

006084

JPRS-TAC-85-040

11 October 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980728 072

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10
87
A45

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.

11 October 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA Editorial Article Condemns ASAT Testing (Moscow TASS, 17 Sep 85)	1
IZVESTIYA's Bovin Analyzes U.S. ASAT Effort (Aleksandr Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 8 Sep 85)	5
USSR: September Comments on Allies' Role in SDI (Various sources, various dates)	9
FRG Defense Minister's Backing Hit, by V. Chernyshev	9
Japanese Tracking Technology to U.S.	10
Allied Representatives Visiting Washington	11
U.S. Pressuring Allies	11
Canadian CP Leader Cited	12
Greece Opposed	13
Denmark Rejects U.S. Pressure	13
U.S. Attention to Spain	14
Italian CP Head Cited	14
Canada Officially Rejects Participation, by Yuriy Kharlanov	15
IZVESTIYA on FRG Stance, by V. Matveyev	16
NATO 'Open Discussion' Critical	17
Subordinate European Role Seen, by Nikolay Borin	18
NATO, Public Opposition, by Vladimir Tsvetov	19
European Parliament Members Opposed	20
Japan's Participation Criticized, by Boris Andrianov	20
Conservative Norwegian Daily: ASAT Testing Poorly Timed (Editorial; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 6 Sep 85).....	22
Norwegian Industry Federation Spokesman Backs SDI (Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 27 Oct 85)	24
Eureka Official on Hopes, Aims for Program (Paris LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE, Aug 85)	25

Europe's Strengthes, Weaknesses in Eureka Technologies (Andre-Yves Portnoff, et al.; Paris LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE, Aug 85)	31
---	----

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS Cites U.S. Air Force Secretary on B-1 Program (Moscow TASS, 18 Sep 85)	44
TASS on Trident Sub Program Development (Moscow TASS 15, 19 Sep 85)	45
Alaska Sea Trials	45
Nevada Launched	45

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Dutch Cabinet Ponders 5-Year Cruise Missile Treaty (The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN, 19 Sep 85)	46
--	----

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

USSR: Reports, Comments on Opening of Next Round of Talks (Moscow Domestic Service, 12, 25 Sep 85; Moscow TASS, 25, 26 Sep 85)	48
Delegation Head Interviewed, by Igor Charikov	48
Talks Said Deadlocked	51
Soviet Delegation Arrives	52
Talks Reopen	52
TASS Correction	52

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Dutch Defense Minister Opposes Chemical Weapons (The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN, 11 Sep 85)	53
---	----

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow Views New Zealand Nuclear Policy, U.S. Reaction (Yevgeniy Kachanov; Moscow Domestic Service, 29 Sep 85)	54
TASS Cites New Zealand Deputy Premier on Ship Ban (Moscow PRAVDA, 21 Sep 85; TASS 21 Sep 85)	56
Talks in Washington	56
ANZUS Membership Reaffirmed	56

TASS: UN Calls for Mideast Nuclear-Free Zone (Moscow TASS, 13 Sep 85)	57
TASS: U.S. Battleship's Route Draws Protests in Scandinavia (Moscow TASS, 27 Sep 85)	58
Defense Institute Chief Attacks Nordic Zone Idea (Thorleif Andreassen; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 6 Sep 85)	59
Briefs	
TASS: U.S. Rejects C. Europe	62
TASS on Swedish Campaign	62
PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR	
Briefs	
TASS on UN Report	63
GENERAL	
USSR's Shevardnadze Addresses UN Security Council (Moscow TASS, 26 Sep 85)	64
PRAVDA Weekly Review: Geneva Talks, Space, Chemical Arms (Vitaliy Korionov; Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Sep 85)	67
Japan Socialist Party Delegation Discusses Arms Issues in USSR (Various sources, various dates)	71
Kremlin Meeting With Gorbachev	71
TASS Correction to Report	72
Newspaper Versions	73
Criticism of SDI	73
SS-20's Discussed	74
Press Conference	74
Meets Soviet Scientists	76
Moscow Broadcast to Japan, by Askold Biryukov	77
Politburo Discusses Visit	78
Joint Communique	79
Briefs	
UK Labourite in Moscow	82

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE CONDEMNS ASAT TESTING

LD170813 Moscow TASS in English 0746 GMT 17 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, Sep 17 TASS -- The newspaper PRAVDA today published an editorial headlined, "Step in the Dangerous Direction", which exposed the rationale behind the U.S. testing of an ASAT system.

Follows the full text this article:

The Soviet Union is persistently looking for ways of solving the overriding question of the times, that of stopping the arms race, taking the arms limitation process out of the deadlock and ensure a turn for peaceful mutually beneficial cooperation. The peaceful policy of our country meets the aspirations of all nations. The constructive initiatives lately made by the Soviet Union have evoked a positive response in different political and government quarters and broad public circles.

The USSR's decision to impose a moratorium on any nuclear explosions has also been welcomed across the world. This moratorium, in force since August 6, 1985, will remain in effect also after January 1, 1986, if the United States also discontinues its nuclear testing. The Soviet moratorium on the placement of anti-satellite weapons in outer space has been effective for as many as two years now, while lying on the negotiating table in Geneva there is a Soviet proposal to the United States for a mutual and complete end to all efforts to develop anti-satellite systems whose testing has not been completed. The USSR has suspended the deployment of its medium-range missiles as well as other counter-measures in Europe.

So more and more people are asking what is a legitimate question in this situation: How has the American Administration reacted to all this, what has been Washington's response to the sincere manifestation of a commitment to peace, to the concrete and tangible moves undertaken by the Soviet Union to preserve peace on earth and preclude a nuclear catastrophe?

The answer to this question is obviously not comforting. The U.S. Administration has not just turned down the Soviet initiatives under different **pretexts**, dismissing them as "propaganda". It has done more than that: Whereas the USSR has terminated nuclear blasts, the United States conducted nuclear weapons tests one after another immediately afterwards. While the USSR has suspended the deployment of its medium-range systems way back from April 7, 1985; the United States, having deployed as many as over 200 Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe, has continued a crash effort to build up this group of first-strike arms. The USSR has submitted in the United Nations a proposal for

international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in conditions of the latter's non-militarization, while the United States has responded by trying out an anti-satellite ASAT system and thereby demonstrating an intention to rev up preparations for "star wars".

The United States on September 13, 1985, fire-tested an air-launched anti-satellite ASAT missile against a target in space, which was a real space craft. That was already the third testing of the system. The previous two tests, which did not involve any target damage, took place in 1984.

One cannot fail to note that the latest test was staged while the Soviet Union maintained its unilateral moratorium on the placement of any kinds of anti-satellite weaponry in space for as long as other countries, including the United States, also refrain from such actions. As it made that commitment, the Soviet Union proceeded from the belief that the moratorium would provide a good basis for radical measures to prevent the militarization of outer space and help put an end to the arms race in all areas. The moratorium decision has graphically demonstrated the Soviet Union's good will and its determination to strengthen peace and international security in practice.

As it took that step, the USSR hoped that the United States would follow the lead.

But that has not happened. Washington has ignored the offered possibility to move forward jointly with the Soviet Union along the road of preventing the militarization of outer space, reducing international tension and checking the arms race. Disregarding the serious warning about the consequences of the U.S. continued testing of anti-satellite weapons, made in the TASS statement of September 5, 1985 the White House has chosen to carry on the policy of destabilizing the situation, heightening confrontation and achieving military superiority.

The U.S. Defense Department's testing of the anti-satellite system has been a step in the dangerous direction. It has been meant to help pave the way to creating a new class of armaments, space strike systems, whose emergence would inevitably sap stability in the world and open new channels for an unbridled nuclear arms race, first of all a race in strategic weapons, resulting in lesser world security.

In Washington it is being claimed that the testing of American anti-satellite systems has been prompted by the need for the United States to catch up with the USSR in the development of anti-satellite weapons. Such claims are nothing more than an invention, pure and simple. The United States began developing anti-satellite weapons as far back as the mid-1950's. It became the first country to test such weapons in 1959. In the early 1960's the United States deployed two ground based anti-satellite complexes on Khajalein and Johnston Islands in the Pacific. By testing air-launched anti-satellite (ASAT) missiles now, the United States is creating an anti-satellite system of already the second generation. Compelled to take counter-measures in response to the above U.S. actions, the Soviet Union began its tests of anti-satellite weapons much later. Besides, those tests were halted in 1983 as the USSR announced its unilateral moratorium and have not been conducted since.

The United States' development of anti-satellite weapons among other kinds of space strike systems is directly connected with its pursuance of the "star wars" program which is part of overall U.S. strategic military plans to achieve military superiority over the USSR. The United States has been out to fulfill these plans ever since the appearance of nuclear weapons. But it has not gained any advantages from the nuclear arms race it has launched. None of the U.S. attempts to win superiority over the

Soviet Union has achieved the desired end. The USSR's counter-measures have invariably brought all such efforts to naught.

Now it is outer space where the United States has decided to try and achieve military superiority. In Washington they have set themselves the aim of creating an anti-missile shield which would enable the Pentagon to acquire capability to deal the first nuclear strike with impunity. This is an extremely dangerous plan. And for justice's sake it ought to be said that it is dangerous not only to those against whom it is directed, but also to the United States itself.

Isn't it clear that Washington's implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) would inevitably lead to the undercutting of Soviet-American accords in the field of strategic arms limitation, most notably the ABM Treaty of 1972? No reasoning, no pseudoarguments by American Administration spokesmen can refute this fact. The objectives of the ABM Treaty and the objectives of the SDI are directly opposite. Whereas the treaty is aimed against the deployment of a large-scale ABM system and bans laying even the groundwork for such systems, the SDI's prime goal is to create a comprehensive multi-layered anti-missile system. Every step towards the SDI's realization thus leads to undermining the ABM Treaty and hence the entire process of limiting and reducing strategic arms.

The creation and deployment of strike weapons in space by one side will compel the other side to restore the strategic balance being upset in this way and will inexorably lead to increases in the number of strategic nuclear arms and their qualitative improvements and make it impossible to limit and reduce them. This is why the U.S. Administration's attempts to reassure the public that it is possible to achieve cuts in strategic nuclear arms without banning space strike weapons and that the SDI issue should be taken out of consideration at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms appear irresponsible. As Mikhail S. Gorbachev has said, "If there is no ban on the militarization of outer space, if an arms race in space is not prevented, then there will be nothing at all".

Misleading world public opinion, U.S. Administration spokesmen claim that the USSR evades making concrete proposals for arms limitation and stronger world security. But there are concrete Soviet proposals lying on the negotiating tables in Geneva, Vienna and Stockholm.

In Geneva the USSR has proposed a full ban on space strike weapons, including anti-satellite weapons, and, in the conditions of such a ban, a radical reduction of nuclear armaments. What it means is not only nuclear weapons delivery vehicles but also nuclear munitions, not only strategic weapons but also medium-range nuclear arms. What can be more concrete?

In Vienna the USSR and other socialist countries involved in the negotiations have tabled what are no less concrete proposals for cuts in the numerical strength of the sides' armed forces in central Europe together with their armaments. It has been proposed as a first step to cut the number of the USSR's and the United States' ground troops respectively by 20,000 and 13,000 men. Other carefully-detailed measures, including those concerning verification, have also been suggested. These proposals can take the Vienna talks out of the impasse. The only thing lacking is the desire of Western powers to come to terms.

In Stockholm the USSR and other socialist countries are pressing for working out major and effective confidence-building measures, including agreement on the no-first-use of nuclear weapons and on the no-use of force in state-to-state relations. Working docu-

ments have been submitted with amplified proposals on confidence- and security-building measures.

This is how matters are standing in reality.

Lying concealed behind the U.S. testing of the anti-satellite ASAT system is the Pentagon's striving not only to acquire weapons for anti-satellite warfare in the immediate future but also to master, under the guise of the testing of anti-satellite systems, also anti-missile systems of air and other basing modes, which are banned under the ABM Treaty. Here too Washington is demonstrating its real attitude to the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly urged the American Administration to weigh the inevitable negative implications of the testing of anti-satellite weapons for the prospects for the Geneva negotiations. As has been said in the recent TASS statement, in the event of the U.S. testing of anti-satellite weapons against a target in outer space the Soviet Union would consider itself free of its unilateral commitment not to place anti-satellite systems in space. This means that the U.S. hopes to achieve military superiority over the USSR will fail to materialize this time as well.

The U.S. testing of the ASAT system has not only been a "strength test" of the Geneva talks. It has also been an obvious attempt by certain American quarters to damage the process of preparations for the Soviet-American summit meeting forthcoming next November and aggravate the world atmosphere even further.

As is known, the Soviet Union prepares for the Geneva meeting in earnest, attaching tremendous significance to it and linking serious hopes with it. It does and will continue doing everything for the meeting to yield palpable results in improving relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union is going to this meeting with sincere good will and a desire to do everything possible to enhance peace. And the latest step by the American side, aiming to poison the international atmosphere in the run-up to the meeting in Geneva, will of course be duly assessed both in the Soviet Union and in the world as a whole.

Comparison to PRAVDA Test

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 18 September carries in its First Edition on page 4 an editorial article under the headline "A Step in a Dangerous Direction. What Is Behind the Test of the ASAT System in the United States." The editorial article has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published above, revealing the following variations:

Paragraph four, line seven, reads in PRAVDA: ...develop antisatellite systems and to destroy the antisatellite means existing in the United States and the USSR whose testing has not been completed. The USSR has temporarily halted the development of..(adding new phrase on destroying existing antisatellite means and substituting "temporarily halted" for "suspended").

Paragraph sixteen, line four, reads in PRAVDA: ...but also nuclear charges [zaryad], not only strategic...(substituting "charges" for "munitions").

CSO: 5200/1009

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA'S BOVIN ANALYZES U.S. ASAT EFFORT

PM091445 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Sep 85 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "The Aim of ASAT"]

[Text] Washington is preparing in a very peculiar way for the Soviet-American summit meeting.

In August there was another nuclear explosion. In September they plan to test an antisatellite system. This is what the acronym ASAT stands for. In both cases the demonstrative nature of the U.S. actions is emphasized by the fact that they are being performed against the background of the Soviet Union's unilateral decisions to halt tests of nuclear and antisatellite weapons. In both cases the U.S. authorities are citing the U.S. "lag" and the need to "catch up" with the USSR, "redress the balance," and so on.

I will remind readers that the U.S. "lag" in the nuclear tests sphere is as follows, if you take the data of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute: 772 U.S. explosions against 556 of ours. And what about anti-satellite weapons?

In fact, the United States has been working on the creation of these weapons for more than 2 decades now. In 1963 President Kennedy approved a plan to create an "active antisatellite potential." In 1964 several Nike-Zeus missiles were tested and deployed for antisatellite purposes. At the same time, the U.S. Air Force was testing Thor missiles for the same purpose. These antisatellite weapons were installed on Kwajalein Atoll and Johnston Island in the Pacific and stayed in position until 1975. Of course, the Soviet Union had to react to the situation. But, as ever, it was the Americans who provoked the arms race. If anyone had to do the "catching up" it was us. Not because we were that far "behind." But because the arms race was not of our choosing.

The years of detente led to the start of talks on banning antisatellite weapons. But in 1979, after three rounds of talks, the Americans refused to carry on. The course was set toward actively incorporating antisatellite weapons into the combat potential. The 4 July 1982 U.S. presidential directive on national space policy clearly states: "The United States will continue to develop an antisatellite systems potential for the purpose of...depriving

any enemy of the opportunity to use space-based systems designed to support armed forces."

Since it turns out that nuclear explosions can knock out one's own as well as others' satellites, the emphasis is now being planed on nonnuclear antisatellite weapons. Here is a general outline of ASAT. An F-15 jet fighter flies almost vertically toward the upper strata of the atmosphere and releases a 2-stage missile. Fastened to the missile is a cylindrical "miniature homing device" (like "a large jam jar," U.S. journalists write), containing miniature motors and an infrared homing system. The device homes in on the satellite's heat emission and rams it. The satellite is thus put out of action by a simple blow, without an explosion.

Work has started on a second-generation antisatellite weapon (using lasers and so forth).

The intensive U.S. efforts to create an antisatellite system should be viewed against the background of constant attempts to gain strategic military superiority over the USSR. The purpose of the antisatellite weapons is to ensure that the aggressor is able to survive after he has delivered the first strike. "For the United States," one U.S. expert, (T. Keras), indicates, "the creation of antisatellite systems would be pointless unless the plan was to deliver a first strike and start a nuclear war." U.S. Under Secretary of Defense F. Ikle was more specific: "The use of antisatellite systems, as an integral element of a first strike to destroy all or many 'key' enemy satellites, is intended to make retaliation considerably more difficult."

The task is to destroy other people's satellites and preserve its own. But preserving its own means substantially increasing the accuracy and effectiveness of nuclear missile strikes and maintaining constant control of nuclear potential, in other words, acquire the capability, as U.S. strategists see it, to wage and "win" not only a "limited," but a "protracted" nuclear war.

Here we meet a curious feature of U.S. military thinking: overestimation of its own potential and underestimation of the "enemy's" potential. As a result, the Americans' calculations assume an ephemeral character.

The White House is trying to persuade the public that ASAT has nothing to do with the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]." This is untrue. ASAT and SDI are similar in terms of their strategic prerequisites--disarming the "enemy" and depriving him of the opportunity to deliver an effective retaliatory strike. ASAT and SDI are closely related technically as well. Here, for example, is what F. Kaplan, military observer of the BOSTON GLOBE, writes: "In fact, the technical facilities needed for the latest antisatellite weapon systems--tracking mechanisms, sensors, and so forth--are fairly similar to the technical facilities needed to bring down ballistic missiles. And the logic of the arms race in the sphere of antisatellite weapons offers great opportunities for the advocates of "Star Wars," who will be able to get their programs through the back door by various means if the front door ends up being closed to them." You can also read about this in THE NEW YORK TIMES. The question of antisatellite weapons, (Ch. Mor) writes, is also of great

significance "since some of the abovementioned equipment could be used in the context of the Reagan administration's plan to create space-based ABM systems. For example, last year a missile warhead was successfully intercepted outside the atmosphere. This was done within the framework of the army's ABM plan using a homing technique virtually identical to the Air Force antisatellite weapons."

All in all, ASAT is part and parcel of the U.S. policy aimed at creating a variety of space strike systems. Of a policy which will make our already not exactly comfortable world even more dangerous.

The Soviet Union is actively struggling for a different kind of future. Our premise is that guaranteeing the safe operation of every state's satellites is currently an element of overall military strategic stability. We are prepared, on a reciprocal basis, not only to refrain from testing or creating new antisatellite systems, but to liquidate those that already exist. The Soviet Union set a good example in August 1983 by declaring a moratorium on all launching and testing of antisatellite weapons. The moratorium will continue as long as the other side refrains from similar activity. And as TASS said the other day, if the United States tests the ASAT system the USSR will consider itself free from the unilateral obligation.

But Washington is pressing on. In January 1984, within the framework of ASAT, the United States tested the motor of a missile launched from an F-15. In November the infrared telescopes and motors guiding the warhead to the target were tested. Now we have comprehensive testing of the entire system.

It should be said that in the United States a substantial number of people are aware of the danger of the administration's militarist aspirations. In late 1984 the U.S. Congress banned antisatellite weapon tests until 1 March 1985. In late February 1985 more than 100 congressmen sent a letter to R. Reagan appealing to the president to retrain the moratorium on ASAT system tests for the duration of the Geneva talks.

Unfortunately, in May 1985 the U.S. Senate authorized the Pentagon to carry out three more antisatellite weapon tests. The House of Representatives did not agree with the Senate and voted for a test ban.

In the end the following compromise was found. Congress sanctioned appropriations for carrying out three tests. But the White House had to give Congress assurances, at least 15 days before the tests, that four conditions had been met:

- that the White House was seeking to reach an accord with Moscow on anti-satellite weapon quotas;
- that the tests could not worsen the prospects of talks;
- the the tests accord with U.S. security interests;
- that the tests would not violate existing arms control treaties.

Naturally, R. Reagan gave Congress all the necessary assurances. Although, the president will clearly have to take his own words more seriously....

In conclusion, I want to return to the idea I presented at the beginning of the article. The U.S. administration is preparing for the Geneva meeting in a very odd way. The impression is that both nuclear explosions and space experiments are not just weapon tests but tests of our restraint, our great restraint and patience. Certainly our intentions are good. But I fear that the Americans' self-importance, their arrogance, and their intoxication with their own strength could let them down badly....

CSO: 5200/1009

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: SEPTEMBER COMMENTS ON ALLIES' ROLE IN SDI

FRG Defense Minister's Backing Hit

PM091521 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Sep 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS-attributed commentary by V. Chernyshev, observer on military questions:
"Hastening to Participate in the 'Celestial' Adventures"]

[Text] "Star wars" are giving FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner no rest. He is afraid of missing out and is hastening to involve his country in the space strike weapons race and to "reinforce" the Washington-Bonn militarist axis even more. The Herr Minister does not begrudge his spare time: On his way back from vacation in Canada he "dropped in" at the Pentagon to discuss a "more precise schedule" for U.S.-FRG government-level consultations on the question of Bonn's participation in implementing the U.S. "star wars" program.

As I remember, addressing a session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in 1984, M. Woerner admitted that this program leads to destabilization of the strategic situation, promotes the whipping up of a new arms race spiral, and involves the danger of the emergence of "reduced security zones in NATO." However, he did not "maintain" this position very long. Bonn's role as Washington's "general representative" in West Europe does not permit it to have its own opinion. Moreover, the defense minister rapidly realized that FRG participation in the "star wars" program would give it equal "rights" with Britain and France, considerably reducing the latter's advantages as European nuclear powers. And indeed, the opportunity is emerging of attaining the long and passionately desired but forbidden goal of joining in the creation of nuclear weapons. For Bonn knows that, despite all the assurances of U.S. Administration representatives that the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) will make nuclear weapons "powerless and obsolete," Washington is creating a new generation of nuclear weapons within the framework of the "star wars" program. Finally, the Herr Minister feels a certain "responsibility" to the FRG military-industrial complex, which is thirsting with longing after the excess profits it could make from a "slice" of the multibillion-dollar "celestial" cake.

For this reason, casting aside his earlier skepticism about the SDI, M. Woerner has taken up a totally pro-American position. Now he is hastening to express dissatisfaction because "the train is already moving" but the FRG Government is still pondering "whether it is going in the right direction." At the

American-West German meeting in Dallas this year, he said bluntly: "We support the SDI research program." M. Woerner is in total solidarity with Chancellor H. Kohl, who proclaimed in the Bundestag: "From our viewpoint the American research program is justified.... It is politically necessary."

Excuse me, necessary for whom: for the FRG people? No: for Washington, which is dreaming of attaining military-strategic superiority and creating a first nuclear strike potential and is planning all kinds of "limited" nuclear wars and counting on impunity. Representatives of the opposition have described this policy of the FRG federal government as "glaring evidence of groveling" to the United States. It must be added to this that participation in the "star wars" program goes counter to the FRG's national interests, prepared for it the role of Washington's "celestial-nuclear" hostage and supplier of scientific-technical ideas and financial resources to the United States, and makes the Federal Republic an accomplice of those who plan to upset the process of arms limitation and reduction and drive the world to nuclear catastrophe.

It is time that all this was assimilated by the Bonn emissaries drafting and coordinating the "schedule" for involving their country in Washington's "celestial" adventures.

Japanese Tracking Technology to U.S.

LD052300 Moscow TASS in English 1937 GMT 5 Sep 85

["Acting Hand in Glove With the USA" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 5 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

Japan is starting the supply of technology to the USA to be used in the creation of missile tracking systems. An official statement to this effect was made in Tokyo on Wednesday. This step means practical implementation of the bilateral U.S.-Japanese agreement signed in November 1983, under which Japan undertook to share with the United States new technology that can be used for military purposes. This transfer and the consent in principle of the Nakasone cabinet to join in Washington's "star wars" programme places Japan into a position of an accomplice in the U.S. plans for a militarisation of outer space.

Washington has apparently set out to gear its Japanese ally even closer to Reagan's "Strategic Defence Initiative". This striving is also explained by the fact that Japan already boasts major achievements in the field of the latest technology and is engaged in intensive research and design projects, which the Pentagon intends to use to its advantage.

They in Tokyo are trying to portray the transfer of military technology to the United States as some kind of an advance designed to bring down the strong protectionist sentiments at the U.S. Congress and ease Washington's pressure in its demands that Japan's military spending should exceed the earlier-set limit of not more than one percent of the country's GNP. This pressure is being exerted and is further increasing as the adverse balance in U.S. trade with Japan is speedily growing.

But with all their acuteness, these political and trade and economic problems move to the background in face of a broadening Washington-Tokyo military alliance. It has become some kind of a tradition that each visit to Japan of the head of the U.S. military department is accompanied with Tokyo's new concession to its American ally. This time again on the eve of the visit to Japan of Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger scheduled for early October the Japanese side has prepared a "gift" in the form of the above-said decision on the transfer to the USA of missile tracking technology.

The Nakasone cabinet even earlier contravened the principles established by the parliament and setting a framework for arms exports abroad. Nowadays, they are also violating the resolution of the lower chamber of the Japanese parliament confining Japan's participation in the exploration of outer space to peaceful aims only.

The American military doctrine determines the Asian-Pacific region as a potential arena of military-political confrontation. The alliance with Japan is assigned a special role in it, which cannot but be a source of concern for the neighbour peoples. Marking the 40th anniversary of the routing of Japanese militarism, they condemn the Washington-Tokyo alliance and declare of turning Asia by joint efforts into zone of peace and security, of equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation.

Allied Representatives Visiting Washington

LD102352 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Sep 85

[Text] The Reagan administration is continuing its concentrated brainwashing of its NATO allies, trying to attract them towards the implementation of the U.S. star wars program. In order to influence public opinion in West Europe, an instructive talk was organized in the Pentagon for journalists from NATO countries, which was conducted by U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger. He demanded that West Europeans agree to take part in the implementation of Washington's plans. The head of the Pentagon noted in particular that Japan and several European countries, including Great Britain, Italy and the FRG, are sending representatives to the United States to discuss work within the framework of the program. He maintained that, quite soon, a corresponding agreement would be concluded with London.

In the assessments of informed observers, Washington is counting on using the visit of Danish Prime Minister Schlueter, who has arrived in the United States, in order to try to make Denmark review her position on the issue of the star wars program.

U.S. Pressuring Allies

PM1201040 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "The Pentagon Is Eying Space; The United States Is Formulating a Program in Preparation for 'Star Wars'"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 10 Sep--According to a report by the CBS television company, the Atlantis reusable spacecraft which is scheduled to be launched 3 October under the space shuttle program will put a secret Pentagon load into

orbit. Television company commentators have said that in the future the principle of secrecy will apply to all military flights under the space shuttle program.

At the same time the Reagan administration is continuing to exert massive pressure on its NATO allies, trying to involve them in the implementation of the "star wars" program. In order to influence public opinion in West Europe a briefing for NATO countries' journalists by U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger was organized in the Pentagon. The zealous apologist of the "strategic defense initiative" demanded from the West Europeans that they throw off all misgivings and reservations and agree to take part in the realization of Washington's plans.

According to well-informed observers' assessments, Washington is hoping to use the visit of P. Schlueter, the Danish prime minister who has arrived in the United States, to try to make Denmark revise its position on the "star wars" issue. As is well known, the Danish Government has declined the U.S. invitation to take part in the implementation of the plans for the militarization of space.

Washington's dangerous plans to transform space into a potential theater of combat actions have met with resolute condemnation both in the United States itself and throughout the world.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the Reagan administration's decision to test antisatellite weapons will be the topic of two congressional hearings. Congressman G. Brown (Democrat, California) has described the assurance given by the president to Congress on antisatellite systems tests as "pious deceit."

Canadian CP Leader Cited

LD120644 Moscow TASS in English 0637 GMT 12 Sep 85

[Text] Ottawa, September 12. [TASS]--General secretary of the Communist Party of Canada made the following statement on the government's attitude towards "star wars" program:

"Public pressure compelled Prime Minister Mulroney to say no to direct government participation in the United States star wars program.

This however does not mean the government won't participate. It will do so indirectly through various private companies, all financed by the government. This is all the U.S. Government wants at this time.

"This back door operation will suck Canada into the star wars program with all its serious consequences."

LD121414 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 12 Sep 85

[Text] Athens September 12 TASS--The Greek Government has condemned the U.S. plans aimed at militarising outer space. "We are categorically against war and against the strategic defense initiative," said Kostas Laliotis, a spokesman of the Greek Government. "We reject the development of any technological programs connected with the arms race."

Denmark Rejects U.S. Pressure

LD120952 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 12 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reports:

Denmark's prime minister Poul Schluter has confirmed that his government rejects participation in the work to realize the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" of the United States.

Speaking at a press conference upon the completion of the official visit to Washington, Poul Schluter stated that his government does not support this initiative. Denmark is not the sole NATO country to have refused to join the dangerous Pentagon plans to militarize outer space. In this connection, the prime minister recalled that the same stand was taken, for instance, by the Canadian Government.

Denmark's refusal to take part in the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative", confirmed by Poul Schluter, drew particular attention of observers in view of the fact that strong pressure was put on the prime minister during his meetings with President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and other high-ranking administration officials. Attempts were made to force him to revise this stand and join "star wars" preparations.

The question of Denmark's "contribution" to NATO defense, under discussion during the visit, also revealed substantial differences. Poul Schluter did not conceal that the U.S. side demanded in a rather categorical manner that the Danish Government raise dramatically the level of military spending. Judging by the prime minister's statements at the press conference, he refused to do it, saying that he considers the present level of spending to be "rather high".

At the same time, one cannot disregard the fact that the positions of the sides on a number of issues have coincided. For instance, Poul Schluter made it clear at the press conference that he shares the view of the Reagan administration that progress at arms control talks allegedly depends entirely on the Soviet side which has to come up with "respective initiatives".

The Soviet Union is known to be calling for an improvement in the international situation and putting forward specific proposals on this score. The graphic example of this is the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions with the call to the U.S.A. to act likewise, the Soviet proposals at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms and the proposal on international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space in conditions of its non-militarization, tabled at the United Nations Organisation.

U.S. Attention to Spain

LD161120 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 1900 GMT 15 Sep 85

[Excerpts] The U.S. Administration's "star wars" program, aspirations to militarize outer space, and ASAT tests against a real target in space, have all caused great alarm in Spain's public.

Our observer Yevgeniy Olin writes: Is the possibility of the future inclusion of Spain in the Strategic Defense Initiative in one way or another being considered?

The statements by some political observers are significant when, in their enthusiasm, they talk about involving Spain further in the West's collective defense system.

The United States has started to pay more and more attention to Spain, stressing technical and scientific cooperation. For example, great publicity is given to the authorization given by the U.S. Administration to the U.S. consortium of AT&T to build one of the most modern plants in the world for the manufacture of electronic integral microdiagrams for microprocessors in Spain. The United States gave this authorization together with a whole series of conditions. The main one is that Spain is to guarantee security within the framework of the general line of keeping U.S. industrial secrets and not permitting the reexport of high-technology production to socialist countries. The Spanish side accepted these conditions.

Washington considers Spain's close cooperation with U.S. firms, including AT&T, working for the military-industrial complex and in particular, for the SDI program, will eventually allow it to participate in the new U.S. space doctrine.

Italian CP Head Cited

LD161822 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 16 Sep 85

[Excerpt] Rome, September 16 TASS--General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party Alessandro Natta delivered a lengthy speech at the nationwide fete of the newspaper UNITA that ended in the city of Ferrara.

Alessandro Natta spoke highly of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions, stressing that this step has become a great positive contribution to the preparation of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. "Hawks" from the other side stated that this is merely propaganda. I believe that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev said justifiably that if the United States did the same, no one would be harmed by competition in such "propaganda", Alessandro Natta said. But the Reagan administration made these days a step which causes extreme concern, a test of anti-satellite weapons in space.

We demand that Italy should declare clearly against the new spiral of the arms race and militarization of outer space, he said.

Canada Officially Rejects Participation

PM201531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[Article by Yuriy Kharlanov under the rubric: "Our Commentary": "Mixed Feelings
[I Khochetsya i Koletsya]]]

[Text] Canada has officially rejected the U.S. offer to take part in the "star wars" program on an intergovernmental basis while, however, giving private companies and institutions the freedom to accept orders for that purpose from the United States. This is announced in a letter which E. Neilsen, the deputy premier and defense minister, has sent to U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger. And, although the Canadian minister praises Reagan's space "initiative" in his letter and even, contrary to the truth, states that it does not contradict the ABM Treaty, it remains a fact that Ottawa has understood that involvement in U.S. plans to transfer the arms race into space does not accord with the country's national interests.

As W. Kashtan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, has noted, the government has said no to Washington as a result of pressure from the Canadian public. Yes, this is in fact also acknowledged in Neilsen's letter, which says that a specially created parliamentary committee has held detailed consultations with the public in various parts of the country. As is well known, these consultations showed that the Canadian population resolutely rejects the "star wars" plans despite the strong political and propaganda pressure which Washington has recently been constantly exerting on its northern neighbor. It is this pressure which explains the fact that the Canadian Government needed nearly 6 months to define its attitude toward the U.S. official proposal in Weinberger's letter of 26 March this year.

Canada, the British newspaper THE DAILY MAIL notes, has become the sixth Western country to reject the space promises of Washington's pitchmen. France, Norway, Greece, Denmark, and Australia had previously announced their refusal to take part in "star wars" plans at government level. The other recipients of the U.S. defense secretary's March letter still have not given a clear answer although the letter set an ultimatum, 60 days. Although Weinberger himself stated recently that he is firmly counting on the participation of Japan, the FRG, Britain, and Italy in the "star wars" plans, these countries have not made their final choice yet either; officially, at any rate.

The FRG Government is circling round the U.S. proposal like a cat on a hot tin roof. It is not only being weighed by the sentiments of the majority of the country's population, which has a negative attitude toward plans to militarize space. To be the first to announce its participation in creating space strike weapons would mean openly emphasizing that there are people in the FRG anxious to possess weapons of mass annihilation. It is clear that this policy in no way tallies with Bonn's official statements that the threat of war will never again come from West German soil.

To take part in the U.S. plans, the Japanese Government would have to flout an extremely important official document: the resolution of that country's parliament to use the near-earth space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The militarization of space will entail truly unprecedented and extremely dangerous consequences. Thus, the British newspaper THE TIMES acknowledges that the "star wars" plans will cast doubt on "fundamental issues of arms control and NATO strategy."

And that is indeed so. What arms control can we speak of under the conditions of the transfer of the arms race into space? And how will we be able to believe assurances of a love of peace by the United States' NATO allies if they take an active part in the Americans' creation of first-strike space weapons?

IZVESTIYA on FRG Stance

PM171009 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by political observer V. Matveyev under the rubric "Pertinent Notes": "Running Errands for the Pentagon"]

[Text] If matters continue as they have been developing now in relations between Washington and Bonn, in the very near future the FRG military-industrial complex will be joined to the Pentagon as one of the auxiliary units or sections of the space armaments forge planned in accordance with the Reagan administration's so-called "star wars" program.

Washington's official circles are displaying unconcealed interest in associating the FRG with the work which has begun and which is being planned in the United States to design space strike systems.

The question is being put almost in the form of an ultimatum. U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle recently stated that before the end of the year Bonn must (!) give an answer as to its readiness to participate in the "star wars" program. The Pentagon chief, C. Weinberger, has expressed himself no less categorically on this score. He asserted that "it (the FRG's participation) will cost Bonn nothing...."

What kind of simpletons are these statements geared to? Chancellor Kohl and his government colleagues are speaking publicly of billions of Marks which Bonn will be required to put into this program's fund. But its financial cost is just one aspect of the matter. H. Kohl and his fellow thinkers keep quiet about another which, without exaggeration, may be said to affect the FRG's very destiny.

Why, it is reasonable to ask, is Washington seeking so persistently to ensure that it is primarily the FRG which is harnessed to the chariot which is called the "Strategic Defense Initiative" but which in practice means flinging open the doors into space for the arms race? Is it reckoning on the resources and potential of West German science and technology? That is hardly the main point. The FRG's position as a NATO country which is the main bridgehead for U.S. nuclear missile weapons in West Europe -- this is undoubtedly what is of determining importance for U.S. strategists.

When you have lost your head you don't cry about your hair.... Inasmuch as the FRG already has an arsenal of the most destructive U.S. weapons, why should it not "in the long term" also serve as a base for the space armaments which are being developed across the ocean? That is obviously the reasoning in the brain centers of the U.S. military-industrial complex. How else can the Pentagon's heightened interest in the FRG "running errands" for the United States with regard to developing (and probably deploying) these armaments be explained?

Kohl's government cannot fail to be aware of the role assigned to the FRG by the "star wars" strategists. If there is something in this connection which it fails to comprehend, then it has the opinion of the country's most authoritative scientists, and they are resolutely opposed to the "star wars" program.

How is Bonn acting? It has launched an unseemly game of hide and seek with the public. In public H. Kohl and his supporters are pretending that they are "considering" and "analyzing" the question of whether the FRG should take part in the U.S. program. In practice, without any publicity, steps of a more binding nature are being taken to associate the FRG to the work on space strike armaments.

A large (30-strong) delegation from the FRG has just visited the United States for talks on this question. The trip was designated by official circles in Bonn as a "working mission" and "familiarization visit." It is asserted that if the FRG Government does give any kind of consent it will only be to participate in "research work" with respect to space armaments. In brief, Bonn propaganda is repeating Washington's methods in this respect in an attempt to portray, in an innocuous light, something which is in fact an expansion of the scales of the arms race which threatens to cancel out all efforts to resolve the package of disarmament issues.

The nature of the FRG delegation's visit in the United States is borne out by the very fact that it was headed by Horst Teltschik, Chancellor Kohl's foreign policy adviser. Across the ocean, he and his delegation engaged in what were by no means "theoretical investigations." It was announced that they visited "establishments connected with the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' program."

As is well known, it is precisely at this time that the Pentagon has undertaken the new test on an antisatellite weapon. Further such tests are planned.

This step has caused indignation in the world, including the United States itself. Washington is issuing a challenge to world public opinion which is demanding that governments make our planet safe from the nuclear threat and do not play with something which could cause a catastrophe.

Ruling circles in Bonn, believing that they may win something as a result of association with Washington's militarist plans, are displaying something worse than mere political short-sightedness. They could place their country on a most dangerous brink.

NATO 'Open Discussion' Critical

LD192126 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 85

[Commentary by own political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] In a special address to participants in the Atlantic bloc assembly being held in Portugal, NATO General Secretary Lord Carrington expressed his concern in connection with the open discussion of the American "star wars" project. Here is a commentary from our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

[Zholkver] Concern on the part of one of NATO's leaders is easy to explain. The fact is that the wider the expansion of this "open discussion" which is such a cause for alarm for Lord Carrington, the more obvious it becomes that the very widest circles of the world public condemn Washington's plans to militarize space. Let us recall just a few of the most recent facts. In the Bundestag in Bonn, representatives of both opposition groups, the SPD and the Greens, have spoken against the FRG's involvement in American space weapons programs. The Finnish foreign minister called for the prevention of space militarization. In Carrington's own native country, the British

11 October 1985

Liberal Party Assembly just rejected the "star wars" concept by an overwhelming majority. We should note that this concept is being criticized more and more harshly in the United States itself, especially in scientific circles. The Union of Concerned Scientists has called it an extremely dangerous fantasy, which will not only not protect Americans, but also cause an escalation of the arms race.

Bearing in mind the mood of the American public, more and more congressmen and senators are speaking out against continuing the arms race. To mention but one example, Senator Kennedy has appealed for the resumption of talks on the complete cessation of nuclear explosions, which, as the latest tests in the United States have shown, are being used in the implementation of the "star wars" program as well. There is no need to mention here that at the UN General Assembly session, which just began at our country's suggestion, there will be a broad discussion on the subject of using space not for military purposes but purely for peaceful purposes.

Thus, I may be so bold as to say that the open discussion of the American "star wars" plans, which, as Lord Carrington's speech shows, is causing such concern to the NATO leadership, will clearly continue, drawing ever more resolute condemnation of Washington from the world public.

Subordinate European Role Seen

LD192259 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 19 Sep 85

["Glance at the British Scene" feature by commentator Nikolay Borin]

[Text] There have been more signs that the American Administration is not at all forthcoming as far as Britain hopes for large orders under the "star wars" program are concerned, notwithstanding what is described as the special relationship between the Reagan administration and the conservative government. At any rate, the President of the Washington-based SRI [Stanford Research Institute] international research concern, Mr Bader, left little doubt about that in an article carried by THE TIMES. He warned that Britain must not hope for any special cooperation with the United States under the program for the development of attack space weapons. He went on to say that the desire of British industrialists to become broadly involved in the "star wars" program ran into opposition from American military and scientific circles, which believe that British scientific and technological standards are below those in the United States.

Now this contradicts the statement of Dr Gerald Yonas, who is the head of the "star wars" program, to the effect that Britain can assist the program in a wide spectrum of problems and that it can take part in practically every part of the program. Why did Mr Bader then go out of his way to misinform the British public? He himself answered that question in part, having said that the American Government was amazed by the resolute British demands for guarantees of bilateral exchanges of technology as a condition for British participation. The Reagan administration was not enthusiastic either about the British request for a guaranteed share of the program, worth between 1 and 2 thousand million dollars. But what is the United States prepared to part with?

The indications are that the best the West European partners of the United States can hope for is the status of subcontractors in return for their political support for American plans to militarize space on a large scale. Neither the British delegation, led by Michael Heseltine, nor the West German delegation led by Mr (Teltschik),

managed to get a straight answer to their questions during their recent visits to Washington. It's unlikely that Washington will be giving Europe any guarantees of technological or financial gain if the West European nations get involved in the "star wars" program. West German military experts believe that the United States is not prepared to show the Europeans a single blueprint of its projects as far as strategically important programs are concerned, as was the case with second-generation cruise missiles.

The profits from the program are addressed above all to the United States military corporations and American universities. As the West Europeans go cap in hand at the White House and the Pentagon, the research funds at the leading American universities are becoming militarized. The large funds paid by the Pentagon to the United States' universities enable them to attract West European scientists specializing in space research. The organizational rationale of the "star wars" program too ensures that the United States gets a vantage position. A major center is being set up in the United States to coordinate military preparations in space, and the participation of the West Europeans in the program will be confined to taking orders from that center and carrying them out.

London and Bonn are aware of that, but nevertheless they made it clear that agreements will be signed shortly. This means that to show their loyalty to Washington and their support for the "star wars" program before the summit meeting, the allies are prepared to walk into a deadlock blindfolded. There is, however, a price to be paid for that deal, because the issues at stake are the security of Britain and West Germany, and indeed the security of all of Europe, which will be facing a deadly threat if space militarization goes ahead.

NATO, Public Opposition

OW231329 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 23 Sep 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] As the Soviet-United States summit meeting draws near, the speeches by advocates of the plan to prepare for "star wars" resound more frequently and sharply in the United States. U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary Perle stated in the latest issue of U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT that it would be a mistake for the United States to agree to limit work being conducted by the Pentagon within the framework of the "star wars" program. According to Perle, the President has clearly made it understood that the United States does not intend discussing the "star wars" plan at the summit meeting.

A little earlier, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger said in an interview that the President does not consider the Strategic Defense Initiative -- as the "star wars" plan is officially called -- a topic that can be used at the talks. Thus, is there no likelihood of preventing the militarization of space? I would not exclude the likelihood until all the ways and means of not permitting the transfer of the arms race into space are exhausted.

You know very well the opposition of the broad popular masses to the U.S. plan of preparing for "star wars". It is shown on television and reported by newspapers. I would like to discuss the position of the governments of NATO member-countries, that is, the closest allies of the United States. Five of them have already refused to take part in the realization of the American plan. They are the Governments of France, Norway, Canada, Denmark, and Greece. The other 10 NATO members are not rushing to agree to the plan. Only the Governments of Britain and the FRG are inclined to take part in SDI.

I will turn to the opinions of Americans. Judging by a poll conducted by THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC television company, 3 out of every 4 inhabitants of the United States are against "star wars".

125,000 American scientists, engineers, and technicians, including 54 Nobel Prize laureates, are protesting against the preparations for such wars. They have united into the Alliance of Concerned Scientists. Finally, there are opponents of SDI among American congressmen, State Department staff, and even among high-ranking officials in the Pentagon.

President Reagan must take into account this powerful opposition. This explains his contradictory statements. The near future will show whether coolheadedness and realism prevail in the President's consciousness. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is carefully preparing for the summit meeting, believing that no opportunity can be missed in the search for solutions to the most important problems of war and peace.

European Parliament Members Opposed

LD272301 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT 27 Sep 85

[Text] Brussels, September 27 TASS -- Members of the Commission for Power Engineering, Research and Technology of the European Parliament have opposed the participation of West European countries in the "star wars" plans imposed by Washington upon its allies.

The resolution jointly put forward by communist and socialist deputies and approved by the majority of votes contains the appeal to scientists of the EEC countries not to take part in the research within the framework of the U.S. program of militarization of outer space. Scientific thinking should serve only peaceful purposes, the document stresses.

Many deputies pointed out in their reports that the militaristic plans of the White House which sought to turn near-earth space into an instrument of its hegemonistic policy were extremely dangerous for the cause of peace and universal security, and denounced these intentions.

Japan's Participation Criticized

LD292040 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Sep 85

[Boris Andrianov commentary]

[Text] An official representative of the Japanese National Defense Directorate has reported that a group of high-ranking representatives of that military department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Scientific-Technical Directorate, and a number of other governmental establishments, today left for the United States. There it will discuss issues connected with Japan's possible participation in Reagan's "star wars" program. Here is a "latest news" commentary by Boris Andrianov:

In sending such an impressive delegation across the ocean, the Nakasone government is in effect yet again confirming that it is backing up its verbal approval of the White House's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" with practical action. It is no secret that the way toward Japan's participation in the "star wars" program was actually opened by the signing of a Japanese-U.S. document in Tokyo as far back as 9 May this

year. It is known as an agreement on Japan's participation in the construction of a permanent U.S. space base, which will become one of the main elements of the notorious strategic defense. This document sets out the conditions for cooperation between Washington and Tokyo in the creation of an orbital base. It will be used for military ends, and will become a new step on the dangerous road to space militarization.

Washington is of course pursuing its own designs in involving Tokyo in its space program. After all, Japan possesses a very powerful scientific-technical and economic potential, and in certain scientific and technological spheres, it has far outstripped the United States. U.S. "star wars" strategists are reckoning on using Japanese scientific and technical achievements in order to create space weapons. These achievements, according to the schemes of militaristic circles across the ocean, in particular should lay the foundations of the nervous system for the future network of military space apparatus in near-earth orbit. In regard to the initiators of the space fever in the United States, their motives are clear. Washington's plans for the militarization of space have been spawned by a desire to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. This idea has long been possessing the U.S. Administration. But what are the motives of Japan's ruling circles in actively joining Washington's new militaristic design? Without a doubt "big business" on the Japanese islands is anticipating much profit from participation in the U.S. "star wars" program. After all, according to certain estimates, a total of about \$1 trillion will be spent on it. The Japanese monopolies are counting on mining such a gold vein.

But, this is only the financial-economic side of the affair, whereas the main reason probably lies elsewhere. Legislation exists in Japan banning the government from creating an offensive military potential. This ban has long irritated aggressive forces in the Land of the Rising Sun, who dream of the country's military rebirth and of turning Japan into one of the leading military powers. The Japanese military now sees a real chance of achieving this aim by joining in the program for the militarization of space, a program which U.S. politicians stubbornly persist in portraying as defensive. Although Washington's and Tokyo's secret desires differ, their space alliance is a great danger to the cause of peace.

CSO: 5200/1026

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CONSERVATIVE NORWEGIAN DAILY: ASAT TESTING POORLY TIMED

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 6 Sep 85 p 2

[Editorial: Unfortunate Timing]

[Text] One of these days the United States will probably carry out a test of a new anti-satellite weapon after the obligatory notification period of 15 days for Congress has expired. The response from the Soviet Union was not long in coming. An official statement from the news agency TASS says that the Soviets will no longer feel bound by their promise of two years ago not to place such a weapon as long as others do not do this either.

With regard to the agreement and in military terms Washington is safe. The testing of an anti-satellite weapon is not in conflict with the ABM agreement of 1972 which limits the defense against strategic nuclear rockets. It is only the Soviets who have made use of the right to build an ABM defense with a system around Moscow, a system which is being constantly improved and which can now also be expanded to other areas of the country within a short time.

But the timing for the testing of the new American ASAT weapon which may suit their developers could hardly have come at a politically more delicate time. The third round of the Geneva negotiations which includes a discussion of space weapons will start again later this month. Before the summit between President Ronald Reagan and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev in November the younger and well-educated Soviet leader has shown himself to be on the offensive in the tug-of-war over international opinion.

Moscow has every reason to be happy over the fact that Washington again seems to master the tactical game poorly by timing the testing of the space weapon so close to important negotiations.

It is of little help that the Americans point out that Moscow has had an anti-satellite system for a long time. The system which consists of rockets which are launched into orbit and release a 'killer satellite' has been ready since 1971. It has also been tested several times, even though not all tests have been equally successful according to military experts.

The Soviet Union has no reason for moral indignation over the fact that the Americans are also developing an anti-satellite weapon, even if of a somewhat

different type than the one the Russians have installed. If one looks more closely at the wording in the TASS statement it also becomes evident that Moscow is talking about the "installation of an anti-satellite weapon in space." This admission indicates that the Russians have a system which is installed on the ground.

But despite of this and indications that the Soviets also have a large-scale development program for advanced radiation weapons Moscow has made a propaganda stab before the summit meeting. It is regrettable and unfortunate that President Reagan and his advisors did not recognize the political consequences of the anti-satellite testing.

12831

CSO: 5200/2770

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN INDUSTRY FEDERATION SPOKESMAN BACKS SDI

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 27 Oct 85 p 42

[Text] Norwegian industry is very interested in Reagan's invitation for research cooperation in the American space weapons program SDI-Strategic Defense Initiative. It will be essential for Norway to participate--and possibly lead--in certain areas of the technological development in the future.

Department director Helge Fredriksen of the Norwegian Industry Federation tells NTB [Norwegian Wire Service] that this became quite clear in the large meeting which the industry association arranged concerning the French research project Eureka before the weekend. Thirty to thirty-five firms and representatives of Norwegian research institutes participated in the meeting which was attended by well over 70 people.

"Norwegian industry is interested in the research part of SDI--here at home called the United States' strategic defense initiative.

It will certainly influence and develop technology which in civilian industrial application can have vital importance for the future competitive situation," says director Fredriksen. (NTB)

12381

CSO: 3639/166

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

EUREKA OFFICIAL ON HOPES, AIMS FOR PROGRAM

Paris LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE in French Aug 85 p 17

[Article: "Towards a New Scientific and Industrial Cooperation" by Yves Stourdze, director general of CESTA [Center for Studies of Advanced Systems and Technologies], which compiled the document "Eureka, the Technological Renaissance of Europe" that serves as the basis of the work being undertaken under the Eureka project; and secretary general of the TCE [Technology, Growth, Employment] Working Group]

[Text] No one believed the TCE Working Group, created at the Versailles summit in 1982 at the instigation of Mr Francois Mitterrand, would survive. His initiative, however, unquestionably prefigured the new modes of technological cooperation, of which Eureka is today the most fully developed one, and the 18 programs that have issued from it that many beacons for the next 30 years ahead.

The TCE Working Group was given the task of studying the possible use of the new technologies as an instrument for the revitalizing of growth and employment. From its very first meeting at the Quai d'Orsay in August 1982, it was undeniably the battleground for unyielding clashes of ideologies--or methodologies--clashes that were inevitable, what with big nations arguing as to forms of desirable economic development and comparing the different modes of stimulation each of them deemed necessary for rapid progress to be made in the new technologies. But in counterbalance, the possibility--indeed the necessity--of defining concrete projects, of establishing tangible forms of cooperation, had already made itself felt.

Nevertheless, all the delegations strove resolutely to control their expenditures. Deep down within each, the sentiment prevailed that--with a few notable exceptions, namely, Ariane, Airbus and CERN⁽¹⁾--the classic forms of technological cooperation had more often than not ended up as failures. Failures that had proven all the more disastrous for having, in general, perpetuated themselves in the form of top-heavy, inefficient and costly bureaucratic structures.

Thus, the rolling out of concrete and detailed work programs took on as much urgency as the drawing up of wording setting forth the general principles of an international accord. In December 1982, the TCE Group agreed to the

18 programs covering the following objectives: Training and studies; standards; redefinition of scientific policies; undertaking of new lines of research and new lines of development.

Moreover, the agreed domains (energies, food resources, improvement of quality of life and employment, protection of the environment, basic research) are to provide the stepping stones of growth over the three coming decades.

A Flexible Combination

The rapid progress of the TCE Group would not have been possible without having acknowledged two things as facts, namely: That there are no magical formulas for overcoming a crisis; and that the magnitude of the difficulties involved could lead to none other than a pragmatic approach. Hence, the emergence of an essential notion: A variable geometry that operates, within the TCE Group, as a guarantee of effectiveness. It enables each country to dimension its interest in each project. Thus, participation in each TCE program can be apportioned in accordance with the extent of the interest manifested by each country, and not on the basis of a formal equality.

The TCE Group reinvented, so to speak, the formula of "precompetitive joint programs," a methodology that is fundamental today to putting advanced technologies to practical use.

Competition /and [in italics]/ cooperation in the high technologies: That is clearly the issue, as much on the domestic-market as on the planetary scale. It is also the crucial factor for the future of Europe.

Contrasting with the collapse of firms like Trilogy, Gavilan, Atari, and Osborn in the United States, and with the difficulties being experienced by Acorn in Great Britain, is the prosperity--recovered or enhanced--of firms like General Motors, General Electric, Fiat, AT&T, and IBM, which are beginning to dominate the sectors of microinformatics, robotics and communications networks, etc.

In short, in all the big industrialized nations--in the United States, in Japan and in Europe--a mixed architecture is setting in. It associates lightweight, active, innovative organizations--an indispensable force during the conception and start-up phase of new technologies--with heavyweight structures, which are the only ones capable of funding, over a long period of time, a costly and arduous process of development, dissemination and commercialization. This flexible combination, which is manifest from London to Washington, from Tokyo to Paris, from Bonn to Brussels, works in conjunction with a craving for subsidization--in direct and oblique forms--and for governmental support by way of immediate pump-priming programs or lateral fiscal incentives; incentives in the form of legal provisions or defense program tie-ins; etc.

Such is the case, for example, in Great Britain, with its voluntarist action by the state to promote new information technologies through the Alvey⁽²⁾

program, and in the FRG [Federal Republic of Germany], with its program of support by the BMFT [Research and Technology Ministry] for the introduction of microinformatics into traditional industries. This triangular cooperation--innovative PME [Small- and Medium-Sized Business]-big enterprises-government--is at work on the American continent, in Japan and in Great Britain. It is explained by the need to combine efforts and talents in order to master the new technologies. Why? Because these high technologies are being born of cross-fertilizations and grafts: Telecommunications and informatics; biology, agriculture, health, and energy; mechanics, electronics and informatics.

By forming a working group on normalization of new materials, the TCE Working Group has positioned itself at a strategic round point, owing to the role that new materials will naturally be called upon to fill in all future industrial activities, and owing to the position of privileged intermediary that normalization is called upon to take between fundamental research and industrial developmental work. Friction, wear, surface treatments, ceramics, cryogenic materials⁽³⁾: These are the domains being looked into by the group's experts.

A common approach to norms: This is also a concern of the food technology, biotechnologies, aquiculture, robotics and photovoltaics groups. In a world in which deregulation is the order of the day, the technical norm becomes an instrument of control... or of conquest. It loses its character as an abstract ideal and becomes a strategic instrument. IBM with the PC [Personal Computer], the Japanese with the MSX standard, AT&T with UNIX, the European information processing with OSI⁽⁴⁾, have all clearly understood this. The contours of the high-technology markets of tomorrow will be of a geography determined as much by customs tariffs, subsidization policies, and financial strategies as by the explicit--or implicit--play of norms and standards. An international accord such as is taking shape within the TCE on standards enables the participants to better understand the stakes, to delimit their interests with the least delay, and to negotiate the taking into account of their interests in sufficient time.

Working conditions and quality of life, human ethics, the environment, high technologies: These do not develop in an abstract universe of cabalistic signs and esoteric formulas. The acid rains, the carbonic gas in the atmosphere call us to task with regard to the balances that are essential to life itself. And working and living conditions, subjected as they are to ordeal by unemployment, are in the process of complete metamorphosis: Do robots loom on the horizon as allies or as enemies? Biology, for its part, investigates our species in its every aspect, even in its most intimate retrenchments: The conditions of our reproduction. And the tragic destiny that is Africa's, confronted as it is by drought and famine, reminds us of our limitations and brings out the powerlessness of certain of our efforts.

The loss of relevance of energy as an issue, the recall to question of the logic of large-scale equipment and facilities, the emphasis on

multidisciplinary technologies: These comprise more than a mere earth tremor; they have swelled to a full-fledged earthquake that is demolishing the structures of research and development.

Suddenly, all the cards are revealing themselves stacked. Are we not witnessing what amounts to an attack in reverse by the United States against its allies and their industrialists? On the one hand, it reiterates publicly and very assertively its support of free trade and its desire to extend the regulations of the GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] to high-technology and services transactions. But on the other hand, it shows the utmost inflexibility as regards controls on the export of "sensitive" products, such, that is, as may pose a threat to its national security. This exaggerated sensitivity, however, seems limitless: It is capable of affecting practically the entire spectrum of technologies, so completely are the high technologies now marked by a revolution that is diffusing the sophistication of the military technologies to the "civil" technologies. The "Yalta" that had been established between "top-of-the-line" technology and "light" technology has ended. The bulwark that had been erected between "heavy" equipment and "consumer-goods" technologies has collapsed. The boundary between the two worlds has been torn down. And in these circumstances, all scientific information, all civil development, can be considered "defense confidential." The desire to liberalize exchanges is coupled with the intent to screen them. And the selfsame Government that posits itself as liberal by day can exhibit a Draconian authoritarianism at night. Trade and security appear in this case to be mutually opposing principles, and the rules of the game appear fluid and even contradictory.

Triple Challenge

Understandably, then, caught between the horns of this dilemma in which any and all civil technology can be shown to be strategic, the President of the United States has been compelled to shift the boundary between these two technological "spheres" to a position out of reach at the edge of our universe, so as to definitively cut through the dividing terrain between the civil and the military, and then, with his SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative], to pave the way for "Star Wars." The countries of the East, and Japan and Europe thus find themselves facing a new front which is in the process of taking shape--that of the high technologies.

At this point, many cards are being redealt. And, duly considering the issues on which France has taken the lead in the TCE Group--particularly, its leadership of the groups on advanced robotics, biotechnologies, new training technologies, advanced technologies, and the traditional industrial structure--it appears that France, which for the past year has also been urging an intensification of the space effort, has given substance to orientations that can comprise the core of an active response to "Star Wars."

Indeed, three deregulating, or destabilizing, maneuvers comprise the backdrop and the moving forces behind the actions undertaken by the TCE Group:

--Destabilization of communications, begun in the United States, then in Great Britain and in Japan, and prefiguring the destabilization of the service industries;

--Destabilization of the energy sphere;

--Strategic destabilization, undertaken by President Reagan's SDI of 20 March 1983.

To meet this 3-pronged challenge, a redeployment becomes indispensable, because national resources are limited. A united Europe, of itself, compels recognition. From Copenhagen to Rome, from Paris to Athens, from Dublin to Brussels, from The Hague to Luxembourg, what a vast capacity! What an arsenal of capabilities! What an array of exceptional potentialities! Provided these talents close in the locks and close ranks among themselves instead of spreading out and annihilating each other! Strangely, however, the Europe of advanced technologies progresses not while retracting but rather when it opens up with intelligence. At the slightest sign of a withdrawal within itself, the centrifugal forces present inside it, and desiring to counteract this effort to unite, either establish or strengthen outside ties. Europe as an entity, therefore, can neither be conceived nor be brought into being other than by way of vitalizing confrontation and intelligent cooperation with the rest of the planet. It must, as a full-grown adult, exercise international relations in such a way as to strengthen its solidly-based power and enhance its role as partner, then as arbiter.

FOOTNOTES

1. CERN: European Nuclear Research Center.
2. British programs in information technologies and artificial intelligence.
3. Materials that retain the cold or resist it.
4. IBM, having opted for the MS-DOS operating system, has imposed it as a de facto standard for the microprocessing of information.

All the Japanese builders use the same operating system--the MSX--for personal microcomputers. Philips has joined them.

UNIX is the operating system conceived by Bell Laboratories (AT&T). UNIX is very highly regarded but has not yet imposed itself, largely owing to its many versions.

OSI is a network architecture norm that enables the interconnection of heretofore incompatible computers, and particularly computers of different makes. It has been adopted by 12 European builders and recently by Digital Equipment, the American No. 2 computer manufacturer.

The OSI norm, drawn up under the aegis of the ISO [International Standards Organization], is not yet completely defined.

IBM, MSX and UNIX are de facto standards, while OSI is a norm.

9399

CSO: 3698/663

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

EUROPE'S STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES IN EUREKA TECHNOLOGIES

Paris LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE in French Aug 85 pp 18-19

[Article by Andre-Yves Portnoff, Claude Vincent and Claude Gele, respectively, chief editor, editor and assistant chief editor of SCIENCES ET TECHNIQUES]

[Text] Will the current proposals under Eureka facilitate the "technological renaissance of Europe," to use the phrase comprising the subtitle of the document submitted by France at the Milan summit on 28-29 June of this year? For obvious reasons of efficacy, the fashioning of those proposals was necessarily neither very detailed nor very exhaustive, since each partner had not yet been able to make known its centers of self-interest, and no convergence of views had as yet been worked out. Actually, Eureka will have to remain, for some time to come, a "Spanish open house" before it can bring forth the technological Europe it envisions.

As presented at the beginning of summer, the French ideas appeared heavily influenced by the impact of President Reagan's SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] and by the listless reactions of many industrialists--particularly German and British--to certain of the EEC's initiatives, such as the ESPRIT information processing and electronics program. Three complaints are frequently voiced: The program's industrial objectives are too far in the future; the profusion of subjects of research disperses the financial--and above all, the human--resources of the European teams, a problem that is more acutely felt in the field than at the general management levels; and lastly, the enterprises would prefer agreements between genuinely self-interested partners, which is in direct contradiction with the program's objective of systematizing the inclusion of each and every member of the Community in the joint pursuit of each and every subject of activity covered by the program, while excluding participation by third countries, such as Switzerland or Sweden, for example.

Thus, the principle that guided the conception of Eureka will be welcomed by many industrialists. "Provided, however,"--as put by Mr Pierre Chavance, adviser to the president of CGE [General Electric Company] and president of CESTA [Center for the Study of Advanced Technologies and Systems]--that the project, drawn up, of course, in liaison with the enterprises, does not on this basis prejudge positions the latter could take in the final phase or

concrete agreements that could be signed between groups of countries, based on relations already in being and on market projections." Joint ventures could thus be launched with only two or three partners, if necessary, to obtain results leading as close as possible to industrialization: Prototypes and preliminary pilots.

Electronics, informatics, lasers, intervention robots: A quick run-through of Eureka's initial subjects of research, and "Star Wars" does not seem all that distant to the industrialists. And with very good reason. Still fresh in their memories is General de Gaulle's anger at the American refusal to release the supercomputers needed for the development of the French H bomb: Technology always rhymes with autonomy of decision.

Moreover, from a marketing standpoint, the French armaments industry's "lobby" is already worried about the advantages that fallouts from the SDI will confer on their American competitors. The United States will be achieving major advances which, in 10 years, will threaten European positions in the international markets for conventional arms. Through their military and space programs, the Americans have already achieved some notable breakthroughs in the domain of power lasers, sources and storage of energy, high-temperature materials, infrared sensors, etc. These are all subjects of activity covered by the SDI. What is going to be their impact in the civil domain? More generally speaking, it should be noted that the Federal Government's expenditures on research and development are accelerating their growth. The contribution of military funding to the financing of American university research, which had dropped to 7 percent following the Vietnam War, has risen to 12 percent and will exceed, next year for the third consecutive time, the volume of civil subsidies provided by the NSF [National Science Foundation].

All of this strengthens the case of the big European industrialists. They invoke the example of the mother country of economic liberalism to demand of the different governmental authorities larger-scale funding of development in certain domains, and that of supercomputers in particular, in which 10 years of talks among European firms have led to no real spontaneous joint undertakings. The statements being issued by Matra, Thomson, Siemens, Norsk Data, Philips, GEC, etc, which have proliferated since the announcement of Eureka, must be interpreted more as calls for government funding than as independent commitments to concrete actions.

Significantly, the enterprises that have reacted publicly are all engaged in electronics and information processing--two domains that account for the lion's share of the project proposed by France and that link up with five major sectors: Information processing and electronics; the manufacturing plant of the future and robotics; communications; biotechnologies; and materials, the latter two appearing to be somewhat as yet unsold.

For the first sector, baptized EUROMATIQUE (see boxed insert at end of article), the goal is to furnish the components, machines and softwares needed by the two major information processing axes of advance: Ultra-rapid numerical computation and artificial intelligence.

From basic research to applied research, from oil prospection to weather forecasting, from the design calculations for civil or military planes to those for nuclear weapons, the volume of data to be processed is growing constantly, attaining tens of billions of mathematical operations per problem to be solved. Thus, the calculation of the air flow around an aeronautical fuselage requires 10,000 billion operations. The most powerful supercomputers--the American Cray XMP, for example--take several hours to complete them. The realization of the supercomputer envisioned under Eureka would reduce this processing time to a few minutes, thus approaching the quasi instantaneousness of the "real-time" results furnished by computers in conventional operating modes.

To attain these speeds, one can no longer be content to process operations one after the other using sequential-type computers. Instead, it is necessary to put a very large number of processors, which are the basic units of computers, to work simultaneously. This is what is called parallel architectures. The principal existing supercomputers are American and Japanese ones. In Europe, they are still in the research stage. The French national program MARISIS, launched at the beginning of 1983, should yield, next year, two prototypes with power comparable to that of the machines being marketed today. But the Americans and Japanese are already announcing performance objectives 50 times faster within 2 years from now: Between 4 and 10 gigaflops (the gigaflop is the equivalent of 1 billion operations per second). Very ambitiously, Eureka has set for itself a goal of 30 gigaflops, which will necessitate, of course, the pooling of European resources. These represent real needs. In France, the CISI [International Information Processing Services Company], the information processing subsidiary of the AEC [Atomic Energy Commission], affirms its readiness to equip itself with the most powerful computers available.

The other highly promising axis of research is AI [artificial intelligence]. All problems cannot be solved by ultra-fast computers, which only crunch numbers. Most decisions, personal as well as business, are in fact arrived at through heuristic procedures, the term "heuristic" being derived from the Greek word Eureka: I have found it! Our choices are guided in relation to knowledge, generally empirical, which cannot be reduced to numbers or to mathematical models. The goal of the so-called fifth-generation computers is to be able to manipulate no longer numerical data but rather knowledge and symbols, and derive deductions from them amounting to true reasoning.

Expert systems are one of the essential applications of AI. These systems integrate the pieces of knowledge acquired by the human experts in a specific domain and apply to them certain rules of deduction. They can thus make medical or technical diagnoses, for example, such as the identification of malfunctions. There are now already more than 200 expert systems throughout the world, but most of them are still experimental and limited to aiding the decision process, the human operator still being necessary to implement the latter. This is a stage that should be gotten past under the

project "Management and Surveillance of Large-Scale Industrial Processes" proposed in Eureka. The firm FRAMENTEC, together with Krupp and a British partner, is already developing a project that aims to integrate expert systems directly into the heart of production control and command systems. It is now a matter of going from the simulation stage to the implementation stage. The British industrialists, under the Alvey program, have already set a project in motion in this regard, that is to culminate in an initial test at ICI, the number one in chemicals on the other side of the Channel.

Much more modest applications are also being contemplated, such as aid to the financial decision process, and to the identification of parasitic diseases in tomatoes, for example. These will require only simple microcomputers, since expert systems are not machines but rather softwares, or in other words, programs. They can be run on conventional computers, but their full potentialities cannot be realized except on computers specially designed to process symbols and knowledge. With this in mind, the Japanese launched a vast program in 1982 which is to culminate in a so-called "fifth-generation" pre-industrial computer by 1988. The Japanese objectives, initially viewed with a great deal of skepticism in the West, are on the verge of being attained, outpacing even the efforts of several American civil and military programs. In this domain, the unit of measurement is no longer the instruction, or arithmetical operation, but the inference, or logical operation. It is the equivalent of 100 or 1,000 instructions in information processing work. The Japanese want to attain 100 million inferences per second. The French are proposing an objective 10 times higher, while present American commercial hardware can handle no more than 100,000 inferences per second.

For the time being, the specialized machines in these domains, capable of using "symbolic" information processing languages such as LISP or PROLOG--the latter being of French origin--are being built mainly in the United States. In France, the prototypes of the MAIA machine, developed jointly by the CNET [National Center for Telecommunications Studies] and CGE, will be available within a few months. The European lag in this sector is considerable, since the Japanese and Americans--NCC, Texas Instruments, in particular, with military funding--are ready to build machines of this type whose "core" will no longer consist of conventional IC's [integrated circuit(s)], but that are specially designed to process knowledge. Very few researchers are working on this subject in France.

The American and Japanese projects are being centered on the relations between human beings and their automated facilities, since the commercial development of information processing is highly dependent on simplification of computer interrogation procedures. Computers must become accessible by non-experts in information processing. Likewise, a system permitting interrogation of its data bases in natural language, and no longer requiring a long and constraining ritual, would be a decisive step towards the exploitation of these resources by a large consumer public. Eureka sets

for itself the goal of developing such a system, wherein the data would not be limited to text alone but would include graphics, images and the spoken word. And--European diversity requires it--interrogation could be in any language whatever, constituting a powerful factor in the acceleration of international cooperation.

Custom Software and Circuits Engineering

All these AI developments require the development of new application software, of information-processing tools, a field that is heavily dominated by the Americans. Mr Jean-Claude Rault of the ADI [Information Processing Agency] has calculated that more than 70 percent of the specialized enterprises are located on the other side of the Atlantic, with French firms in third place with 10 percent of the total, just behind the British and ahead of Canada, Italy, Japan and FRG [Federal Republic of Germany].

The French working document proposes a European effort in software engineering as a whole, thus going beyond the heading of AI. It is traditional to emphasize France's respectable position in this domain. The abundance of creativity necessary to consolidate this position can find the support it needs in the resources of a few laboratories and of several small-sized specialized firms, whose dynamism with respect to software appears more to be relied on than that of the big groups. In this domain, as in many others, the success of Eureka will depend also on the capacity for mobilizing the gray matter of the PME's [Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises].

Machines, architectures, softwares... . Lacking still are components and peripheral memories. It is not surprising, therefore, to find, in the French proposals, a project for a top-of-the-line microprocessor, a circuit integrating 1 million transistors. This portion, which is even less detailed in its formulation, seeks to go after what is now a de facto American monopoly. The customized-circuits design center project, on the other hand, is more detailed. As opposed to the standard, all-purpose "Europrocessor," the customized circuit is the "tailor-made" of the IC's. Designed and optimized for a specific application, it is more reliable, more efficient and more compact. Its design takes several months and its fabrication cost is high. The market penetration rate of these special-purpose circuits is very high: 1 percent of the IC world market in 1974, 20 percent today, and 30 percent within the next 10 years. A disturbing sign is that European users represent a declining fraction of this market, which translates their lag in the "electronization" of things.

Computers also use IC memories, containing in permanent storage form the program that dictates its the microprocessor's manner of operation and the data on which it operates momentarily. Eureka would aim for a "live" (erasable and reprogrammable) memory with a capacity of 64 million bits or units of information. Currently available memories did not go beyond 256,000 bits until the announcement made only a few weeks ago by Hitachi and Texas Instruments, offering 1-million-bit (1-Mbit) memories. On the European side, Siemens and Philips have just signed an agreement to also

manufacture 1-Mbit memories and to work together towards 4 megabits. Thomson, which depends on LETI [Electronics and Information Processing Technology Laboratory] of the CENG [Grenoble Nuclear Research Center], has just joined them with the British GEC [General Electric Company] Group.

The EUROMATIQUE series of projects thus has a high degree of coherence, since it provides for the components and softwares necessary for the construction and operation of microcomputers, of conventional computers and of those needed by AI and supercomputers. Inversely, these different machines will be aiding in the design and production management of components and even, one day, softwares. The advances made in each domain interact with each other.

Third-Generation Robots

These tools are also indispensable to the projects grouped under the heading EUROBOT, the basic aim of which is the development of third-generation robots. These would be mobile, autonomous devices equipped with sensors enabling them to interact with the environment. The first generation of robots is that of industrial equipment, programmable machines controlled by an information processing system and designed to perform various tasks: Materials handling, welding, painting. There are some 2,800 robots of this type in France and some 20,000 in Europe, Germany leading the other countries in this respect with half this total. The second generation of robots incorporates vision sensors for the recognition of parts, essentially for assembly purposes. These machines number less than some 100 in France.

Today, EUROBOT seeks to speed up the development of mobile devices designed to assist humans in the performance of dangerous or difficult tasks. This interpositional robotics is not new. During the 1960's it was one of the first pieces of research undertaken by the Stanford Research Institute, involving experimentation with the mobile robot Shakey. In France, the ARA [Advanced Automation and Robotics] research program was limited for 10 years to a meting out of thinly allocated credits, controlled by the CNRS [National Center for Scientific Research] and divided among 45 research "teams" consisting of 150 scientists in all. Its concrete results have yet to be seen: The Toulouse LAAS's [Systems Automation and Analysis Laboratory('s)] mobile robot Hilare is but a 1980 version of the American Shakey, which was abandoned in 1973. As for the ARA projects to develop flexible workshops⁽¹⁾ for assembly, involving two industrial enterprises--Renault and Telemecanique--they have not yet yielded concrete realizations. They have been brought to a halt by the dispersion of resources and facilities and by the difficulties of transferring the products of research to industry.

Results have been more encouraging in other European countries. In Great Britain, for example, the University of Cranfield, and in Germany that of

Aix-la-Chapelle, have become application research centers working with the industrialists in the domain of flexible workshops, robots and automated machine tools. In Italy, research is focusing on the technology of laser machining.

By bringing together the scattered teams, by pooling the gains being made by each country, so as to better incorporate them into industrial projects, the EUROBOT project should enable the overcoming of the difficulties of developing European third-generation robots.

An analogy will be evident between the EUROBOT project and the RAM [multi-purpose self-propelling robots] program, which was launched in April 1984 by CESTA. RAM is the "advanced robotics" component of the TCE [Technology, Growth, Employment] program [see article "EUREKA OFFICIAL ON HOPES, AIMS FOR PROGRAM" in this book]. From the outset, the launching of RAM was handicapped by funding problems and by problems owing to international implications. The Regie Renault and COMEX [Maritime Appraisal Company], approached on heading the two--domestic and underwater--robot programs, have just declined. All that remain at this time are a nuclear robotics project, which is indispensable to the AEC [Atomic Energy Commission] and is funded by it; an agricultural robotics subproject RAMAGRI comprising two facets, namely, a fruit-picking robot and a forestry undergrowth-clearing robot; and a cleanup robot for the Paris buses of the RATP [Independent Parisian Transport System]. In 1985, 20 million francs were committed, amounting to only half the planned funding.

Perhaps EUROBOT will permit realigning RAM on several objectives: A robot for agriculture, in which CEMAGREF [National Center for Mechanization of Agriculture, Rural Engineering, Water and Forestry] would be an active participant; an interpositional robot for dangerous environments, to fill civil safety needs such as firefighting, natural catastrophes, pollution, etc. Under EUREKA, some industrial firms have already submitted proposals. Among these are Hispano-Suiza, which has the benefit of experience with its ISIS robot for the maintenance of nuclear power plants, Technicatome, CSEE [Signals and Electrical Enterprises Company], and some innovative PME's [Small- and Medium-Sized Business(es)] such as AID [expansion unknown] at Grenoble, which is already engaged in educational robotics. The military, through the Defense Ministry's DRET [Directorate for Research, Studies and Techniques], are also interested. This past May, a seminar was held at Toulouse on battlefield interpositional robots, especially for mine-clearing and decontamination operations.

Are the EUROBOT choices justified? It is by no means certain that the French industrialists will wax enthusiastic over this third-generation robotics. Their concerns lie elsewhere and are short-term ones: The four CIM [computer-integrated manufacturing] "engines" put in place by the government last year under the "programme productique" [CIM Program]⁽²⁾ have not yet fulfilled the role as prime movers that was expected of these big enterprise groups. Renault is questioning its interest, if any, in

"atomization" of its Renault Automation branch; Matra has just sold its subsidiary Robotronics to the American firm Allen Bradley and is going to form a joint company with the Swedish ASEA so as to settle the question of Sormel, its other assembly-robotics subsidiary installed at Besancon. CGE is not very satisfied with the initial results of the Compagnie Generale de Productique [General CIM Company], formed a year ago, as was the SGN Engineering Company with its grouping of six enterprises under the banner of "Productivity Plus." In the robotics industry, following the optimistic views that have been expressed these last few years, the pervading feeling borders on the morose... .

The second major aspect of the EUROBOT program consists of building an automated and flexible workshop, requiring the integration of present-day CAD/CAM techniques, combining automated machine tools, robots and materials-handling systems, into a manufacturing or assembly workshop controlled by an information-processing system. In this domain the French builders and design engineers are, theoretically, at least, in a good position: Two big machining flexible workshops have been put into service by RVI [Renault Industrial Vehicles], at Boutheon, and by Citroen Mechanical Constructions, at Meudon. These two pilot installations, which were to serve French industry and their promoters--Renault Automation, SODETEG-TAI for RVI, and Automatique Industriel for Citroen--as showcases, have produced only very limited fallouts to date. No other big workshop of this type has yet been installed. The industrialists have settled for less futuristic plants of the future! SODETEG-TAI has installed a mechanical welding workshop for Poclain-Potain and a surface treatment workshop for Aerospatiale at Toulouse.

The main obstacle to the installing of highly-automated CIM plants is the necessary mastery of the simulation software for dealing with flow analyses and scheduling problems in real time. Expert systems for production will be developed in due time to facilitate the scheduling and management of the machines, quality control and automatic maintenance troubleshooting. In France, a few teams are working on this question, particularly at CGE which, in its laboratories at Marcoussis, is testing its expert scheduling system SOJA, for Alsthom-Atlantique's pilot sheet-metal workshop. The British and the Norwegians are also at work on the problem.

The last of the four major components of EUROBOT is the power laser, unquestionably an industrial tool that is being incorporated today into machine tools designed for cutting and heat treatment. In France, CETIM [Mechanical Industries Technical Center] figures show some 100 laser machines in service in mechanical industry enterprises. In due time, the trend points to laser-type flexible workshops, as the Japanese are proposing. At Tsukuba, the plant of the future is a 20-kW, CO₂-type, laser generating unit that distributes the beam to the different machines. The principal builders of power lasers are Americans. Powers, generally speaking, range up to 5 kW. The Japanese have picked up and improved the technology developed by AVCO in the United States, some 10 years ago, for NASA, and have attained powers of 15 to 25 kW. In France, CILAS [Industrial Laser Company] offers lasers

of 3 to 4 kW, and Ferranti (United Kingdom) offers up to 3 kW, as do also Rofin Sinar (FRG) and CLB [Belgian Laser Company] (Belgium). EUROBOT seeks to bring about a collaboration among these builders for the development of a 50-kW research laser and of a standardized industrial source.

In sum, the integrated workshop of tomorrow will not exist until all these links in the information processing chain are interconnected by a network. The general problems of communications networks comprise one of the pivotal axes of Eureka [EUROCOM], which proposes, to begin with, the installation of an information processing interconnection system linking all the European researchers. IBM is known to be already installing a network of this type, EARN, linking 50 European universities equipped with its hardware. The DGT [General Telecommunications Directorate], for its part, has just launched the first phase of the installation of its RNIS [ISDN [Integrated Services Digital Network]]. Its capacity (100,000 lines) and its transmission rate (up to 144 kbits/sec) will provide access to a "palette" of telematics services. In due time, this will be a broadband digital network capable of transmitting video communications linking interactive terminals. Optic-fiber cable networks will find in it a very vast field of application.

From a reading of the document submitted by France, it appears that the preparation of the projects in biotechnologies (EUROBIO) and materials (EUROMAT) was not as extensive as that of the other subjects. Nevertheless, the priorities set by EUROBIO concern two key domains from the standpoints of both marketing and human impact, namely: Agriculture and food farming; and health care.

The project on creation of new plant seeds through genetic engineering is aimed at producing species promising higher yields and higher resistance to diseases, to pests, to chemical products and to hostile climates. These are long-term objectives for which a timetable is hard to establish. As for materials, their presence already is implied in EUROMATIQUE, which addresses methods for the putting to use of silicon and, for very fast circuits, gallium arsenide. And in EUROBOT, the performance ratings envisioned will obviously necessitate a lightening of their articulated structures through the use of composite materials. The use of optic fibers is also implicit in EUROCOM.

The specific EUROMAT project mentions as an end-use objective only the development of a terrestrial 500- to 1,000-hp heat-engine turbine using ceramics for heat exchangers and other components. In reality, this is a project in which materials are but one aspect of the innovations it seeks. It is being urged because of the importance of new ceramics, particularly for enhancing the performance ratings of Diesel engines and turbines. The Americans, and especially the Japanese, are giving priority to programs in this regard. The British, who pioneered in this field, then abandoned it, have resumed work in it. The Germans have for several years been pursuing a specific program on turbines.

Many other subjects could be brought in under the materials domain, and some of them are sitting in desk drawers. To cite just one of them: The lightening of vehicles is a future necessity. The development of advanced composites that can be produced at low cost and high output rates would be a very reasonable objective. In this sector, however, as in the others, Eureka cannot be reproached with not having encompassed all the key sectors: Its intent was not to present a paper on technology, but rather to identify those of the important problems that can be made the object of concrete joint undertakings among several European partners.

A Creational Society

Will all of this suffice to ensure European technological success? The principle itself of these projects calls for the creation of standards as regards electronic components, software development tools, languages. This is an essential aspect. For example, despite the French parentage of the AI language PROLOG, there exist, in France itself and throughout the world, so many incompatible varieties of PROLOG that the programs written using this language find limited marketability. This raises the risk of ending up with an imposed American *de facto* norm...

It is also reasonable to assume that the setting in motion of actions such as those envisioned in Eureka is not in itself sufficient to automatically harvest the famous industrial fallouts that are always referred to in connection with major undertakings and that are rarely totted up in the concrete terms of a balance sheet... Why not organize these fallouts by providing, for each project, a head of applicative development, with his own budget and responsibility for compiling all the good ideas, all the germs of innovation, and disseminating them throughout the European industrial fabric? After all, Europe's lag behind Japan is owing, first and foremost, to its slowness in applying new ideas and techniques, in accepting change. The problem is, first and foremost, cultural.

Cultural also are the reasons for European slowness to adopt modern methods of organizing creativity and work: Mastery of quality, value analysis, design, non-Taylorist organization. Without the adoption of methods such as these, the introduction of modern machines or techniques can only lead to failures, as the counter-performances of some big flexible workshops have proven.

A Eureka program that incorporates technique alone, in its strict sense, without its methodological, organizational and human environment, cannot possibly help Europe to succeed in this vast technico-social transformation in which we are involved--the "intelligence revolution." This transformation will not consist, as is often being said it will, of the advent of a communication society, but of that of a creational society. Competitiveness will now be demanding the mobilization of the intelligence and dynamism of each of us, as much as it does that of our capital resources and machines.

[Boxed insert p 18]: Eighteen Programs

The summit meetings of the industrialized countries, the most recent of which was held in Bonn in May of this year, the next one being scheduled for 1986 in Tokyo, include Canada, the United States, France, Italy, Japan, FRG, United Kingdom, and the Commission of the European Communities.

Each of the TCE Working Group's programs is headed by one or more of these countries and/or the Commission, as follows [countries listed in French alphabetical order]:

I. Stimulation of Growth Conditions for Improved Management of Energy.

1. Photovoltaic solar energy (Italy, Japan).
2. Controlled thermonuclear fusion (European Communities, United States).
3. Photosynthesis (Japan).
4. Fast-neutron reactors (United States, France).

II. Improved Management of Food Resources.

5. Food technology (France, United Kingdom).
6. Aquiculture (Canada).

III. Improvement of Living and Job Conditions and Environmental Protection.

7. Space-based remote sensing (United States).
8. High-speed trains (France, FRG).
9. Habitat and urbanism for developing countries (France).
10. Advanced robotics (France, Japan).
11. Impact of new technologies on traditional industries (France, Italy).
12. Biotechnology (France, United Kingdom).
13. Advanced materials and norms (United States, United Kingdom).
14. Education, occupational training and culture, using new technologies (Canada, France).

IV. General Advances in Basic Research.

- 16. Biology (European Communities).
- 17. High-energy physics (United States).
- 18. Exploration of solar system (United States).

[Boxed insert p 19]: The 24 French Proposals

EUROMATIQUE

Supercomputers, parallel architectures, AI and expert systems, fast silicon, gallium arsenide:

- Vectorial supercomputer;
- Massively parallellled information processing architectures;
- Synchronous-architecture-multiprocessor machine;
- Mass memory;
- Software engineering center;
- Dedicated circuits and line of symbolic machines;
- Generalized applications-design-and-realization tools for expert systems;
- Multilingual information processing system;
- Management and surveillance of large-scale industrial processes;
- Europrocessor;
- 64-Mbit memory;
- European plant for production of gallium arsenide circuits;
- European customized-circuits plant.

EUROBOT

Third-generation robotics, automated plant, CAD/CAM, lasers:

- Civil safety robots;

- Agricultural robots;
- Automated plant (CAD/CAM);
- CO₂, CO, excimer and free-electron lasers.

EUROCOM

Research networks, equipment for broadband networks:

- Information processing networks for research;
- European large-scale digital switcher;
- Wideband networked office automation and information processing;
- Wideband transmission.

EUROBIO

- Artificial seeds;
- Control and regulating systems.

EUROMAT

- Industrial turbine of advanced design.

FOOTNOTES

1. Workshops capable of producing different pieces without changes.
2. A 3-year program adopted by the Government on 5 October 1983 to modernize manufacturing industries and develop a French CIM hardware industry, and to promote training and research.

9399

CSO: 3698/663

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS CITES U.S. AIR FORCE SECRETARY ON B-1 PROGRAM

LD180929 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 18 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 18 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Legantsov reports:

U.S. Air Force Secretary Verne Orr, addressing the conference of the Conservative Air Force Association, voiced special satisfaction with the pace of the program to build B-1 strategic bombers. The fielding of these bombers, according to him, will add considerably to the potential ballistic missiles, the construction of which had been approved by Congress. The secretary noted that research and development work to create the mobile Midgetman ICBM was in progress.

According to the secretary, in the past four years the U.S. Air Force received almost 1,200 new A-10, F-15 and F-16 fighter bombers. The capacity of the Air Force to air-lift U.S. troops to foreign theatres of operations have grown considerably, he added. The Air Force has received new C-5B transports and modernized the C-141 transport fleet, and also expanded the involvement of civil aviation in carriage for the armed services. Orr made it clear that the Pentagon was energetically training U.S. troops, including the Air Force, in both nuclear and chemical warfare.

CSO: 5200/1024

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS ON TRIDENT SUB PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Alaska Sea Trials

LD190543 Moscow TASS in English 0525 GMT 19 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 19 TASS -- The seventh U.S. "Trident" missile-carrying submarine which has been named "Alaska" has started running trials. According to the Pentagon, the submarine's trials have begun near the U.S. Atlantic Coast in the area of the town of Groton (Connecticut). The shipyards of the "General Dynamics" military company, at which those gigantic submarines with 24 ballistic missiles on board are built, are located in Groton. The running trials of the "Alaska" will continue for several months. At the end of this year or at the beginning of next year the "Alaska" will join the U.S. Navy. It will be based at Bangor base on the U.S. Pacific Coast.

Nevada Launched

LD151052 Moscow TASS in English 1039 GMT 15 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 15 TASS -- The atomic submarine "Nevada" with a water displacement of 18,750 tons has been launched at the shipyard in Groton (Connecticut). This is the eighth Trident submarine that can have aboard missiles with nuclear warheads. Another five such submarines are under construction in Groton. These include the Alaska submarine which is to be handed over to the U.S. Navy late this year. A mass anti-war demonstration was held at the gate of the shipyard by the anti-Trident coalition during the ceremony of launching the new submarine missile carrier. Police details were summoned to disperse the activists of the anti-war movement. 12 manifestators [as received] were arrested.

CSO: 5200/1024

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH CABINET PONDERES 5-YEAR CRUISE MISSILE TREATY

The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN in English 19 Sep 85 pp 4-5

[Text] The Hague, September 19--The Netherlands and the United States were today reported to have agreed that a prospective treaty governing the siting of U.S. cruise missiles on Dutch soil must be irrevocable for at least five years.

The envisaged clause would make it impossible for the opposition Labour party, which is campaigning on an anti-cruise platform, to pull the Netherlands out if it returned to power after the May 1986 elections. The treaty is to be signed early next year.

The protestant morning newspaper TROUW said in an unsourced front-page report, headed "Missiles Treaty to Bind for Five Years", that agreement had been reached which would make it impossible for the Netherlands to tamper with the treaty for at least five years.

Other issues to be laid down by treaty are still being negotiated, TROUW said amid reports of a row among key cabinet ministers over the need for consultation procedures which would give the Netherlands some sort of say in the use of the missiles in time of war.

The liberal newspaper ALGEMEEN DAGBLAD, in a report headed "Row Over Missiles" said the views of Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek and Defence Minister Job de Ruiter were still far apart on this issue.

'Double Key' Unwanted

The foreign minister wants the launching of the missiles, if this ever becomes necessary, to be purely an American affair, while De Ruiter wants some sort of say, although he is not pleading for a Dutch veto, the paper said.

In view of the highly controversial nature of the issue, Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers does not want to submit the draft treaty to parliament until all ministers are agreed and no room is left for different interpretations, the paper added.

TROUW said the Dutch Government wanted some say in the use of cruise missiles and mentioned some special consultative procedure within the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO).

Before deciding to launch one of the 48 cruise missiles to be sited in the Netherlands, the U.S. President should at least consult the Netherlands in good time, the paper said.

The paper said this request by the Netherlands must not be confused with a "double key" which would make it possible for the Netherlands to veto a launch.

Precedence

Such a veto would detract from deterrence and would be expensive because the Netherlands would then own and control the missiles with the U.S. supplying the warheads, the paper says.

"But the Dutch Government sets great store by some special consultative procedure", the paper says, adding that although this would set a precedence within NATO the Netherlands assumes that a Dutch decision to site must be worth something to the U.S. administration.

The popular right-wing newspaper **DE TELEGRAAF** speaks of annoyance on the part of Foreign Minister De Ruiter over demands by Defence Minister De Ruiter for some sort of Dutch veto right.

De Ruiter, who is being supported by Lubbers, is thinking of a procedure that also applies to the F-16 fighter planes. This procedure enables this country to prevent an F-16 from taking off from Dutch soil in time of war by pulling the Dutch Air Force out of NATO.

DE TELEGRAAF says De Ruiter wants an explicit reference to this F-16 procedure in the cabinet's letter to be submitted to parliament soon together with the draft treaty.

This would overcome criticism by a host of constitutional experts that the Netherlands by siting of the missiles would surrender some of its sovereignty requiring the treaty to be approved by a two-third parliamentary majority, the paper said.

CSO: 5200/2501

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON OPENING OF NEXT ROUND OF TALKS

Delegation Head Interviewed

LD121759 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1145 GMT 12 Sep 85

["Topical Problems of International Life" program, presented by Igor Charikov]

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! Our broadcast today deals with one of the sectors of the diplomatic front where our country is waging a persistent struggle for the consolidation of peace, security, and disarmament. This is the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Representatives of the two opposed military-political alliances, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, are taking part in them. These talks are taking place in the Hofburg Palace in the Austrian capital, Vienna. For this reason, they are often simply called the Vienna talks. In 2 weeks time the next round of the Vienna talks starts. The dialogue in the Hofburg Palace has already been going on for 10 years, but so far no agreement of any sort has been achieved. What is the main reason for this unsatisfactory situation? I am putting this question to Ambassador Valerian Vladimirovich Mikhaylov, leader of the USSR delegation at the Vienna talks, who is taking part in our program.

[Mikhaylov] The subject of the Vienna talks in itself, of course, is not simple.

However, the main reason for the lack of positive results so far and the impasse which has arisen in Vienna lies, to be frank, in the reluctance and unwillingness of the United States, and its closest NATO allies, to negotiate seriously with Warsaw Pact states about lowering the level of military confrontation in the center of Europe on the basis of equality and equal security of the sides. It is only necessary to look at the proposals by Western participants in the talks, which they have put forward so far in Vienna, for it to become obvious that all their proposals have a one-sided, biased nature. They are calculated, in essence, not for the achievement of equally weighted, mutually acceptable accord, but for the imposition on the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries, under various kinds of far-fetched pretexts, of conditions which would put them in an unfavorable and constricted position in comparison with NATO countries from the point of view of security.

As for the socialist countries participating in the talks, proceeding from the approximate balance of forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, which has really become established, they came out in favor, right at the beginning of talks, of mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe on a basis of equal numbers or equal percentage and have submitted specific proposals on this account many times. However, this equitable approach has been blocked by Western participants.

In this connection, I will cite a revealing example: The original draft agreement submitted in Vienna by the Soviet Union together with other socialist countries in November 1973 proposed that all -- and I stress all -- its participants should, in the course of 3 years, reduce their armed forces and armaments in an agreed upon region of central Europe by 17 percent on the basis of the approximate uniformity and similarity of type of the units being reduced. The proposal in response by NATO countries put forward the arbitrary demand that the Soviet Union, in the first phase of the agreement, would withdraw from the region of reduction a tank army consisting of 5 divisions, numbering approximately 68,000 men and 1,700 basic combat tanks. And, for the United States, the withdrawal of only 29,000 U.S. soldiers, individually or in units, without armaments and combat equipment, was stipulated. The reduction of armed forces by other NATO countries was put off to a future date.

From the example cited it is evident that, from the very beginning, NATO participants adopted a stance which is a very long way from observance of the principle of not damaging the security of any of the sides, the necessity of which is stated in the actual mandate of the Vienna talks. Nevertheless, NATO representatives, to this very day, are continuing to resort to this selfsame tactical stance. This stance, however, is deprived of realism.

[Charikov] A whole series of recent decisions taken by NATO -- not without pressure from Washington -- has been manifestly directed not at the restraining and limitation of conventional armed forces and armaments, but on their buildup. How can this be reconciled with the aim and sense of the Vienna talks? Does the North Atlantic bloc leadership want a halt to the buildup and lowering of the military confrontation in Europe in general?

[Mikhaylov] This is a legitimate and completely pertinent question. The obstructionist way of acting by NATO representatives in Vienna is by no means accidental. It reflects a certain policy. And indeed, the military-political plans and the practical actions by NATO countries have, particularly in recent times, been more and more in contradiction with the aims of the Vienna talks. Serious doubts inevitably arise as to whether the NATO capitals want reduction of the buildup of armed forces and armaments in central Europe and lowering of the military confrontation in general, as the mandate of the Vienna talks, consistently upheld by socialist countries, demands. Many things point to the fact that the Vienna talks are being used by the Atlantic politicians more for the sake of appearance, for purposes of screening their true intentions.

In particular, the stubborn reluctance of Western powers to reduce or limit armaments together with personnel strength of forces or to undertake any other possible steps for a real lowering of military confrontation points to this. In other words, at Vienna, as at other talks, socialist countries have to fight attempts by the West to impose on Warsaw Pact states conditions which, in upsetting the present approximate balance of military forces of the sides, would create one-sided advantages for NATO. On such a basis it is, of course, impossible to reach agreement. All this also creates great difficulties and even puts the talks in a spurious position capable of resulting in the loss of their very sense.

[Charikov] Valerian Vladimirovich, in certain utterances by NATO countries' representatives, reference is often made to the so-called problem of numbers and the difficulties of monitoring. How do you regard this? What is the point here?

[Mikhaylov] I must say that the incessant attempts by the Western side arbitrarily to call into question official data on the forces of socialist countries, its proposal of excessive and deliberately unacceptable demands as regards monitoring, and the avoidance, at the same time, of realistic measures for disarmament are nothing but tricks devised in order to screen its reluctance to genuinely negotiate in Vienna.

One should recall that in their draft agreement of 23 June 1983 -- which incidentally remains in force to this day -- Warsaw Pact states proposed a simple and practical solution, to wit: to reduce over the course of 3 years the armed forces of the sides in central Europe, together with their authorized weapons and combat equipment and to agree in principle equal but lowered collective levels of 900,000 men each, including 700,000 each in land forces, for each alliance irrespective of any divergences in appraisals of the present strength of forces of the sides in this region. In brief, it was proposed that, having put aside the useless and hopeless arguments about figures, to concentrate efforts on the achievement of the end result of the reductions. However, NATO also took up a negative stance in relation to this proposal.

[Charikov] Yes, I remember well this situation and the press conference in the Hofburg Palace, when the Western delegations rejected the draft agreement without any explanation. At that time, many journalists asked the question: Where is there a way out, does one exist at all? Incidentally, this is also of interest to many of our radio listeners. Valerian Vladimirovich, do you believe that there is, all the same, a possibility of progress in Vienna?

[Mikhaylov] Yes, there is a way out. The possibility of progress also exists, but its realization depends not only on the position of the Warsaw Pact countries. The achievement of mutually useful accords in Vienna will become possible if Western participants finally review their unconstructive way of acting and correctly adjust their position. There is a completely realistic basis for the achievement of a specific, practical accord in the near future. It is contained in the draft of basic provisions of an agreement about initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of land forces and armaments in central Europe and subsequent stabilization of the level of armed forces and armaments of the sides in this region -- a draft submitted by the Soviet delegation on behalf of the Warsaw Pact countries at the Vienna talks on 14 February this year.

In submitting the above-mentioned proposal, socialist countries were proceeding from the fact that in the deadlock situation which has arisen at the talks, when conditions do not exist for the elaboration of a broad-scale accord, there is sense in searching for an agreement, if only partial, on those questions which can, so it seems, be resolved now. Specifically, the proposal by the socialist countries envisages a reduction during the year starting when the proposed agreement enters into force, of USSR and U.S. forces in Central Europe, together with their authorized armaments, correspondingly by 20,000 and 13,000 men, with a subsequent non-increase or, as they say, freeze for 2 years in the level of armed forces and armaments of the sides in the given region.

In the meantime, the NATO countries have not given their answer on the essence of our proposal. The nature of this answer will show whether NATO capitals in fact desire the success of the Vienna talks. So, Igor Pavlovich, whether the forthcoming round will be productive depends on our Western partners at the talks.

[Charikov] Thank you, Valerian Vladimirovich. Well, comrades, our conversation is coming to an end. I would like in conclusion to advance the following idea: The Vienna talks are being conducted on questions of arms of the conventional type, not nuclear arms. It seems they are inferior in terms of significance to those taking place not far away in Geneva. However, comrades, you will agree that peace and security in the central European region, and maybe in the whole world, will not become more stable nor people more confident about their future, if military confrontation continues to remain in the center of this continent, a continent which twice in the past century has been the seat of world wars.

I think the utterances by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his conversation in the Kremlin with Johannes Rau, prime minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, are very applicable to the situation which has arisen at the Vienna talks. He said: Our proposal for scaling down the race of all types of arms is on the negotiating table. If the relevant states, first and foremost the United States, have the desire to come to an understanding on all these questions affecting the fate of entire peoples, this can be done effectively and without delay. The truth of this utterance, comrades, is evident, it is borne out in everyday reality by the principled foreign policy stance of our state. Our broadcast has come to an end. Goodbye comrades, all the best to you!

Talks Said Deadlocked

LD251713 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 25 Sep 85

[Text] Tomorrow, in Vienna, the capital of Austria, another round of talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe starts. Igor Charikov, Moscow Domestic Service commentator is at the microphone.

These talks, which are called the Vienna talks after their venue, have been continuing for almost 12 years. However, during this rather lengthy period not one agreement has been reached and the ultimate goal, to reduce the level of military confrontation, is as far away as in October, 1973. Moreover, to our deep regret, the Vienna talks can, in essence, be considered deadlocked.

We regret it because, from the very beginning of the dialogue at the Hofburg Palace, the delegations of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact states have been doing everything possible to reach an agreement on practical steps to reduce armed forces and weapons. During the first round a proposal was made to reduce, over 3 years, the contingents of armed forces and weapons of both military-political organisations by 17 percent on the basis of similarity of type of units being reduced. NATO countries replied by putting forth demands for reductions which would violate the principle of not harming the security of any of the sides.

Such a position by the United States and their allies in essence doomed the Vienna talks to a standstill. In the intervening years, the USSR and other socialist countries repeatedly put forward more and more new initiatives in order to find a compromise. On the current agenda are the main provisions of an agreement on the initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of the ground forces and arms in central Europe, following the period during which armed forces and arms levels in this region will not be increased. According to a whole range of observers this document serves as a quite constructive and acceptable base for the first concrete step on the way towards achieving the final goal of the talks. The talks which open tomorrow must show how seriously the United States and their partners are ready to continue the dialogue and how sincerely they are interested in real disarmament.

Soviet Delegation Arrives

LD251333 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 25 Sep 85

[Text] Vienna, September 25 TASS -- A Soviet delegation arrived here today to attend another round of the talks on mutual reduction of the armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The USSR delegation at the talks is headed by Ambassador Valerian Mikhaylov.

Talks Reopen

ID261118 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 26 Sep 85

[Text] Vienna, September 26 TASS -- The delegations to talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments and related measures in central Europe opened another round of the negotiations here today with a full-scale meeting.

It was addressed by S. Przygodzki, leader of the Polish delegation, on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty states and by L. de Mortel, head of the Dutch delegation, on behalf of the NATO states.

TASS Correction

Moscow TASS in English 1326 GMT 26 Sep 85

The following correction to the preceding item was supplied by Moscow TASS in English on 26 September at 1326 GMT: First paragraph, line two reads: ... armed forces and armaments in central Europe opened... (deleting "and related measures").

CSO: 5200/1027

DUTCH DEFENSE MINISTER OPPOSES CHEMICAL WEAPONS

The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN in English 11 Sep 85 pp 2-3

[Text] The Hague, September 10—Dutch Defence Minister Job de Ruiter said today his government does not agree with the views of General Bernard Rodgers, the Supreme Commander of allied forces in Europe, on use and storage of chemical weapons.

The NATO military leader said recently that modern chemical weapons were essential to the defence of Western Europe.

De Ruiter, replying to parliamentary questions, said General Rodgers in no way spoke for the Dutch government with this comment.

The government was unchanged in its view that chemical weapons should form no part of allied NATO defence, he added.

The U.S. government did not intend to introduce chemical weapons to the front lines of NATO defence, he added.

The minister said it was unnecessary to draw the general's attention to the Dutch views, as these were already well enough known.

Pledge

The U.S. tabled a draft treaty banning chemical weapons at the 40-nation conference on disarmament in Geneva in April last year. The sticking point in discussions has been Soviet refusal to accept unlimited on-site inspections to make sure all stocks are destroyed.

The Dutch government pledged to the United Nations in 1982 that its armed forces did not have chemical weapons, that it would not consider their introduction and that it opposed storage of such weapons on its soil.

Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek confirmed this in June of this year after the U.S. Congress decided to restart production of chemical arms from 1987.

CSO: 5200/2789

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW VIEWS NEW ZEALAND NUCLEAR POLICY, U.S. REACTION

LD292117 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 29 Sep 85

[Commentary by Yevgeniy Kachanov]

[Text] According to reports from Washington, a U.S. State Department spokesman, speaking at a news conference, directed threats at New Zealand's Labor government. He effectively demanded that it abandon its chosen political course whose gist is rejection of the siting of nuclear weapons on New Zealand's territory and a ban on the entry into the country's territorial waters of foreign ships carrying nuclear weapons or that are nuclear propelled. Here is a latest commentary by Yevgeniy Kachanov:

[Kachanov] It would appear that New Zealand's antinuclear policy is very much its own domestic affair. Indeed, the majority of that country's population supports and approves of that course. A recent public opinion poll, as a REUTER cable testifies, shows that the New Zealand laborites now enjoy the electors' highest support since their victory at the general elections in July of last year.

The firm antinuclear position of the David Lange government is definitely a leading reason for this popularity. It is understandable that if the government veers from this position the New Zealand electors' attitude to it will change. I do not believe that this is not realized in Washington either. Yet, the White House is exerting unprecedented pressure upon Lange's cabinet, bordering on interference in New Zealand's domestic affairs.

The point here is that the U.S. Administration's plans regarding the South Pacific, indeed the whole Asian-Pacific region, are radically different from what is desired by the states located in that part of the globe. You know, comrades, that these states, including Australia and New Zealand, quite recently, made the decision to declare the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone. Well, the United States, as was announced in Manila today by Philippine Minister Blas Ople, plans to build a major new military base there within the next few years. The recent past has seen a considerable growth there in the concentrations of American warships carrying nuclear weapons.

Overall, it can be said that the Pacific is being given an increasingly important role in the White House's global strategy which is directed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. A substantial element of this adventuristic strategy, so dangerous to the cause of peace, is the ANZUS bloc, which, in addition to the United States, comprises Australia and New Zealand. Formally, these two countries possess the same rights, but, in fact, for Washington they are just junior partners. Note that the same State Department spokesman did not conceal this. If Wellington does not abandon its antinuclear position, he declared, we will have to review New Zealand's status as an ally within the ANZUS bloc. In other words, it is Washington that determines the status of its, excuse the expression, equal partners.

As I have already stated, that bloc is an element primarily of U.S. strategy, and the New Zealand Government is not too keen on pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for its uncle across the ocean. If Wellington's antinuclear course is considered inappropriate to the ANZUS treaty," Prime Minister Lange coolly declared, the treaty will have to be cancelled; for the siting of nuclear weapons on our territory, he said, may cost New Zealand too dear.

A firm and realistic position is held by the government of the island state, and judging by everything, it intends to adhere to it in the future as well.

CSO: 5200/1021

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CITES NEW ZEALAND DEPUTY PREMIER ON SHIP BAN

Talks in Washington

PM231340 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Fruitless..."]

[Text] Washington, 20 Sep -- "The sides did not find a mutually acceptable solution to the problem" -- this is how U.S. Administration spokesmen described the talks held here between G. Palmer, dupty prime minister of New Zealand, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger.

Washington attempted to use the talks to exert pressure on New Zealand and force it to abandon its demands that the Southern Pacific be turned into a nuclear-free zone.

THE WASHINGTON POST notes that New Zealand's deputy prime minister declared at the talks that his country will allow only ships not carrying nuclear weapons to call at its ports and that it insists on its own inspection of every U.S. ship asking permission to call. Furthermore, as G. Palmer pointed out, the New Zealand Government intends to consolidate this stance by passing the relevant laws.

ANZUS Membership Reaffirmed

LD210556 Moscow TASS in English 0548 GMT 21 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, 21 Sep (TASS)--Deputy Prime Minister of New Zealand Geoffrey Palmer has reaffirmed that his government remained true to the policy of banning the access of nuclear-capable ships and planes to the territory of the country. In his speech here Palmer also supported the proposal that the south of the Pacific Ocean be announced a nuclear-free zone. In an obvious attempt to tone down Washington's wrath he meanwhile underlined the government's intention to increase military activity in the Pacific region. New Zealand, he said, remains the U.S. "partner" and ally in the military ANZUS bloc.

CSO: 5200/1012

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: UN CALLS FOR MIDEAST NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

LD132035 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 13 Sep 85

[Text] New York, 13 Sep (TASS)--In view of the further escalation of tension in the eastern Mediterranean, the aggressive policy conducted there by Israel with the United States encouragement, there is a need for urgent measures leading to the creating of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. This is said in a report of United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar which sums up the answers of member countries of the international community to the request to set out their opinion on this problem.

The United Nations member-states show justifiably serious concern over nuclear aspirations of Israel which does not conceal its intention to get nuclear weapons to establish its domination over the entire Middle East region, it is said in the document. The dangerousness of the situation is aggravated by the fact that Israel stubbornly refuses to state clearly that it has no nuclear weapons. It ignores decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency which urge Israel to assume the pledge not to produce and not to acquire nuclear weapons. The responsibility for Israel's policy and actions is fully borne by those who encourage and support their "strategic partner", it is said in the report.

The Soviet Union holds that time has come to embark on practical implementation of the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East, it is said in the Soviet Union's reply. The achievement of this aim would be largely promoted by the joining to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty of all Middle East countries which had not done so yet, the prevention of the deployment of nuclear weapons on their territories.

It is quite apparent that such actions as the concentration of groups of warships near the coasts of the Middle East countries as a show of strength, continued cooperation with Israel in the nuclear sphere, run counter to the resolutions of the General Assembly, it is said in the reply.

CSO: 5200/1012

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. BATTLESHIP'S ROUTE DRAWS PROTESTS IN SCANDINAVIA

LD272126 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 27 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 27 TASS -- TASS commentator Valeriy Vavilov writes: The American battleship Iowa has gone through the Geresund Strait near Swedish shores and sailed to the main Danish seaport of Copenhagen. It was to visit the Norwegian ports of Bergen and Oslo before that.

This voyage by the Iowa, which has 32 nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missiles aboard though Norway's and Denmark's policies on bases and nuclear weapons prohibit such arms in their territories in peacetime, has drawn angry protests from peace-minded people in the Scandinavian countries. The passage by that vessel carrying nuclear weapons off Sweden has been seen there as a threat to its policy of neutrality.

The American battleship has taken part in the just-ended large-scale maneuvers of the North Atlantic bloc's joint naval forces, codenamed Ocean Safari-85. The 160 surface warships and submarines from ten NATO countries, including the United States, Canada, Britain, West Germany, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Denmark and France, as well as more than 400 aircraft and helicopters involved in the three-week war games acted out another scenario for the third world war. No sooner had the show of force in the Atlantic ended than the NATO command started another exercise in the Baltic. It was there that the Iowa has been sent.

Eager to scare the Scandinavian nations with a "Soviet threat", Washington is holding its provocative maneuvers in a bid to deal a blow to the powerful public campaign for proclaiming the north of Europe a nuclear-free zone.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, supports the idea of making northern Europe such a zone and has expressed readiness to take concrete steps towards carrying it out.

CSO: 5200/1021

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

DEFENSE INSTITUTE CHIEF ATTACKS NORDIC ZONE IDEA

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 6 Sep 85 p 41

[Article by Thorleif Andreassen: "Scandinavian Zone Treaty Not Worth Anything"]

[Text] "No, we do not paint the devil on the wall. He is there already. We only point to him. We must be watchful. Not succumb to wishful thinking and complacent indifference." These are the words of the chief of the Institute for Defense Information, Ambassador Thore Boye. In an interview with AFTENPOSTEN the committed friend of the Defense warns against the disinformation which is going around and he launches a frontal attack on plans for a Scandinavian nuclear-free zone. "Frightening," is ambassador Boye's comment on Labor Party Deputy Chairman Einar Forde's initiative in the zone matter. "Treaties and promises are not worth the paper they are written on if breaking them is to the Soviets' advantage.

"We have almost forgotten that not too long ago there were three countries on the Baltic Sea called Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. They were small countries. Each of them had a few million inhabitants. They were gobbled up. Today they have been more or less forgotten. This should teach us something," ambassador Boye thinks.

In the beginning of 1942 he became bureau chief under Oscar Torp in the Ministry of Defense in London. One of the special assignments was the cooperation between the military Home Front in Norway and the outer front. The bureau chief represented Torp on the Anglo-Norwegian Collaboration Committee, the committee which directed the Linge company's activity and sabotage actions in Norway.

Now and then announcements appear in the newspapers which are signed 'Institute for Defense Information.' Some time ago there was a warning against the 'A Treaty Now' arrangement in Holmenkollbakken. And the other day the institute's name could be found among the organizations which supported the street run in Oslo 7 Sep: 'Run for Afghanistan--Run for Freedom.'

"What actually is the 'Institute for Defense Information'?"

"It is an organization, established last year on Liberation Day, 8 May. The objective is to support Norway's defense and to strengthen our connection with NATO.

Special Question

"But we already have the Norwegian Defense Association and other organizations which work for the same goal. Don't you get into each other's way?"

"No, the Defense covers a large area and we work together. I am also a member of the Defense Association and know that they do a fine job. But this still leaves room for smaller organizations which can take up special questions--and which possibly can proceed more unconventionally."

Disinformation

"Nowadays war is no longer waged only with bullets and gunpowder; the term psychological warfare has come up. Our institute has concerned itself with the defense against this type of warfare--disinformation and threats.

"Are we exposed to a lot of disinformation in our country?"

"Yes, not only intentionally wrong information, but also wishful thinking and muddy thinking which is presented as certain facts.

April 9

"Who is backing the institute which you are heading?"

"This is a varied collection of men from different social levels and with different political backgrounds. What we have in common is that we saw the war at close range from 1940 until 1945, even though from different vantage points. April 9 made an indelible impression on all of us. Some say that we are suffering from the April 9 complex. We see it that way: we must not forget the mistakes we made and we must learn from our experience which we paid dearly for. We were caught napping. That must not happen again!

Allies

"We must have a strong defense. But during the last war we also made the experience that a small country must have allies. The security we need we have found in NATO. Here we must keep up our reputation as a reliable alliance partner who is actively working towards the solution of common problems, and not consider it a national task to criticize the United States and enter into close combat with our allies."

Boye continues: "I believe it was Nils Orvik who pointed out a few years ago that Norway has had peace for 40 years and that this is the longest period of independence our country has had since the Middle Ages. According to professor Orvik we can thank NATO and the United States for this. Other

countries have not been as fortunate. Think of Czechoslovakia, think of Hungary, think of Poland!"

"The Institute for Defense Information does not have much sympathy for the organizations 'No to Nuclear Weapons' and 'A Treaty Now'?"

"No, that is true. We fully share their wish for peace on earth. But we do not believe that it is the American nuclear bombs which threaten world peace. On the contrary. And they call themselves 'peace movement' and believe for sure that they have a monopoly on this name. It is, however, our defense and NATO which secure our peace. We threaten nobody, and the members of our armed forces can rightfully claim that they belong to the largest and strongest peace movement in this country."

Scandinavian Zone

"What could then be the reason that the Kekkonen plan has proponents in Norway?"

"Wishful thinking and disinformation. Incidentally, president Kekkonen is not the originator of the plan. The idea was first brought forward in the fifties by Nikolay Bulganin, the Soviet prime minister at the time. As is known, there are no nuclear weapons in the North, and one can ask oneself why Bulganin did not like the idea that the Scandinavian countries could be defended by nuclear weapons from the outside should they be attacked. Attacked by whom?"

12831

CSO: 5200/2770

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

TASS: U.S. REJECTS C. EUROPE--Washington, 11 Sep (TASS)--Washington again demonstrated its reluctance to work toward improving the situation in Europe and reiterated that it was going to carry on with its large-scale military preparations. At a news conference here a spokesman for the White House rejected the Soviet Union's proposal on the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in central Europe. At the same time he answered affirmatively when asked whether President Reagan intended to continue building up the U.S. arsenal of chemical weapons. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 11 Sep 85 LD]

TASS ON SWEDISH CAMPAIGN--Stockholm, 23 Sep (TASS)--The Swedish peace campaigners have demanded that the government ban the U.S. battleship "Iowa" with nuclear-tipped "Tomahawk" cruise missiles on board from entering the waters of this neutral country. The largest combat ship of the U.S. Navy will take part in NATO's naval exercises in the Baltic Sea and intends to pass through Swedish waters in Oresund Strait. The Swedish peace champions urged the government to follow the example of the New Zealand authorities that have banned port calls of U.S. nuclear-armed ships from entering the country's territorial waters. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0440 GMT 23 Sep 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1012

PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR

BRIEFS

TASS ON UN REPORT--New York, 7 Sep (TASS)--The removal of the nuclear war threat is an urgent task of our times, Perez de Cuellar, secretary-general of the United Nations Organization, stressed in a report "To Prevent a Nuclear War." The report, which was circulated Friday at the headquarters of the international community on the eve of the 40th session of the UN General Assembly, says that nuclear weapons pose the gravest danger to mankind and that it is imperative to stop and reverse the nuclear arms race in all of its respects. The report draws attention to the peaceful stance of the socialist countries, the entire foreign policy activity of which is aimed at preventing a nuclear war from being broken out and at restraining the forces of reaction and militarism. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2240 GMT 6 Sep 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1013

GENERAL

USSR'S SHEVARDNADZE ADDRESSES UN SECURITY COUNCIL

LD262004 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT 26 Sep 85

[Excerpts] New York, 26 Sep (TASS)--Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, addressed today the commemorative meeting of the UN Security Council at the level of foreign ministers on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the United Nations.

He said:

Mr. President,

The anniversary of the United Nations is a good occasion, with due regard for the lessons of the past, to assess the present and look into the future.

Our representative gathering has before it a concrete task of enhancing the role of the United Nations in building a better world and augmenting the effectiveness of the Security Council, entrusted with the primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security.

The urgency of this task is due above all to the complexity of the international situation. We have already had an opportunity to indicate the reasons for the present tensions at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. Now I wish only to stress once again that the blame rests with those who persist in their unwillingness to reckon with the realities of our time, who count on obtaining military superiority and seek to dictate their will to others.

The world finds itself at a crossroads of sorts. Either the present dangerous trend fraught with catastrophic consequences for mankind continues to develop or it proves possible by joint effort to avert the threat of war, put an end to the arms race and release funds for solving urgent economic and social problems.

It is only by uniting the efforts of all states that mankind can be saved today from the danger hanging over it. This is also attested to by the experience of the anti-Hitlerite coalition and indeed by the very fact of the establishment of the United Nations, which is inseparably linked with the great victory of the freedom-loving peoples.

The indisputability of this conclusion is particularly obvious in the nuclear-and-space age. Strict compliance by states with the United Nations Charter requirement to live

in peace with each other as good neighbours -- and this, as we see it, is precisely what peaceful coexistence means -- is the only rational alternative to a nuclear tragedy.

Indeed, the very name of this organization -- the United Nations -- is pronounced with such hope and respect in all languages precisely because it embodies the idea of uniting the efforts of states for the sake of a peaceful future.

History demonstrates that whenever members of the United Nations were able to rise above their ideological, political and other differences for the sake of their common interests, this produced real results in strengthening peace. On those occasions the organization lived up to its role of an effective mechanism for fruitful international cooperation.

A realistic and responsible approach to international affairs requires overcoming the present tensions, reviving detente and making concrete efforts to build a better world.

Were people on any continent, in any country, asked what a better world means for them, it can be safely asserted that, despite differences in their world outlook, ideology and national or cultural traditions, they would be of one mind primarily in that a better world is a world without fear of a nuclear catastrophe, a world free of weapons, whether nuclear-missile, chemical, or any other.

Today there are already so many means of warfare in the arsenals of states as to destroy all life on earth. Nevertheless, their accumulation and qualitative buildup continue.

Furthermore, in addition to the, so to say, "earthly" weapons, there are plans for acquiring space arms, including weapons that can practically instantaneously strike any target wherever located -- on land, at sea, in the air or in space itself.

The Soviet Union has stated that it will not be the first to step into outer space with arms. But let no one hope that it will not be able to take necessary counter-measures should anyone else take such a step.

The genius of man should be directed not at inventing ever more sophisticated means of self-destruction but at attaining new heights in scientific and technological progress in order to improve the life of people.

This is precisely what the Soviet Union is doing. Our country was the first to place an artificial satellite in orbit around the earth. A citizen of the USSR, Yuriy Alekseyevich Gagarin, was the world's first cosmonaut. Soviet engineers were pioneers in building a nuclear power station and a nuclear-powered ice breaker.

Pursuing its invariable, principled course, the Soviet Union has submitted for the consideration of the current General Assembly session a proposal on developing international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space in conditions of its non-militarization. We are in favour of preventing the appearance of arms in space and of opening it up for the states' joint constructive endeavor. A decision to this effect should be adopted without delay, before the arms race breaks out into space.

In accordance with the United Nations Charter, all members of the organization should contribute to achieving disarmament. Of course, this applies above all to the nuclear-weapon states, all the more so that all of them are permanent members of the Security Council.

The Soviet Union has unilaterally ceased nuclear explosions. In view of the presence in this chamber of the representatives of the nuclear powers we once again urge them, particularly the United States, to consider this initiative most seriously and to follow our example. As for verification, the problem is raised artificially. Today a nuclear explosion cannot be concealed, and those who make assertions to the contrary are also well aware of that.

Our country proposes that agreement be reached on the entire complex of issues concerning the removal of the nuclear threat -- from freezing to completely eliminating nuclear arms. In limiting and reducing arms of any kind the Soviet Union will go as far as its partners are prepared to go.

The Soviet Union is consistently acting in the belief that all states and peoples should really live in peace and harmony, in conditions of dependable security. We are pursuing this objective in our bilateral relations with other states as well as on the regional level, when we work to continue and develop the CSCE process started in Helsinki and when we put forward the idea of a comprehensive approach to security in Asia. We seek the same objective on a global scale, in particular in the United Nations where we advance major initiatives.

Let me mention something else, too. A better world cannot be built by taking into account the interests and views of only one state, however powerful and economically developed that state might be. It cannot be built for a limited group of states. A better world means peace for all, which can only be achieved through the efforts of all.

I wish to stress this here, in the Security Council, whose work is based on the principle of unanimity among all its permanent members.

The responsibility incumbent on the permanent members of the Security Council of course in no way detracts from the role the other Council members and all other member states of this organization are called upon to play in maintaining world peace. Whatever their differences, they should not be allowed to overshadow the main thing: namely, their common responsibility for eliminating the nuclear threat and for safeguarding peace.

In the words of Mikhail S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "all people want to live, no one wants to die. Therefore we should muster political courage and stop the ominous process that is developing. It is necessary to stop the arms race and to proceed to disarmament and begin improving relations."

I wish to express the hope that our meeting today will give a new impulse to enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations and its Security Council in their efforts for the benefit of peace and for the good of mankind.

CSO: 5200/1014

GENERAL

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW: GENEVA TALKS, SPACE, CHEMICAL ARMS

PM241015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korionov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] Responsibility

In the present dangerous international situation socialism's peace-asserting mission appears particularly clear before mankind. We know only too well, V.I. Lenin noted, the enormous calamities that war brings to the peoples. "...We promise the workers and peasants," he said, "to do our utmost for peace. And we will." The Leninist party is sacredly fulfilling its leader's behests.

The plans for the future being formulated and implemented by the CPSU and the Soviet state are invariably directed toward achieving a peaceful situation and international cooperation. The complete and comprehensive elimination of nuclear weapons and mankind's complete freedom from the threat of nuclear war -- that is what the CPSU considers its most important foreign policy goal and what it devotes its efforts to attaining. Many foreign commentators state that the present international situation is developing against the background of a powerful new peace offensive by the socialist community countries.

Our country confirms by word and deed that war will never come from the Soviet Union, that we will never begin war. It was the USSR that unilaterally renounced the launching of antisatellite weapons in space and simultaneously proposed to the United States the mutual and complete cessation of all work on the creation of antisatellite systems; the USSR halted the deployment of medium-range missiles and the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe; and it imposed a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. These are clear and concrete moves, and this process could make such progress if Washington played its part, too!

The Soviet delegation has begun the third round of talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva with the U.S. delegation with the task of achieving significant mutually acceptable decisions that would meet the task of preventing the arms race in space and eliminating it on earth. It is ready for constructive, businesslike talks in all three areas under discussion -- space, strategic arms, and medium-range facilities -- which, as agreed, are to be examined and resolved as a package.

What about the U.S. side? It is well-known that its position in Geneva to date, particularly on the key question of the nonmilitarization of space, has made it impossible to resolve the tasks facing the talks. Has that now changed? That question may be answered by the White House chief's statement at the 17 September press conference to

the effect that the U.S. delegation has brought no new proposals to Geneva. "I sent them," the U.S. President said, "with the same guidelines as we had at the beginning."

Whereas the Soviet side is making persistent efforts to maintain a peaceful sky above the earth, the U.S. side on the contrary is working to free its hands for the production of space strike weapons. Speaking about the "star wars" program at the same press conference, the head of the U.S. Administration stated: "I do not consider this proposal to be a bargaining counter at the talks."

The U.S. reply to the Soviet proposal on peace in space was provided by the recent ostentatious testing of the ASAT antisatellite system. The Pentagon brasshats were not just firing at a target, they were also effectively aiming at the Soviet proposal on the nonmilitarization of space and the ABM Treaty.

Nor can one disagree with those representatives of the international public who state that the testing of the ASAT system is an attack by certain U.S. forces on the approaching Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. By all accounts the Washington administration is alarmed at the tremendous response generated in the United States by the new Soviet peace initiatives. The public there, including the scientific community, are speaking out more loudly, demanding a conscientious and businesslike approach to the highly promising prospect offered by the USSR's constructive stance. The powers that be in the U.S. capital are trying to stem the increasing tide of support for the Soviet proposals.

"Within the Reagan administration," Britain's TIMES states, "there are influential people such as CIA Director W. Casey, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, and the conservative R. Perle, Weinberger's assistant, who oppose the very principle of holding talks with Moscow at present." Administration officials, THE TIMES says, are continuing to point out that "the summit is meant to be nothing more than an opportunity for the two leaders to get to know one another." Moscow's position, however, the influential London newspaper acknowledges, is the very opposite. "Moscow," the article says, "has initiated real progress on the most important questions, particularly on arms control. The Soviet leadership is offering a prospect which has always been strikingly attractive to Western public opinion, the prospect of a way out of the nuclear deadlock...."

The USSR has also brought goodwill to the latest UN General Assembly session which has now begun. The year 1986, which the United Nations has declared International Peace Year, is to be marked by major international community actions aimed at realizing the peoples' peace-loving aspirations. The USSR, which from the UN platform itself adopted the solemn commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons, is fully resolved to do everything in its power to increase the United Nations' effectiveness.

The USSR is working determinedly for the policy of detente to be revived and given new substance by appropriate efforts from all states, East and West. It advocates the strengthening and development of all-around ties with our traditional partner, France. For example, Soviet people understand the protests in France against the militarization of space, protests which rightly warn that Washington's "star wars" program could be a "destabilizing factor for the strategic balance of force."

In a Spirit of Goodwill

In the past few days the peoples have witnessed yet another important peace initiative by the socialist community countries: In Berlin and Prague identical letters were

published from E. Honecker, chairman of the GDR State Council, and L. Strougal, premier of the CSSR Government, to FRG Chancellor H. Kohl containing a proposal that the FRG Government join in talks on the creation of a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe. The initiating countries stated that they are ready to conclude an agreement with the FRG Government leading to the elimination of chemical weapons on the territory of the countries located along the dividing line between the two military-political alliances.

How did the West, and above all Bonn and Washington, treat this act of goodwill by the socialist countries? While stating that the FRG Government official spokesman (F.) Ost announced at the same time that this goal could only be "undermined" by partial regional measures. The situation was further clarified when White House spokesman L. Speakes said in Washington: "An attempt to discuss the question of a ban on chemical weapons which would apply only to central Europe would undermine international efforts aimed at achieving a world ban through talks."

A most original stance! Washington has deliberately been deadlocking the talks which have been in progress in Geneva for 15 years now aimed at formulating an international convention on the banning and destruction of chemical weapons, a convention which the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries and indeed the overwhelming majority of the world's states have been urging. At the same time, the blocking of a solution to this question on the international scale is being turned into an "argument" with which to try to prevent the implementation of regional measures. A hopeless situation indeed!

The reason for this "quiet sabotage" should be sought primarily in the U.S. ruling elite's position regarding chemical weapons. One of the present administration's earliest decisions was to set up a binary chemical munitions plant in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas. This plant is now ready, but work was held up by the stance adopted by Congress, which for 3 years rejected the Pentagon's demands for the production of binary weapons. The White House and the Pentagon used every form of pressure, and Capitol Hill capitulated: Congress rubberstamped a resolution authorizing mass production of binary munitions.

This decision has been taken at a time when the talks at the Geneva Disarmament Conference are entering the decisive stage -- the delegates have begun the practical formulation of the articles of a future convention on banning chemical weapons and eliminating stocks. The aim of the moves undertaken by Washington is to prevent an accord.

U.S. and other Western specialists do not hide the fact that up to 100 million people in Western Europe will suffer if the stocks of toxic agents which the United States now has in the FRG alone are used in combat conditions. And if binary weapons are added to those stocks, Europe will be turned into a "binary gas chamber."

But that is precisely the "prospect" that the apologists for chemical weapons want to make more likely for densely populated Europe. U.S. General Rogers, supreme commander, NATO Allied Forces, Europe, resolutely opposes any moves that might make it more likely that chemical weapons would be removed from the NATO arsenals. Speaking about the creation of chemical weapon-free zones, B. Rogers said in an interview in the Hamburg newspaper DIE WELT: "It is the same as with nuclear-free zones. They create an entirely unfounded illusion of security." But what kind of security are we talking about when the zealous general states quite plainly that the use of binary weapons

is envisaged along with nuclear weapons at the very outset of military actions in Europe!

The GDR, the CSSR, and the other socialist countries are trying to divert this deadly threat from Europe. The Soviet Union, following its fundamental foreign policy principles, is ready to guarantee and respect the status of a chemical weapon-free zone if one is created in central Europe. If the United States did the same, such a guarantee would enter into force.

CSO: 5200/1014

GENERAL

JAPAN SOCIALIST PARTY DELEGATION DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN USSR

Kremlin Meeting With Gorbachev

LD161322 Moscow TASS in English 1311 GMT 16 Sep 85

[Excerpts] Moscow, September 16. TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received the delegation of the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) led by Masashi Ishibashi, chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee, in the Kremlin today.

During a conversation which was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, Mikhail Gorbachev informed the delegation members of the CPSU's and the Soviet people's activities directed towards fuller utilization of the potential of socialism and towards acceleration of the country's socio-economic development. Our plans for the future are oriented towards a peaceful situation and international cooperation, he said and it cannot be otherwise, considering the immense domestic tasks facing the Soviet people and the nature of our social system.

Attention was drawn to the continuing aggravation of the international situation. At a time when the Soviet Union has unilaterally ceased the launching of anti-satellite systems into space, suspended the deployment of medium-range missiles and the taking of other reply measures in Europe, and has introduced a moratorium on any nuclear explosions, the U.S. Administration is conducting a campaign of stirring up hatred for the USSR and performs new actions in the arms race. Enlisting the efforts of the world public against the nuclear war threats acquires great importance in these conditions. The CPSU considers it a major goal, which accords with the aspirations of all the peoples, completely to eliminate nuclear weapons everywhere and fully rid mankind of the nuclear war threat.

The Japan Socialist Party, Masashi Ishibashi said, also regards the prevention of nuclear war as the most important task of the present, supports the Soviet Union's ending of nuclear explosions as a concrete and important step on the road of curbing the arms race and elimination of nuclear weapons.

Both sides declared against the plans of spreading the arms race to space. Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that militarization of space would mean a new, ever more dangerous spiral of the arms race, would enhance the threat of war. It would call in question the destiny of the talks on cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear arms reduction.

Masashi Ishibashi said that the Japanese public would like the coming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting to have a positive outcome. Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet side will be doing everything so that the meeting lead to positive results. At the same time he pointed out that, deplorably, a lot is being done in the U.S. official circles to aggravate the Soviet-American relations before the opening of the meeting.

A thorough exchange of opinions was held on the ways of ensuring peace and stability in Asia and the Pacific. Mikhail Gorbachev and Masashi Ishibashi pointed out that it is desirable to pool in some form or other the efforts of the countries of that vast region, regardless of their social system, to turn the area into a zone of peace and equal cooperation.

Mikhail Gorbachev noted that people in the Soviet Union have respect for Japan and its people. Japan's role on the world arena can be increased through its contribution to peaceful solution of ripe international problems, through the establishment of peaceful cooperation with all countries and peoples, and not on the road of militarization and its ever greater involvement in the U.S. military plans.

Taking part in the conversation were: from the Soviet side -- Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Stepan Chervonenko, Petr Fedoseyev, Andrey Aleksandrov, members of the CPSU Central Committee; Yuriy Zhukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee; Ivan Kovalenko, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee;

From the Japanese side -- Masao Hori, deputy chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee (CEC); Masahiro Yamamoto, deputy chairman of the JSP CEC; Naoboru Yagi, member of the JSP CEC, head of the International Bureau of the JSP CEC; Wataru Kubo, member of the JSP CEC; Kozo Igarashi, member of the JSP CEC, head of the Information Bureau of the JSP CEC; Chisato Tatebayashi, member of the JSP CEC; Hajime Fukada, member of the JSP CEC, head of the Youth Bureau of the JSP CEC; Akira Ono, leader of the JSP group in the House of Councillors; Toshiharu Okada, chairman of the Special Committee on Japanese-Soviet relations at the JSP CEC.

TASS Correction to Report

LD161716 [Editorial Report] Moscow TASS in English at 1656 GMT on 16 September issues the following "corrected version" to the proceeding item, "Kremlin Meeting With Gorbachev," substituting the following for paragraph three:

"Attention was drawn to the continuing aggravation of the international situation. At a time when the Soviet Union has unilaterally rejected the launching of anti-satellite systems into space, suspended the deployment of medium-range missiles and the taking of other reply measures in Europe, and has introduced a moratorium on any nuclear explosions, the U.S. Administration is conducting a campaign of stirring up hatred for the USSR and performs new actions in the arms race. Enlisting the efforts of the world public against the nuclear war threat, acquires great importance in these conditions. The CPSU considers it a major goal, which accords with the aspirations of all the peoples, completely to eliminate nuclear weapons everywhere and fully rid mankind of the nuclear war threat."

Newspaper Versions

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian publishes the preceding TASS item in its 17 September 1985 first edition on page 1. Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian publishes the TASS report in its 17 September 1985 second edition on page 1. In paragraph three, line two, PRAVDA uses the term "ceased" [prekratil vyvod], using the original TASS version instead of the "corrected version" noted above. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in this place uses the term "rejected" [otkazalsya ot vyvoda], following the corrected TASS version.

Criticism of SDI

LD161918 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 16 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 16 TASS -- We disagree with President Ronald Reagan of the United States and his "Strategic Defense Initiative", and with his assertions that it will lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons, Masashi Ishibashi, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Japan Socialist Party (JSP), has stated here at a press conference for Soviet and foreign correspondents. We are against the idea because it leads to a transfer of the dreadful arms race to outer space.

Touching upon today's meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the JSP delegation, Masashi Ishibashi voiced satisfaction with the conversation with the Soviet leader. The conversation was substantive and very interesting, the chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee said.

The Soviet side and the Japan Socialist Party reached a consensus that it is essential for us to wage a resolute struggle against the war threat and a struggle for the ensurance of lasting peace. I emphasized for my part, Masashi Ishibashi said, that the Japan Socialist Party was founded on the basis of a critical reassessment of the World War Two experience. Proceeding from the premise that the bitter error of the past should by no means be repeated, we consistently struggle for the preservation of Japan's current constitution of which renounces the conduct of war and an arms build-up.

Masashi Ishibashi stressed that the JSP considers it one of its main tasks to frustrate the intentions of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party to abandon the existing one-per-cent-of-GNP limit on military expenditures. Already now with the one-per-cent-of-GNP limit, Japan ranks the eighth in the world by the level of military expenditures, the chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee said. There are strong voices in the USA and NATO countries that demand, with a view to neutralizing Japan's trade and economic drive, that Japan augment its military budget up to three per cent of GNP.

We do not consider that the one-per-cent-of-GNP ceiling is an important barrier to an uncontrolled rearmament of Japan, Masashi Ishibashi pointed out. If this limit is lifted, a danger will arise that the logic of unlimited arming will triumph. The JSP in every way opposes that.

Answering correspondents' questions, Masashi Ishibashi expressed agreement with the Soviet Union's proposal to conclude a treaty between the two countries on the so-called "nuclear guarantees", i.e. to seal in a treaty form the USSR's pledge not to make a nuclear attack on Japan provided the latter observes the three non-nuclear principles: not to have nuclear weapons, not to produce them, and not to bring them into its territory.

SS-20's Discussed

OW160929 Tokyo KYODO in English 0914 GMT 16 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, Sept. 16 KYODO--Masashi Ishibashi, chairman of the Japan Socialist Party, Monday met Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to discuss wide-ranging bilateral and international problems.

The official contents of the talks which started at the Kremlin at 11 am (4 pm Japan time) were not known immediately.

Ishibashi, leader of Japan's major opposition party, is the first top-ranking Japanese politician to have talks with Gorbachev since he took power last March.

Ishibashi is in Moscow at the head of a 13-member JSP delegation which will stay in the Soviet Union until September 20. It will then visit East Germany September 21-25.

Japanese sources said Ishibashi first conveyed to Gorbachev Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone's message hoping for a successful U.S.-Soviet summit in November.

Ishibashi then urged the Soviet leader to set up a firm line of communication with U.S. President Ronald Reagan to discuss nuclear disarmament, the sources said.

They said Ishibashi called on Gorbachev to remove SS-20 medium-range nuclear missiles from Asia and was briefed on his proposed conference on Asian security.

The socialist leader also sounded out Gorbachev about ways to improve Japan-Soviet relations, including foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze's Japan visit, the sources said.

Press Conference

OW201135 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 17 Sep 85

[Excerpts] At a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists, Masashi Ishibashi, chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee who is currently visiting the Soviet Union, said:

[Begin Ishibashi recording] I think the conversations I had were very substantive not only in quantity but also in quality. This is not only my opinion. As General Secretary Gorbachev stated at the end of the meeting, the conversations were very significant and substantive. We share the same view.

Before coming here, I met with Prime Minister Nakasone. First, I relayed his message during the talks. In response to a question concerning the summit meeting, Gorbachev said: We should realize that we have a great responsibility not only to the American or Soviet people, respectively, but also the people of the entire world. In the United States, there seems to be a move [words indistinct] saying that the summit meeting is significant merely for the sake of meeting. However, I do not share the same view. In conclusion, he said that despite various difficult conditions, he would do everything with sincerity to make the meeting a success.

On Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit to Japan, he said that the visit would certainly materialize, adding that he would do his best to realize the visit. However, to my request that a definite date be set for the visit, he said that it would be decided by the foreign minister himself.

We also discussed many other issues. I will discuss another matter that concerns Prime Minister Nakasone. As you all know, Soviet Culture Minister Dimichev is currently visiting Japan with a personal message from General Secretary Gorbachev. The message states that the Japanese Government should pay due attention to a recent proposal for working out comprehensive measures to ensure security in Asia. I asked for more specific details. I said that Asia needs something similar to the European security conference. To this, he said: The European security conference is certainly an organization of great significance. However, much effort was involved in establishing it. I think Asia should have something similar, but I do not think it is necessary to follow the example of the European security conference. There are other ways, including the signing of multinational or bilateral agreements. We can start from whatever is available. This is what he stated.

The JSP and the CPSU have reached a consensus on issues concerning resolute opposition to war and pursuance of peace. On my part, I emphasized that the JSP was founded on the basis of a critical assessment of the experience of World War II. Proceeding from the premise that bitter errors of the past must never be repeated, we have persistently maintained our stand on safeguarding the constitution which renounces armament.

We consider the 1-percent-of-GNP ceiling on defense spending as the last barrier to Japan becoming a military power. If this barrier is removed, the armed forces will continue to expand, and Japan will take the road of becoming a military power. Needless to say, if Japan should spend, say 3 percent of GNP on military expenditure, it would become the third largest military power in the world. I have stated that the JSP will do everything to prevent this. Moreover, as the only nation that has experienced an atomic bombing, we take it as an important task to oppose nuclear weapons. Herein also lies one of the JSP's guidelines. We appeal to the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate nuclear weapons.

We sincerely hope that serious discussions will be held and results will be achieved at the coming summit meeting and the disarmament talks that have been resumed in Geneva. I have also stated our approval of any proposal that aims or leads to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

As for the SDI program, I have stated that we disagree with President Reagan's assertion that it is a defensive or a nonnuclear weapon and that it will lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons. We oppose the idea because it leads to the transfer of the dreadful arms race to outer space.

Next, we touched on Japan's relations with its neighbors in East Asia. We reached a consensus that the military alliances in both the East and the West blocks should be resolved at the same time. More specifically, I stated that it should include the Japan-U.S. security treaty, the U.S.-ROK treaty of mutual cooperation, and the treaty of mutual cooperation between the United States and the Philippines. I confirmed that these treaties in the West should be resolved. I also pointed out that in order to cover the Asia and Pacific area, it would be better to also include the ANZUS pact. [end recording]

11 October 1985

At the press conference, Chairman Ishibashi also remarked on the outcome of exchanges concerning USSR-Japan and USSR-China relations. Views were also exchanged on the peaceful reunification of Korea. Answering a Radio Moscow reporter's questions, Chairman Ishibashi agreed with the Soviet proposal to conclude a treaty between the two countries on the so-called "nuclear guarantees"; that is, to seal in treaty from the USSR's pledge not to launch a nuclear attack on Japan provided that Japan strictly adheres to its three nonnuclear principles.

Meets Soviet Scientists

LD182055 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 18 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 18 TASS -- Averting nuclear war, preventing space militarization and struggling for a total ban on chemical weapons are the key tasks of our times, to which people in the USSR attach particular importance, said Petr Fedoseyev, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, today while addressing a meeting of Soviet scientists, members of the Scientific Council on the Study of Peace and Disarmament Problems, with a delegation of the Japan Socialist Party [JSP] led by Masashi Ishibashi, chairman of the party Central Executive Committee.

Academician Fedoseyev said that Soviet scientists, like the entire Soviet people, are worried over Japan's moves to build up its military potential. The global strategy of the U.S. Administration, which is aimed at uniting the United States, Western Europe and Japan into a certain military force to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the other socialist countries, is seen more and more clearly.

"We are very interested in ensuring peace and stability in Asia and the Pacific and, therefore, we constantly declare for improving the political climate between the USSR and Japan," the Soviet scientists stressed.

The problem of ensuring security is real, but it cannot be solved by means of efforts in the military field, said Oleg Bykov, deputy director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The quest for ways to resolve the problem should be conducted in the political direction. Soviet scientists vigorously advocate cooperation between the Soviet and Japanese peoples in all spheres, The scientist emphasized.

The head of the Japanese delegation agreed that cooperation of scientists in urgent issues is necessary and useful. In his opinion, the Japanese Government's stand for building up armaments impedes this cooperation.

Masashi Ishibashi stressed that the Japan Socialist Party, abiding by the concept of "unarmed neutrality," is working for preventing Japan from being converted into a major military power and for getting the country to pursue the policy of peace, neutrality and friendly cooperation with all countries and to advocate the settlement of all issues by peaceful means.

The participants in the meeting expressed common views on a number of international problems, specifically, on the need to settle the situation on the Korean Peninsula. They regarded as a positive fact the improvement of relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Japan.

OW201417 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 19 Sep 85

[Askold Biryukov commentary]

[Text] On 16 September, talks were held between Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU, and Masashi Ishibashi, chairman of the Japan Socialist Party [JSP] Central Executive Committee. The talks which aroused worldwide attention gave explicit endorsement to the fact that the USSR, Japan's neighbor, is making plans for the future, as in the past, oriented toward a peaceful world situation and extensive international cooperation. TASS political commentator Askold Biryukov comments on the talks:

During the talks which were held in a friendly atmosphere at the Kremlin, the Soviet side stated that the CPSU considers it a major goal to completely eliminate nuclear weapons and to fully rid mankind of the threat of nuclear war. This is our consistent policy as can be proved by the series of our recent actions taken unilaterally in the tense world situation. These initiatives include banning the launching of antisatellite systems, suspending the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, and suspending all nuclear tests beginning 6 August. In the past, the Soviet Union also made many other important peace-oriented decisions, including the pledge not to be the first to resort to nuclear weapons.

The JSP delegation indicated its understanding of the Soviet position and stressed its view that the most important task at present is to prevent a nuclear war. The JSP delegation supported the suspension of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union, stressing that it is a barrier to arms expansion and a practical step toward eliminating nuclear weapons. Both sides reached a consensus on opposing the militarization of space which would mean greater danger of a nuclear catastrophe.

This is precisely the Soviet understanding of its responsibilities in respect to peace on earth and, on the basis of this understanding, the Soviet Union intends to work for a positive outcome at the Soviet-American summit scheduled for Geneva in November. However, the situation has become complicated as a result of various actions, including the expansion of arms and the start of a new anti-Soviet campaign by the U.S. Government aimed at aggravating Soviet-American relations.

An exchange of salutary opinions was held at the talks on ways to ensure peace and stability in Asia and the Pacific. What should be pointed out here is that General Secretary Gorbachev made a proposal in May of this year on studying a comprehensive approach to the issue "On Asian Security." According to the proposal, starting with bilateral or multilateral negotiations, the Asian countries could eventually concentrate efforts on holding an all Asia-Pacific conference to search for a constructive solution to this issue. The conference must be held because the issue of ensuring peace has become just as important in Asia as it is in Europe and because the people on the Asian Continent cherish the same strong aspirations for peace and peaceful cooperation as the people on European and other continents.

As MAINICHI SHIMBUN points out, General Secretary Gorbachev's proposal conforms to the moves oriented toward peace and mutual understanding that have become increasingly apparent in Asia.

The proposal for a comprehensive approach to the issue of Asian security is also stated in General Secretary Gorbachev's personal message to Prime Minister Nakasone delivered by Soviet Culture Minister Demichev who is currently on an official visit to Japan. In this personal message, it is stated that we can cooperate positively on this important issue which affects the future of the Asian people.

At the meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev, the JSP delegation accepted this Soviet proposal with understanding and the proposal was explained more concretely. Both sides stressed that it is desirable to pool, in some form or other, the efforts of the Asian countries, regardless of their social system, to turn the area into a zone of peace and mutual cooperation. Based on the view that peace in Asia cannot be ensured with force of arms, there is no alternative to ensuring peace in Asia except the comprehensive approach to the issue of Asian security.

The measures proposed by the United States such as arms expansion, strengthening military bases, establishing new bases, and confrontation based on power, cannot ensure peace; on the contrary, they will dim the prospects for strengthening peace.

Chairman Ishibashi stated that Japan can increase, but not decrease, its prestige by contributing to peaceful solutions of international problems, establishing peaceful cooperation with all countries and peoples, and taking the road of unarmed neutrality. He said that Japan will create greater danger for itself if it should escalate its armament and get involved in the military programs of the United States.

Japanese papers have given a correct appraisal of the talks, saying that the Soviet Union has made clear its intention to improve its relations with Japan. The Soviet Union has always sought friendly relations with Japan, its neighbor. The talks between General Secretary Gorbachev and Chairman Ishibashi have also made it clear that there are great possibilities for improving the political climate and promoting the development of trade and economic relations as well as exchanges in cultural and other fields between the two countries.

The overall development of Soviet-Japanese relations is beneficial not only to the peoples of the two countries, but also to peace in the Far East. The Soviet Union has treated all its neighbors, including Japan, with respect, and is ready to improve its good-neighborly relations with them. In General Secretary Gorbachev's personal message to Prime Minister Nakasone, it is stressed that we are ready to take various concrete measures to further promote new or existing cooperative relations of mutual benefit. Similar efforts in this orientation on the part of Japan will always have the understanding and support of the Soviet Union.

Politburo Discusses Visit

LD191819 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Sep 85

[Excerpts] In the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. At its routine meeting, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined and approved a comprehensive program for the development of the production of consumer goods and of the services sphere in 1986-2000.

The results of the meetings between a CPSU delegation and the delegation of the Japanese Socialist Party [JSP] which is in Moscow, were approved.

11 October 1985

It was noted that, in the course of the talks, the identity or commonality of the two parties' views on many cardinal issues of the international situation was revealed, the desire to establish genuine good-neighbor relations between the USSR and Japan was confirmed, and confidence was expressed that the talks in Moscow between delegations of the CPSU and the JSP would serve as a new stimulus for activating the two parties' joint struggle to remove the danger of nuclear war and to consolidate peace and security in Asia and throughout the world.

Joint Communiqué

PM231044 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS Report: "Joint Communiqué on Talks Between the CPSU and the Japan Socialist Party"]

[Excerpts] A delegation of the Japan Socialist Party [JSP] led by Masashi Ishibashi, chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee, paid a visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee 14-21 September 1985.

The JSP delegation was received on September 16 by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In the course of the meeting, which passed in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, the sides exchanged opinions on the problems of the present-day international situation, a search for peace and security for the Asian peoples, improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations, and the expansion of friendly contacts between the CPSU and the JSP.

The talks were continued at a meeting at the CPSU Central Committee on September 17.

In the course of the talks representatives of the CPSU and the JSP voiced deep concern over the serious aggravation of international tension, especially in the continuation of the arms race and the escalation of the danger of nuclear war, which can lead mankind to its destruction. Both delegations agree that the most urgent, pressing, and important task of all the peoples of the world today is the achievement of nuclear disarmament to the point of the complete prohibition and abolition of nuclear weapons.

The CPSU and the JSP believe the nuclear arms race may become irreversible in the event of the militarization of space. The delegations of the two parties voiced serious worry over the attempts of the United States -- contrary to the protests of the peoples of the world -- to carry on research and development within the framework of its "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). It is their common conviction that the arguments of the U.S. Administration that the "initiative" is defensive, unrelated to nuclear weapons, and even conducive to nuclear disarmament are false and aim at deceiving the peoples of the world. The fulfillment of these plans intensifies the militarization of space and considerably increases the probability of nuclear conflict.

The delegations of the two parties consider it necessary to prevent at all costs the militarization of space because it would be an irreparable mistake with pernicious consequences for the future of the world and for the very existence of mankind. They fully agree the peoples of the world must work jointly for the early conclusion of international agreements to prevent the militarization of space and to prohibit the fulfillment of plans similar to the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The delegations of the two parties confirm that to prevent nuclear war, it is necessary to conclude timely agreements on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, on the no-first-use of nuclear weapons, and on the renunciation by the nuclear powers of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states; to proceed towards the universal and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

Both sides recognize the special responsibility borne in the field of nuclear disarmament by the states possessing nuclear weapons, primarily the United States and the Soviet Union. The JSP delegation welcomed the resumption of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons and the agreement on the summit meeting of the Soviet and U.S. leaders.

It expressed the hope that both sides would make the necessary efforts to achieve real results in reducing nuclear armaments. The JSP delegation spoke highly of Mikhail Gorbachev's statement that the Soviet Union and the United States immense responsibility for the outcome of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting; not only to their own peoples, but to the peoples of the whole world.

The CPSU informed the JSP delegation about the consistent efforts of the Soviet Union aimed at achieving the complete prohibition and abolition of nuclear weapons, the prevention of the militarization of space, and a stronger world peace.

The JSP delegation stated the JSP understood the Soviet peace initiatives and voiced an especially resolute support for the Soviet Union's moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The task today is to mobilize world public opinion to exert proper influence on the other nuclear powers so that they will announce a halt in nuclear testing.

Discussing questions about the situation in Asia and the Pacific, the CPSU and JSP delegations voiced serious concern over the spread of the nuclear arms race to that region.

The JSP delegation said that U.S. nuclear weapons were being built up in Japan and in adjacent maritime areas. It stated that the JSP, firmly standing by the three non-nuclear principles officially proclaimed by Japan, was resolutely opposed to the introduction of U.S. nuclear weapons into Japan and to the use of the country as a U.S. nuclear base.

The JSP delegation stated that it is pressing for the reduction and withdrawal of any nuclear-missile weapons, including Tomahawk cruise missiles, SS-20's and other types of these weapons from the Asian-Pacific region. In this connection, the CPSU delegation recalled the Soviet Union's readiness to freeze the number of its missiles in the Asian part of the country on the condition that the United States would not take actions leading to a change in the strategic situation in the Asian-Pacific region.

The sides agreed that in conditions of the mounting nuclear arms race the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of Asia and the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins could become an important stage in improving the situation in the Far East. Both sides consider it important for all Asian non-nuclear states to adopt the known non-nuclear principles (not to have nuclear arms, not to manufacture them, and not to import nuclear arms to the territory of their countries) and for the nuclear powers to undertake not to use nuclear arms against them and to respect these non-nuclear principles.