long-term programme of concrete actions to strengthen peace and international cooperation accords with the vitally important interests of the whole of mankind and opens up prospects of large-scale and purposeful peaceful interaction of all countries and peoples. It imparts a new impulse to the struggle for such a solution of key problems of our time that is worthy of human civilisation and is the only correct one. And such a solution should be adopted without delay, with an understanding of responsibility and the acuteness of the moment experienced by the world.

The chairman of the special committee on the question of preventing an arms race in outer space, the representative of Egypt Sa'd al-Farargi noted in a conversation the big importance of the Soviet initiative, its non-confrontational nature. Many delegations at the committee expressed their conviction that the Soviet proposal will become a central issue in the work of the forthcoming anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly. A number of delegations of non-aligned countries, in particular India and Sri Lanka, declared in favour of creating a new international organisation on the peaceful uses of outer space and convening for this purpose a representative conference.

The new Soviet initiative is consonant with the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of states taking part in the Disarmament Conference that want concrete tangible actions for the good of peace and peaceful cooperation, and curbing the arms race.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET GENEVA CONFERENCE DELEGATE DENOUNCES SDI

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 15 Jul 85 pp 1-2

[TASS item: "No! to 'Star Wars' Plans!"]

[Text] Geneva, July 12 (TASS)--The Soviet Union, like the overwhelming majority of states, opposes the militarization of outer space. It considers that the implementation of the so-called "strategic defence initiative" (SDI) of the USA would have fatal consequences for mankind, including the United States. This statement was made by V.L. Israelyan, who leads the delegation of the USSR, at a plenary session of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

He said that the SDI was the only programme which proclaimed the intention to base a new type of weapons in outer space--i.e., space strike means, global weapons with qualitatively new tasks and parameters. The Soviet Union has got neither such programmes, nor an intention of this kind. The Soviet representative said that Mikhail Gorbachyov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, wrote most unambiguously in his reply to the Union of Concerned Scientists (an American voluntary organization) that "the Soviet Union will not be the first to step into space with weapons."

Effective steps must be urgently taken as a result of talks, both bilateral and multilateral, in order to stop the dangerous developments which involve a real threat of the arms race spreading into outer space. This is the goal of the draft working document on the prevention of the arms race in outer space, which has been tabled by a group of socialist countries, participants in the Geneva Conference. Its authors propose, among other things, to reach agreement on banning and eliminating a whole class of space strike means, including space-based satellite and missile killers.

Tabling the draft document, representative of the Mongolian People's Republic L. Bayart said that it reflects the socialist countries' sincere striving to protect outer space from the arms race, and use it for peaceful purposes alone, for the benefit of mankind.

(PRAVDA, July 13. In full)

CSO: 5200/1379

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ON 'INTER-RELATEDNESS' OF SPACE, OTHER GENEVA ISSUES

LD031124 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 3 Aug 85

[Political observer Aleksandr Druzhinin answers listeners' letters]

[Excerpts] In looking through the mail, I found myself paying attention to the very great interest being shown by our listeners in problems connected with halting the arms race. How are the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on nuclear and space armaments progressing? What obstacles are there in the way of reaching agreement? What are the prospects for these talks? This is being asked, for example, by Comrade Shcherbakov of Moscow. I would like to begin today's review of letter by replying to his question.

In brief, Comrade Shcherbakov, I would answer your question as follows. The main obstacle in the way of the Geneva talks is the obstructive position of the United States which has in essence been blocking the achievement of success in Geneva. How is this being expressed? Let me remind you that on 8 January this year after the meeting in Geneva between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state a joint Soviet-American statement was published which defined precisely the subject for the talks. The subject, the statement said, and I quote, will be a complex of issues concerning space and nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium-range, with all these issues being examined and resolved in their interrelationship.

The interrelated nature of the issues being discussed is a key condition. After all, judge for yourself, if one of the partners in the talks begins an extensive program for space militarization, this will lead to an upsetting of the strategic military equal balance, or what is termed the parity, between the participants in the talks. Then, understandably, efforts in other directions, that is efforts to reduce strategic offensive armaments and medium-range nuclear weapons, will be brought to nought. The interrelated nature of the problems will have then been disrupted and fruitful talks will become virtually impossible. However, this is precisely the line that the Washington administration has been embarking on. You are of course well aware that the United States is now pushing ahead with its program for the deployment in outer space of the latest

types of strike weaponry, which is called the Strategic Defense Initiative in official Washington circles, but which has been aptly dubbed by the American press as a Star Wars program. This program, of course, has nothing in common with defense. Its aim is to turn space into a sort of springboard for inflicting a first strike on other countries. Washington politicians and Pentagon generals see it as a means of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. The United States is planning to spend \$500 billion on implementing its program for militarizing outer space. It is precisely this program, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his Dnepropetrovsk speech, that is playing the part of a solid wall barring the way to the achievement of agreement in Geneva.

If Nikolay Fedorovoch Shelko from Moscow and Lev Semenovich Orlyayev from the village of Belogorka in Leningrad Oblast are listening to this broadcast, then obviously everything that I have said provides an answer too to their question about the results of the second round of talks in Geneva. The position adopted by the United States led to this round finishing without yielding any results.

What are the prospects for the Geneva talks and is it expedient for the Soviet Union to continue the dialogue in Geneva? This is the question asked by Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov from the village of Krivozerye in Penza Oblast. In my opinion, esteemed Yakov Tikhonovich, it is expedient to do so. In actual fact what is the alternative to these talks? It is clear that the alternative is a further uncontrolled and unrestrained nuclear armaments race. All means should be used to halt this race and to eliminate the military threat. This is the approach of the Soviet Union.

As for the prospects for the talks, the third round is due to begin in mid-September. But, if the American side is hoping that it will be able to protract these talks endlessly, while being engaged in effect in sabotaging them, this is a dangerous illusion. The Soviet Union simply cannot allow the talks to be used again only to divert attention and as a screen to cover up military preparations that are directed at securing military superiority for the United States and its policy aimed at world domination.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S CHERVOV DETAILS SOVIET VIEW OF SDI, RESPONSES

AU140949 Vienna Television Service in German 1810 GMT 13 Aug 85

[From "Foreign Reports" feature program, "exclusive interview" given by USSR Colonel General Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, "close adviser of CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev in the armament field" and chief of the arms office in the Soviet General Staff, to ORF Moscow correspondent Otto Hoermann; date and place of interview not specified; videotaped -- in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Chervov] To be sure, there are no offensive weapons in space at present, neither American nor Soviet ones. At present there is military-type equipment in space which carries out an auxiliary function and which is used in compliance with international law. They are satellites for communication, navigation, reconnaissance, early warning against missile attacks, and others. These satellites are not offensive weapons. Naturally they are being improved, and we are pursuing research in that direction. Our research is not pursuing any other aims. We are not building any offensive space weapons, in our country there are no "star wars" plans as exist in the United States.

[Hoermann] Does the Soviet Union reject any research regarding "star wars" or is there a point up to which such research could be tolerated?

[Chervov] The Soviet proposals for a ban on offensive space weapons are all-comprehensive.

At present there are no arms in space, space is the common property of mankind, and there should be no offensive weapons in space, nor should there be any military conflicts there. If we proceed from this premise, then there is no point in pursuing any research into offensive weapons. That is what we want. The ABM treaty bans the production of offensive space weapons, the establishment of a comprehensive antimissile defense with space-based elements. However, the United States is seeking to convince us, and to prove to us, that there is a fundamental difference between research and the production of such weapons. That is not true. Research is the decisive phase of any weapons development, including offensive space weapons. Almost 90 percent of the efforts and means go into research, and only 10 percent are used for control tests. That is why the U.S. attempt to split up the term production is nothing but an attempt to camouflage their activities, an attempt to enable them to produce offensive space weapons despite the ban on the production of such weapons.

The talk about research into space weapons in the United States is only a smokescreen. For all practical purposes, the United States is producing a banned weapon. If the Americans say that SDI could be fitted into the ABM treaty, then this is evidently not true.

[Hoermann] Would the USSR consent to U.S. inspection, to verify this research?

[Chervov] As you know, the United States and the USSR now have one land-based limited antimissile defense system each, in our country in the Moscow region, in the United States in the region of the Grand Forks missile base. These systems are permitted under the ABM treaty. All of these systems are becoming outdated. Of course, they need to be replaced and, in this respect there is research being done in our country. Our activities, that is, the activities of the United States and the USSR, in the field of antimissile defense are regulated by the ABM treaty, which also provides for a reliable and effective control system. There are various national technical means, the standing U.S.-Soviet Consultative Commission, and other means.

The ABM treaty has existed and been effective for 13 years now, without needing any inspection, least of all by the United States which has a whole series of means of national technical control, including those close to the Soviet borders.

[Hoermann] General Chervov, what will be the specific measures by which the Soviet Union will react in the event that no agreement is reached about space arms in Geneva?

[Chervov] The U.S. "star wars" concept, as the Americans themselves admit, is aimed at rendering the Soviet strategic nuclear potential ineffective and disarming it, while at the same time enabling them to threaten the Soviet Union without risk of retaliation. Former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara declared on 31 July before newsmen in Washington, and I quote, SDI is clearly aimed at guaranteeing for the United States inviolability after its own nuclear first strike.

You know that the USSR lost 20 million people in World War II. The USSR suffered enormous losses and has made tremendous efforts for the reconstruction of its national economy. After all this the Soviet Union is now to face a new threat unarmed? That will not happen. That will not be permitted by the Soviet people. If the American plans for "star wars" are further implemented, then the USSR will have no choice but to respond with measures of its own. These reply measures will primarily concern nuclear offensive weapons, as well as defensive weapons. Our reply measures will be sufficiently effective and will guarantee the security of the USSR and of the other socialist countries. They will be adequate to the U.S. threat.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS COMMENTATOR ON U.S. SPACE ARMS, TEST MORATORIUM

LD271735 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 27 Aug 85

[Text] During his current visit to Czechoslovakia, Yuriy Kornilov, leading commentator of the Soviet press agency TASS, was invited to be our guest.

Asked about the current state of Soviet-American relations, the subject with which he is primarily concerned, Comrade Kornilov replied as follows:

[Begin Kornilov recording in Russian fading into superimposed Czech translation] The Soviet Union and the United States are the two most powerful states in the world in the economic sense. They have colossal arsenals of modern nuclear weapons. They are members of the UN Security Council. Our view is that none of this gives either the Soviet Union or the United States any privileged rights. At the same time, however, we are convinced that this lays special responsibility on both our states for the fate of the world. Relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are exceptionally important for both sides, but they are also immensely important for the international situation as a whole. In January, Reagan predicted that the year 1985 would become the year of dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States. To some extent, this prediction gradually is being fulfilled, but only to a certain extent. The point is that today nations judge the policies of states and governments not according to their words but primarily according to their actions, and if we analyze Washington's political strategy it is difficult to rid ourselves of the impression that certain very influential circles in the United States are still concerned with seeking social and political reprisals; that it still seems to them that if just one more missile is acquired, if just one more launching pad in space is provided, if just one more peace initiative is blocked, if just one more terrorist action is carried out, then they will succeed in turning back the wheels of history. This approach, of course, cannot create good prospects for improving the development of Soviet-American relations, and this is regrettable. We must hope that sensible views and a sense of reality will, after all, gain the upper hand in American foreign policy. [end recording]

The next question concerned the reaction to and perspectives for the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. Here is commentator Yuriy Kornilov's reply:

[Begin Kornilov recording in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] The reaction to this Soviet initiative is represented by, and I don't think I am exaggerating, thousands and thousands of pages in newspapers and magazines, and thousands of kilometers of teletype. The reaction is varied depending on which forces are behind one or the other press organ or media form that is commenting. But if we were to single out the important thing from this enormous mass of reaction, we can say that the Soviet initiative was rightly received by the whole world as a very important, positive, timely step on the path toward putting the brakes on the arms race.

At a time when Washington strategists are making every attempt to avert the pressure of demands for an acceptance of the idea of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, Washington's ruling circles make it clear how much value one can give to their proclamations of their peace-loving nature. Not long ago, under pressure from the White House and the rulers of the arms industry, Congress approved the 1986 military budget, which exceeded \$3 billion, which is a record figure in the country's history.

Another step is also proof of the true nature of American policy. A few days ago the American President signed the law 960, which sets out the dimensions of American military economic aid to other states for fiscal 1986 and 1987, and these amounts to nearly \$26 million. These are the realities of American policy. They themselves clarify the causes of why the Americans rejected a moratorium on nuclear tests. All this is seen on one level and according to one line, the foundation of which is betting on being the winner. [end recording]

We have acquainted you with the replies of a chief commentator of the Soviet press agency TASS, Yuriy Kornilov, to questions put by our editor.

CSO: 5200/1378

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET JOURNAL EDITOR ON SUMMIT, SDI, TEST MORATORIUM

LD240700 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2015 GMT 23 Aug 85

[From the "Fifteen Minutes of Foreign Politics" program on the Soviet-American summit to be held in November; with Valentin Berezhev, Editor-in-chief of the Soviet Journal, USA, and Gabor Bankuti]

[Excerpt] [Bankuti] A year ago hardly anyone would have regarded a Soviet-American summit meeting possible within such a short time. I imagine you would not have considered it likely either.

[Berezhev in Russian with superimposed translation] You are quite right. At that time, the situation was rather complicated, although it must be said that so far there has hardly been any significant change in the relations between the two countries. The whole of Soviet-American relations continue at a very low level and the international situation is not very much better than last year either. Nonetheless, if I consider what made the summit possible, I must say that the new Soviet initiatives -- which have been, so to speak, more attacking, more decisive in recent times, particularly since the election of Gorbachev -- have played an important role. This made the position of those American circles which do not want any sort of agreement with the Soviet Union more difficult. However, many other factors have also played a part.

[Bankuti] For example?

[Berezhev] For example, relations between the United States and its allies. As it began to become clear how dangerous the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative is, the concern felt in West Europe and Japan increased over the direction of the arms race and what sort of situation this could bring about in Europe. This was particularly so in the wake of ideas which were voiced by Reagan and the people around him about the possibility of local wars which would not be fought by the world powers on a world scale but, in Reagan's words, would be limited to Europe.

The Europeans are worried by all this and while the present governments in West Europe . . . trying to keep in step with Reagan, public opinion exerts a great deal of pressure on them.

[Bankuti] Forgive me for interrupting you, but is it that they are trying to keep in step with Reagan or are they obliged to do so? After all, if they disassociate themselves entirely from American policies, for example as regards space weapon research, they could find themselves lagging behind in technological development and they would not receive any orders.

[Berezhkov] Are you thinking of the new technology? Yes, on the one hand, they are attracted by it and, on the other, they cannot ignore it in their considerations. That is why the French proposal regarding the creation of an independent shield against missiles and the Eureka system have evoked so much interest in Europe. However, the question here is whether what is involved is general technological development or an endeavor to create a situation in which the United States could inflict a first strike on the socialist countries without being punished for it. This, of course, is an entirely different matter, even if some of the new technology is perhaps utilized in the interest of general technical and scientific progress. This is so because it would bring Europe, in particular, into a dangerous situation. Because, despite all high sounding statements, what is involved is an endeavor to make the United States invincible.

But what about the rest of the world? It would continue to be at risk, even if the plan were to be successful.

The other aspect of the matter is that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will under no circumstances permit the United States to gain military superiority over them and will do everything to maintain the equilibrium. This is their firm stand. It makes the American ideas hopeless. Thus, they can only increase the arms race without creating the kind of situation which certain American circles dream about.

[Bankuti] In your opinion, does the fact that a summit will be held in November, despite all this, mean that there has been some sort of change in the American policy and, as you seem to be hinting, in the Soviet approach as well?

[Berezhkov] I can only talk about this as an observer, as an outsider who has been studying America and Soviet-American relations for a long time, but who is a long way away from the processes of political decision-making. Looking at the situation, my impression is that it was a very sensible step not only to agree on the possibility of holding a summit but to publish the date as well, namely 19 and 20 November. Experience so far shows that when the specialists have a long and unspecified length of time for the preparation of similar meetings, particularly when the pressure exerted by those in the United States opposing the meeting is so great, it can take months and years, almost infinity, to hold talks, and without results.

What does it mean that the meeting has to be prepared? It can be prepared for 2 months or for 2 years and problems will always arise indicating that the preparations are still not quite complete. So, in this instance, very sensibly a dateline was set for the specialists and for the diplomats; by a certain date the preparatory work must be completed. This does not mean any superficiality. The preparatory work will be done in a serious manner.

It is already apparent that there are several versions concerning the agenda. Naturally, the details will gain shape in the future. What is, however, certain is that the American participants find it difficult to evade solutions: after all, the date is a fact which has already been decided.

Why have the Americans agreed to this? In my opinion, on the one hand because there is a great deal of pressure inside the country, many people are concerned by the policies pursued by Reagan. Most recently, I could even say in recent years, we have found that almost no one says that America could win or survive a nuclear war. Nothing is being said anymore about the losses which the United States could afford; yet not so long ago they spoke about the United States being able to lose 20 or perhaps 40 million people, while still preserving an organized society. These were shocking, cannibalistic statements. It raised the issue about why so many Americans would have to be sacrificed. It appeared impossible that this should follow from the order of the world; that it should be impossible to come to an agreement without the death of 40 million Americans and tens of millions of other people or even perhaps the destruction of the entire world. The social pressure was great and the American leadership had to change its tone.

However, there are other factors as well. Many well-known American personalities from the world of science, journalism, and politics, whom I met recently, said that some of the people around Reagan, and even Reagan himself, had probably reexamined and modified to some extent their positions. Naturally, one can never exclude the possibility that this is just a matter of tactics. There are, however, those who believe that during his first term as President, Reagan succeeded in giving Americans the impression that he had once again made America strong. Not that much had changed in reality; they are only working on plans and the arms race is going on. Nonetheless, there is an impression that Reagan has done something, that he made America strong. The feeling of patriotism, nationalism has increased; the evaluation of the Vietnam War has changed in a fairly wide sphere.

In other words, as they say, America has regained its self-confidence. Since Reagan was able to achieve this during his first term, largely with the help of the propaganda machine, we think that in the second term as president he would like to win the glory of peacemaker. He would like to be regarded in the world as the one who has achieved a peaceful settlement of relations.

What follows from this? First of all, he has to improve relations with the Soviet Union because it is only when this is done that people will feel that they can live more peacefully, that relations will be settled, that he is not preparing for another crusade against socialism, and that we can live together in peace; as, by the way, the Soviet Union and its allies profess.

There are two alternatives. One of these is a clash, fighting -- in the final analysis the destruction of each other; the other is a search for a peaceful solution, advantageous cooperation, understanding, and competition between the two systems. If it is true what many people are saying, that Reagan would like to go into history as the embodiment of peace, it is understandable why, despite pressure from the extremists, the American leadership has agreed to the meeting. At the same time, the negative reception given to the Soviet moratorium on experimental nuclear explosions shows that those who wish to carry on with rearmament, who want to perfect the weapons systems are still strong. They want to carry on with the underground tests because, in part, these are connected with the development of the new weapons systems.

Public opinion, on the other hand, has welcomed the Soviet moratorium everywhere, in America as well. At any rate, as Gorbachev has also stated, putting a stop to the explosions could be one of the topics of the summit. This is even more possible since essentially we have agreed, what is more, with the present administration. We reached agreement on the method of carrying out checks in 1982, including both national and international controls. We agreed to on-site inspection, which had always been a contentious issue. We made a concession. From the technical aspect, all of the preparations have been carried out, all that is needed is a political decision. If such a decision comes about, this will be a very important achievement from the point of view of the improvement of relations.

[Bankuti] I think the Soviet approach has also changed. After all, earlier they said there could be a summit meeting only if its success was assured.

[Berezhkov] I think the formulation was a little different. It was: "If the meeting is well prepared." How could one secure success in advance? The meeting of the number one political leaders makes it possible at times for a final decision to be reached precisely there, on the spot. This is why the phenomenon to which I have called attention is interesting. The meeting is being prepared on this occasion as well, but the fact that the date for it has already been published is a very brave decision. In this instance, the United States has also supported it. This puts pressure on the specialists to complete their work on time. We have always endeavored to settle our relations with the United States. In recent times, as is apparent from Gorbachev's statements, we have emphasized this with new initiatives, whereby we want to achieve something concrete that could be a step toward the further improvement of relations.

It is also part of this that we can and do discuss a whole series of lesser issues, such as, for example, revival of the cultural agreement which was suspended by the Americans, resumption of Aeroflot flights, which were banned, the opening of new consulates, and so on. These are, naturally, marginal issues. They are not the important questions. However, their solution creates a better atmosphere. Naturally, the most important issue is the curbing of the arms race, the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war.

For that a political decision is required. What must be decided is the future direction of our relations: confrontation or mutually acceptable agreement.

CSO: 5200/1383

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

POLISH COMMENTARY ON SDI FROM DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

Bush Tours West Europe to Tout SDI

Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 6-7 Jul 85 p 7

[PAP dispatch from London: "Bush West European Mission Completed: Europeans Dislike the Star Wars Project"]

[Text] US Vice-President George Bush has completed his tour of seven West European countries; its main goal was to get the NATO allies support for their broad participation in implementing the American "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI)--as Washington calls the "Star Wars"--as the West's best hope for total elimination of the nuclear war threat.

The conception, however, does not assume agreement on limitation and elimination of nuclear weapons, nor prevention of the militarization of space, but deployment of anti-missile "space shield" simultaneously with construction of new weapon systems, including aggressive space systems. That is indeed the gist of Washington's efforts to impose SDI, both in the US and in West Europe. But most of the West Europeans realize that they would not be admitted to the construction of the essential elements of the new weapon systems, both those based on ground and in space. US leaders try only to gain access to the most modern scientific accomplishments in West Europe.

There are numerous indications that Bush has not succeeded in his role as proponent of the "Star Wars" program. According to the London DAILY TELEGRAPH, the US vice-president has not managed to eradicate the "wholly natural scepticism" toward the "Star Wars" in West Europe. Such scepticism assumes various forms and actions.

Finally, the sober-minded statesmen and scientists realize the total nonsense of the present US administration's plans to achieve military superiority over the USSR. Former US defense secretary, Robert McNamara, and physics professor at the Cornell University, Nobel Prize laureate, Hans Bethe, quoting views of numerous American experts, stated in the ATLANTIC MONTHLY that all the technological initiatives in the field of nuclear arms race have originated in the US; their effect was to undermine gradually the US security, since the Soviet Union had neutralized all the US attempts and had created its own deterrence potential. "There are no reasons to believe that space weapons could be an exception," the authors claim.

SDI Hit at SIPRI Conference

Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 6-7 Jul 85 p 7

[PAP dispatch from Stockholm by Tomasz Walat: "International SIPRI Conference"]

[Text] "Space Weapons and International Security"--was the subject of an international conference opened on 5 July in Saltsjoebaden resort near Stockholm. The conference, organized by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, is attended by statesmen, scientists, and civic activists from 15 countries, including the USSR and USA.

Ralf Bjoernerstedt, president of the SIPRI Council, pointed out that the militarization of space escalates the armaments spiral. That is why one of the goals of the present conference should be to search for effective measures to halt this dangerous process.

Minister of Energetics Brigitta Dahl, speaking on behalf of the Swedish government, presented the well known position of her country, shared by all the political parties: the American "Star Wars" program amounts to an enormous threat to peace.

Frank Gaffney, advisor to the US Defense Secretary, attempted to defend the American efforts, pointing to the allegedly defensive character of the SDI project. Yevgehii Velikhov, vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, replied, stating inter alia that in this way the United States aim to achieve the nuclear first-strike capability.

'Backstairs' Deal on SDI Collaboration

Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 13-14 Jul 85 pp 1, 7

[Dispatch by the Bonn correspondent, Ryszard Drecki: "'Backstairs' to SDI: A Nazi General as Consultant at FRG Exercises"]

[Text] A. Dregger, leader of the CDU/CSU parliamentary faction, launched a new appeal for FRG participation in the American "Star Wars" program.

In an article published by AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE, the spokesman of the Christian-Democrat right wing described the Reaganite plans for the militarization of space as "politically necessary and morally justified," claiming that "Europe should not exclude itself" /as well known, enthusiastic promoters of FRG participation in SDI hide behind the screen of "common West European interests"/.

Simultaneously with the Dregger pronouncement, W. Schuble, chief of the Chancellor's Office, hinted that FRG would not participate in the American project "on a state basis." The explanation of this striking formula can be found in his claim that the Bonn government will "only" attempt to reach with the US "an outline agreement on safeguarding cooperation between American and West German private corporations" in the SDI implementation. This would provide a solution which reminds of reaching the target through the proverbial backstairs.

A peculiar point concerning the military collaboration between Bonn and Washington was raised recently by a TV magazine MONITOR: it revealed that at a Rhine-Palatinate military range American commands had carried out exercises and training based on "Land-Air Battle" guidelines. The codename alludes to one-time famous American guidelines for carrying out combat operations of an openly aggressive character. According to the above mentioned TV program, the military exercises at the Rhine range used the "experience" of the Nazi Wehrmacht aggression against the USSR, and among the West German advisors there was a former general of the Nazi armored troops, von Mellenthin.

12485

CSO: 5200/3077

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

PRAVDA: U.S. TO DEPLOY ASAT WEAPONS AT BASE IN JAPAN--Tokyo, 28 Jul -- The Pentagon is preparing to deploy space weapons on the Japanese islands. The newspaper AKAHATA reports today that the F-15 fighters stationed at the American Kadena Air Base on Okinawa will be equipped with antisatellite missiles of the ASAT system. Some 72 F-15's are based at Kadena. In the very near future these aircraft will start to be reequipped with the latest electronic equipment needed to launch these missiles, which has already been delivered to Kadena. AKAHATA emphasizes that antisatellite missiles are a constituent element of Washington's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." The plan to deploy space weapons on Japanese territory attests that the Reagan administration intends to include Japan in the orbit of the aggressive "star wars" strategy. [TASS Report: "Including Japan"] [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 85 First Edition p 5 PM]

CSO: 5200/1378

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

POLES RATE U.S. LEADERS, IMPACT ON REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

Warsaw FAKTY I KOMENTARZE in Polish No 28, 14 Jul 85 pp 14-15

[Article by D. R.: "Who Makes U.S. Foreign and Defense Policies"]

[Excerpts] In connection with the expected November meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, the secretary-general of the CPSU Central Committee, and US President Ronald Reagan, the attention of the world public opinion is focused on people who side by side with Ronald Reagan shape the foundations for American policies. It is an exceptionally meticulously selected team, well known for its reactionary views and anti-Communism. Let us then look at them more closely.

--The post of Ronald Reagan's National Security Advisor is held by Robert McFarlane. The former Marine at the time of the US aggression against Vietnam, and cadres officer of the CIA, he started to "make waves" in 1985. The US president sent him then to the Middle East to look for a way to reduce tensions in that part of the world.

McFarlane found just one way: to increase the US military presence in the Middle East. Soon after, he became known as an advocate of the ruthless growth of MX ICBM production, and later as a promoter of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," or "Star Wars."

Although he holds no ministerial rank, McFarlane--according to American media--has more influence over President Reagan's foreign and defense policies than Secretary of State George Shultz, or Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger. Spectacular evidence is provided by the fact that the President's regular weekly meetings with McFarlane usually last for 4 hours, much longer than the President's meetings with either Shultz or Weinberger. Another proof: McFarlane signs many documents on various matters as "McFarlane on behalf of the President," without have to clear it with Reagan beforehand.

--George Shultz, the US secretary of state, having taken over from Gen Alexander Haig, is the man who had laid the foundations for the Reaganite American policy. As American media point out, if Shultz was quick to find common language with McFarlane and "agrees with him at least 85 percent," he considers Weinberger, the secretary of defense, as his rival in fight for influence in the White House.

The Shultz-Weinberger rivalry has lasted for nearly 20 years. As far back as 1967, Ronald Reagan, as governor of the state of California/the seat of headoffices and of a considerable number of plants owned by major American armament corporations/, appointed both Shultz and Weinberger to the state administration and budgetary commission. Earlier both of them had managed the Bachtaj /sic/ Corporation, a construction firm specialized in military engineering. In both cases Shultz was Weinberger's superior.

When friend Reagan brought both of them into his administration, they did not stop competing. The point is, however, that theirs is a rivalry directed toward the same goal. The Secretary of State aims at achieving US world domination through policy of strength. The Secretary of Defense aims at the same goal by stepping up the arms race and using US military power to blackmail the world.

Despite their formal rivalry, Shultz as well as Weinberger advocate the use of armed forces as a political argument. In February 1984, when Shultz was out of the country, Washington decided to withdraw the US Marines from Lebanon; Shultz immediately called to convince the advocates of withdrawal to change their mind. It was Shultz who provided the rationale for the Grenada invasion, and at present he advocates more pressure on Nicaragua, including the use of armed forces.

--Caspar Weinberger, the US secretary of defense, has identified himself unconditionally with Reagan's post-war policy. "The President," he claims, "knows what he is doing. Without the slightest hesitation he follows once traced course. I like it fine." When asked to name people he considers his ideal models, Weinberger replies unhesitatingly: Winston Churchill and Ronald Reagan!

In Weinberger's case his loyalty toward Reagan is no blind obedience. Weinberger simply professes the same ideology Reagan does, and implements it in the same way. This could be demonstrated by the outlay of over one thousand million dollars, already spent during Reagan's term for the arms race on land and at sea, in the air and in space.

Weinberger replies to the charges that he is a "typical protector of the armament industries" by an argument: "Opinions I profess are opinions I sincerely believe in." No one who knows Weinberger has any doubts that he means above all achieving US superiority over the USSR.

--William Casey, the CIA director, is the first head of the US intelligence agency to achieve the rank of a cabinet member. His role in formulating and implementing US policies can best be gauged by the fact that President Reagan receives him at least twice weekly, not mentioning frequent ad hoc phone calls.

Casey, more than any one of his predecessors, uses the CIA for frequent covert operations carried out in countries regarded by Washington as a threat to the US. He acts, without asking for Congressional approval. After all, he regards the Congress as a "bunch of yes-men, who always interfere in somebody else's business."

12485

CSO: 5200/3078

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

USSR'S ISRAELYAN SUMS UP SUMMER SESSION

LD301531 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] Geneva, August 30 TASS -- The summer session of the Disarmament Conference ended in the Geneva Palace of Nations today. Summing up the results of its work, the head of the Soviet delegation Viktor Israelyan said in his speech that while the Soviet Union and socialist countries jointly with nonaligned states have been pursuing persistently the line at achieving concrete results, the United States and its allies had been exerting efforts in the opposite direction. He said that as a result of vigorous actions of the socialist countries the conference started considering this year one of the most topical questions of the present, that of prevention of the arms race in outer space.

The participants in the conference received with much interest the new initiative of the Soviet Union which came out with the proposal to put on the agenda of the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly the question "On International Cooperation in Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in the Conditions of its Non-Militarisation." Many delegations pointed to the consistency and persistence of the Soviet Union's efforts on the question of preventing an arms race in space and noted that the implementation of the Soviet programme of "star peace" opens broad prospects for cooperation of states in the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space to the benefit of all countries and peoples of the earth.

The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions since August 6, 1985, could give a new impetus to the talks in the framework of a conference on comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons. But the stand of Western countries, above all the United States and the proclaimed intention of the U.S. Administration to continue nuclear tests impeded progress in this matter.

The talks on the ban on chemical weapons were intensified somewhat this year. The progress at the talks could have been even more telling, if it were not for the decision of the U.S. Administration to start the production of binary chemical weapons.

The Soviet representative said that the Soviet Union, true to its Leninist foreign policy, will continue a resolute struggle for the limitation of arms race and for disarmament, using in these purposes also the possibilities of the disarmament conference.

The results of the work of the conference are expressed in its report which will be submitted to a regular session of the United Nations General Assembly. On the proposal of a wide range of states it includes, specifically, the provisions which welcome the Soviet Union's decision to impose a moratorium on any nuclear explosions and expresses the conviction that if the United States should adopt such a decision, too, this would be a very useful step. The report expresses concern over continued U.S. statements that a nuclear test ban is only a "long-term aim" of the USA. The report also expresses much anxiety over information that the USA intends to almost double the volume of its nuclear armaments by the late 80s. The report of the conference also rejects resolutely the doctrines of nuclear deterrence that increases the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war.

CSO: 5200/1385

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS ATTACKS U.S. 'CHEMICAL REARMAMENT' PROGRAM

LD021514 Moscow TASS in English 1436 GMT 2 Sep 85

[Text] They in Washington are fond of talking about the striving for peace, about the reduction and limitation of armaments, etc. They like to talk about these topics, but are not eager to act in this direction. Moreover, any practical step undertaken by the Soviet Union, showing a policy of genuine peacefulness and inviting Washington to follow the good example, are dismissed offhand as "propaganda". The Soviet Union halted nuclear explosions -- the United States hastily conducted a nuclear blast, the USSR advanced a proposal on peaceful outer space -- Washington responded by the decision to conduct the first field-testing of an anti-satellite weapon.

The U.S. Administration is implementing its large-scale programme of rearming America at a high pace, stepping up work on developing space strike weapons. Besides, one more dangerous step will be made shortly -- a step down the road of "chemical rearmament" of the United States, its preparations for chemical warfare. Preparations for starting the production of a new barbaric kind of chemical weapons -- nerve binary munitions -- are nearing completion. The House-Senate Conference Committee gave the green light to the new generation of chemical weapons. This month, U.S. Congress will hold a final vote on the issue.

The U.S. Administration is no longer satisfied with the 150,000 tons of toxic chemicals -- the filling of three million tons of artillery chemical shells, several thousand airbombs, hundreds of thousands of chemical mines. These amounts, as disclosed at U.S. Congress, are sufficient for fifty divisions to wage a chemical war for 100 days, that would probably rid Europe of all living things.

The "chemical rearmament" programme provides, in particular, for an increase of artillery chemical shells up to five million units. It is planned to master the methods of using new types of chemical weapons and build more storage facilities outside the United States. Conveyors of a new plant in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, may annually churn out more than 700,000 artillery shells and airbombs -- the carriers of "binary death,"

All this cannot but worry the Western European allies of the United States, with their territories housing immense stockpiles of chemical weapons. Four large bases in West Germany alone contains more than 10,000 tons of chemical munitions. Binary weapons are also to be deployed in Western Europe. According to General Bernard Rogers, supreme allied commander Europe, binary weapons along with nuclear arms are planned to be used at the early stages of hostilities precisely in the European Continent.

The U.S. leadership, in a bid to "calm down" the American public, declares that binary weapon production is relatively safe since its components are not so much toxic as the end product. What is meant is to "safeguard" American territory from possible chemical contamination in accidents. The processes of filling shells, their transportation to army depots, storage and deployment in combat positions are extremely dangerous, however. Precisely these stages, as conceived by Washington, should be conducted on the territories of the U.S. allies -- above all Western European states. Even in peacetime, they are assigned the part of likely victims of accidental chemical exposure. It goes without saying that they become Pentagon hostages not only in a nuclear war, but also in a war with the use of chemical weapons.

It is surprising that the governments of some Western European NATO member states, above all West German, play down Washington's new step towards chemical warfare preparations. The aspiration to evade making a single concrete statement on the imminent U.S. decision that directly affects the interests of Western European states is clearly defined by the general public as irresponsible policy.

CSO: 5200/1381

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR'S FALIN ON U.S. CHEMICAL WEAPONS PROGRAM

Valentin Falin Commentary

PM291338 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion": "'Safe' Weapons and Dangerous Concepts"]

[Text] Intense discussion is under way on both sides of the ocean these days. The United States is soon going to begin production of two types of new generation chemical weapons -- "Big Eye" bombs, designed to turn entire regions into lifeless deserts for a long time, and GB gas, which evaporates rapidly after hitting the target and should not prevent the side using it from conducting offensive operations. Artillery shells have begun to be filled with GB gas and will, initially, be located without warheads but with the launchers in regions of potential use.

The Reagan administration made the decision to brew even more poison on the basis of updated U.S. ideas about security and ways to achieve it. The NATO members were left to show allied solidarity with Washington. Following tradition, the FRG Government applauded louder than the rest and, without taking the trouble to collect and analyze the facts and more zealously than many others, placed the blame for beginning yet another round of the arms race, in the toxic agents sphere, on the socialist countries.

To be blunt, Defense Minister M. Woerner and his colleagues in the ruling coalition were not particularly successful in this venture. It does not console the West Germans that binary chemical weapons are "safer" to produce and use. They cannot fail to see the Americans are manufacturing these toxic agents in their own country but are planning to use them in other countries and even on other continents with all the ensuing dangers. Here again, there were talkative Pentagon specialists who, when trying to persuade the senators and congressmen to release the required appropriations for setting the production lines of death in motion, announced that the ideal place for the "noiseless, colorless, odorless weapon" is Europe and that it was intended precisely for that theater of operations.

But not for all of Europe. The Americans' main arsenals are located in the FRG. Enough VX war gas alone has been shipped there to annihilate the population of the entire planet. Now please welcome these instruments of aggression, endowed, according to their creators, with an unsurpassed strike capability -- if the wind is in the right direction.

When the truth is harmful, a useful lie will do. In accordance with this rule firmly mastered by "democrats," the powers that be on the Rhine immediately put several soothing versions into circulation. Binary weapons will not be shipped from America to Europe "for the time being." M. Berger, the Christian Democratic Union [CDU] military expert, even expressed the view that these weapons "could also be used from the American Continent." Thus the "need to deploy them in the FRG near the front line" does not arise.

A. Dregger, chairman of the CDU/Christian Social Union Bundestag faction, went further. He attributed to U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger words which the latter claims he did not say. According to Dregger, the U.S. plans are to clear the FRG dumps of "obsolete and partially corroded poison gas grenades just as soon as the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate approve the production of the new chemical weapons." Consequently, binary toxic agents will be delivered to the FRG not in addition to those already there, but in their place and then "only in the event of a crisis."

C. Weinberger "painstakingly" corrected A. Dregger: He had given no such "simple promise." What then? Neither the former nor the latter, apparently -- neither that the United States would remove the old chemical munitions nor that it would bide its time before beginning to transship the new munitions.

FRG Government spokesman F. Ost, trying to extricate himself from an ambiguous situation, obscured matters even further. "The deployment question," he said, is not for Bonn to face since it will be discussed "within the framework of the alliance." C. Weinberger can be satisfied: They are playing into his hands. F. Ost has confirmed that it is not within the West Germans' competence to ban the deployment of the new weapons. Well, what about removing the old ones? F. Ost found an elegant way out: The FRG Government would be very grateful if the United States would give the promise which it seemed to A. Dregger it had already given.

Bonn officials alternate "fresh" arguments with the standard reasoning that in conniving with bellicose Americans they are guided by tasks of "deterrence," that toxic agents may be used only "in response to chemical attack," and that the decision on this matter will be taken with the FRG's knowledge. "With its knowledge" clearly means that Bonn will be told about Washington's decision to act. Again let us cite F. Ost, who explained that the "federal government cannot and does not intend interfering in any way" in the disputes occurring in the United States over binary weapons. Nevertheless, the disputes are not limited to production, but are focusing increasingly clearly on the essential matter -- what to do with the barbarous weapons when they are produced.

Propaganda must be set in motion. And the public must be made to forget certain basic facts. They may be summarized as follows.

All of America's postwar strategic plans have included the use not only of nuclear but also of chemical, radiological, and biological weapons and, furthermore, used not "in response" but first. The principle of the pre-emptive use of all types and systems of armaments has not been renounced to this day. I shall quote Ms Hoeber, who is in charge at the Pentagon regarding questions of preparations for chemical and bacteriological warfare. The administration, she stated, "cannot rely on arms control" including control of chemical weapons; "the United States must constantly threaten the Soviet Union" in that sphere and view chemical warfare as a "component of any conflict."

The use of chemical weapons was envisaged by the "Air/Land Battle-2000" doctrine recently adopted by the U.S. Armed Forces and also by the so-called "Rogers plan."

The United States has rejected and continues to reject its partners' demands to determine what weapons the Americans may or may not keep at the foreign bases allocated to them. The United States seeks advice and consent in such matters less from the West Germans and Japanese than from the others because the bases in those two countries have, as it were, a dual status -- to the public they present an allied facade but for serious matters retain their foundation of occupation.

One last thing. As R. Reagan has repeatedly stressed, the United States is stationed in Europe and Japan primarily for its own sake. Accordingly, the procedure for using the U.S. forces stationed there is to be determined primarily by U.S. needs, correspond to its tactics and strategy, and be subordinated to priorities formulated by Washington. Those who accept U.S. "defensive" protection are obliged to follow the "leader."

If the President is so categorical his defense secretary will scarcely "promise" anything or want to tie the U.S. military's hands in any way. C. Weinberger did not promise A. Dregger any peaceful dreams. As a former lawyer he is simply a master of the "ambiguous" phrase which has a pleasing sound to those who want to be deceived and deceives the rest without undue mental anguish.

U.S. Policy 'Dangerous'

LD291434 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 29 Aug 85

[Excerpts] The American news media report the Pentagon intends to bend every effort to get more funds for a chemical weapons buildup. Radio Moscow's Aleksandr Pogodin comments:

Preparation for chemical warfare is one of the main trends in the activities of the United States military industrial complex. Experts say there are more than 3 million chemical artillery shells alone at the disposal of the United States Armed Forces. The existing stockpiles are sufficient to destroy everything living on earth several times over and this threat would grow notably if a new generation of chemical weapons, the binary, was adopted. To conceal the truth, the U.S. news-media harp on certain purely tactical aims of chemical weapons and a certain limited chemical warfare. They are trying to persuade the people that chemical warfare is nothing to be afraid of because only troops in the theater of operations will be involved. But it is downright falsehood. Commander of NATO's Armed Forces in Europe, General Bernard Rogers has noted in a recent interview that the influence of chemical weapons on the civilian population is in no way more controllable than that of nuclear weapons. In other words these two types of mass annihilation weapons differ little in the degree of danger.

It is significant that the United States intends to wage chemical war not on its territory, but in other countries including its military allies. Can the threat of chemical war be forestalled? Well, for years the Soviet Union has been pressing to remove this threat. Anyone can see that the prospect for outlawing chemical weapons and scrapping the existing stockpiles conflicts with the military and political course steered by the administration in Washington. The move being made by the United States towards another stage of the race in chemical weapons is fresh proof that this policy is dangerous indeed.

CSO: 5200/1381

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW: U.S. CHEMICAL WARFARE PREPARATIONS OBSTRUCT BAN

Yuriy Soltan Commentary

LD242042 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 24 Aug 85

[Excerpts] Agreement has been reached in the United States Congress on the allocation of \$155 million in the next fiscal year to develop new kinds of chemical weapons. Commentary is by our observer Yuriy Solton, and this is what he writes:

First of all this envisages the manufacture of binary weapons. This is a new, highly toxic substance to paralyze the nerves and which affects humans at once. A small amount of that chemical is quite enough to achieve a devastating effect on vast densely populated areas. Construction has been completed in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, of a production facility that will manufacture 70,000 chemical shells, mainly binary, every month. Yet the chemical arsenals already stockpiled in the United States are tremendous as it is.

Scientists have estimated that the United States has already stockpiled a quantity of chemical weapons sufficient to kill humanity several times over, but the Pentagon thinks that that is too little. In 1983 a 5-year program for chemically rearming America was put into action. And to implement this in full it's planned to spend more than \$10 billion. So, as one can see, this program is being meticulously carried out.

Now, where does the United States intend to apply the chemical weapons -- after all, the United States doesn't intend to contaminate its own territory and poison the Americans? The men in the Pentagon, U.S. newspapers point out, bank on using chemical weapons in Europe, in the Middle East and in other areas far removed from the territory of the United States. Chemical weapons can practically appear and be applied wherever there are U.S. military bases or American aircraft carriers are cruising.

And the United States is itself getting ready for chemical warfare. The U.S. Armed Forces are now the scene of a restructuring and strengthening of the military chemical services, and special training schools are being set up. Methods for waging chemical warfare were worked out by the Americans at their latest military maneuvers in Federal Germany, South Korea and in the South Atlantic.

The threat of chemical warfare is becoming ever more real. The United Nations has time and again urged ending the manufacture of chemical weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles. A persistent struggle for banning chemical weapons is being waged by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

But the United States is evading all these appeals and proposals. The draft agreement the United States tabled before the disarmament committee in Geneva is actually aimed at preventing agreement on the banning of chemical weapons.

That draft has the character of an ultimatum envisaging the inspection of chemical enterprises in the socialist countries and forbidding such an inspection of the privately owned plants in the United States, where most of America's chemical weapons are being manufactured.

By putting up obstacles to prevent reaching an agreement on a total ban of chemical weapons, and by stepping up their production, the United States is assuming responsibility for a new and dangerous round in the arms race, in the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction that threaten mankind with what could be described as silent death.

U.S. Navy Tactics Criticized

PM131541 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

[Captain Second Rank A. Kieselev "Military-Technical Review": "Chemical War at Sea. Another Adventurist Pentagon Design"]

[Text] It follows from press reports that the U.S. legislative organs have, in practice, already adopted a decision to allocate funds for the production of a new variety of chemical ammunition, binary ammunition. With this action, one more step has been taken on the path of chemical rearmament which is part of the large-scale program designed to ensure U.S. and NATO military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries.

Commenting on the Senate debate on the question of allocating the necessary appropriations for the production of binary weapons, the NEW SCIENTIST magazine points out that it was accompanied by the Reagan administration's insinuations about the so-called "Soviet chemical threat." Commentators admit, the magazine emphasizes, that if Congress supports the Pentagon strategists, this will be the start of the mightiest chemical rearmament in the West.

The American program of so-called "chemical modernization" embraces all branches of the U.S. Armed Forces, including the Navy. As the Western press testifies, the Pentagon is seeking to equip with chemical weapons not only warships, but also the transport ships used to deliver military freight to overseas theaters of military operations.

The foreign press does not conceal the fact that the U.S. Navy possesses a wide range of means for waging chemical war. The large number of arsenals, military chemical enterprises, test and scientific research centers, proving grounds, and stores located both in the continental part of the United States and outside it, make it possible to supply warships with the most modern toxins.

Foreign commentators emphasize that American specialists have long been cherishing the idea of using chemical weapons in sea operations. However, for a number of reasons, it has long been impossible to realize it.

The foreign press points out that new opportunities appeared in the late fifties and early sixties, when highly toxic nerve poisons emerged. It was precisely then that the American military began actively resolving questions on the use of this kind of mass destruction weapon not only on dry land but also at sea.

The creation of binary toxins was the next major step on the path of enlarging chemical arsenals, including those for use at sea. The action of binary toxins is based on the use of two (hence the term "binary") nontoxic or low toxic components which are capable of a chemical reaction resulting in the formation of a combat toxin of the sarin or VX type.

These components are housed separately in the ammunition and are mixed only during the flight to the target.

According to the views of U.S. naval experts, an important advantage of chemical weapons is the possibility of inflicting considerable casualties on enemy naval manpower with the help of means which "are silent, have no smell, taste, or color, and are hardly liable to be detected quickly either by the organs of sense or with the help of instruments." According to their calculations, the atmosphere over water remains contaminated longer than over dry land.

Foreign specialists point out that chemicals possess a wide range of harmful effects. The use of some of them leads to a rapid fatal outcome, while others put enemy personnel out of action only temporarily. And they go on to draw this conclusion: Toxins will make it possible to achieve greater casualties in comparison to conventional weapons.

Cherishing their designs, the Pentagon strategists cynically claim that the use of chemical weapons at sea is preferable when it is necessary to make an immediate strike on a lone ship or group of ships and also on a specific onshore target with an area of up to 1.5 square kilometers. They believe that the greatest effect from combat use against sea targets could be achieved if the personnel of enemy ships subjected to an attack do not know that they are in a contaminated atmosphere until the first signs of poisoning appear on the personnel.

Commenting on this idea, foreign commentators point out that the U.S. Navy's guiding documents recommend the covert use of chemical weapons. The technique for doing this is even set forth: For example, shipboard tube artillery is to fire conventional and chemical ammunition by turns or alternately.

The U.S. Navy is also developing special vehicles to deliver toxins to the target which make it possible to contaminate large areas. In the opinion of experts, it will be possible with their help not only to achieve the initial effect of surprise by masking the very moment of attack but also to maintain that effect until the harmful effect of the toxins manifests itself.

American specialists believe that the efficiency of the combat use of these weapons will be higher at comparatively low wind speeds, for the wind has a profound impact on the dispersal of toxins. And, as the foreign press points out, the effect of surprise initially, as well as in the course of combat operations, can be realized by means of the extensive contamination of the air from the leeward side of ship formations or enemy bases.

The U.S. Navy now possesses a large assortment of delivery vehicles for this lethal cargo. The most widespread chemical ammunition on board American warships are bombs of varying caliber, rockets, aerosol thermogenerators, airborne discharge devices, artillery shells, mines, and other devices of an explosive and disposal nature. All of these types of ammunition are distinguished from conventional ones only in terms of their special contents.

Chemical ammunition of the explosive type is subdivided into contact and remote-control ammunition. With the help of contact ammunition, foreign military specialists point out, it is possible to achieve accurate strikes against large and small, stationary and moving enemy sea targets, regardless of wind direction and weather conditions. The U.S. Navy Department has recently been planning the possibility of using chemical weapons with the help of sea-based cruise missiles; which, in view of their long range (up to 2,500 km) and accuracy of strike (down to 30 meters), will, in their opinion, considerably enhance the efficiency of the use of this kind of weapon.

The facts cited are further graphic evidence that the Pentagon, seeking military superiority for the United States and its allies in key regions of the world ocean, is utilizing all means, including building up means of mass destruction, the latest models of chemical weapons.

CSO: 5200/1381

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: FURTHER CRITICISM OF U.S. BINARY ARMS PROGRAM

Description by Military Officer

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 23 Jul 85 pp 1-3

[Article by Captain O. Mironov: "What Are Binary Munitions?"]

[Text] "The Soviet Union emphatically denounces the plans for the production and deployment of binary weapons", the TASS statement of 11 July 1985, said. This concern has been occasioned by the recent US Congressional decision about appropriations for the production of a new generation of chemical weapons -- binary munitions. What are they like and how dangerous are they to the human-kind?

The terms "binary chemical weapons", "binary munitions" and "binary toxic agents" appeared in the West 20 years ago when research to develop such chemicals was just getting underway in the US. The action of binary weapons is based on the use of two (hence binary) non-toxic or low-toxic components which, once combined, produce a chemical reaction to form a highly toxic agent within a short space of time.

The components, or semiproducts, as they are often called, are kept separated in pressurized plastic containers. When fired at their target, the weapons have the rupture discs between the two canisters broken, the components mixed, thereby producing a chemical reaction which forms a highly toxic agent. In other words, it is within the frame of a shell, mine, or bomb that the closing stage of the agent-producing technological cycle takes place. As it bursts, the weapon sprays a ready-made toxic chemical.

The main parts of a binary weapon are: a warhead with a detonator, an explosive charge to break the membrane, the weapon frame, and canisters with semiproducts, and all kinds of auxiliary devices.

The US Armed Forces have been reported by foreign sources to have developed binary agents, using already well-known most toxic ingredients, above all, VX and sarin which, in binary usage, are designated as VX-2 and sarin-2. Among other devices developed and phased in are 155-mm and 203.2-mm artillery shells for the main artillery weapons systems, the Big-Eye air bomb fitted with VX-2, and developing work (involving testing) is in progress on binary mines, air-borne sprayers, cluster munitions, unguided missiles and warheads for theatre missiles.

One point to note is that, as stated by foreign military experts, the toxicity of agents produced by binary munitions as well as their combat performance are on a par with the most toxic nerve agents yet designed, like VX and sarin.

Yet, for all that, while deciding on the production of binary weapons and the "chemical rearming" of their Army with a new generation of chemical munitions -- binaries -- the US military-political leadership have been enlarging on their concern for environmental protection and for the safety of production and maintenance staff.

The actual reason behind such arguments is entirely different. Binary chemical weapons will enable the production, transportation and storage of their stocks to be made cosmic secret. Monitoring these stocks will be of little use or altogether useless as the semiproducts -- binary components -- can be kept at ordinary warehouses without any precautions, just like ordinary industrial chemicals. Inspection of such weapons will be very difficult because of the absence of special technical safety arrangements which betray the presence of chemical weapons. And that will deadlock the work on the convention now in the drafting stage at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

There is yet another reason why the extreme right elements and munitions corporations are pressing for binary weapon production to be launched as soon as possible. It is the possibility of the production of such weapons, if need be, at ordinary commercial enterprises of a civilian chemical industry. Such a prospect is reported to be considered in the US to meet the challenge of a convention banning chemical weapons, which will call for the destruction of all stocks of chemical weapons and factories making them. That is to say that US imperialism is trying to assure itself a military and technological lead in this area as well. And that is one more reason to explain why the US has been deliberately delaying the drafting of the convention. It first wants to store up more of such weapons, hide them and, only afterwards, perhaps, sign the convention.

A unit of high output -- about 70,000 munitions a year -- designed to produce components for binary artillery shells and Big-Eye airbombs stands ready at the Pine Bluff chemical munitions arsenal, Arkansas. The US Administration has allocated an appropriate amount of resources for the actual start-up of the production of these barbaric weapons. Such plans do disturb and incense all peace-loving public.

The Soviet Union strongly condemns Washington's designs and reaffirms its readiness for full-scale cooperation with all peace-loving nations in fundamentally resolving the issue of prohibition and destruction of all types of chemical weapons. (Trud, July 23. In full.)

'Compromise' in Congress

LD311356 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Text] The Conference Committee of the U.S. Congress, discussing a bill on military appropriations for the next financial year, has worked out a so-called compromise solution on the production of chemical-binary ammunition, production of which is planned for the beginning of 1987. Over to international journalist Vadim Biryukov:

The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress has adopted a decision according to which production of the new type of American chemical weapons must be conditional upon NATO member countries agreeing to it being deployed on their territories. Thus, the essence of the compromise is that now even this limited proviso has been liquidated. So before beginning the production of binary ammunition, the United States only has to consult its allies. The issue of West European agreement to deploy chemical binary ammunition in the United States; the individual components are environmentally-safe. The ammunition becomes a weapon of mass destruction of people only through the interaction of both components, and this procedure -- according to the plans of the Washington strategists -- will take place on European territory.

Thus, as in the case of the Pershing-IIs and long-range cruise missiles deployed by the United States in a number of West European countries, the intention to begin production and to deploy binary ammunition in the Old World again reflects Washington's perfidy.

While preparing for war, the White House would like to stand aloof and put the territory of its allies under an inevitable retaliatory strike. The commencement of production of a new variety of chemical weapons has been at the center of attention. An overwhelming majority of participants favor the quickest possible elaboration of the relevant international convention, which is already under discussion. However, the main obstacle on the path toward the signing of this convention is the obstructionist stance of the U.S. delegation. The banning and destruction of all kinds of chemical weapons is the order of the day -- an important step in the creation of an atmosphere of security on our planet.

FRG Still Possible Site

LD152259 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1625 GMT 15 Aug 85

[Text] According to reports from Bonn, the question of where American binary chemical weapons are going to be sited if, in defiance of the protests of the international public, the United States does in fact commence their manufacture, is currently the subject of lively debate in the FRG. Dregger, the chairman of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] parliamentary group, who recently had a meeting with the Pentagon chief, claimed that he had won an assurance that these weapons would not be deployed in the FRG. Washington has repudiated Dregger, however. The U.S. Embassy in Bonn has released a letter written by Weinberger in which the American defense secretary categorically denies that he made any such statement to Dregger. The Bonn politician is now trying to extricate himself from the situation. Whether he manages to wriggle out of it or not is altogether a secondary matter. The main point is whether or not West Germany is to become a site for the deployment of American binary charges. In the view of Klaus Boelling, a former official spokesman for the FRG Government, it is possible that the U.S. Administration, invoking the 1954 treaty, will deploy the new chemical weapons on West German territory even without the agreement of Bonn officials.

Motivating the "need" for chemical rearmament, representatives of the Washington administration and the Pentagon assert that the present stockpiles of American chemical weapons have become outdated and that the USA has no "credible deterrent." Meantime

the United States possesses already now a huge arsenal numbering three million chemical bombs and shells. And the production of a still more dangerous variety of this barbarous weapon is part of a general program for arms buildup designed to ensure military superiority for the USA.

One can hardly imagine a more shocking exercise in hypocrisy when one hears the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency say that the USA needs to renew and replenish its chemical arsenals in order to facilitate the conclusion of an early agreement on a comprehensive ban on these mass-destruction weapons. A wild logic, indeed.

The chemical arms buildup in the USA pushes back the prospect of a ban on chemical weapons and exacerbates military confrontation in general. Talks on the drafting of a convention banning chemical weapons have been going on for years. The General Assembly called more than once for stepping them up. A great deal has already been done in this respect. This problem would have already been settled positively if the United States had not been aiming to bring the talks in Geneva to a deadlock. Indeed, what is said in Washington is echoed in Geneva.

The American Administration claims that binary chemical weapons will be more secure. But such promises are intended for the population of those West European and Asian countries where the United States has storages of toxic agents. These promises are nothing more than an attempt to sweeten a bitter pill.

FRG Opposition to Storage

LD231219 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 23 Aug 85

[Text] Bonn, August 23 TASS -- The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) should say "no" to the deployment of new U.S. binary chemical weapons in the country, stated Egon Bahr, member of the presidium of the board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). The opinion of the Social Democrats is that, in the interests of bilateral relations with the United States, it is essential to tell Washington in time that the government of the FRG will not approve plans to site binary weapons in the country. This is particularly important, since the FRG is the only West European country where deadly U.S. chemical bombs and shells are already kept.

Klaus Boelling, former official spokesman of the FRG's Government, has criticized Bonn's statement about the need to consult NATO partners on this matter before deciding whether binary weapons should be or should not be sited in the country's territory. That statement, he pointed out, is simply a deceptive stratagem because under the provisions of the 1954 treaty the U.S. Administration may bring new chemical weapons to the FRG's territory even without consent of the present CDU-FDP government.

Spokesmen of the Greens Party group in the West German Bundestag (Parliament) have demanded that the government renounce the deployment of new U.S. chemical weapons in the country's territory. The conclusion of a treaty on establishing in Europe a zone free from chemical weapons may become the best solution to the question, they point out.

The Federal Association of Fighters against Storing Toxic Agents in the Federal Republic has demanded immediate and complete removal of the entire amount of U.S.

chemical weapons sited in the FRG. An appeal issued by the association and signed by more than 10,000 West German citizens urges the Government of the FRG immediately to state its disagreement with the Washington administration's intention to deploy newest chemical weapons in the FRG's territory.

U.S. 'Need' Refuted

LD201330 Moscow TASS in English 1319 GMT 20 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 20 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

Pending a decision by Congress which is expected in Washington to legalize in mid-September the production of a new generation of chemical weapons, the Washington administration is stepping up its campaign for a chemical rearmament of the USA. One example of such efforts is an article by Kenneth L. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, published in THE NEW YORK TIMES on Monday [19 August].

The arguments used by this high-ranking official to justify a large-scale program for the production of binary chemical munitions are far from being original. Especially the threadbare myth about a "Soviet menace." He does not hesitate to repeat allegations, refuted more than once by authoritative international commissions and by American experts, that Soviet chemical weapons are being used in South East Asia and Afghanistan.

Dangerous' U.S. Policy

LD230431 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 22 Aug 85

[Text] According to press reports from Pine Bluff, Arkansas, a new military chemical plant has just been commissioned there to produce a new generation of chemical arms known as binary weapons. Here is observer Vladislav Kozyakov with his comment:

[Kozyakov] The American public is very much concerned over the prospect of further extending the chemical weapons industry in the United States.

This explains why the Pentagon hurries to push legislation through the House of Representatives in September. As Russell Rourke, a defense secretary assistant, said, it is best of all to seek the approval of the new chemical weapons program this year when there are no elections this year.

The question arises however, what are the reasons for stepping up output of chemical weapons? Kenneth Adelman, a director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said in his article published in THE NEW YORK TIMES that a further chemical weapons buildup is needed to achieve the earliest conclusion of a comprehensive chemical weapons ban treaty. Such is the strange logic of policy-makers in Washington. To achieve strategic arms reduction agreements they continue to conduct nuclear tests in Nevada, to build the MX, the Midgetman and other missiles and to manufacture thousands more nuclear warheads. And to ensure the non-militarization of outer space the United States Administration pursues its "star wars" program and live tests of an anti-satellite weapon launched from an F-15 jet fighter. As is known, this approach by Washington has already resulted in blocking the nuclear arms control process as a whole.

The Pentagon budget has been increased by more than 100 billion dollars, but no new arms reduction agreements have been concluded during the last 5 years. Something similar takes place in the United States policy with regard to chemical weapons. The Pentagon has the world's largest chemical arsenal, it consists of more than 3 million shells, tens of thousands of bombs, hundreds of thousands of landmines and other ammunition. Experts estimate that the United States stockpiles of chemical weapons are sufficient to kill all people on earth several times over. Despite this, however, a huge 5-year program was launched in 1983 for the chemical rearmament of all armed services. It is in accordance with this program that the new binary weapons plant has been built in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. It will have a rated monthly capacity of 70,000 items of ammunition. Binary weapons will be hard to scrap once deployed, their components can be produced by most civilian manufacturers. The production of the weapons in the United States will complicate the enforcement of a chemical weapons ban treaty.

Washington's assertions that new types of mass destruction weapons can promote negotiations on reducing arms are aimed at misleading the public. In fact the development of ever more sophisticated weapons in the United States reflect a dangerous policy of achieving military superiority, which is fraught with catastrophic consequences for mankind. Each new type of weapon built by the Pentagon has a damaging effect on arms reduction efforts and initiates a new round in military confrontation. It is true of American nuclear and space weapons. This is also true of chemical weapons including those mapped to produce in Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

CSO: 5200/1380

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS RAPS ADELMAN REMARKS ON SOVIET, U.S. CHEMICAL ARMS

LD192148 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT 19 Aug 85

[Text] New York, August 19 TASS -- Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in an article published in THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper writes that Washington is planning to spend 163 million dollars for "chemical rearmament" in the next financial year alone. In order to justify those plans, the high-ranking spokesman of the U.S. Administration again resorted to the hackneyed myth about a "Soviet military threat". He slanderously asserted that the USSR has allegedly used chemical weapons in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia, although all those conjectures have been repeatedly disproved by authoritative international commissions and even by U.S. experts.

At the same time Adelman did not say a word about the fact that it was precisely the United States that had used toxic agents during its criminal aggression in Vietnam in breach of the 1925 Geneva protocol on banning the use of asphyxiating, poisonous and other such gases and bacteriological means, the protocol which bears U.S. signature. Besides, it was precisely the United States that in 1980 unilaterally broke off the Soviet-U.S. talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Insisting on "chemical rearmament", the spokesman of the Washington administration also passed it over in silence that U.S. arsenals, which are the world's largest ones, include more than three million chemical munitions. Fifty-five thousand tons of highly toxic poisonous substances of neuroparalytic effect are stored at depots in the United States and at U.S. bases in a number of countries, in Western Europe, in the first place.

CSO: 5200/1380

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS ANALYST DENIES USSR BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS PROGRAM

LD121300 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 12 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 12 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has floated another anti-Soviet falsehood. It claims that the USSR is running a major biological weapons program, apparently including genetic experiments. The Washington politicians seem to need these absurd allegations to lessen the shock made on T.V. viewers by a program aired by British television late last week. It showed how upon the end of the Second World War the U.S. authorities had exploited Japanese scientists who had conducted on prisoners of war biological experiments which resulted in the death of their subjects. Those inhuman "scientists" were members of special "Unit 731" of the Kwantung Army, who were working on bacteriological weapons.

Paying for the information obtained from them, the American authorities did not put on trial the leading specialists of "Unit 731," classified all their findings and even withheld information on their research from the court which tried Japanese war criminals in Tokyo till April 1948.

Meanwhile, there were more than 1,000 U.S. prisoners of war among the human "guinea pigs."

In 1984, three British scientists published a book called "No Fire, No Thunder," in which they pointed out that the USA was looking for loopholes in the 1972 international convention banning the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction and that it had already created "highly pathogenic organisms...under the flag of medical or protective research."

The USA is also conducting intensive research in another area of the development of weapons of mass destruction, namely, in the production of advanced chemical agents, such as binary gases. U.S. news agencies report that a Pentagon complex has been built in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and readied to produce binary bombs, shells and mines. To camouflage those inhuman activities, the Washington leaders are floating allegations about a "chemical threat" posed by the Soviet Union.

Practice shows that whenever the public learns about some unsavoury actions of the U.S. Administration, the U.S. secret services immediately release a "scientific report" or "paper," blaming the Soviet Union for precisely those dirty things in which the USA itself indulges. It is strange they have not yet accused the USSR of having dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW REBUTS CIA REPORT ON USSR GENETIC WEAPONS

LD192208 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 19 Aug 85

["Glance at the British Scene" by observer (Igor Muniquev)]

[Text] The Western news media may accuse the Soviet Union of everything, but they never dare claim what conflicts with facts. It is a fact, for example, that not a single kind of mass destruction weapon has seen a first development or testing in the USSR. Every new spiral of the lethal arms race has always been initiated by the United States.

Ever since the United States developed the notorious Little Boy that incinerated Hiroshima 40 years ago, it's been sending the arms race spiraling. The U.S. President has now given the green light to preparations for so-called "star wars." The bourgeois press, however, is still trying to equate the responsibility of the superpowers and if not whitewash the United States then accuse the USSR of a desire to develop a new generation of weapons of mass annihilation. The source of information is the American CIA, an undoubtedly interested party. Nevertheless the British press believes it's a fully trustworthy source, and last week all evening papers in London carried headings that accused the USSR of developing and testing genetic weapons, which violates the 1972 convention on biological weapons.

It is significant that the GUARDIAN, which has used the CIA report for information, just like other British papers, did not bother to supply any proof. Apparently it believes inventions by the American CIA are more than enough; and the CIA, following its usual tactics, has classified the part of the report that allegedly carries convincing arguments to prove that the Soviet Union has violated the 1972 convention.

To put it mildly, the situation conflicts with common sense. Imagine the counsel for the prosecution asking the jury to take his word because for reasons of secrecy the evidence cannot be made public. The jury would certainly make fun of it, but the GUARDIAN and some other papers have played such a strange role by repeating the utterly unfounded and indemonstrable invention of psychological warfare experts from Langley.

The CIA goals are obvious, the agency acts in the interests of an administration that has spent every effort to bury detente, frustrate agreements curbing the arms race, and sow mistrust between the East and the West. For this purpose it comes up with one false argument after another. We hope you remember that the CIA recently slipped to the Western press a falsehood about the USSR violating the convention on chemical weapons. With CIA assistance, too, a hue and cry has been raised this year about the Soviet Union allegedly disregarding provisions of the antimissile systems treaty.

The current falsehood will be forgotten soon, this is certain. But it will infect the thinking of Westerners with another lie about the Soviet Union. By spreading inventions about the USSR allegedly developing new kinds of weapons of mass annihilation, the British press itself has turned into a lever of misleading people, a lever cynically used by the CIA.

At a time when the international community has just marked the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki summit conference, whose Final Act urged the news media of participating countries to help improve the international situation and promote understanding and trust between nations, the role of slanderous Nazis assumed by leading papers in London appears especially unsightly.

CSO: 5200/1380

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS RAPS FRG OFFICIAL'S CALL FOR SOVIET AGREEMENT TO BAN

LD112153 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 11 Aug 85

["Accusing the Wrong Person" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 11 Aug (TASS) -- TASS commentator Lev Aksenov writes:

Juergen Todenhoefer, a CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] expert in the FRG Bundestag, a man well-known for his commitment to U.S. military policies, has called on the Soviet Union "to agree finally to a comprehensive chemical weapons ban"(?!). [TASS punctuation] In a statement issued in Bonn on Saturday [10 August] he demagogically pontificated about the fact that "the world requires no deterrence in the form of chemical weapons" and about some alleged "Soviet military superiority in all the most important categories of weapons."

Listening to Mr Todenhoefer, you find out that a solution to one of the central problems of the present day -- the elimination of chemical weapons -- is being held up by Moscow's "intractability." But who is really building up chemical weapons day and night?

The figures are common knowledge: More than 10,000 metric tons of such ammunition is held in U.S. stockpiles in the FRG alone. Altogether, the Pentagon has more than 200,000 metric tons of chemical weapons, a substantial proportion of which, moreover, is stockpiled outside the United States. Recently the U.S. Congress approved the allocation of funds to produce binary chemical weapons. A couple of years ago the United States was again the only state among the 157 UN member states to vote against the General Assembly adopting a resolution calling on all states to refrain from producing and deploying new types of chemical weapons, and from siting them on the territory of states where they were not already sited at the time.

As for the elimination of the threat of this weaponry, particularly in densely populated Europe, member states of the Warsaw Pact last year proposed to the NATO countries that the Old World should be free from chemical ammunition. The FRG, as an influential member of NATO, could have used its prestige to convince its bloc partners of the urgency of this initiative. This is even more important for official Bonn when one takes into account the fact that the country's territory is literally covered with chemical weapons.

Todenhoefer's appeal, of course, has some justification but the addresses should be different, it should not be Moscow, but Washington. It is precisely West Germany's transatlantic ally which is persuing a course of whipping up the arms race, including chemical arms.

CSO: 5200/1380

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW: U.S. PLANS TO SITE CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN FRG

LD121822 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 12 Aug 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpts] Hello, comrades. Today is an important date in the history of Soviet-FRG and pan-European relations: the 15th anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-FRG treaty in Moscow.

In addition to the distinguished statesmen and public figures who stress the unchanging importance of that document, there are also forces in the FRG who try to belittle its importance, and even demand a revision of the postwar borders. For instance, what about the statement by Volker Ruehe, one of the leaders of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] faction in the Bonn Bundestag? He claims that the Moscow treaty allegedly ensures a kind of inconclusiveness regarding the present situation in Germany. In other words, he is repeating the fairly well-known but nevertheless totally unfounded Bonn thesis that allegedly the German question remains open.

Behind this, as you know, lies hopes of swallowing up the GDR and revising those same European borders.

However, it is not just a matter of extremely dangerous future plans but also of extremely risky actions now. As you know, the siting of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles targeted on the USSR and its allies has been permitted on FRG territory. And one cannot fail to be concerned by support from influential circles in the FRG for U.S. plans to create space weapons. And in the FRG itself the manufacture of various types of armaments is being increased, including the so-called combat aircraft of the 1990's. Incidentally, it will be manufactured by that same firm of Messerschmidt which equipped Hitler's air force. Over the last few days the FRG public has started voicing concern about yet another particularly dangerous aspect of the arms race, the plans to site new type of U.S. chemical weapons in the FRG.

Erwin Horn, the Social Democratic Party's defense spokesman, who has just returned from a visit to the United States, reported that the Pentagon is planning to send so-called binary ammunition to the FRG. The United States, Horn declared, is trying to include these battle toxins in the strategy of the West along with conventional and nuclear weapons, and the U.S. Government is reckoning that Bonn will consent. True, Bonn so far denies such plans, but unease in the country is growing, especially when one takes into account the fact that the U.S. press has just reported that a new military chemical complex has been constructed in Arkansas where binary ammunition will be manufactured. The U.S. Congress conference committee has already given the green light for the manufacture of this new generation of chemical weapons, having permitted \$155 billion for expenditure on chemical rearmament in the United States next year.

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA: EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS CONDEMN U.S. CHEMICAL WEAPONS

PM221019 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Aug 85 First Edition p 5

["False Pretexts: The United States Steps Up the 'Chemical Rearmament' Program"
... TASS headline]

[Text] Oslo, 14 Aug -- There is growing indignation in Western Europe at the Reagan administration's plans to use it as a bridgehead for waging chemical war. An urgent demand to Washington to abandon the development, production, and deployment of new types of chemical weapons and, above all, the barbaric new binary nerve gas munitions was proposed at the meeting here of representatives of the Norwegian Socialist Left Party, the Danish Socialist People's Party, the Dutch Pacifist Socialist Party, and the West German Green Party.

A document adopted on the results of the forum points out that the implementation of the U.S. plans in the chemical weapons sphere would accelerate the arms race and lead to the production of barbaric new types of weapons of mass destruction. The delegates resolutely supported the removal of the arsenals of chemical weapons deployed on their countries' territories.

The United States has already transformed the territory of its West European NATO allies into "chemical hostages": Over 10,000 tons of chemical munitions have been deployed at four major bases in the FRG alone. There are also plans to deploy binary nerve gas munitions on West European territory. What is the aim? As General B. Rogers, supreme commander in chief of NATO allied armed forces in Europe, stated unambiguously, binary chemical weapons in addition to nuclear weapons use are planned at the very outset of hostilities on the European continent itself.

The West European alarm over their future is quite justifiably increased by America's massive "chemical rearmament" program, estimated to cost \$2.6 billion. Within the framework of these aggressive preparations, which are being implemented at an accelerated pace, plans are underway to significantly update the existing arsenals of barbaric chemical weapons and, first of all, to produce a new type -- binary weapons. THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that the flow lines of the Pentagon's chemical complex in Pine Bluff, (Arkansas), designed to produce binary munitions, are ready to go into operation.

The Reagan administration "justifies" its program for America's "chemical rearmament" by claiming that the existing U.S. chemical weapon stocks are "obsolete" and "inadequate." Yet, according to press figures, the U.S. arsenals contain at least 150,000 tons of poison gas. False stories have been circulated about an alleged "chemical threat from the USSR" although, as the above newspaper acknowledges, citing officials in the Reagan administration, "binary weapons are not being produced in the Soviet Union."

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA DENIES USE OF 'YELLOW RAIN' IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

PM131306 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Unnamed TASS correspondent report: "Blatant Lie"]

[Text] New York, 12 Aug -- The fabrications about some kind of use of mythical Soviet "chemical weapons" in Southeast Asia or of so-called "yellow rain," which have been vigorously disseminated by official Washington in recent years, are a deliberate blatant lie.

This is reaffirmed by the report published by a group of American scientists headed by Professor M. (Mizelson) of Harvard University, a renowned expert in the sphere of chemical and biological weapons.

Comprehensively analyzing the existing information, the scientists came to the authoritative conclusion that the "yellow rain" discovered in certain Southeast Asian countries which the U.S. Government tries to present as "Soviet chemical weapons," in fact has a natural provenance and is the product of bees' natural functions. Specimens of this substance presented by the U.S. State Department to confirm its accusations against the Soviet Union contain bee pollen, the specialists point out. Even Pentagon laboratories, the report states, have been unable to discover any toxic substances in research on 80 specimens.

Most similar fabrications, as has repeatedly been exposed previously, stemmed from cutthroats closely linked with the CIA from diehard Pol Pot gangs encamped in Thailand. The actual worth of this "evidence" is graphically attested by the story of one Cambodian, who, the State Department claimed, died as a result of a "chemical attack." However, a group of Canadian doctors who carried out a postmortem examination established that he died of malaria.

So why did Washington need such unscrupulous fabrications and fictions which have been documentarily exposed as false both by U.S. specialists and by experts from other countries? The answer to this question is provided by the United States' own large-scale preparations for waging chemical and biological warfare, from which it would like to distract attention by using "gross lies."

CSO: 5200/1380

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

TASS CITES NEW YORK TIMES--New York July 25 TASS--Violating the Geneva Protocol and a number of other international legal documents banning chemicals and bacteriological weapons, the United States is conducting preparations for chemical warfare. A NEW YORK TIMES correspondent reports from Washington that a special congressional team, including members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, have drafted recommendations for the Congress that would enable the Pentagon to resume the mass production of chemical weapons. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 25 Jul 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1381

GENERAL

GORBACHEV, PCF'S MARCHAIS ISSUE JOINT COMMUNIQUE

LD031508 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 3 Sep 85

[Excerpts] Moscow, September 3 TASS--Follows the full text of the joint statement of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the French Communist Party adopted as a result of the September 2 meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the General Secretary of the FCP Georges Marchais:

Socialism needs peace for its development and the ever more extensive satisfaction of the people's new and diverse requirements.

A world without arms and wars is an ideal of all communists. That is why they constantly and everywhere struggle for peace and disarmament.

They are by no means alone. The growth on each continent of most diverse and boundless peace forces is an important factor of recent years. Their activity is not passing without leaving a trace. It has facilitated in many ways the resumption of the talks in Geneva. This is a positive fact. But in view of Reagan's plans to militarize space it is necessary for all supporters of peace and disarmament to double their efforts.

Observance of the accord on the subject and aims of the Geneva talks is of decisive importance. The following fundamental question, that today are the most important ones for the whole world, are being raised with all firmness at them: not to launch an arms race in outer space, to stop it on earth, to undertake a radical reduction of nuclear arms and press as the ultimate aim for their total liquidation.

For this reason the FCP and the CPSU are concerned by the statements expressing support for the American position that deadlocks the talks that were adopted in Bonn during the meeting of the leaders of the seven biggest industrial capitalist countries. Both parties condemn the decision of the leaders of the Atlantic alliance to continue the deployment of American missiles in Europe.

The stakes are high: It is either the arms race will continue and the danger of an outbreak of war will grow, or we will embark on the path of strengthening general security and peace all over the world.

The American "star wars" project far from ending the arms race, spreads it to outer space. This project is being implemented and new weapons systems are being built up. Additional billions of dollars are invested into military budgets.

At a time when people intuitively sense the danger of the "star wars" plans, it would be criminal irresponsibility or deception to portray things as if the point at issue were harmless research, which will allegedly bring about technological benefits. In real fact, the point at issue are attempts to camouflage by any means exceptionally dangerous plans.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the French Communist Party declare and work in favour of prohibiting any militarisation of outer space, for an immediate freeze on the deployment of missiles in the West and in the East, for a constructive dialogue with the aim of ensuring a cut in arms to the lowest possible level, for the success of the talks being held and all initiatives from wherever they may come, providing they contribute to the process of detente, to a peaceful settlement of the existing conflicts on the basis of talks.

The Soviet Union and the socialist countries tirelessly fight for peace and security of peoples.

The French Communist Party expresses satisfaction with the fact that the proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev on behalf of the Soviet Union on imposing for the whole time while the talks are in progress of a moratorium on the creation, research, testing and deployment of strike space weapons, and on a freeze on strategic offensive weapons, have evoked the broad response of a large number of countries, many heads of state, leaders of various political, trade union and religious organisations. This is the way of common sense and wisdom. The same concerns the moratorium imposed by the USSR till November 1985 on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and implementation of counter-measures in Europe, which were undertaken after the start of the deployment of new American missiles.

Of tremendous significance is the Soviet Union's new move -- the decision to halt unilaterally from August 6 this year all nuclear blasts. It opens up the possibility to put an effective barrier in the way of the nuclear weapons race.

The deliverance of Europe from nuclear weapons, both medium range and tactical ones, the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world would contribute to the cause of preventing war. Of exceptional significance would be the adoption by all the nuclear powers of the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, which has already been done by the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Ten years ago the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference was adopted. Its principles and all of its provisions remain highly topical for security in Europe, for the recognition of sovereign rights of every state, cooperation in the economic, scientific, technological and cultural fields, protection of the environment and observance of human rights.

The French Communist Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union reaffirm their wish to work for a broad consolidation of different forces working for peace and disarmament, of all who, irrespective of their political, philosophical and religious views, do not wish the flames of war to engulf the earth and outer space.

Both parties point out that the peace initiatives of the socialist states, of the non-aligned countries, the heads of some other states and governments, of major political, public and ideological forces, accord with the demands of the large-scale popular movement for peace and disarmament. The initiative of the leaders of the six countries -- India, Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden -- is very positive.

The French Communist Party points out the importance of France taking a stand against the militarisation of outer space, for constructive proposals in the disarmament field. The French Communist Party presses ahead for France using the whole of its weight to make a contribution to thwarting the "star wars" projects, along with such countries as the USSR, China, the other socialist states, the Non-Aligned Movement and some other states.

The arms race has already brought about grim consequences for the whole world, in particular for the most destitute peoples. Enormous funds are absorbed by the needs of armament, while millions of women, men and children live in misery under the conditions of the capitalist system. This is intolerable. It is necessary to use immediately a part of these funds to improve the position of these people. The fight for peace and disarmament is also a fight for life itself.

Yes, peace is the greatest value. The Soviet and French communists are expressing confidence that in the present-day situation, preservation of peace is the main task of the present. They stressed the need for reversing international relations back on the path of detente and cooperation, for putting an end to the arms race, for reducing and finally completely scrapping nuclear weapons all over the world.

CSO: 5200/1382

GENERAL

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVES

LD231942 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 23 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 23 TASS -- The newspaper PRAVDA in the August 24 issue carries an editorial [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian uses "redaktsionnaya statya"] titled "The World Ought To Know About This". Following is the text of the article:

It is no overstatement that peoples have never before had such a striving for peace, a striving to stop the race of armaments, above all nuclear ones, avert the war menace and achieve a turn from confrontation to peaceful cooperation. It is no accident that the Soviet Union's latest peace initiatives evoked such an extensive positive response from most diverse circles in different countries, inspired hopes for changes for the better.

The introduction by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on any nuclear explosions from August 6, the day of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, evoked a tremendous response. In order to curb the nuclear arms race and to erect obstacles in its way, it is first of all necessary to stop nuclear tests. And then move downwards, toward the reduction and total elimination of nuclear weapons.

This was a bold step, an initiative designed to persuade other nuclear nations, and above all the United States, to follow our example.

The Soviet side took into account the historic precedent -- the signing in 1963 of the Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under-water, which showed that, given political will and realistic approach to the current world situation, it is possible to achieve results in the solution of the most acute and complicated international problems.

Our initiative received understanding and support of the broadest circles of the world public, including in the United States. This was because people on earth perceived it to be a practical step along the road towards defusing international tension, towards life in the world in which there should be no room for nuclear weapons.

The world public assessed the Soviet Union's action as a logical continuation of the pledge earlier adopted by our state -- not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It was also viewed as a real factor designed to facilitate success at the Soviet-American talks on space and nuclear armaments in Geneva.

Several months before, the Soviet Union introduced another moratorium -- that on the deployment in Europe of medium-range missiles and the adoption of countermeasures in connection with the stationing of American Pershing II's on the European Continent. We are prepared for a zero option in the correlation of medium-range missiles between the USSR and the United States in Europe, are ready to leave only as many missiles as France and Great Britain possess.

We are also ready for a radical reduction in strategic nuclear armaments in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security.

Earth is already overflowing with nuclear weapons. The plans to spread the arms race into outer space, nurtured and implemented by the White House, amount to madness. The Soviet leadership declared with full certainty that the USSR will not be the first to bring weapons into outer space. Our moratorium on the launching of anti-satellite weapons has been in effect for two years already.

We proposed that the USSR and the United States stop all work on developing anti-satellite systems and eliminate those that are in existence.

The proposals for international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarization, just tabled by the Soviet Union at the United Nations, constitute a new constructive programme of preventing an arms race in outer space.

All these peaceful, constructive and realistic proposals of ours have been motivated by one thing, namely the striving to arrest mankind's sliding to thermo-nuclear war. Advancing these proposals, the Soviet Union was least of all seeking their propaganda effect. The essence of its initiatives is one: to create the favourable atmosphere, the real conditions for the mankind to pause, look around, realise the dangerousness of the nuclear arms race and jointly get down to their reduction. The Soviet Union hoped that the U.S. side will duly assess all the seriousness of the situation and respond positively to our initiatives prompted by the concern about universal peace and security of peoples. For weapons which we suggest freezing, reducing, and in the long run eliminating, pose mortal danger to everyone, including the people of the United States.

In what way has Washington answered this?

First, particularly after the Soviet Union introduced a moratorium on nuclear weapon tests, it answered with silence which covered up obvious confusion. Having slightly recovered from it, they in Washington started feverishly casting about for the cleverest ways of avoiding the answer to the direct and clear Soviet proposals.

And since they had nothing with which to answer them in essence, they proclaimed these proposals to be "propaganda". This gimmick failed, for when one side stops nuclear explosions, this is not propaganda but an example to follow.

Now they have come up with the problem of control asserting that the ending of tests cannot be verified. This was deliberate lie. Specialists know full well that with the existing scientific and technical means it is impossible to conceal a nuclear explosion, even one of a small yield.

And then they resorted to outright exaggerations. Ignoring elementary arithmetic, the Washington propagandists tried to prove that the Soviet Union carried more tests than the USA, so the hands of Americans are untied. But this falsification has not lasted for long. It is well known that they across the ocean staged a far greater number of tests than we did.

A nuclear explosion was set off in Nevada in answer to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. According to the information received not from the U.S. sources the explosion with a yield of not less than 20 kilotons was made on August 17 at the depth of 330 metres 120 kilometres north-west of Las Vegas. As we see, the assertions of American politicians that national verification system are ineffective are untenable.

In this connection I would like to recall what was said recently by Mikhail Gorbachev in his answers to questions from a TASS correspondent: "The scientific and technical possibilities existing in this country, in the United States and in other countries provide the necessary degree of confidence that a nuclear explosion, even of a small yield, will be detected and will become known..." "In short, we are for a verification of the ending of nuclear explosions but we are against the cessation of tests being substituted by their continuation in the presence of observers," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

Our proposals at the United Nations about international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarisation and our moratorium on anti-satellite weapon tests were answered by the USA with a report that it will hold shortly the first test of such weapons at a real target in space.

To cover up at least slightly its militarist, hegemonistic ambitions and its desire to achieve military-strategic superiority over the USSR, the USA has launched a new anti-Soviet campaign. The higher White House echelons have joined in it. Presidential Adviser Robert McFarlane went into attack with a set of rabid anti-Soviet concoctions.

Everything has been brought into play: discourses on Soviet superiority in nuclear weapons, used on more than one occasion in the past, allegations that we have long been developing and producing space-based ASAT systems, claims that we are violating our commitments under the treaties on nuclear weapons and ABM defences. They have even roped in "human rights violations" and gone so far as alleging that some chemicals are used against U.S. diplomats in Moscow. In so doing, they have cited no proof because there is none, nor can there be any.

Escalating its anti-Soviet campaign, Washington is doing whatever it can to involve its West European allies in it. Tension is being whipped up, for instance, in Britain in connection with the largest military exercises since the Second World War, Brave Defender, due to begin in September. The purpose of the exercises is to repulse an "attack" of "Soviet special-purpose forces" on the British isles. Better to simulate "reality," it is planned to drop paratrooper units and to land naval beaching parties consisting of Russian-speaking "Soviet agents" in civilian clothes near major defence installations with instructions to subvert communication lines and plant mines, and also to foment public unrest.

This plan of the British authorities to all appearances, is not so much military as political. Its purpose is to create another negative "Soviet threat" stereotype, "international terrorism." The involvement of large numbers of the civilian population and broad announcements of the exercises to train methods of countering "Soviet subversives" are going to be used to brainwash the population in an Anti-Soviet spirit.

One is entitled to ask what is the purpose of all this ado in the United States and some NATO countries? Apparently, it is further to poison the atmosphere in relations between the USSR and the USA and to make the world public believe in advance that no substantial progress towards improving the international situation is possible. This idea is being preached day after day both by official White House spokesmen and by the U.S. mass media and propaganda bodies.

But the truth is that the U.S. Administration would not follow the road of detente and of ending the arms race. It is still seeking U.S. military superiority over the USSR and for this purpose keeps escalating the arms race. The world ought to know about this.

The world should also know that our country is trying to do everything possible to avert nuclear catastrophe. We are ready to go our part of the way towards that goal -- but the United States should go the other part, and not in words but in deeds.

CSO: 5200/1384

GENERAL

MOSCOW WEEKLY ROUNDTABLE ON ARMS ISSUES

LD81718 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 18 Aug 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with political observers Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin and Nikolay Vladimirovich Shislin, and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

Nuclear Test Moratorium

[Excerpts] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades! An event of paramount importance this week was the replies of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to questions by a TASS correspondent

which set out once again the approach by the Soviet Union to the problem of cutting back nuclear explosions and which develop our position on this question. I will recall that on 6 August the Soviet Union unilaterally adopted a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, both military ones and those for peaceful purposes. The moratorium will remain in force until the end of this year, but -- and this is very important to stress -- it will stay in force after that if the United States joins in with it. As you know, the reaction by the United States to our proposal was negative, and the replies by Comrade Gorbachev to the TASS correspondent's questions remove the problems that the United States has been trying to raise.

[Bovin] I think it is worth telling our listeners what the problem of these nuclear tests is in fact about. It is quite a complicated question, but why in fact are nuclear tests carried out? Let's put the question that way, and then it will be clear what people will gain if they do not take place. First of all, without carrying out nuclear tests it is impossible to create new types of nuclear warheads. That's the first, and perhaps the most important thing. Second, without nuclear tests it is impossible to modernize existing nuclear weapons. Third, and no less important, is that the weapons that have already been created and stockpiled, thousands of warheads, must be selectively checked every year for reliability because, strange as it may seem, they can age, and it is by means of nuclear tests that the reliability of what you already have, what you have stockpiled, can be selectively checked and monitored. Finally, the fourth important thing: During such tests, the reliability of military hardware, military equipment, can be checked to see how it stands up to nuclear explosions. Those are the four chief reasons why nuclear tests are necessary.

From this it is clear that if nuclear tests are ended, while of course this will not solve the whole problem of disarmament, it will substantially slow down the pace of the arms race, because it won't be possible to create new weapons, or modernize the old

ones, or check out what you already have. So overall it is quite a substantial and important step, and it is no accident that for 30 years now it has been the subject of quite stormy argument; it was in 1955 that the Soviet Union first proposed that nuclear tests be ended.

Perhaps a little history would also be useful here. You probably know, comrades, that quite big steps have been taken in a positive direction in the sphere of ending nuclear tests. The first Moscow treaty of 5 August 1963 put a complete ban on nuclear tests in three mediums: in the atmosphere, under water, and in space. It was quite a big success. After that, in 1974, we concluded a treaty with the Americans to limit nuclear tests -- a so-called threshold treaty, because the upper threshold of nuclear explosions was set at 150 kilotons. Two years later a treaty on peaceful explosions was signed. Unfortunately the Americans, as they quite often do, in practice renounced their signature and did not ratify the treaties of 1974 and 1976. And the last chapter in the story, so to speak, is that in 1977 trilateral talks started between Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. These were talks on a universal ban on nuclear tests.

[Shishlin] It must be said that the talks took place successfully.

[Bovin] Yes, successfully, and incidentally decisions were made on practically everything -- well, aside from a few technical questions -- and this was what the three countries reported to the Disarmament Committee in 1980. But again, unfortunately, after the 12th round of the talks the Americans went into reverse. A new administration came to power there following the 1980 elections and they took time out, so to speak, for the new administration to think things over. In July 1982 Reagan stated that they would not ratify the treaties, but would agree to talk about making improvements to the procedure of control as it stood. We could not agree to that because everything in that area was already polished enough, and that, for the time being, was where things came to a halt. But what we have now proposed is a very important step that brings us back to the core of the matter and makes the issue, well, virtually ready for solution. There are no technical problems of any sort here: There are only problems of political will. Just that one problem. And incidentally, the Americans have shown by their reaction that they do not have this political will, and Mikhail Sergeyevich, in his replies to the TASS correspondent's questions, very clearly and thoroughly refuted all the arguments that the Americans bring up in the attempt to justify their position.

[Levin] One of those arguments is that, as the American side alleges, we have already carried out our series of tests, we have carried out more tests than they have, we have completed our program and that is why we are announcing a moratorium, while the Americans have not yet completed their program. Comrade Gorbachev answered this directly by saying that during this year, up to the announcement of the moratorium, the USSR carried out virtually the same number of nuclear explosions as the United States. But if we speak of all the nuclear explosions that have been carried out to date, then the United States has carried out far more than the USSR.

[Bovin] Since 1945 the Americans have carried out 765 tests, and 765 is a considerably greater number of tests than the Soviet Union has carried out. That figure, incidentally, is an important one because the Americans are always moaning and crying that the Soviet Union is overtaking America in the development and perfection of nuclear weapons. But how can it overtake America if the Americans have carried out a considerably larger number of tests than we have? Plus, of course, there is the much-vaunted U.S. equipment and technology that they like to brag about, but in this case they are for some reason forgetting about this.

[Shishlin] Plus, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, there are the British nuclear tests and the French nuclear tests.

[Bovin] Yes!

[Shishlin] As far as the British nuclear tests are concerned, the British shared those results with the Americans.

[Bovin] Yes, the British have carried out about 40 nuclear tests, while the French have carried out about 130 nuclear tests. And apparently there was some sort of exchange of information.

[Levin] Yes, and when the Baltimore SUN, for example, an American newspaper, quoted all these figures, it also came to the conclusion that the United States has immeasurably greater opportunities for obtaining this sort of information than the Soviet Union. Quoting specific figures also, to show that the United States itself carried out considerably more tests than the Soviet Union, the Baltimore SUN concludes that the Russians do not have nuclear friends to give them information.

In other words, the disparity is quite obvious. The argument does not stand up to criticism. Nonetheless, it can still be heard now in the statements by U.S. officials.

[Bovin] And take the problem of control, for example. They are always also moaning and crying over the fact that, as they put it, in order to reach agreement on a moratorium, first of all the procedures for 100 percent guaranteed control must be agreed on in order to observe the treaty, particularly, they say, because the Soviet Union -- although they do use little words like apparently, probably or possible -- is violating that threshold treaty limiting the strength of explosions to 150 kilotons.

[Levin] They don't have any concrete data at all.

[Bovin] Yes, but they do say that themselves. So it's a red herring they are bringing up. And as regards control, what exactly is the issue? Well, if the Americans had ratified the 1974 treaty, by this time, by today, in the first place sides already would have exchanged geophysical and geological data on their tests areas, which is incidentally very important and very necessary for control.

In the second place, this would have made it possible to carry out so-called calibration blasts. Such blasts are necessary in order to adjust the equipment for remote seismic measurements; they have to be carried out specially. But since the Americans have not ratified the treaty, these blasts have not taken place. Now, if the Americans had not hindered the drawing up of a tripartite treaty, then under this treaty, first, an international bank of seismic data would have been set up and there would have been an exchange of information on an international level. Second, the treaty would have provided for the possibility of on-site inspections when the circumstances require. Incidentally, this is what the Americans are kicking up a fuss about all the time. In difficult cases provision would have been made and the legal basis established for on-site inspections. But, having torpedoed both agreements, the Americans were responsible for effectively blocking all verification measures that they talk about with such insistence. So I would describe all this as an attempt to lay the blame at someone else's door.

[Shishlin] It must be understood once and for all that the Soviet Union has no less interest than the United States in effective and comprehensive verification of steps being taken to limit and curtail the arms race. But the Americans' use of the problem of verification as an obstacle on the road to any agreement is another matter.

[Bovin] And this is all the more so now that U.S. specialists are writing, in their comments on our proposal, that the relevant equipment and methods have now effectively been developed to provide 100 percent, guaranteed verification of the threshold obligations, and it would be easy to verify whether or not a nuclear blast has taken place. There were doubts about how easy it would be to distinguish nuclear blasts from earthquakes, but American scientists themselves are writing that now they have effectively learned to do just that. So I want to say once again that this is not a problem of technical possibilities or impossibilities. This is an exclusively political problem. The principle of the matter must be resolved. And, unfortunately, the Americans are still avoiding this.

[Levin] In his replies to questions from a TASS correspondent on this matter, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated our country's position in a very clear-cut way.

Unilateral steps to halt nuclear blasts cannot, of course, be the final solution to the problem of the complete and universal halting of nuclear weapons tests. In order to resolve this problem once and for all an international agreement is needed. In addition to the relevant obligations, an agreement would also contain a proper system of verification measures, both national and international. In short, we back the verification of the halting of nuclear blasts, but we are against a situation in which the continuation of tests in the presence of observers would substitute for the halting of tests.

[Bovin] The Americans have done just this. They invited a group of our experts to the Nevada test site, saying that they should bring with them any equipment they want, set it up there and measure the strength of the American blasts. But what is the whole point? The point is to halt nuclear tests. What is the political point of our people sitting there, of our instruments standing there, and of us recording the modernization of American nuclear weapons? We do not want that at all. The American proposal has been made to divert attention, to switch people's attention somehow to a completely different problem. This is the game that is being played.

[Shishlin] The bold Soviet step involving a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests is, of course, an organic part of the large-scale work being pursued by Soviet foreign policy to improve international relations, and, in particular, to prepare the proper atmosphere for the Soviet-American summit meeting. The difference in the approach of the two sides is simply striking. The United States is attempting to harden its position in every possible way on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting, and seems to be stressing these strong-arm elements in its position. Such tactics are indeed the cause of sharp confrontation in the international arena. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is really seeking practical and absolutely specific and tangible solutions capable of introducing elements of trust -- something in such short supply -- into Soviet-American relations. And the problem of halting nuclear tests has not been chosen at random, because it really is -- and I agree here with my colleagues -- the most simple and easily verifiable step, which requires only political will to be achieved.

U.S. Arms Buildup, SDI

[Bovin] Yes, the step has already been prepared; it has been prepared. A very great deal has been done here, and only a little remains to cover the full distance. But the Americans do not want this. They do not want it for a very simple and comprehensible reason: They want to acquire fresh nuclear weapons, the so-called third-generation weapons. And that is why they have planned a nuclear test program into the nineties. They want to complete this program at all costs. That is the crux of the matter.

[Shishlin] They are directly saying that they want to add the Midgetman missile to their armaments. A new nuclear warhead is necessary for Midgetman. They intend to complete its development, but have not yet done so. Therefore, when President Reagan broached this topic at a press conference, it was no accident that he confused the issue, continually saying exceedingly contradictory things, and later that a whole series of White House representatives kept trying to persuade all and sundry that the United States is not offering a new position, but that their stand is as before the massive military program aimed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union.

[Levin] This is a fantasy that is undoubtedly not destined to be realized. We are demonstrating our good will. We are prepared to stop nuclear testing.

We are willing to take radical steps in limiting and reducing armaments. If the United States maintains its present position, however, we will also be forced to take appropriate measures to secure the defense capability of the Soviet Union and our friends and allies. If necessary, we will do it. Our path is not, however, to strengthen confrontation, not a new attempt to engage in a tug-of-war of military confrontation, but rather to consolidate peace. This is the aim of our initiative on a nuclear-blast moratorium, of our pledge not to use nuclear weapons first, and of the decision, already in force, on a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons.

The constructive search for solutions to the problems, which have become acute, is evidenced by the proposal of the Soviet Union to put them on the agenda of the 40th United Nations. In putting forward this proposal, Comrade Shevardnadze stresses: The Soviet Union is proceeding from the fact that mankind is now faced with a choice, either space will bear ever more tangible fruits for improving the living conditions of our planet's inhabitants, or it will turn into a source of a new fatal danger for them. The only sensible choice worthy of the earth in the space age, can and must be made in favor of preventing the militarization of space and conserving it for peaceful activity. To further this idea, the Soviet Union has put forward its proposals on basic guidelines and principles for international cooperation in the peaceful development of space under the condition of its nonmilitarization. The course of the Soviet Union in smoothing out and normalizing international relations naturally has an effect far beyond Soviet-American relations. These are very important relations because of the strength of the responsibility that lies with the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Bovin] And because of the strength, of course, of the uniqueness of the nuclear missile potentials that American and the Soviet Union possess.

South Pacific NFZ

[Bovin] In this connection, we are, of course, interested in overcoming the slump in Soviet-Japanese relations. We are interested in a further normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. We consider that it is necessary to strengthen elements of political stability in the whole of the Pacific Basin. We are ready to do so and we have indeed repeatedly proposed various programs to this end; naturally, we shall work at achieving that goal.

Incidentally, it is very pleasant to note that we are not the only ones to be concerned about this and thinking about this. Take, for instance, a recent fact. You have most likely already read about it, comrades. Quite recently the so-called South Pacific Forum decided to declare the southern party of the Pacific Ocean Basin a nuclear-free zone, a zone free of nuclear weapons.

[Levin] This is a concrete step toward a ban on the access of nuclear weapons to the southern part of the Pacific Ocean. As you know, New Zealand made a corresponding decision despite very strong pressure by the United States.

[Bovin] You mean the decision not to allow ships carrying nuclear weapons or powered by atomic installations to enter its ports.

[Levin] This fits in organically with a nuclear-free zone.

[Bovin] Yes, indeed.

[Levin] And a poster seen by a correspondent for the American news agency AP in Rarotonga characterizes the attitude of the local inhabitants.

[Bovin, laughing] Incidentally, it was nailed to a palm tree.

[Levin, also laughing] Yes, that was so. The poster was very expressive. It said: If they -- that is to say nuclear weapons -- are safe, then deploy them in Washington, store their waste products in Tokyo, and test them in Paris.

[Bovin] This agreement on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean has two aspects. On the one hand the 13 states which gathered in Cook Islands -- on Rarotonga, to be precise -- agreed that they themselves will not produce, test, or deploy these nuclear weapons in their own countries. The disposal of radioactive waste in the Pacific Ocean is also prohibited.

But, there are, after all, nuclear powers, too. Therefore a protocol appended to this treaty will ask all nuclear powers -- namely, the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France, and China -- to sign this protocol and undertake the commitment to observe the status of the nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean.

[Levin] Incidentally, speaking of Asia, it wouldn't hurt to recall that two nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and China, have stated that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. This point is very significant for the general situation in Asia and introduces a very important factor for stability.

[Bovin] Incidentally, it is of interest that recently the Indonesian foreign minister said that the question of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the ASEAN nations' area is now being considered. True, there are no more problems there because of the existence of American bases. Nevertheless, the issue is under consideration, and that is very significant.

[Shishlin] It is doubly and triply significant considering that the threat of the creeping spread of nuclear weapons precisely in this area is fairly real in connection with the things that are going on in Pakistan. The Pakistani authorities, of course, are in general carefully disguising their nuclear program.

It is not fortuitous, however, that very great apprehensions exist in India, Pakistan's neighbor, regarding the intention of the present Pakistani authorities to acquire their own nuclear weapons. Indeed, the political attitudes that are now definitely starting to prevail in this zone are a very important type of political barrier for those striving to break through to the possession of nuclear weapons.

[Bovin] It seems one needs to recall that one nuclear-free zone, namely Latin America, does already exist. In accordance with a treaty that was signed in 1967, the deployment of nuclear weapons is prohibited there. Incidentally, the nuclear powers, including the Americans and us, agreed to this and signed the relevant protocol. Then there have been plans for the creation of nuclear-free zones in the Balkans, northern Europe, and the Mediterranean area.

[Levin] If one returns to Asia, one ought to note that the states of the region have been putting forward a whole number of different proposals aimed at ensuring security in Asia. Thus a number of nonaligned countries proposed that the Indian Ocean be transformed into a zone of peace. The Mongolian People's Republic put forward an initiative for the conclusion of a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force between the state of Asia and the Pacific area. We have proposed that the question of confidence-building and security measures in the Far East be discussed. We have also proposed quite recently that the question of a comprehensive approach to the problem of security in Asia be raised and that the efforts of Asian states be united in this direction. Indeed, we think that there may even be sense in exchanging views and thinking about the convening of an all-Asian conference after the pattern of the all-European conference on security and cooperation.

CSO: 5200/1382

GENERAL

MOSCOW WEEKLY TALK SHOW VIEWS TEST MORATORIUM, CDE

LD241105 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 23 Aug 85

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Igor Surguchev, all-union radio foreign affairs commentator; with Edgar Anatoliyevich Cheporov, APN political observer; Andrey Yevgeniyev, international affairs journalist]

Nuclear Moratorium

[Excerpts] [Surguchev] In their letters many of our listeners write about the fact that peace is the most prized possession of all people, all peoples on the planet, that it must be looked after and protected. They remember the horrors of the last war, the main brunt of which the Soviet people bore on their shoulders, and resolutely advocate specific and effective measures aimed at removing the threat of thermonuclear war which will mean the end of mankind.

Disregard for the opinion of the broad public was obviously displayed these last few days in the refusal of the United States and other countries in the West who possess nuclear weapons to join the Soviet moratorium. I call upon Edgar Anatoliyevich Cheporov, Novosti Press Agency political observer, to dwell on this issue in more detail.

[Cheporov] The arms race and preparation for war policy being carried out by Washington looks more and more self-exposing in the eyes of millions and millions of people: It is being subjected to pointed criticism by government figures, military experts, and scientists. At the same time, Soviet initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race and at the preservation and consolidation of peace are encountering greater and greater support.

Washington's refusal to join the Soviet moratorium has not only stimulated a wave of discontent but also an argued and conclusive critique of the theses of the U.S. leaders. They, as is known, maintain that it is allegedly impossible to verify the observance of a moratorium on nuclear blasts. This argument has evoked numerous protests. Such a check, say the specialists, is possible with the aid of existing national means of control. Among those who side with such views and state then openly one can also name in particular the former director of the CIA, Colby. I do not doubt, he said, in the successfulness of verifying the moratorium's observance.

There is, it should be emphasized, the most direct connection between Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative and the continuation of nuclear blasts. The implementation of this initiative is based on the use of various types of beam weapons, elementary

particle accelerators, antimissile electromagnetic guns, while the power source for many types of similar weapons is the energy from a nuclear blast. Thus, the continuation of nuclear tests and preparations for "star wars" are closely united.

As regards the Soviet Union, it advocates both the cessation of such tests and the peaceful exploration of space in conditions of its nonmilitarization. Why has Moscow presented its new initiative to the world community? Because, first and foremost, the implementation of space militarization plans would lead to an acute increase in the nuclear threat and deprive peoples of any hope of a day when nuclear weapons will disappear off the face of the earth. The arms race would acquire a qualitatively new, even more dangerous dimension in all directions.

The USSR has turned to all countries and peoples with the proposal to do everything in order to avert the arms race in space, in order to work jointly for the good of all mankind. The topicality of such an appeal, it seems to me, is obvious. Currently, proponents of the most varied political views are realizing the danger of the militarization of space.

[Surguchev] And another question: It is asked by Minsk inhabitant Sybkov. Is the negative reply from the White House to our proposal to join the moratorium on nuclear blasts final?

[Cheporov] Well, it's of course difficult to answer for Washington. But, I want to emphasize that the period of our moratorium stretches up to 1 January 1986. What does this mean? Washington has time to think and weigh the consequences of both its refusal and the reaction to this refusal from the public of the world. Criticism addressed at Washington's militaristic plans and demands for support for Soviet initiatives are to be heard everywhere today. First of all, they testify to the fact that the public understands: The genuine threats to the security of mankind emanate from those who are interested in the arms race, who are possessed by ambitions to achieve military superiority. The genuine issue in the current acute international situation is the need for a return to the road of detente, for constructive negotiations on curbing the arms race. That is precisely the course, a course bound for peace and universal security, being followed by the Soviet Union. The new Soviet initiatives have once again demonstrated the USSR's loyalty to a policy of peace.

Stockholm Conference

[Surguchev] Comrade Petrenko, our listener from Odessa, enquires about the state of affairs at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. He asks: Where do the disagreements lie on measures to build confidence and monitor military activity between the Warsaw Pact and NATO bloc countries, and have the sides made progress toward surmounting them? Andrey Yevgeniyev, international affairs journalist, replies to these questions:

[Yevgeniyev] Indeed, at the Stockholm conference extremely serious disagreements have arisen on a number of questions linked with confidence-building measures in the military sphere. Unfortunately, the sides' positions have not yet drawn any closer. We may begin with the fact that the United States and its NATO allies give unwarranted emphasis to military-technical questions, including that of verification, and endeavors to avoid discussion of important political questions. The Warsaw Pact countries, on the other hand, proceed from the premise that the political and military aspects of

European security must be discussed as closely interrelated matters. It is our conviction that only a combination of major measures of a political nature and specific measures in the military sphere can truly restore the political climate in Europe to health.

At the same time, the Warsaw Pact countries attribute great significance to specific confidence-building measures in the military sphere too, in particular to notification and verification. They have, for instance, proposed that all major exercises by land, naval, and air forces, as well as major movements and transfers of troops, be subject to prior notification. The United States and NATO have adopted a different stance on this question. Their proposal on confidence-building measures provides for the supply of information on deployment of armed forces, and individual subunits and headquarters, that is to say, of that information which is in essence intelligence information.

At the same time the United States itself has no intention whatever of providing information on the distribution of units and formations on its territory; this includes the distribution of those units especially destined for military operations in Europe. The United States does not wish to provide notification of military operations by the Navy and Air Force, either. Why not? On what grounds does the United States put itself in a privileged position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, the Warsaw Pact countries, and the neutral and nonaligned countries? These proposals pursue a perfectly obvious aim, that of obtaining unilateral advantages for the United States and NATO, and are thus unacceptable to us.

Furthermore, the NATO countries insist on verification and on-site inspection, which leads to the legitimization of espionage and interference in internal affairs. The legitimate question arises: How does confidence-building come into this? After all, the receipt of such information, on the contrary, intensifies suspicion regarding those seeking to obtain it. At the same time, the NATO proposals lack any real confidence-building measures, like a limitation on the scale of military exercises, notification of the more dangerous types of activity by naval and air forces, and much more. In other words, the United States and its NATO allies would like to supplant real confidence - and security-building measures with an exposure of the structure and the work of the Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact countries. By putting forward the so-called concept of transparency, NATO's strategists are in essence asserting that their establishment of unilateral monitoring of the Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact countries is a little short of the best guarantee of the prevention of nuclear war. It transpires that not restrictions and reductions in armaments, not a renunciation of the use of armed force, but legitimized NATO espionage against the Warsaw Pact is what guarantees peace.

However, it is unlikely that many gullible people will be found, people able to believe this talk seriously and sincerely. Nor are any specialists likely to have any doubt that the striving to obtain espionage intelligence about the Armed Forces of the socialist countries, while keeping one's own military activity secret, is inseparably linked with the aggressive preparations of the North Atlantic bloc. Attempts to make monitoring an end in itself are incompatible in principle with the mandate of the Stockholm conference. Verification must be carried out in a form and on a scale appropriate to each specific confidence-building measure.

Generally speaking, the conclusion of any agreement in itself presupposes the sides' trust in each other with regard to their implementation of the obligations they take upon themselves. However, the manipulation of the problem of monitoring can only give rise to a legitimate question: Do the United States and its allies want to use it, as they have done several times at other forums, to block the work of the conference?

GENERAL

USSR'S BURLATSKIY EXAMINES U.S. NUCLEAR CONTROL SYSTEM

PM280938 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Aug 85 p 9

[Political observer Fedor Burlatskiy "Pertinent Remarks": "The 'Last Judgment' Button"]

[Text] The U.S. military-strategic doctrine contains a problem of which people have hitherto preferred not to speak. This is the problem of decisionmaking in the event of a nuclear conflict.

The reason why this problem is so delicate lies in the fact that it concerns actions by the U.S. President, whose duty it is to make such decisions, or by the person who would replace the President in the event of his death.

It was 20 years ago that we first heard an amusing and simultaneously dramatic fact. In actual fact, the U.S. President can never be alone: his permanent shadow is a man carrying a black briefcase. This man sleeps at the White House, hovers about in the President's office, and accompanies him on every trip, wherever he may travel. This mysterious individual is a Pentagon officer. The briefcase contains metal plates with secret codes. Using these plates, the President can -- at any time and from any place -- give the order to effect a nuclear strike. In other words, this small black box contains the death of all beings on our planet.

The problem is primarily moral and political. Who has entrusted the U.S. President with this black box? Who has given him the power to destroy the American people or other peoples in today's world?

I will leave aside another issue -- the issue of what must be felt by a President possessing such power or doomed to perform such a mission. We could learn something about it from Lucifer, whose power, however, was miniscule compared with that of the President. The pranks of which we read in books by Goethe or Bulgakov seem like child's play compared with the nuclear reality of our age.

There is, however, also a practical problem: Will the President, or any other person replacing him, be capable of making a decision on a nuclear counterstrike? How could the President make such a decision within the few minutes at his disposal, under the chaotic conditions in the event of a nuclear conflict?

This is precisely the problem which is being widely discussed in the U.S. press today in the light of the publication of a book which actually bears the title "The Button." It is written by Daniel Ford, former director of the Union of Concerned Scientists. The scientist's conclusion is incontrovertible: The President is incapable of making a decision on a nuclear counterstrike. This is practically impossible. And here are Ford's arguments.

The entire "control and launch" system, which determines the decisionmaking process for a nuclear strike, was set up in the period between the fifties and the eighties, and it has simply failed to adapt itself in practice to the present-day evolution of nuclear missile weapons. Now a potential enemy has no need at all to use up his entire nuclear missile arsenal for a first strike. It is sufficient to hit vitally important command and communication centers. And these comprise no more than a few dozen targets. "Nuclear bombs are not even necessary to destroy these centers," Ford remarks. "Just a few strike units armed with bazookas would be sufficient."

The most important element in the book is the conclusion which Ford draws from his deliberations. And this conclusion seems to be to be incontrovertible. Ford proves that the U.S. military command has deliberately disregarded the modernization of the "control and launch system" because, although it is verbally in favor of a counterstrike doctrine, in actual fact the White House intends a first strike in the event of an acute crisis.

The "Button" problem raises several acute and urgent questions concerning guarantees against the emergence of a nuclear conflict. These include the question of guarantees against the accidental outbreak of nuclear war; the question of the machinery of mutual information (the "hot line" and others) by means of which the sides can remain in instantaneous communication in critical situations; the question of the machinery to prevent an escalation of the nuclear conflict; and a number of others. And, of course, the fundamental question concerns the absolute and unconditional rejection of the first-strike doctrine which, in fact, creates an unavoidable threat.

This is why we overflow with disgust at the entire "black box" situation, created by shortsighted politicians who started this game 40 years ago and are incapable of stopping their deadly run [zabeg]. The space round of this run can make the situation even more tragic and even more irrational. Honest people, including those in the U.S. Union of Concerned Scientists, are called upon to do everything within their power so that the "last judgment situation" disappears forever from the life of human society.

CSO: 5200/1382

GENERAL

BRIEFS

BELORUSSIAN UN STATEMENT--New York, 8 Aug (TASS)--The present international situation requires that all states join forces to tackle tasks in the sphere of averting nuclear war, of limiting the arms race, and of disarmament, says a reply from the Belorussian SSR to the UN secretary general, who requested UN member-countries to express their views on the activities of the United Nations in the area of disarmament. The Belorussian SSR believes that the United Nations can and must play an important role in the struggles for the prevention of nuclear war and for disarmament, the document notes. If these aims remain unrealized, the reason is to be found in the obstacles set in the way for disarmament by the United States and its closest allies.
[Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 8 Aug 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1382

END