


002085

JPRS-TAC-85-046

6 November 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



19980728 096

700 100 100 100 100 100

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10
63
A04

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.

6 November 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS Assails Weinberger 9 Oct Speech on SDI (Various sources, 10, 11 Oct 85)	1
'Provocative' Speech	1
'Dangerous Challenge', by Vladislav Kozyakov	3
Reagan 'Exempt' From Soviet Criticism	4
Moscow TV on U.S. Response to Gorbachev, ABM Treaty (Spartak Beglov; Moscow Television Service, 13 Oct 85)	5
Moscow Assails Administration Interpretation of ABM Treaty (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 18 Oct 85; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 21 Oct 85)	6
'Distortion' of Treaty, by V. Chernyshev	6
'Violence to Principles, Common Sense', by Valentin Falin	9
USSR Army Paper on U.S. Booklet on Soviet SDI (V. Chernyshev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 9 Oct 85)	13
TASS: UN General Assembly Attendees Support 'Star Peace' (Moscow TASS, 5 Oct 85)	15
More on NATO Assembly Discussion of SDI (Moscow World Service, 11, 14 Oct 85)	16
Europeans 'Alarmed'	16
U.S. Seeks Support	17
Soviet Scientists Discuss Space Defense Arguments (Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow in English to North America, 12 Oct 85)	18
Further Reports on U.S. SDI Technical Developments (Various sources, various dates)	22
Possible Launch of Nuclear Reactor	22
Space Shuttle's Role	22

'Space Cannon'	23
Military Shuttle Mission	24
Moscow Paper Comments on SDI Experiments, Purposes (Mikhail Stoyanov; Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 28 Jun 85)	25
PRAVDA on U.S. Concern Over West European Public Opinion (Vladimir Mikhaylov; Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Oct 85)	29
Soviet Army Paper Assails FRG 'Pretensions' (A. Yevgen'yev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Jun 85)	33
Further Comments on Prospect of Japanese SDI Participation (Moscow PRAVDA, 28 Sep 85; Moscow TASS, 4, 22 Oct 85)	34
'Dubious Honor', by B. Barakhta	34
'Outstrips Allies'	35
Demands Accord on Secrets	36
USSR Space Institute Director Interviewed on SDI (Vienna NEUE AZ, 19/20 Oct 85)	37
Briefs	
Scientists Colloquium Denounces SDI	38
U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
USSR: Connection Between Space, Offensive Arms Cuts Stressed (Igor Sinitsyn; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 14 Oct 85)	39
NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
Finnish Paper: USS Iowa in Baltic Points Up 'Zone' Problem (Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 28 Sep 85)	41
NUCLEAR TESTING	
TASS on Continued Testing by U.S. (Moscow, TASS, 10, 17 Oct 85)	43
Energy Department Spokesman Cited	43
Debate in U.S. Noted	43
Arguments for, Against Moratorium	45
Soviet Seismologists Contend U.S. Can Check USSR Nuclear Tests (Moscow TASS, 11 Oct 85)	46
Moscow Paper Cites FRG Experts: Seismic Monitoring Reliable (Vladimir Markov; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 34, 1-8 Sep 85) .	47

GENERAL

CPSU Draft Party Program: Armed Forces, Arms Control (Moscow PRAVDA, 26 Oct 85)	49
USSR: Shevardnadze UN Jubilee Speech, Gorbachev Message (Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Oct 85)	53
Shevardnadze Speech	53
Gorbachev Message	57
Briefs	
'Formal' Soviet Arms Proposal	59

TASS ASSAILS WEINBERGER 9 OCT SPEECH ON SDI

'Provocative' Speech

LD101526 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, 10 October (TASS)--The new peace-loving Soviet Initiatives which were expounded by M.S. Gorbachev in the course of his trip to France, are continuing to attract universal interest; first and foremost, in Western Europe. According to an official representative of the Belgian Government, they will be the main question on the agenda at the extraordinary session of the NATO Council at foreign minister level which will take place in Brussels on 15 October.

French President F. Mitterrand is today meeting FRG Chancellor H. Kohl to discuss them. P. Nitze, an adviser of the U.S. president and of the secretary of state on arms reduction talks, is travelling around the capitals of Western Europe with the U.S. interpretation of these proposals. He spoke in Brussels before the ambassadors of the NATO member countries, then held a news conference at which he reported that the U.S. administration is not yet ready to give "a full public response" to the Soviet proposals and that Secretary of State G. Shultz would inform the U.S. allies about Washington's reaction next week. Nitze has now arrived in Bonn, where he will meet the FRG chancellor. It is in this way that discussions are taking place in Western Europe in a search for ways to establish a constructive dialogue between East and West, a dialogue which would lead to the curbing of the arms race and to an improvement of the international climate.

This clearly does not please U.S. militaristic circles, who do not want to reckon with new realities and who are now making feverish attempts to prevent an improvement [sdvig] in limiting the arms race. It is in this light that observers assess the provocative speech made in Washington's National Press Club by one of the chief apologists of the U.S. military-industrial complex, Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger. His speech was advertised before hand as a "programmatic" explanation of U.S. strategy for the 90's. In actual fact, the speech contains nothing new--just the same old stories about an imaginary "Soviet military threat" and the same old demands for an increase in military spending, for activating research within the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), i.e. "star wars," and for pursuing the notorious "from a position of strength" policy.

Weinberger stated that U.S. military strategy for the 90's should rest on three "pillars": "The Strategic Defense Initiative" and the potential of "restraint"; increasing the might and use of U.S. conventional armed forces; and the strategy of reducing weapons and establishing control over them. He emphasized that the aim of this strategy is to ensure the notorious "peace through strength," that is, the achievement by the United States of military superiority and the pursuance of a policy of diktat on the international arena. He confirmed the well-known pretensions of the United States to world dominion, including such pretensions to almost half the world in the sphere of the notorious "U.S. national interests." In doing so, he has made a clear claim for the use of military force in order to assert these interests, emphasizing that the United States should not only "preserve freedom for itself and its allies," but also contribute toward "a larger and larger number of the world's states' gaining freedom." This statement becomes especially ominous if one bears in mind that this formula was used by Washington in order to justify such an act of blatant international piracy as its unprovoked armed aggression against the nonaligned country of Grenada.

In arguing for a buildup of U.S. "military muscle," Weinberger endeavored to call into question the whole of the previously elaborated Soviet-American treaty system regulating the quantitative and qualitative balance of strategic nuclear forces of the USSR and the United States; launching attacks on the Soviet-American SALT I and SALT II treaties.

Striving to clear the path for the uncontrolled militarization of space, he went further than officials in the U.S. administration, who, for the same purpose, attempt to "interpret" the antiballistic missile defense treaty in such a way as to claim that it supposedly permits the development [razrabotka] and testing of components for space arms systems. All the indications are that the Pentagon boss is pushing matters toward the point of excising "at the root" this agreement, which is one of the most fundamental between the two countries in the field of arms control. "We must consider the possibility of a real break with the ABM defense treaty," he stated directly.

While speaking in favor of arms control, the master of the Pentagon was, at the same time, pushing for an uncompromising, hard-line U.S. position in Geneva. Speculating on the feelings of those Americans who are demanding effective measures to limit the arms race, Weinberger hypocritically said that the arms build-up is allegedly almost the most promising means of achieving progress on this path; that it is U.S. might which serves as an "urgent incentive" for the USSR to conclude an agreement in Geneva. "We must not only conduct talks from a position of strength," he declared. "It is the only way to conduct effective negotiations."

Mr Weinberger knows very well that speaking the language of diktat to the Soviet Union is an activity with no prospects. If he continues to do this, it can only mean one thing: Those circles standing behind him do not wish for any progress at Geneva. They are seeking to wreck the possibility of curbing by treaty the nuclear arms race which threaten all mankind.

6 November 1985

Commenting on Weinberger's address, UPI notes that he left no doubt as to his intention to continue seeking major increases in U.S. military spending. "Weinberger's speech was, in essence, a reiteration of his earlier political declarations," THE NEW YORK TIMES notes.

'Dangerous Challenge'

LD111638 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 11 Oct 85

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger in a speech to the National Press Club on Wednesday [9 October] once again advocated the development of space strike weapons (?in) the United States. Our observer Vladislav Kozyakov comments:

Actually the chief of the Pentagon spoke in favor of further developing both nuclear and space weapons. He said that the [words indistinct] rearmament program started in 1981 and the Strategic Defense Initiative known as the star wars project represent a new defense strategy for the 1990's. According to Caspar Weinberger, star wars should be a far safer deterrent than the mutual suicide pact we have pledged, which is now our only way to keep peace. In other words, to develop only strategic nuclear weapons as the previous administrations did means to pursue an absolute strategy while to further build-up nuclear weapons and to simultaneously develop space strike weapons as the present administration does mean to adhere to a new defense strategy. Such is the logic of the United States secretary of defense. Mr Weinberger has probably forgotten that the present United States Administration agreed with the Soviet Union last January that the major goal of the current Soviet-American talks in Geneva would be to prevent the arms race in outer space and to end it on earth. It is in full accordance with this understanding that the Soviet Union has recently advanced new far-reaching initiatives. One of them provides for a 50 percent reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of their strategic nuclear arsenals and nonmilitarization of outer space. Another Soviet initiative provides for a reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The Soviet Union on its part has recently cut its medium-range missiles in Europe to a lower level than it had 10 or even 15 years ago.

Against this background, the new strategy of the United States for the 1990's, Caspar Weinberger spoke about in his speech in the National Press Club, looks as a dangerous challenge. For a decade ahead, Washington is mapping out plans to build new, sophisticated nuclear weapons and to develop space strike weapons. The realization of the plans would make nuclear arms control problems even more complicated and agreements less possible. It is not surprising that the chief of the Pentagon called the latest Soviet proposals quite unsatisfactory. The military-industrial complex he represents in the administration is not prepared to outlaw space strike weapons and to cut nuclear arsenals by 50 percent as Moscow suggests. But what is good for the United States military-industrial complex is not good either for the American nation as a whole or for universal peace.

Reagan 'Exempt' From Soviet Criticism

LD101834 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1759 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, 10 October (TANJUG)--The Soviet Union publicly voices discontent over the way in which official Washington reacts and interprets Gorbachev's recent proposals on the reduction of existing armament and other proposals in this connection.

But Soviet commentators in the press and the agency TASS exempt President Reagan from criticism, which is a certain fresh sign. They, however, sharply criticize other U.S. officials, especially Defence Secretary Weinberger.

In a TASS commentary this afternoon, Weinberger's speech at the National Club in Washington was said to have been "provocative" but this "should not be surprising" because "he is one of the main advocates of the U.S. military-industrial complex."

Moscow reproaches the Pentagon chief for repeating the phrases about "Soviet military threat," for seeing the American military strategy in the further enhancing of the arms race, and, what is most important, for attempting to talk with Soviet Union "from the position of force."

TASS said this was a "futile attempt" that may mean but one thing: quarters represented by Weinberger are opposed to progress at the Geneva negotiations.

CSO: 5200/1058

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TV ON U.S. RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV, ABM TREATY

LD132057 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Oct 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Spartak Beglov]

[Excerpts] Our country has gone its part of the way to open up broad possibilities for constructive decisions to be made at the coming Geneva summit.

However, is Washington prepared to go its part of the way to meet the Soviet proposals? That is another question to which the world is now seeking an answer.

To be fair, it should be said that the head of the U.S. Administration, perhaps for the first time in the whole history of his presidency, did not venture to reject the Soviet proposals outright and stated that the United States would pay attention to them and would study them. It is, of course, well understood that the scale, depth, and specific content of the Soviet initiatives have received such an attentive response everywhere that to brush them aside would amount to flouting the whole world public.

The American side, however, is stubbornly giving the impression that Article 5 of the Anti-Ballistics Missile Defense Treaty, which prohibits the creation, testing and deployment of ABM systems and components based in the air, in space, or ground-mobilized, somehow does not exist as far as they are concerned. Mr Weinberger rather cynically spoke out in a tone which other politicians in the United States have not up to now brought themselves to speak: We should examine the possibility of a real break with the ABM treaty.

The real reason for such candor was revealed by the Pentagon chief himself. The new U.S. Strategy for the 90's, which he had just proclaimed, is a new acceleration of the same old arms race. The Soviet peace program has become an obstruction along this road. These are the real reasons why the so-called "proponents" of a hard line in the U.S. Defense Department, and in the president's circle itself, gave such a hostile reception to the USSR's proposal for a 50 percent reduction in both sides' strategic arsenals. And, you know, in this, together with the proposal on the nonmilitarization of outer space, lies the key to a way out of the vicious circle of the arms race.

The sort of counter-position which Washington has adopted for all the world to see is a manifestation of the very militarization of political conscience which Comrade Gorbachev condemned in one of his speeches, when he urged Washington to reshape the way it thinks and acts from a military to a peaceful outlook.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ASSAILS ADMINISTRATION INTERPRETATION OF ABM TREATY

'Distortion' of Treaty

PM181013 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Technical Sciences Reserve Colonel V. Chernyshev:
"Criminal Actions; Washington Tries to Destroy the ABM Treaty"]

[Text] The Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, concluded in May 1972, has now been in effect for more than 13 years and is one of the foundations on which the sides' relations are built. Its signing denoted recognition by the Soviet Union and the United States of the objective interconnection between offensive and defensive systems and of the dangerous role which attempts to create a large-scale ABM system would play in provoking an arms race. The preamble to the treaty clearly states that "effective measures to limit ABM systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the arms race and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons."

Its conclusion also marked recognition of the fact that only mutual restraint in the sphere of ABM systems can make possible progress along the path of limiting and reducing nuclear arms. Thus, the ABM Treaty, according to the design of the sides which signed it, is meant to fulfill two extremely important functions: first, to be a kind of brake and a restraining factor on the arms race and, second, to serve as the principal foundation and basis for the whole process of limiting and reducing arms.

During the validation of the ABM Treaty, the USSR and the United States have twice--in 1977 and 1982--examined it jointly, we emphasize jointly, and have agreed unanimously that it continues to meet their interests, operates effectively, and does not require changes or amendments. Essentially, this assessment of the treaty by both sides has confirmed over and over again that the interconnection between offensive and defensive arms is of a lasting nature, regardless of the technical level that their development has reached.

But in March 1983 the United States proclaimed the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" and began intensive work on the "star wars" program--a program for the creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements and the development [razrabotka] of space strike arms. It is quite natural

that such actions conflict with the principles on which the ABM Treaty is based. For this important document prohibits the deployment of ABM systems in the interests of defending the entire territory of the United States and the USSR (that is, large-scale ABM systems) and the creation [sozdaniye] of a basis for such defense.

Rejection of the ABM Treaty under conditions whereby its tremendous international significance is clearly recognized throughout the world would mean a frank admission for Washington that its aims are by no means those of curbing the arms race and proceeding to arms reductions. This was why the U.S. administration did not venture to follow the persistent appeals of figures such as Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle, for example, to get out of the treaty. A different path was chosen--the path of maneuvers, of seeking "loopholes" in the formulas of the treaty itself, and of one-sided "reinterpretation" and "revised" interpretation of its articles.

At first the U.S. leadership "contented" itself with claims that the United States was just conducting "research," which the ABM Treaty supposedly does not prevent. Later, however, the premises of laboratories and scientific establishments become too "cramped" for this "harmless research." There arose an ever greater need to perfect and test assemblies, components, models, and prototypes of space strike arms and they needed to "step out" onto firing ranges and, what is more, into near-earth space.

The scale of work assumed such a nature that it became clear even to official Washington that it has to seek more "serious" explanations for this. A new step was taken on the path of destroying the ABM Treaty: Interviewed on U.S. television during the NBC program "Meet the Press," R. McFarlane, assistant to the U.S. president for national security affairs, declared that the ABM Treaty "sanctions and approves" tests which are "an inalienable part of the development [razrabotka] of systems. According to him, the agreed statement accompanying the treaty "permits" the testing and creation [sozdaniye] of ABM components based on "different physical principles" to antimissile missiles, that is, such "exotic" antimissile means as laser and beam weapons, and so forth.

Thus, we see here an attempt to totally distort the essence of the ABM Treaty and to justify Washington's antitreaty actions by means of a "new interpretation" of it. For Article V of the ABM Treaty quite ambiguously prohibits the creation [sozdavat] and testing of ABM systems or components which are space-based. The claims that the treaty's provisions apply only to those ABM systems and components which existed at the time it was signed are designed to manifestly misinform people.

In actual fact, the treaty's provisions--and any specialists can confirm this--apply to any systems designed, as defined in article II, to counter strategic ballistic missiles or their elements in flight trajectories.

Since the ABM components being created [sozdavat] within the framework of the "star wars program"--including laser and beam weapons, and so forth--are designed for precisely this purpose, that is, they are meant to replace (or complement)

the antimissile missiles mentioned in the treaty, then all the treaty's provisions apply in full to them. And, above all, the ban on the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space-based AMB systems or components.

As for the references to the agreed statement, here too we see a blatant juggling of facts. The said statement really does not rule out the possibility of the sides' acquiring antimissile means "based on different physical principles," but only within the framework of the restrictions envisaged by the treaty as a whole, that is, for each side in one permitted region (each side is permitted to have just a limited ABM system in one region--the capital or an ICBM base--V. Ch.). But the large-scale ABM system with space-based elements envisaged by the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a territorial and even a global system, totally prohibited by the treaty. Consequently, the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment for it of laser, beam, and other destructive components "based on different physical principles" is a direct violation of the treaty.

It was not for nothing that THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote in connection with R. McFarlane's "new interpretation" of the ABM Treaty that for 13 years the treaty has everywhere been understood the way it was formulated: That any ABM system placed in space is prohibited. Now it is maintained this treaty means the opposite. That "not permitted" and that "from below" means "from above." All this, the newspaper concludes, must put even the most arch-jurist in Washington in an awkward position.

Something else is also noteworthy. The present U.S. administration has "revised" not only the legal interpretation of the ABM Treaty by previous U.S. administrations, but also its own earlier statements. Thus, for example, reports submitted to the U.S. Congress by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1983 and 1984 set forth a position according to which the ABM Treaty imposes restrictions on ABM programs based on the "use of directed energy" or other "nontraditional technologies."

What tasks have those persons in the U.S. administrations of the ABM Treaty made both by previous administrations and by the present administration, are producing a "new interpretation" of it now set themselves? It is perfectly clear they are pursuing the aim, first, of "freeing" themselves of the fetters which to not give the "star wars" strategists any "freedom" and, second, of removing all obstacles and all factors which still curb the arms race in any way.

All this must undoubtedly arouse and does arouse serious concern in sober minded specialists and politicians, including in the United States itself. As C. Smith, one of the most authoritative U.S. experts on questions of arms limitation and former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-American talks on strategic arms limitation (SALT I), declared recently, a "new reading" would make the ABM Treaty a "dead letter" and create doubts as to the advisability of concluding any other agreements in the arms control sphere with the United States. According to him, the present U.S. Administration's attitude to the ABM Treaty "reminds us of a number of cases in history when treaties have been treated like scraps of paper."

D. Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress, condemned the "new interpretation" of the treaty as "not inspiring confidence." He emphasized that such a decision will have "serious and far-reaching consequences" and will "jeopardize arms control."

It is possible to agree fully with this opinion. Indeed, how would it be possible to speak of limitations and reductions in nuclear arms if the United States has, in point of fact, denounced the chief existing agreement in the sphere of limiting the arms race? The transfer of the arms race into space, the Soviet Union has declared repeatedly at a most authoritative level, would make the reduction of nuclear arsenals objectively impossible.

Evidently, some people in Washington are too worried by the program advanced by the Soviet Union for improving the dangerously explosive international situation and fear the very possibility of this program's realization. The "new interpretation" of the ABM Treaty has been thought up by those "strategists" in the U.S. administration who are seeking to abolish all measures in the sphere of limiting and reducing arms and to preserve tension in the world and who wish to lead the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms into an impasse and to secure the failure of the Soviet-American summit meeting.

'Violence to Principles, Common Sense'

PM211337 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Valentin Falin under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion":
"Pretexts, Slander, Treaties"]

[Text] R. McFarlane, the U.S. president's national security aide, was originally a Marine. A delicate attitude toward the norms of international law is not his province. And he has been assigned to watch over not legality, but "U.S. interests" which are by no means the same thing. The latter, as they will not fail to observe to you, is a most dynamic category; in contrast to treaties, which hold life captive in the articles and paragraphs of convention.

Repeating yourself tiresomely, trying to wriggle out of it, and arguing that the United States respects the law? Too much honor for others and too much trouble for you. There is a simpler way: To say there are no immutable obligations. And that's that. No eternal enemies and no eternal friends, only imperial interests are eternal! The notorious war cry of the British Tories is adapted to the Washington manner.

Violence to principles and common sense is perpetrated with such cynicism that even hardened bourgeois "democrats" are shuddering. Not surprisingly. They are being treated like pawns with no opinion of their own, no dignity, and no self-esteem. Some grow tougher skins as a result of this treatment. But there are also those whose skins become thinner and their outrage seeks an outlet.

R. McFarlane's recent speech was the last straw for many people in the West. For 13 years the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems has been interpreted in the way it was formulated: The creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment

of sea-, air-, or space-based or mobile land-based ABM systems and components is **BANNED** [uppercase word published in boldface]. Under the 1972 treaty, the USSR and the United States undertook, further, not to give other systems and technical devices, apart from those specifically designated, the capability to counter strategic missiles and their elements at all stages of their flight. Both powers renounced the emplacement of ABM systems beyond their own national territories. No one's national sovereignty extended into space. Consequently, a barrier was erected to the strike armaments race in near-earth and outer space.

For 13 years, the world failed to realize it was reading by syllables, without perceiving the main thing. The Reagan administration itself was misled for 4 years. Back in 1984, it officially stated: "The ban enshrined in the ABM Treaty on the creation, testing, and deployment of space-based ABM systems or components of such systems applies to systems utilizing a directed particle beam and any other technology used for this purpose." Among themselves, it is true, the Americans argued about what constitutes "research" and how experiments to satisfy scientific curiosity comply with testing, for use by increasingly aggressive doctrines, models of new weapons or individual elements of such weapons exceeding the treaty's framework.

It turns out there was no point in their arguing, it was in vain that they curbed their fantasy and their appetites. McFarlane lit up U.S. television screens and declared that the 1972 treaty "sanctions and authorizes" the deployment and testing of ABM systems in space. So that's it. You can't fire at an approaching missile from a hunting rifle. Strictly speaking, a rifle comes under the term "mobile" and "rechargeable" system. But as soon as it's a case of a combat satellite, then everything's okay if previously unused "physical principles" are employed to strike the missiles.

It's all very simple. According to McFarlane's logic, limitations under the 1972 treaty are restricted to traditional systems, while a new agreement must be reached on unconventional systems. In other words, although the ABM Treaty is of unlimited duration, it must be admitted that it has had its day and we must think about "updated" concepts for the future. Actually, the Soviet side is not advised to think. It is being palmed off with Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative." But what if the Soviet Union prefers, as is its wont, to have its own opinion? Then they will set about slandering its position and blame it for the fact that there will be no agreements at all. As though the United States concludes agreements out of kindness.

From childhood every Russian is familiar with the funny story how the keen-witted soldier cooked gruel from an ax. In the broth McFarlane is concocting, the function of the ax is performed by "point E" of the agreed statement accompanying the ABM Treaty. This point stipulates that in the event of the future creation [sozdaniye] of weapons systems based on different physical principles and containing components which could modify antimissiles in particular, corresponding discussions and agreements should take place between the parties. Naturally, this was written in so that scientific and technical discoveries would not harm the basic idea of the treaty, which is designed to prevent the arms race in one more very sensitive sphere. Given a distorted approach, however, everything, including axioms, can be turned upside down.

The soldier took an ax for his breakfast, but he cooked a natural product. Washington's skilled workers are taking half-phrases out of the context of the 1972 treaty to undertake an act of subversion against international peace and cooperation--an act which, like all other acts of sabotage of U.S. origin, is presented as manna from heaven.

In its 21 October issue NEWSWEEK notes that the overthrow of the legal viewpoint of three previous administrations and the former interpretation of the treaty provided by Reagan himself was the result of a "slip of the tongue." It can happen to anyone. "What was left for the president--to dissociate himself from his national security aide?" The magazine was told by a White House spokesman. Understandably, it was easier to repudiate the treaty. According to NEWSWEEK, the "slip of the tongue" was turned into policy, into a lever for pressurizing adversaries and allies in NATO.

If this is improvisation, then it is carefully prepared. If there was a "slip of the tongue" then perhaps it was mistimed, but useful. Let's recall what Reagan and McFarlane said in late December 1984 and early January 1985 about the motives which prompted Washington to embark on the ABM Treaty. In their interpretation, Americans at that time were guided by sheer expedience. At the technical development level of the seventies it was cheaper to live with the treaty. Lofty words about peace and the solution of the questions which arise in a spirit of consensus, in the view of the present U.S. rulers, bore no weight, bear no weight now, and do not affect the material part of the treaty. They are like a toast at a banquet. The main thing is not principles, but technology. It has made headway since then and it is time to consider whether it is not more advantageous to eliminate the ABM limitations. This cannot be ascertained without tests and it is inconceivable to conduct tests without violating the treaty. The conclusion is obvious--the U.S. treaty heritage must be revised, proceeding from the President's "democratic" convictions and inspiration.

For those who are unable to make the effort to remember, we can state that as recently as 15 October R. Reagan repeated: "The idea of using technical and technological successes in America to create a system for our defense against nuclear missiles is morally justified." According to him, the "moral" imperative rates higher than legal commitments especially because "our (American) prime efforts and funds are being used in an attempt to create new equipment and technology whose aim is to save human lives"; in contrast to the "anti-American" (the President's term) strategy to which the United States adhered in the past and to which it adheres to day and which "creates a threat to the lives of totally innocent people." Alas, expatiations on the need to bring principles into "harmony" with technology are constantly hammering home the same point--the former treaties are defective and unnecessary. The peoples will lose nothing if the United States cancels them.

But are international agreements necessary at all? Do the Americans need agreements, especially now that the U.S. military potential is undergoing an unprecedented upsurge? The extreme conservatives are categorical--they are unnecessary and harmful. Their calculations do not include even the most minimal rapprochement of the sides' positions or even a clearing of the air in relations between West and East.

Let's listen to C. Weinberger. He spoke at the same time as McFarlane and could not make a slip of the tongue, but read perfectly off a prepared text. "America's interests are not engraved in stone anywhere," the defense secretary said. "We must never be tempted to define the range of our vitality important interests.... Opinions about vitally important interests will sometimes depend on the circumstances of a specific case, including trends and the internal importance of a situation. The need to win requires clearly defined aims and firmness and resolve on America's part."

The form in which this is set forth is somewhat ornate, but the content is evident even to the naked eye: "Strategy in the defense field," it was this strategy which was the subject of Weinberger's speech, is geared to "victory" and the United States must not encroach in advance on the freedom of choice of the means of achieving "victory" at any time and anywhere in the world. It is more convenient to act according to circumstances than to keep to treaties. Until the skies descent on the earth and the oceans swallow up the continents.

The power-drunk secretary says what the U.S. military-industrial complex thinks. "We must examine the possibility of a real breach of the ABM Treaty," he said, without beating about the bush or grimacing.

And they are examining this possibility. but yet again, their "ungrateful" allies and friends have failed to understand or value the impulse of Reagan and those who think like him. They assert that some officials within the administration itself have been wondering whether the time has not come to engage in something more serious than whitewashing. As a result a "compromise" has been born. The public has been told: "The president has examined the recommendations and reassessment of the (ABM) treaty. We believe that a broad interpretation is the correct one. But the president has decided that the United States must remain within the present framework of the treaty, within the framework of the present interpretation of the treaty, in accordance with which there is no need to use the expanded version to achieve our aims."

McFarlane was not disowned. According to a White House deputy press secretary, McFarlane reflected "a new and important understanding of how the treaty can be objectively interpreted." The aide was in a bit of a hurry and anticipated the president and the secretary of state, revealing a position which was being kept in reserve. But, in principle he was correct; even if G. Shultz, the head of the diplomatic department, is considered to be more correct. The United States is voluntarily limiting itself in the expectation that the public will become accustomed to the worst that is to befall it.

Popular wisdom has it that you learn from every setback. Obviously not every setback, and it does not apply to everyone. How many occasions and reasons Washington has had to see sense! On the basis of its own errors and other people's. but it does not want to. It does not want to consider the fact that other people's interests, no less important formidable than U.S. interests, exist, and that these interests are guarded by weapons no less formidable than U.S. weapons. As for the resolve to defend freedom and honor, here too the Americans do not have a monopoly. It is not worth being deluded. In general, if a person is obstinate that does not mean he is strong.

6 November 1985

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR ARMY PAPER ON U.S. BOOKLET ON SOVIET SDI

PM091103 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[Commentary by TASS military observer V. Chernyshev: "A Turbid Stream From Washington"]

[Text] The more practical steps and initiatives are undertaken and put forward by the Soviet Union with a view to creating a favorable atmosphere for the attainment of positive accords at the approaching Soviet-American summit meeting and the stronger the voices of protest throughout the world against the "star wars" program thought up and being fulfilled by Washington, the more frequently a stubborn "no" is heard from the United States. All kinds of reports, "studies," pamphlets, and other fabrications bearing loud, pretentious titles and laying claim to being "scientific" pursue the goal of muffling the role and significance of the USSR's peace efforts and at the same time "whitewashing" the American administration's plans and deeds, which are dangerous to mankind.

A pamphlet entitled "Soviet Programs in the Strategic Defense Sphere" has just been published, prepared jointly by the Pentagon and the U.S. State Department. A glossy cover, 27 pages of text, diagrams, and drawings. It looks good on the outside, but as soon as you start to read this apology for a "study," the lies jump out at you from every page. The only truthful element is official Washington's desire in any event to create [sozdat] space strike arms and put its "star wars" program into practice.

Take, for instance, the foreword to the pamphlet, signed by Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and Secretary of State G. Shultz. "The strategic defense initiative," they write, "is the most expedient and necessary answer, reaction, to the Soviet Union's implementation of large-scale efforts in the ABM sphere." Maybe, but what about President R. Reagan's authorship of "star wars"? After all, the White House chief constantly stresses that it is his idea, that he is the originator of "star wars," although he prefers to call his brainchild the "strategic defense initiative" (SDI). It is not for nothing that the Western mass media have now drawn attention to this "insult" to the initiator. U.S. attempts to convince the world public that the Soviet Union is working on a "star wars" program, Britain's THE GUARDIAN writes, are contrary to the statements of President Reagan, who presented the "star wars" plan as a "potential means of delivering" mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union, as has been stated repeatedly at the most authoritative level, is not creating space strike weapons or an ABM defense of the country's territory, and has never tried to appropriate to itself the American "claim" to the invention of "star wars." On the contrary, it consistently and firmly advocates the prevention of any steps to militarize space, and calls on the United States to make this law, on a treaty basis.

The pamphlet's authors go so far as to say that "the USSR may be preparing an AMB system for the entire national territory," and that the American "star wars" should lead to the annihilation of nuclear weapons, while the mythical Soviet work..."constitutes a serious threat to the West." There is truly no limit to the cynicism and lies.

Other phrases from the authors of the fabrication are also surprising, to put it mildly. They state that the SDI is a reaction "to the deployment by the Russians of a system permitted under the ABM Treaty." How can any reasonable individual claim that the creation [sozdaniye] in the United States of space strike arms, which are banned by the ABM Treaty, is an "expedient and necessary response" to what is permitted by that treaty? And what is the value of the claim that SDI is a factor for "preventing the Russians from deciding to build up their potential in the ABM sphere"? It appears that intensive U.S. work on the "star wars" program must be regarded as a factor helping to restrain the arms race. A more absurd "logic" could hardly be imagined.

However, the main conclusion drawn by Weinberger and Shultz puts everything in its place: It is necessary, they write, for the United States to carry out the modernization of American offensive nuclear forces and develop [razrabatyvat] a reliable ABM system. That was where the authors of the pamphlet wanted to lead the reader.

The other aim is to shift onto the Soviet Union everything for which the world public has long been criticizing the U.S. Administration. So they declare that the USSR is carrying out "wide research" with a view to creating [sozdaniye] laser and beam weapons, that the world's only operational antisatellite weapon system belongs to the USSR, that the USSR is violating the ABM Treaty, and so forth.

Yet the whole world knows that these are America's sins. It is the United States which is carrying out not only "research," but also tests of laser and beam weapons. It is the United States which is carrying out the development [razrabotka] and testing in space of second-generation antisatellite weapons. It is the United States which is violating the AMB Treaty by setting itself the goal of creating [sozdaniye] a large-scale AMB system with space-based elements, carrying out work on the creation [sozdaniye] of mobile ABM radar systems, testing Minuteman missiles in order to give them antimissile capabilities, and carrying out the other programs.

All this indicates that with the direct participation of the State Department, the Pentagon is working toward the dismantling of existing international agreements which "hamper" Washington's militarist course and seeking, with the help of space strike arms, to secure military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union, at the same time trying to mislead the world public by "justifying" its actions with flagrant slander against the USSR.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ATTENDEES SUPPORT 'STAR PEACE'

LD051602 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] New York, 5 October, TASS--By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev.

The "star peace" concept, advanced by the Soviet Union to counter the sinister "star wars" plans, evokes broad support of the world community. Participants in the general political debate currently under way at the 40th session of the UN General Assembly point out that outer space will serve to improve the life of all of mankind only if all channels for its militarization be securely closed.

The Soviet proposals acquire particular importance in the light of the threat to mankind which emanates from the plans to spread the arms race into outer space concealed behind the fake signboard of "Strategic Defence Initiative," said Vietnamese Government Minister Vo Dong Giang. That is why the Soviet foreign policy initiatives greatly contribute to implementing the top priority task of our time--that of ending the arms race on earth and keeping it away from outer space, and to strengthening universal peace and security.

The Ethiopian foreign minister, Goshu Wolde, drew attention to imperialism's striving to achieve military superiority which threatens mankind with an all-out nuclear catastrophe. Of particular danger is the notorious "strategic defence initiative" the true character of which is being masked in all ways by its authors.

The threat of spreading the arms race into outer space gives cause for alarm to all people, said Guinea's Foreign Minister Facine Toure. That is why the United Nations has no right to play a secondary part on the matter, it ought to fully exercise its possibilities in the field of disarmament.

The chief question today is now to stop the mounting arms race, prevent its spread into outer space and start reducing weapons of mass annihilation that have been accumulated, said V.A. Kravets, foreign minister of the Soviet Ukraine. The Soviet Union repeatedly stressed that on matters of restricting and reducing any type of armaments it will go as far as its partners in the talks will be prepared to go. It is inadmissible that mankind should be threatened with death from outer space at the beginning of the space age. Outer space should serve peaceful constructive purposes.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MORE ON NATO ASSEMBLY DISCUSSION OF SDI

Europeans 'Alarmed'

LD121306 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 11 Oct 85

[Station commentary]

[Text] The British delegate to the NATO assembly in San Francisco has submitted a report criticizing the American star wars program. The main conclusion that can be drawn from the report of John Cartwright, a member of Parliament, is that European countries are alarmed by U.S. military plans for outer space. Western Europe feels the report stresses, that Washington's reluctance to renounce the plans is blocking progress at the Geneva talks on space and nuclear armaments. The American delegation to the assembly should have paid special attention to the Cartwright report on the eve of the conference of the United States and its allies, held in view of the Geneva summit. If the delegate of Britain, that is considered one of the first supporters of the American star wars program, criticized it, there is every reason to think that other countries have much greater misgivings about the program.

These fears are increased by the fact that Washington has to respond to the new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union. During his visit to Paris, Mikhail Gorbachev suggested that the Soviet Union and the United States agree on radical cuts in their nuclear forces in order to ban nuclear strike weapons for both sides simultaneously. Western Europe has realized that the future of the entire process of limiting the arms race, which includes key issues of European security, depends on the response to the Soviet initiatives. With the apparent purpose of pressuring the allies, Caspar Weinberger made a provocative speech at the Washington Press Club, simultaneously with the beginning of the NATO assembly. He spoke for stepping up work on the star wars program and building up the United States arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons. He also said the American side did not rule out the possibility of breaking off the anti-ballistic missile treaty. Many West European allies felt a challenge to their approach, which they made known to Washington immediately after Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Paris.

The assistant U.S. defense secretary, Richard Perle, has admitted that several European NATO countries said it would be a mistake to disregard Soviet proposals as not requiring analysis. The same circles, he said, were alarmed by the absence of U.S. counterproposals which could revive charges that Washington did not take the arms control talks seriously. Disregard for this opinion of NATO allies apparently causes increasing anxiety and John Cartwright reflected it in his report which drew the attention of the participants in the San Francisco Assembly.

U.S. Seeks Support

LD150404 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 14 Oct 85

[Text] One of the main issues before the annual meeting of parliamentarians from the 16 NATO countries in San Francisco is the American star wars program. Here's how Viktor Olin comments on this fact.

There are two reasons for the attention given to the plans to put weapons in space. (For one), the U.S. administration would like to use the NATO Assembly to get full support for these plans, since the public has shown much interest in the Soviet proposals to cut back strategic weapons, and these proposals involve abandoning the star wars program. In the second place, there are growing signs of anxiety in Western Europe and in the United States itself and Canada over what could happen if the arms race were moved into space.

Just before the NATO Assembly opened, President Reagan's national security adviser, Robert McFarlane, announced that the United States would no longer be constrained by the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The announcement stunned the public on both sides of the Atlantic. In the opinion of THE NEW YORK TIMES, it is not only intended to sabotage next month's American-Soviet summit, but has an even more ambitious goal: to remove all constraints on the nuclear arms race.

The chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress, Dante Fascell, reflected the shock many had experienced at this when he said McFarlane's statement was a move that jeopardized arms control and cleared the way for an arms race in space. Former Ambassador Gerard Smith, chief negotiator of the 1972 ABM Treaty, accused the administration of harpooning it, and his former colleagues on the team charged that the administration had distorted the (negotiations record). The NEWSWEEK magazine quoted a European diplomat's warning that the U.S. position might leave its allies more skittish than ever about backing the star wars program. Such a reaction could not but affect the NATO Assembly in San Francisco. The French news agency reports that the new interpretation by the U.S. administration to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has become the subject of impassioned argument among some 180 parliamentarians. The U.S. expert on disarmament Thomas (Longstress), has said in one of the assembly committees that it is both inaccurate and reckless to claim, as McFarlane has, that the 1972 ABM Treaty authorizes research into, and also development and testing of, antiballistic systems. As criticism mounts, the Washington administration is trying to drown out the voices of condemnation without changing its position. According to reports, the NATO Assembly is seen as a test. If it looks as if the assembly will not support the star wars program, the administration intends to prevent any vote on the issue.

CSO: 5200/1058

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET SCIENTISTS DISCUSS SPACE DEFENSE ARGUMENTS

LD131319 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 12 Oct 85

["Top priority" panel discussion conducted by Vladimir Posner with Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Professor Sergey Plekhanov, Soviet scientists at the Institute of the United States of America and Canada in Moscow--live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Posner] Today we'll be discussing a treaty that went into operation 18 years ago on 10 October 1967: It is called the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. Now, considering what has been happening over the past couple of years and in particular SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, I would like both of you, gentlemen, to comment on how you see the present day as relating to this particular treaty. What do you have to say about that? Would you like to begin Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Now I believe that you have mentioned this treaty in a very good and very convincing way. It's as actual as it was 10 years ago....

[Posner, interrupting] Maybe more so.

[Bogdanov] Exactly, maybe more so than before. So I think we should discuss it if you have any questions to ask, we'll be quick to answer to that, but I would like to say it's very important and it's very actual. Thank you very much for inviting us to take part in this discussion.

[Posner] Let me say this: The proponents of SDI would probably say--and I will play devil's advocate today--would probably say that the whole idea of SDI in no way conflicts with the ideals expressed in this treaty. Now what would you say to that, Professor Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Well, I certainly don't agree with this estimate. I think that we have enough evidence--documentary evidence--that supports the notion that the current SDI program, as it is conceived, goes against both the spirit and the letter of this treaty that marks its 15th anniversary....

[Posner, interrupting] It's 18th

[Plekhanov] ...18th anniversary today. I would like to quote from a document which was partially revealed by THE NEW YORK TIMES a couple of years ago, and that is the defense guidance for years 1984-89, which contains a number of paragraphs dealing with the idea of using space as a battlefield. It says for instance--and this is the official Department of Defense document--that provisions should be made to, quote, wage war effectively, unquote, from outer space, and that the Pentagon will vigorously pursue, quote, unquote, space systems to project force in and from space. Now I think this is a clear... clearly in violation of what the treaty is all about.

[Posner] Does that particular quote relate to SDI?

[Plekhanov] Well it certainly does because these people are talking about the implementation of the system which was unveiled by President Reagan in his speech in March 1983.

[Posner] In other words, what you're saying is that it's a defense that it makes it possible to launch an attack. Is that what you're driving at?

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, oh yes. You put it very bluntly and very correct. That's what I mean.

[Plekhanov] I would like to add a few words to that: I think that the idea that one can protect the United States, the whole territory, by a shield impetrable by Soviet missiles, I think it has been put away, put aside, even by the administration itself. It stresses now in its official statements that this can't be done and this is not what they are actually trying to do. They are now concentrating on the idea of protecting their missile launching pads....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] The so-called point defense.

[Plekhanov] ...the so-called point defense; and experts have been pointing out ever since President Reagan unveiled his plans in 1983 that the only way that the system can be made to work is if the country that has such a system, in conjunction with its offensive weapons, uses its offensive weapons first; because if you use your offensive weapons first and destroy much of the retaliatory power of the other side, then and only then, that limited protective shield that can't possibly be built, can be effective in warding off the retaliatory strike. So you see there's no way that you can use it really for defense. You can use it only to defend yourself against a second strike by the opponent.

[Posner] What you're saying then is that this is a shield that is built against a crippled opponent?

[Plekhanov] Exactly.

[Posner] It is not built against a full force opponent.

[Posner] [as received] Well let me retreat just a little bit on this issue. At this point many people in the United States and I'm not only speaking now of people from the different... say from the Heritage Foundation or from the military

industrial complex, I'm speaking about just very average people--they say what is wrong with research? Why can't we look into this? After all what if we discover that indeed it is feasible and that if both sides had this kind of defense, then nuclear weapons would become obsolete and wouldn't that be wonderful? Now people who are very, very frank and they're not playing games and they really feel strongly about this: We seem to say, the Soviets, no research [as heard]. Now would you please clarify that?

[Bogdanov] You know there is a very big difference between research and development and deployment; that's very clear. What... where is the misunderstanding if you call that a misunderstanding? Where is this line? It's just [words indistinct] what means research.

[Plekhanov] I would like to somewhat disagree with you. I think that the line between research and development is so hazy that it's really difficult to draw it. In fact the administration--the Reagan administration--has started saying in the past months, that, well you know, testing is also part of research, and so there is nothing wrong with testing a prototype or two because how can you know that your research is on the right track unless you really see how the thing operates? So there is that problem. Secondly, there is a problem that when you undertake research you do it for a purpose, and the problem with the SDI is those billions that have been laid away for research....

[Posner, interrupting] Something like 30 billion.

[Plekhanov] Yes, for the next 5 years, it has to do with very specific things, not just general... the satisfaction of general curiosity about certain physical requirements, or something like that. [sentence as heard] It's very specific. It's designed to create a system; a system which is designed to do away with the existing arms race.

[Posner] Now look, we have another area here that I would like to look at briefly. Officially, President Reagan and many other people in the United States have said that it would be perfect if as a result of this research development what have you, both sides had this shield, umbrella--call it what you wish--in the sky, and that therefore both would feel very secure and could do away with nuclear weapons. Your reaction to that?

[Bogdanov] You know, my reaction is very negative to that. On one very simple ground: It's impossible to have it simultaneously. [laughter] If you disarm last, I don't know how big....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Someone will have it first.

[Bogdanov] You are right, someone will have it first. For how many years I don't know. even for 1 year you have then a temptation--very dangerous temptation--don't you think so Sergey?

[Plekhanov] I agree. I agree with that fully.

[Posner] Now there's another argument. It's a kind of a Rube Goldberg machine--something like that--because if the idea is to do away with nuclear weapons, as

President Reagan put, to render them obsolete and impotent, why do not do it directly? Why not cut back? Why not reduce the existing arms race? We're proposing to cut them by half and then move down to zero. Why should we continue to build those offensive weapons? Why not waste hundreds of billions of dollars on some nearly impossible idea of building a shield against them? That's ridiculous.

[Bogdanov] That's our problem with this administration. Maybe it's American logic which we don't understand. Our logic is more simple, you know, that that action. Maybe if they can explain to us what is this American logic, to do that from that way, you know.

[Posner] First do the shield and then do away with weapons, instead of simply doing away with weapons without any shield.

[Bogdanov] Yes. That's why it sounds so illogical, that's why you have a suspicion with it. You have very strong suspicion that they're doing that for very clear-cut purpose: to get, to acquire first strike.

[Posner] Well I think we have to note that Weinberger, when he was asked how he felt about the Soviets having a strong defensive system in space said that would be very bad if we had it and they didn't. And if he feels that way about us, I think we can feel that way about them. I mean it's logical.

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, it's logical because this administration, they have divided all weapons into two categories: bad weapons and good bad weapons. Bad weapons, all bad weapons including defense are with us. All good weapons with the Americans. I don't believe it's fair.

[Posner] Well thank you very much, Dr Bogdanov, Dr Plekhanov, and this is Vladimir Posner saying goodbye until next time. Thank you.

[Bogdanov] Thank you.

CSO: 5200/1058

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FURTHER REPORTS ON U.S. SDI TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Possible Launch of Nuclear Reactor

LD091351 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 9 Oct 85

[Text] The United States is preparing to make another step in militarizing space. This follows from what has been said by General Abrahamson, in charge of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. The general spoke in the House Subcommittee for Science and Technology. He said that in the early 90's the United States could launch a nuclear reactor into space. He said that was necessary for solving the energy problems connected with the deployment of technical facilities in space under the Strategic Defense Initiative program. The United States is already actively testing space weapons. Recently it launched a missile which shot down an orbiting satellite. A laser beam destroying missiles has also been tested.

All this is taking place at a time when the participants in the debate at the UN General Assembly session warn against spreading the arms race to terrestrial space. The Soviet Union has submitted to the United Nations the proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space in the context of its nonmilitarization.

Space Shuttle's Role

LD062049 Moscow TASS international Service in Russian 1015 GMT 6 Oct 85

[Text] New York, 6 October (TASS)--As the information agency AP reported, during the continuing flight of the reusable spaceship Atlantis, which is being implemented exclusively according to a Pentagon program, two military communications satellites were put into orbit. Both satellites, according to AP evidence, are equipped with a defense system to defend it against electromagnetic radiation in conditions of a nuclear explosion. However, it is revealed in the AP report that this is the only information on the Atlantis spaceship program which has become known. For the remainder all details of the flight are being kept secret.

As the newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES points out, the Pentagon has reserved for itself for the coming decade between 25 and 30 percent of all flights in the

space shuttle program which, like the present flight, will take place in an atmosphere of the strictest secrecy. The military, according to the newspaper's evidence, plan to use the reusable spaceships to put into orbit satellites for military purposes, and to test laser weapons and conduct other experiments within the framework of the plans to create a large-scale anti-missile defense system with elements to be based in space.

In the near future, THE NEW YORK TIMES reminds us, the country's military department will have at its disposal its won launching pad for launching reusable space-ships at the Vandenberg Airbase in California. As early as March of next year the launch will take place there of a regular spaceship in the space shuttle program, on board which will be two payloads, with relating directly to the developments being carried out in the United States for the star wars program.

On the admission of Pentagon representatives, the newspaper writes, the U.S. militarization of space did not begin yesterday. For several decades now the military have been keeping the American space research program under their unabated control. As the magazine AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY emphasizes, it is essentially impossible at the present time to draw a precise line between the peaceful and military uses of space by the National Agency for Aeronautics and Space Research.

In the United States itself and abroad, the reusable spaceship flight program is being seen to an ever greater degree as one of the most important elements in a large-scale program for the militarization of space, developed and implemented with the aim of undermining global strategic stability on the part of the United States.

'Space Cannon'

PM081320 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Down the 'Star Wars' Road"]

[Text] New York, 5 October--In implementing the "star wars" program put forward by the Reagan administration the U.S. military is expediting the development [razrabotka] of more and more new types of space arms. As THE WALL STREET JOURNAL reports, the laboratories at the University of Texas Electrical Engineering Center are creating a "space cannon"--a weapon for shooting at targets in near-earth space which uses a high-power electromagnetic pulse instead of gunpowder. During tests of the experimental model of this installation carried out back in 1982 a shell of around 150 grams was fired at an ejection [nachalnyy] velocity of approximately 5 km per second. As the newspaper puts it, the creators of the "space cannon" are hoping to achieve a shell ejection velocity of up to 45 km per second, which, they believe, will make the use of these weapons in space considerably more efficient than particle beams or missiles.

As Colonel M. (O'nil), a representative of the organization for the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," stated in an interview with THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, "a space cannon based along with an energy source on a

satellite will be an ideal weapon for 'star wars.'" The work to create [sozdaniye] these weapons was sanctioned by the Pentagon and subsequently President Reagan personally, the newspaper points out. Currently, it notes, U.S. military-industrial complex concerns, including such giants as LTV and General Dynamics, have been fighting for the right to gain orders to produce the "space cannon." In Col (O'nil's) words, not less than 1 billion dollars may be allocated for financing this project in the early 90's.

Military Shuttle Mission

LD121413 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 12 Oct 85

[Text] Washington 12 October TASS--The United States is taking new steps along the way of the militarization of space. According to a representative of the command of the U.S. Air Force, another launch of the reusable spacecraft will be carried out at the Vandenberg base and will further exclusively military aims. The spacecraft whose launching is scheduled for 20 March, next year, will perform a number of programs developed by the Pentagon. These include the checking of the most up-to-date equipment intended for the detection of planes, cruise missiles, ballistic missiles, satellites and other apparatuses in the process of flight for the purpose of their subsequent destruction. A representative of the U.S. Air Force refused to say what type of space weapons apart from detection systems would be installed on board the spacecraft and how it would be used.

CSO: 5200/1058

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW PAPER COMMENTS ON SDI EXPERIMENTS, PURPOSES

Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 p 4

[Article by Mikhail Stoyanov: "In Captivity of 'Star' Mirages" under the rubric: ""International Overview"; text in boldface shown in all caps]

[Text] o WHERE THE LASER RAY IS DIRECTED
 o PENTAGON RUSHES INTO SPACE
 o DANGEROUS ILLUSIONS OF STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY
 o WASHINGTON'S ALLIES PREFER TO HOLD BACK

A laser beam sent from the ground Air Force Station at Maui Island, after "piercing" through hundred kilometers of the near-earth space, plunged into a mirror installed on the spacecraft and, after being reflected from it, rushed to intercept the "enemy's" missile....

This is not a fragment from the Hollywood "Star Wars" series, but an illustration of actual events which took place several days ago during the flight of the reusable spacecraft "Discovery" under the space shuttle program. There were certainly no "enemy" missiles, which were successfully substituted by the inflamed fantasy of Pentagon generals who made one more step toward the militarization of space, where the USA has rushed to outline the "new frontiers of the American empire."

According to the American press, the completed "Discovery" flight represented one more practical step in the realization of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) proposed by the Reagan Administration. Among other objectives of the flight, the most important one was to test one of the possible components of the anti-missile defense system with some space-based elements--laser equipment.

It is said that President R. Reagan and Lt Gen J. Abrahamson, Reagan's protege in the post of head of the organization for the implementation of SDI, do not like the term "Star Wars." According to the General, this term "creates an impression that our program is designed for war time purposes.... Actually," he assures in his interview with a correspondent of the British TIMES "its purpose is perfectly clear: to find the best way for preserving peace and averting war."

THE LEXICAL ARSENAL OF ABRAHAMSON WHICH ALSO INCLUDES "MORAL" ARGUMENTS TO SUPPORT "STAR WARS" PERHAPS CORRESPONDS TO HIS FINE APPEARANCE AND SOFT VOICE

(SOMETIMES IT SEEMS, NOTES THE TIMES CORRESPONDENT NOT WITHOUT SARCASM, THAT THE WHITE HOUSE GAVE HIM THE "CENTRAL ROLE" TO EMPHASIZE THE PEACEFUL DIRECTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S PLANS CONCERNING THE OUTER SPACE), BUT IT IS CLEARLY IN DISSONANCE WITH TRUE SDI PURPOSES. GENERAL ABRAHAMSON HIMSELF IN HIS PENTAGON OFFICE DESCRIBED SOME WAYS OF THEIR IMPLEMENTATION TO THE BRITISH JOURNALIST "WITH ENTHUSIASM OF A SCHOOLBOY EXPOUNDING THE MERITS OF HIS FAVORITE SPORTS CAR." THE GENERAL DEMONSTRATED COLOR SLIDES THAT DEPICTED THOSE KINDS OF WEAPONS WHICH "AS HE HOPES, ONE DAY WILL BE LAUNCHED INTO OUTER SPACE."

However, components of the material and technical preparation to "star wars" can be seen today not only on slides. As Abrahamson has admitted, along with the laser tests, an electromagnetic gun has been tested, and the production of its first samples is due to begin soon. G. Knuort [Sic--probably--Keyworth], the President's Scientific Advisor, stated that already in two-three years the USA will be ready to "demonstrate" its technology of the "star wars" program.

The Pentagon is building at an accelerated pace, a Space Center at U.S. Air Force's Vandenberg Base the Joint Center for Space Operations at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, near which the Air Space Defense Center is located.

These facts undeniably indicate that the plans for militarization of space have transcended the research and development stage and are in the stage of active and broad realization. Here, before touching upon recent events which uncover the essence of SDI, we would like to dwell on some moments related to its origin and motives which caused its appearance in the first place.

DURING THE FIRST TERM OF REAGAN'S PRESIDENCY, AMERICAN NATION MAGAZINE, AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE INCOMPETENCE OF THE MASTER OF THE WHITE HOUSE IN MILITARY AND TECHNICAL QUESTIONS, REFERRED TO HIS SPEECH IN WHICH THE HEAD OF THE ADMINISTRATION CLAIMED THAT NUCLEAR MISSILES LAUNCHED FROM SUBMARINES COULD ALLEGEDLY BE RECALLED. THIS QUEER THING, HOWEVER, IS PERCEIVED TODAY AS AN ECHO OF CERTAIN CONCRETE EVENTS.

WHEN IN MARCH 1983 PRESIDENT REAGAN CAME FORWARD WITH HIS "STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE" WHICH, ACCORDING, TO HIM, COULD "CHANGE THE COURSE OF HUMAN HISTORY," SINCE HE SAYS IT WOULD ENABLE US TO MAKE STRATEGIC WEAPONS "POWERLESS AND OBSOLETE" AND BRING AN END TO THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR NIGHTMARE, THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF OF NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE ASKED HIM: "WHEN HAD YOU FIRST HEARD OF THIS IDEA OR WHEN HAD IT FIRST CROSSED YOUR MIND?" TO THIS THE PRESIDENT ANSWERED: "IT IS FUNNY THAT EVERYONE IS SO SURE THAT I HAD TO HEAR ABOUT IT AND THAT I WAS NOT ABLE TO COME UP WITH IT MYSELF. ACTUALLY, THIS IDEA CAME TO ME."

It seems, however, that the idea already was in the air in Washington. As far back as two years before the above dialogue, the right-wing organization, the Heritage Foundation, which has had much influence upon the Administration, had united around the retired General D. Graham as a group of men close to Reagan, who represented primarily the U.S. military industrial complex. With half-a-million dollars raised during respective campaigns, the research was conducted. In this way, the project "high-altitude frontier," the precursor of Reagan's

SDI, was born. That is where the master of the White House has got "his" idea. Was it really then, when without understanding the essence of the matter he dropped the words about the possibility to "recall" the launched missiles? Both the President and later the Pentagon officials, however, "sized up" the main thing: in their opinion, the possibility appeared to ensure military and technological superiority of the USA and, on this basis, to acquire the ability to threaten with the "first strike," counting on subsequent survival. Those forces overseas, in which the existence of the military-strategic parity caused a nervous allergy, have perceived the "strategic defense initiative" as a kind of "historic chance"--to create "absolutely reliable" anti-missile defense and, while protected with the "space shield," to threaten the Soviet Union with nuclear sword which as is known the USA not only does not intend to sheathe, as the USSR has repeatedly suggested, but to persistently "sharpen" as well.

Is this the kind of "change in the course of human history" that President Reagan spoke about? And was it what the initiators of the "high-altitude frontier" who conducted active persuasion of the members of Congress and public opinion in the USA and abroad in favor of the plans for militarization of space--implementation of which was to a considerable degree commissioned to Californian companies subcontracting to Pentagon, among which the first ten military space contracts were distributed--thought about? It is precisely from their proposal, to a considerable degree, that the "high-altitude frontier" transformed into SDI was developed. It is clear that the large-scale anti-missile defense system with space-based elements, which, according to some data, will cost 500 billion dollars, arouses tremendous joy in military business magnates.

This dangerous militarist venture arouses quite different sentiments in millions of people, including those in the USA, who soberly realize how unrealistic and illusory are the hopes of the U.S. ruling circles to acquire strategic superiority through Pentagon's breakthrough into space, but how real and dangerous are related consequences. Furthermore, the implementation of SDI is a most gross violation of obligations pledged by the USA in the Anti-Missile Defense (AMD) Treaty, concluded in 1972.

Reflecting anxiety of the Americans themselves in relation to Washington's plans for militarization of space, the PROGRESS magazine writes that even the scientists participating in the creation of the space "shield" have arrived to the conclusion that no technology is capable of providing total defense from missiles. The magazine also quotes the words of P. Aldridge, military nuclear weapons specialist, that, "Although the American people are made to believe that the 'star wars' program is of a defensive nature, it is far from being so."

During these days, U.S. Vice President G. Bush, who is voyaging throughout the Old World countries, had also to encounter a negative attitude to the over-publicized "star" enticement of the White House. The "star wars" program has not met such degree of understanding in Europe that Washington counted upon, he admitted on the eve of his trip. To persuade NATO allies and instill them with American understanding of the issue, Bush set off on a tour through West European capitals.

PRIOR TO THE VICE PRESIDENT, THE PRESIDENT HIMSELF, THE PENTAGON CHIEF WEINBERGER AND SECRETARY OF STATE SHULTZ HAVE ATTEMPTED TO SOLVE THE SAME PROBLEM. HOWEVER, EVEN AT THE LAST SESSION OF NATO COUNCIL IN THE PORTUGUESE TOWN OF ESTORIL THEY DID NOT MANAGE TO SECURE THE ALLIES' APPROVAL OF THE AMERICAN "STAR WARS" PROGRAM AND TO AGREE ABOUT A JOINT STATEMENT TO SUPPORT "RESEARCH" ON CREATION OF SPACE STRIKE WEAPONS.

WHAT IS THE REASON? FIRST AND FOREMOST, IT LIES IN A LEGITIMATE APPREHENSION OF THE U.S. WEST EUROPEAN ALLIES THAT SDI WILL ACCELERATE THE ARMS RACE TO AN ASTRONOMICAL LEVEL AND PUT THE WORLD IN EVEN GREATER PERIL. "TO JUMP ON THE SDI BANDWAGON MEANS TO RISK UNDERMINING THE STRATEGIC BALANCE," WARNED IAN DAVIDSON, REVIEWER OF BRITISH FINANCIAL TIMES. WITH ALL THIS, WEST EUROPEANS ARE QUITE SKEPTICAL AS TO AMERICAN PROMISES REGARDING ECONOMIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL BENEFITS FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION IN REAGAN'S "INITIATIVE."

Some were caught by the "space" hook of Washington, though, thereby taking on themselves the responsibility for the participation in pushing the humankind toward "star wars." This is exactly what the White House is trying to achieve--to tie the allies by mutual guarantee given out as Atlantic "solidarity" and to put an American yoke on West European science, technology, and economy, which today are squeezing the USA out in many positions.

That is why under the guise of the space "shield"--as it was in the old days with the atomic "umbrella"--Washington attempts to impose increasingly more strict control over West Europe, tempting the allies with mirages of security that SDI will allegedly provide, and with billions in hard cash intended for the preparation of "star wars," although they do not like to call this program this way on the banks of the Potomac. But, whatever they would call it, notes the French magazine MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE, it remains "star wars"--the most dangerous project of the nuclear era.

Let us emphasize--[a project] dangerous for the whole humankind. That is why the Soviet Union considers the prevention of moving the arms race into the outer space to be the most important objective. At the same time, if the Soviet Union is put before a real threat from outer space, it will find, as comrade M.S. Gorbachev has emphasized, a way to effectively oppose it.

And no one should have any illusions on that score.

12971

CSO: 5200/1331

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA ON U.S. CONCERN OVER WEST EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINION

PM221538 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Mikhaylov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Opening the Way to Peace

Last week has shown once again that in the present-day explosive situation the planet's peoples are attentively following the steps being taken in favor of peace. In this regard the world community makes a high assessment of the consistency of the Soviet Union's course. Little more than 2 weeks has passed since the range of peace moves by the USSR announced in Paris during the Soviet-French summit rocked the entire world. And this time the materials of the CPSU Central Committee October (1985) Plenum attest that the Soviet peace initiatives have not been dictated by some kind of prevailing conditions but accord with the very nature of a socialist state and its domestic needs and plans for the future. A society that has worked out such ambitious creative plans throughout the next millennium cannot contemplate war.

It is worth noting that this fact is acknowledged--albeit through clenched teeth--even by those who are by no means amicably disposed toward our country. The USSR is embarking on "changes on a truly historic scale" (THE WASHINGTON POST) and "intends to create an economic potential approximately equivalent to that built up over all the preceding years of Soviet power" (THE NEW YORK TIMES); the report at the CPSU Central Committee plenum "attests to the great importance that the Soviet leadership attaches to social policy and to the active and effective participation of the masses in state and social life" (MAINICHI--Japan); "the Soviet Union's economic program is aimed at achieving striking improvements" (HELSINGIN SANOMAT); "the Soviet leader has advocated the immediate adoption of decisions aimed at blocking the arms race and stopping the slide into war" (FRG television).

The news from Moscow attesting to the long-term orientation of the USSR's domestic life toward peaceful creative labor irreconcilably contradicts the fabrications spread in the West about the existence of a "Soviet threat."

The truth that ensuring lasting peace and reliable security is seen by the Soviet Union as a fundamental problem of the day is gaining the upper hand. The USSR's adherence to the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence between the two opposing systems is being reaffirmed.

Progressive forces in other countries see the CPSU's program directives as an expression of unswerving solidarity with their struggle, respect for their views and positions, and the desire to promote the strengthening of their unity--that dialectical unity of diversity which encompasses the entire living fabric of the real socialist world, workers, communist, and national liberation movements, and all movements against reaction and aggression and for peace and progress.

Thus, USSR's foreign policy, its goals, and its ways of achieving them are clear, there are no riddles and uncertainties in them. The Soviet Union's policy is, entirely predictably, a stable and reliable one full of responsibility for the fate of the world in our contradiction-crammed era.

Dangerous Unpredictability

On 15 October, after a 30-year break, Washington again started a radio offensive against the West European countries.

The Voice of America resumed round-the-clock broadcasting in English. The most modern equipment and even communications satellites are involved. Charles Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), stated that the broadcasts are to "eliminate the shortage of information" on the transatlantic power's policy and, first and foremost, to combat "mistaken ideas" about the United States that are common among West European young people.

Yes, West Europe is starting to understand Washington less and less. And it is not a case of a "shortage of information." Information streams in from overseas and is backed up by hundreds of pro-Atlantic newspapers and radio and television stations. The "lack of understanding," or rather the alarm at U.S. policy, emerged and strengthened as the United States muscled its new nuclear missiles onto West European soil. Now indignation is once again coming to a head. The reason is Washington's attempts to impose its "star wars" plans and build up confrontation "above all else" and, needless to say, above the vital interests of the West European states in maintaining the foundations of detente and developing international cooperation.

Will the United States sacrifice the East-West dialogue that has been initiated with such difficulty, and, above all, the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit to its militarist ambitions? This alarming question is now prevailing in West European capitals. It was also voiced at the emergency NATO Council session held this week in Brussels. The forum, where most West European participants have usually formed up "in ranks" to honor their transatlantic sovereign, this time presented a different picture. "The United States' European NATO allies," the French newspaper LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS noted, "pressured G. Shultz to make Washington respond appropriately to the recent Soviet initiatives.... The Europeans, concerned at the U.S. SDI project, stressed their desire to strive for the observance of the ABM Treaty."

The fact is that this treaty between the USSR and the United States on limiting ABM defense systems was turned inside out on the other side of the Atlantic literally on the eve of the NATO foreign ministers meeting in Brussels, which was held this week. They attempted to depict the ABM Treaty over there as a

treaty that allegedly allows unrestricted research, testing, and creating [sozdaniye] of ABM systems and "merely" limits their deployment. As a result it turned out that the governments of a number of European NATO countries were misleading their peoples. For even now, echoing Washington, they have given assurance that the implementation of the U.S. SDI ("Strategic Defense Initiative")--more accurately "star wars"--will be restricted to research and the ABM Treaty would be precisely observed. Now it is no longer a question of "precise observance," but of fitting this unlimited-duration international treaty to the "star wars" program. And at the Brussels meeting U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, "tried to dispel the concern in West Europe that the United States might undermine the ABM Treaty that has been in existence for 13 years now." Did he succeed? "European diplomats," THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "are noting that in the long term (U.S.) administration policy remains undefined."

It is no accident that the unpredictability of U.S. foreign policy is alarming West Europe, and not only West Europe. And it is not just a question of the increasing disparity between the United States' verbal adherence to peace and its concrete actions. None other than Secretary of State Shultz provided a reason for alarming doubts. "Any step going beyond the framework of the research work phase (on the 'star wars' program--V.M.)," he stated in Brussels, "will be taken only after consultations with the NATO allies and talks with the Soviet Union."

The procedure proposed by the United States reminded the Europeans of how Washington imposed its Pershing II and cruise missiles on them. Then too "consultations with the NATO allies" were held and they were persuaded that the very decision to site the new U.S. nuclear missiles was necessary "merely" to "force the Soviets" to start talks, although the USSR has been prepared for talks long before the NATO missile decision. But when talks between the USSR and the United States started, Washington incited the allies not to heed the Soviet proposals, however far-reaching they may be. The U.S. NATO partners were meant just to "demonstrate their solidarity" and wait for the "Russians to capitulate...."

Thus West Europe was "imperceptibly" led to the day when--"in accordance with the NATO decision" but against the will of most West Europeans--the new U.S. mass destruction weapons started to be sited on their soil. Judging by everything, this "procedure" is also being prepared by Washington for a new and even more sinister matter--spreading the arms race to space. Space which knows no bounds. On the whole there are grounds for pondering the dangerous "uncertainty" and unpredictability of U.S. policy.

A psychological rethink of many long since obsolete dogmas and resistance to the attempts to return the world to the defunct era of the policy of force are under way despite all the "voices" in West Europe and other continents. In the Austrian capital the Socialist International Conference, in which delegates from almost 50 countries participated and which delegations from the CPSU, and CPC, and representatives of a number of national liberation movements attended as guests and observers, adopted the "Vienna Appeal" calling for the arms race to be stopped. Particular concern was expressed at the spread of the arms race to space. That is why the Socialist International rejects the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative: and any other such concept. Disarmament, peaceful cooperation, and detente are declared in the appeal to be the sole sensible response to the danger currently threatening mankind.

What does all this show? A growth in the realization that each new stage in the arms race makes West Europe more dependent on the United States. Now, in this evil era of confrontation, many people realize more clearly than before the value of international detente and are striving to defend the remaining fabric of cooperation and develop it further.

The opening this week in Budapest of a cultural forum of 35 of the states that participated in the Helsinki Conference was a reflection of the fruitfulness of these advanced trends on the European continent. More than 800 delegates--two-thirds of whom are cultural and artistic figures--have started discussing problems of all-European cooperation.

CSO: 5200/1058

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ASSAILS FRG 'PRETENSIONS'

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 p 4

[Article by A. Yevgen'yev: "What Do They Pretend: On the Increase of Militarist and Revanchist Tendencies in FRG]

[Excerpts] The current wave of activity of revanchist forces in FRG is of an extremely dangerous nature. The coming into power of the CDU/CSU-FDP coalition and political/material support rendered by H. Kohl to the "eternally yesterday's men" have served as its incitement. Beyond question, the stationing of American first strike nuclear weapons in FRG has also contributed to the raging of revanchism.

Revanchism and militarism are inseparably connected to each other. History indicates that revanchism has always inspired militarism, provided it with purposeful objectives, stimuli and, to a certain extent, with some material foundation. Militarism, in its turn, served as a platform at which revanchist ideas grew, sprang up and gained strength. And militarism has flourished in full blossom in FRG. Throughout the years of NATO presence, a large-scale military and economic potential has been created in the nation, and the Bundesver turned into the bloc's strike force on the European continent.

Bonn's attempts to gain access by hook or by crook to the nuclear weapons cause great anxiety. Research work in the field of nuclear energy is actively conducted in FRG, including research in production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium which may serve as raw materials for manufacturing nuclear weapons; the means for their delivery are also being developed. FRG produces missiles and aircrafts capable of carrying nuclear weapons. Simultaneously the nation's right-wing circles are more and more actively soliciting the participation in decisions concerning NATO nuclear strategy.

The interest of West German militarist circles to the development and manufacturing of space strike weapons is tremendous. And this is not surprising. Sure, joining the programs for militarization of space would enable Bonn to further increase its military and political status and to largely "compensate" for the ban on production of nuclear and chemical weapons in FRG. Military concerns of West Germany have already received permission from the government for direct contacts with Pentagon on the issue of scientific and technological research and technological production of space weapons.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FURTHER COMMENTS ON PROSPECT OF JAPANESE SDI PARTICIPATION

'Dubious Honor'

PM011359 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[B. Barakhta "Rejoinder": "Collaboration..."]

[Text] The Japanese-American Committee on Exchanges of Military Technology has held a routine session in Tokyo. The body was set up under pressure from the Pentagon in contravention of Japanese laws banning all forms of arms exports.

In recent years Pentagon strategists have been displaying heightened interest in Japanese innovations in technology and equipment. The increase in the Potomac general's activity is not innocent. experts believe that the United States is inferior to its Tokyo partners in industrial spheres which also have a defense significance, such as electronics, metallurgy, shipbuilding, and fiber optics. According to BUSINESS WEEK magazine, Japanese microprocessors, special ceramics, and super-heat-resistant coatings are beginning to play a decisive part in the production of U.S. missiles and fighters. For example, integrated circuits made by the ("Kisera") firms are used in Tomahawk cruise missiles.

Japan was one of the first countries President Reagan invited to participate in the implementation of the "star wars" program. It is no secret that firms from the Land of the Rising Sun can offer much more in this field than Washington's other allies.

It is known that during the bilateral committee's session there was a discussion of Tokyo's special practical involvement in the implementation of the Pentagon's plans to militarize space. In this connection the visitors from across the ocean demanded access to Japanese developments in laser technology, fifth-generation computers, fiber optics, and tracking and guidance systems.

So it looks like Tokyo is to perform the role of an important partner for Washington in preparing for "star wars." A dubious honor.

'Outstrips Allies'

LD051032 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 4 Oct 85

[TASS headline: "Questionable Honour"]

[Text] Moscow 4 October TASS--TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

According to reports from Washington, a delegation of high ranking Japanese officials has ended talks with the American officials in charge of implementation of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI). The delegation including representatives of the National Defence Agency, the Foreign Ministry and some other government institutions, is returning to Japan, and the KYODO TSUSHIN AGENCY pointed out, "impressed by progress in spelling out (by Washington) the technological details of the Strategic Defence Initiative" and is prepared to present its recommendations on that score to the government.

The agency points out in that connection to the "possibility that Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone may declare his positive attitude to Japan's participation in the 'star wars' research programme even before the visit to the United States planned before the end of the month." The United States, the agency adds, is prepared to conclude with Japan a special agreement on the details of joint research in the field of the Strategic Defence Initiative.

Thus, Tokyo is preparing to outstrip many allies of the United States and to be the first to jump into the "infernal train" of the arms race, which Washington, intensifying the implementation of the "star wars" programme, is trying to speed up. It must be recalled that in Williamsburg more than 2 years ago, Japan already made such a "jump," thus outstripping the other participants in the meeting of the "Seven" as regards political support for the aggressive global policy of the United States, in particular the decision to deploy American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

The Japanese NIHON KEIZAI quotes the circles of the Japanese Foreign Ministry as saying that at the meeting of the leaders of the "Seven" (in which France will not participate) in New York late this month "Reagan intends to get from the allies an official approval for the SDI research project." While Nakasone, the newspaper adds, "attaches much significance to that meeting and intends to give it large-scale 'logistic support' for the U.S. administration.

As is pointed out in Japan, the participation of that country in the Strategic Defence Initiative, which is opening new areas in the arms race, is in direct conflict with the resolution adopted by the Japanese parliament on the use of outer space solely with peaceful aims. Consequently, in agreeing to participate in the SDI project, let it be even at the "research stage," the country's ruling circles once again intend to disregard the clearly expressed will of the Japanese people for peace and peaceful uses of outer space.

Demands Accord on Secrets

LD221659 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Text] Tokyo, 22 October TASS--Washington demanded that Tokyo enter into a special agreement on protecting war secrets in space weapons research. This was stated bluntly by the officials of the u.S. Department of Defense who met members of the visiting Japanese governmental group which studies the U.S. "star wars" program. However, the leading opposition parties and influential [word indistinct] businessmen oppose such an agreement claiming that the United States tries in this way to take Japan's more promising technological developments from the civil production and to use the country's powerful industrial and scientific potential to (?suit) militarist designs.

CSO: 5200/1058

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR SPACE INSTITUTE DIRECTOR INTERVIEWED ON SDI

AU211427 Vienna NEUE AZ in German 19/20 Oct 85 p 5

[Text] In the competition between offensive and defensive weapons, the offensive ones always win, because the offensive weapon that overcomes a new defensive weapon of the other side costs only a fraction of what the defensive weapon costs. This is the basic position from which Roald Sagdeyev, director of the Moscow Space Research Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, assesses the U.S.-pushed space defensive arms program as a project that will drastically accelerate the arms race.

Sagdeyev, with whom NEUE AZ had a talk in Vienna, was a member of the Soviet delegation at the Socialist International's disarmament conference [held in Vienna 16 and 17 October]. The view of McNamara (U.S. defense secretary under Johnson) back in the 1960's that the development of defensive weapons brings some offensive weapons, is still valid, according to Sagdeyev. Even Alfred Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb and propagator of Reagan's "star wars" program--says the Soviet scientist--has admitted that SDI cannot ward off 100 percent of enemy missiles, as Reagan had originally asserted.

Why, then, are Americans doing this? Quite in the cool, little propagandistic Gorbachev style, Sagdeyev analyzes: First, the United States is again--as it has done in the past--seeking to win strategic supremacy by an advance in a technological field. Second, according to Sagdeyev, the SDI program is an answer to the "freeze" movement in the United States: A defense system appears to be more acceptable and "more peaceful." Third, economic pressure is to be exerted on the Soviet Union.

What is Sagdeyev's opinion about the charge that the Soviet Union is farther advanced than the United States? Both powers are not very far advanced in their research. The Soviet Union lags behind a bit. But that is only laboratory research, he says. The point where it becomes dangerous will be reached only when it gets out of the laboratory.

CSO: 5200/1058

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

SCIENTISTS COLLOQUIUM DENOUNCES SDI--Prague 6 October TASS--An international colloquium, dealing with the role of scientists in preventing the arms race in outer space, has come to a close here. More than 40 scientists from 20 socialist and capitalist countries highly assessed the new Soviet peace initiatives proclaimed during the visit to France by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. During 3 days of debates, the scientists unanimously denounced the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative of the Reagan administration. Any development of new arms systems threatens all of mankind, they stressed. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT 6 Oct 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1058

USSR: CONNECTION BETWEEN SPACE, OFFENSIVE ARMS CUTS STRESSED

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 14 Oct 85 pp 1-3

[Article by Igor Sinitsyn, APN political analyst, under the rubric "News and Views: Sunday Main Topic": "Moscow: New Arguments Against 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] APN--The concrete Soviet proposals against "star" and nuclear wars, voiced by Mikhail Gorbachev in Paris, are being studied by statesmen, politicians and the world public at large supported by the world public opinion. In the political centres of the West, to say nothing of the socialist and developing countries, they give it to understand that the USSR's initiatives demand a constructive response on the part of the USA.

The point is that though the new arguments of Moscow concern relations between the USSR and the USA, they are of a global character. They are a full prohibition for the two sides to have strike space weapons and a 50 percent reduction of the nuclear weapons which can reach each other's territory.

As we see, Moscow links the two central problems--space strike weapons and nuclear strategic forces in a single complex of two aspects. Is this right? The point is that the U.S. administration is going to any lengths to prove that "Star Wars" should be moved beyond any accord on disarmament, calling them a "defence initiative."

The recognition by the Soviet Union and the United States of the relationship between the offensive and defensive strategic systems was formalised in international law, in the simultaneous signing, on 26 May 1972, of the termless Treaty of the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and of a Five-Year Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. The ABM Treaty has become the corner-stone of the whole process of limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons. This document says in no uncertain terms that the parties proceed from the premise that effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons.

Maintaining the balance of forces, reducing its level--such are the most important factors for preserving and strengthening peace. In the past this was

recognised by Washington, too. Now that Ronald Reagan's "Star Wars" programme is combined with the build-up of nuclear strategic arms, such as the MX and Trident-2 missiles, Moscow's apprehensions that the USA is planning a first strike can only grow in the context of the repeated assertions by the United States of the doctrine allowing nuclear war.

Under these conditions, the USSR's proposal that the two sides reduce by 50 percent the nuclear arms reaching each others' territories is extremely fruitful. But how is it possible to achieve complete liquidation of nuclear arms on earth? This is the principal task for survival of our civilisation. The Soviet Union has spared no effort to fulfill this task from the very emergence of nuclear weapons. Moscow has long suggested the most radical way--to conclude an agreement on banning nuclear arms under strict international control. But the policy of the other nuclear powers shows that they are not yet prepared to such a move. So, there is only one way--the way of a progressive, stage-by-stage resolution of the problem. The Soviet Union has already suggested reducing the strategic offensive armaments by a quarter. Mikhail Gorbachev has now stated Moscow's preparedness to agree to a 50 percent reduction of the Soviet and U.S. strategic arms reaching each other's territories. The scheme proposed by the Soviet Union envisages that the total number of such nuclear weapons of the USSR and the USA should be 1,250 and 1,680 respectively. Moscow even agrees to a certain advantage of the USA in the number of delivery vehicles, taking into account an equal number of nuclear charges, 6,000, on both sides. This would ensure approximate strategic balance.

What the Soviet Union is suggesting is eventual complete dismantling of nuclear arms on earth and flourishing of humanity.

But the U.S. military-industrial complex pushes humankind to "star" and nuclear war, i.e., the end of life on earth.

CSO: 5200/1075

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

FINNISH PAPER: USS IOWA IN BALTIC POINTS UP 'ZONE' PROBLEM

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 28 Sep 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Nuclear Weapons in the Baltic a Hopeless Problem for Zone Project"]

[Text] The "Iowa," an American battleship equipped with cruise missiles, is participating in the military exercises of NATO in the Baltic and demonstrating the problems involved in establishing a nuclear-free zone in the North. Even if Kekkonen's plan for the zone, which now seems unrealistic, would some day become a reality, it would not in any way prevent the superpowers' nuclear fleets from cruising in the Baltic. Kekkonen's plan, and the zone supported even today by Finland, comprises areas of Finland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, but not the Baltic and other maritime areas bordering the Nordic countries. The reason is obvious: the Nordic countries cannot mutually agree on any other activities than those concerning their own areas.

The Baltic is a sea open to all nations. When initiating negotiations about it being free of nuclear weapons, the parties concerned can include, besides all the bordering states of the Baltic, also the United States. Undoubtedly, bringing the battleship "Iowa" to the Baltic is intended to be a new reminder of it. A few years ago, one of the participants in the large-scale military exercises of the Warsaw Pact in the Baltic was the "Kiev," at the time the most modern aircraft carrier of the Soviet Union.

Nuclear weapons have been commonplace in the Baltic since their integration into standard naval weapons. Let us remember how even the old-fashioned Soviet submarine which ran aground in front of Karlskrona in the fall of 1981 was, according to the Swedes, equipped with nuclear torpedoes or nuclear mines. The Baltic is in a key position as a Soviet naval base, and most of the ship repair yards are on the Baltic shores.

In Sweden and the other Nordic countries--except Finland--the initial assumption has been that a nuclear-free zone in the North does not have much value if it ignores the nuclear weapons of the Baltic. Having previously strictly rejected such demands, the Soviet Union has lately changed its

stand and appears to be more flexible. The Soviet Union has announced that it is ready "to discuss also the nuclear-free zone in the Baltic waters with the parties concerned."

However, being ready for discussions does not make the basic problem itself any easier, as the well-known Soviet scientist Lev Voronkov has explained in detail. The Soviet Union--as undoubtedly also the United States--associates the Baltic situation with the balance of military powers in all of Europe and refuses to discuss it as part of a nuclear-free zone restricted to the North.

If the nuclear weapons in the Baltic are drawn into the zone discussion, new negotiating partners and altogether new questions will have to be included. The whole issue would be incorporated in the arms control negotiations of the superpowers and the Nordic countries would have essentially secondary roles.

If the intention is to continue keeping the project of a nuclear-free zone in the North primarily as an exclusive political project for the Nordic countries, one must unfortunately close his eyes to the nuclear weapons patrolling on and beneath the waves of the Baltic. However, it involves the danger that the stubborn support for the project seems mainly to be obsessive foreign policy masturbation without any hope of the fertility of the activity.

12956

CSO: 5200/2509

6 November 1985

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS ON CONTINUED TESTING BY U.S.

Energy Department Spokesman Cited

LD100856 Moscow TASS in English 0749 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Text] San Francisco October 10 TASS--The United States has conducted underground tests of two nuclear devices at a testing range in Nevada.

A spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy said their yields have been under 20 kilotons.

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL reported the tests had been connected with the U.S. program of developing space strike weapons. It said the United States had staged three such tests this year.

Debate in U.S. Noted

LD101555 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 10 TASS--TASS political observer, Yuriy Kornilov writes: The United States has conducted another underground nuclear test in Nevada, the third nuclear blast there after the Soviet unilateral decision to halt nuclear explosions took effect on August 6.

The roar of the nuclear blast in Nevada has echoed across the globe at a time when people all over the world, including America, are discussing the latest Soviet foreign policy initiatives for checking the arms race and improving the political climate.

These proposals have evoked a positive response from many prominent politicians and public figures in different countries, members of their governments and parliaments, and members of the antiwar movement--all who cherish peace.

A certain shift has also been in Washington: The Soviet proposals are no longer dismissed out of hand as another "propaganda exercise" there.

Obviously, there are sensible, realistic ideas maturing in U.S. public and political, including congressional, circles.

But there are also other facts in evidence that cannot but make one concerned.

This includes not only nuclear trials that follow one after another but also anti-satellite weapons testing.

This also includes persistent statements for U.S. policy-shaping circles that the United States regards its "star wars" program as an immutable goal set once and for all and is bent on continuing to push ahead with preparations to turn outer space into a scene of military adventures.

The militaristic policy has been furnished with a corresponding propaganda cover.

Hardly a day passes without certain quarters in Washington trying to smear and twist the Soviet position and scare people with allegations about a non-existent "Soviet threat."

This may include a briefing in the Capitol, with its message from the U.S. press that it is essential to pass white for black and prove the unprovable in order to persuade people that the Soviet proposals are geared to "securing Soviet military superiority."

This may also include charges by a group of senators, [words indistinct] who have long been parasitic with anti-Soviet fabrications, that the USSR allegedly violates "its obligations in the sphere of armaments control."

Or, this may include Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger talking about a "threat of Soviet aggression" and demanding still faster increases in military spending, which will exceed an astronomical \$300 billion in fiscal year 1986.

The addresses of those who play the role of generators of militarism in the United States are not a secret. They are not only the rightwing conservative and reactionary circles of the Republican Party and not only the Pentagon, that headquarters of the "hawks of war" which has been entrusted with bringing up to strength, arming, and brainwashing the 21.4 million soldiers and officers of the U.S. Armed Forces toward aggression. Behind the hawks who have built their nests on Washington's political Olympus stand America's big business and its heart--the powerful military-industrial corporations. In the years of the World War II, which took 50 million human lives, U.S. arms magnates put over \$120 billion in profit into their safes. Over the last 5 years the joint profits of the 10 leading U.S. companies producing weapons have grown by 2.5 times. The powerful military-industrial complex created in the United States--that sinister alliance of the bomb, the dollar, and the organs of power--is the group that is interested in tension not falling, but rising.

One can hardly avoid getting the impression that some people in the United States have become afraid of the very possibility of accords being achieved in Geneva, the possibility that they will perhaps have to reduce their arms manufacture and keep down their military appetite.

The Soviet Union is prepared for an East-West dialogue, that is a serious and constructive dialogue marked by a sincere desire to identify areas of continuity and the balance of interests and to strengthen trust by joint efforts.

So why do some people in the United States really believe that the rumble of underground nuclear blasts and bellicose broadsides against the Soviet Union's space initiatives is the best overture there can be to the forthcoming summit meeting?

Arguments For, Against Moratorium

LD172037 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 17 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 17 TASS--The United States conducted a new underground nuclear blast on a proving range in Nevada State on Wednesday. As the U.S. Energy Department said, its yield was from 20 to 150 kilotons.

Comments on the latest testing say here that the USA has already conducted 14 nuclear blasts this year. The USA has already conducted 644 nuclear weapons since 1951, when the "death proving ground" in Nevada was established.

The American observers draw attention to the fact that the Washington administration has recently obviously stepped up the implementation of the Pentagon's programme of nuclear testing. It has been sharply accelerated following the Soviet Union's decision to end unilaterally as of August 6 this year all nuclear blasts and urge the USA to answer in kind. Yet the United States has answered that Soviet proposal with a whole series of nuclear tests and refuses to end them despite the broad demands of U.S. and international public for following the USSR's example.

Meanwhile, the termination of all nuclear blasts would put up reliable barriers in the way of a modernization of nuclear weapons and creation of its new types. The introduction of a moratorium would create favorable conditions for concluding an international treaty on complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, would be a giant step forward in the limitation of the arms race and prevention of nuclear war.

After a period of some confusion, the U.S. Administration preferred, however, to follow a different way and carried on the policy of perfecting the nuclear weapons through conducting nuclear blasts. In explaining this stand of the USA, the U.S. press said that the refusal of the USA is directly linked with the Pentagon's plans to spread the arms race into outer space, to speed up the implementation of the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative" of the White House. As the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST stressed, this program of "star wars," which has been advertised as a non-nuclear one, requires the nuclear testing of its components, an x-ray radiation laser.

CSO: 5200/1070

NUCLEAR TESTING

SOVIET SEISMOLOGISTS CONTEND U.S. CAN CHECK USSR NUCLEAR TESTS

LD121327 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 11 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS--TASS correspondent Boris Chekhonin writes:

The U.S. administration's assertion that the national American means cannot control the observance of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, is scientifically unsubstantiated. This is the conclusion of the participants in a seminar which has just in [as received] Moscow at the Institute of the Physics of the Earth of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The seminar was attended by prominent Soviet seismologists Igor Nersesov, Vladimir Keilis-Borok, Vladilen Pisarenko, Ivan Pasechnik, Oleg Kedrov; also prominent American seismologist Jack Evernden from the U.S. Geological Service.

Participants in the seminar cited convincing examples showing that it is possible to detect by national means practically all undernuclear [as received] tests, even weak ones with a power of less than one kiloton. That viewpoint was scientifically substantiated at the seminar by Professor Jack Evernden in his report. The new methods, based on the use of high frequencies, he said will enable American specialists to register through the national means even very weak explosions in the Soviet Union.

The USA has powerful technical possibilities of controlling [as received] nuclear explosions in the USSR. The United States has 105 seismic stations in 55 countries. These stations form a global standardized network. Besides, the United States has 20 seismic grouping stations in 12 countries, 17 research observatories in 15 countries. These seismic stations have actually encircled the USSR territory. The United States also makes an active use of seismic and hydro-acoustic means located in seas and oceans, and artificial earth satellites for the purpose of control.

The results of the discussion by the participants in the seminar of assertions [as received] of the U.S. administration that it is (?impossible) to detect underground explosions, showed that Washington's statement pursues quite a certain political aim. The U.S. administration seeks to continue on various pretexts nuclear explosions so as to create even more pernicious [as received] of nuclear weapons of mass destruction which are called in the Pentagon as weapons of a new generation of the end of this century.

CSO: 5200/1070

NUCLEAR TESTING

MOSCOW PAPER CITES FRG EXPERTS: SEISMIC MONITORING RELIABLE

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 34, 1-8 Sep 85 p 6

[Article by Vladimir Markov]

[Text] It was something unexpected. An official spokesman for a ruling party in Bonn had protested against the course of his own government.

Olaf Feldmann is a Bundestag deputy, one of the leading specialists on military-political questions within the Free Democratic Party which, together with the CDU-CSU, forms the coalition government. In spite of internal party discipline he openly hailed the unilateral moratorium introduced by the USSR on nuclear blasts, describing it as a "fundamentally correct step aimed at ending the arms race". At the same time he expressed disappointment over Washington's reaction to the new Soviet initiative.

"If a complete and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests is not imposed in the near future, then ever more 'efficient' miniature arms systems will appear in the world," he said. "The continuation of such tests diametrically contradicts the efforts for disarmament."

Still the FRG government is continuing to avoid clearly stating its stand concerning the Soviet moratorium on nuclear blasts. Answering my question about this, the spokesman for the Bonn Cabinet declared, in a general form, that the FRG is in favour of a complete and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests. But at once, obviously emulating his US colleagues he said the problem of control over nuclear blasts wasn't yet solved and that the "moratorium doesn't help to solve it".

However, quite a few experts in the FRG realize that the problem of control is artificially being blown up in the West so as to hide its reluctance to stop the arms race.

"The seismic measuring instruments are now so sophisticated that there is practically no longer any need for on-the-spot inspections," says, for example, Professor Helmut Aichele, head of the Central Seismological Laboratory in Erlangen, one of the leading research establishments of its kind in the world.

"We have at our disposal such precise instruments," he says, "that they enable us to check on even the mildest nuclear blasts, removed even as far as 16,000 km from Erlangen (French tests at the Mururoa atoll - V.M.)."

The majority of the world's scientists share the opinion that the moratorium on nuclear blasts can be reliably controlled by national and international means. Professor Werner Buckel, Vice-President of the European Physical Society in Karlsruhe, when speaking about this, emphasized: "The refusal of the US administration to emulate the USSR's example and, in its turn, to stop nuclear tests, is further proof that the US side is banking on beefing up nuclear arms, rather than reducing them."

According to Professor Buckel, Washington also regards the idea of the moratorium on nuclear blasts as an obstacle to implementing President Reagan's "strategic defense

initiative" (SDI). The SDI provides for using in space X-ray laser devices operating on the energy of nuclear blasts. "The Pentagon doesn't wish to stop nuclear tests precisely because it is trying to develop such a space-based attack weapon," says the West German scientist.

The new Soviet peace initiative meets with the broad approval of not only the FRG scientists, but also among the Bonn opposition – the SDPG and the Green party.

Here is the opinion of Egon Bahr, a recognized expert on questions of control over armaments and disarmament, head of the relevant Parliamentary subcommittee, member of the SDPG Presidium: "The unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts in case the USA responds to it constructively, can lead to an agreement of paramount importance. And that could be the beginning of a new stage in fruitful cooperation and confidence building in relations between the great powers, and between the East and West as a whole."

The Social-Democrats and the Green party intend to pose the question in the Bundestag in September on Bonn's stand in respect to the moratorium on nuclear blasts so as to force the US administration to emulate the Soviet example. This demand will also be the focal point when the West German peace movement will be demonstrating this autumn.

CSO: 5200/1068

GENERAL

CPSU DRAFT PARTY PROGRAM: ARMED FORCES, ARMS CONTROL

PM261400 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 85 First Edition pp 1-7

[Heading and boldface passages as published]

[Excerpts] Proletarians of All Countries Unite!

Draft: CPSU Program (New Edition)

Part Two, The CPSU's Tasks for the Improvement of Socialism and the Gradual Transition to Communism

IV. The Development of Soviet Society's Political System

The CPSU regards the defense of the socialist homeland, the strengthening of the country's defense, and the safeguarding of state security as one of the most important functions of the Soviet state of the whole people.

From the viewpoint of internal conditions our society does not need an army. However, as long as the danger that imperialism will unleash aggression, military conflicts, and various kinds of provocations exists it is necessary to pay unremitting attention to reinforcing the USSR's defense might and strengthening its security. The Armed Forces and state security organs must display great vigilance and be always ready to suppress imperialism's intrigues against the USSR and its allies and to rout any aggressor.

The ultimate foundation of the strengthening of the defense of the socialist motherland is the Communist Party's leadership of military building and the Armed Forces. Policy in the sphere of defense and the country's security and Soviet military doctrine, which is purely defensive in nature and is directed toward defense against external attack, are formulated and implemented with the party playing a leading role.

The CPSU will make every effort to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces are at a level excluding strategic superiority on the part of imperialism's forces, that the Soviet state's defense capability is comprehensively improved, and that the combat collaboration of the fraternal socialist countries' armies is strengthened.

The CPSU will continue to show invariable concern for ensuring that the Soviet Armed Forces' combat potential constitutes a strong fusion of military skill, ideological staunchness, organization and discipline on the part of personnel, their loyalty to their patriotic and international duty, and a high level of technical equipment.

The CPSU deems it necessary to continue to strengthen its organizing and directing influence on the life and activity of the Armed Forces, to strengthen the principle of one-man command, to enhance the role and influence of Army and Navy political organs and party organizations, and to seek to ensure that the intimate [krovnyy] link between the Army and the people becomes still stronger. Every Communist and every Soviet person must do all in his power to maintain the country's defense capability at the due level. **The defense of the socialist homeland and service in the ranks of the Armed Forces are the USSR citizen's honorable obligation and sacred duty.**

PART THREE. THE CPSU'S TASKS IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA AND IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

The CPSU's international policy stems from the humane nature of the socialist society, which is free from exploitation and oppression and has no classes or social groups with an interest in unleashing wars. It is indissolubly linked with the party's vital, strategic tasks inside the country and expresses the Soviet people's one desire — to engage in creative labor and live in peace with all peoples.

The main aims and avenues of the CPSU's international policy:

- to ensure favorable external conditions for the improvement of the socialist society and for the advance toward communism in the USSR; to eliminate the threat of world war and achieve universal security and disarmament;
- to steadily extend and deepen the USSR's cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries and promote in every way the strengthening and progress of the world system of socialism;
- to develop equal, friendly relations with the countries which have gained liberation;
- to maintain and develop the USSR's relations with capitalist states on the basis of peaceful coexistence and businesslike, mutually advantageous cooperation;
- international solidarity with communist and revolutionary democratic parties, the international workers' movement, and the peoples' national liberation struggle.

The CPSU's approach to foreign policy problems combines the firm defense of the Soviet people's interests and resolute opposition to imperialism's aggressive policy with readiness for dialogue and the constructive resolution of international questions by means of talks.

The peace-loving foreign policy course which has been elaborated by the party and is consistently implemented by the Soviet state, combined with the strengthening of the country's defense capability, has secured for the Soviet people and for most of the world's population the longest period of peaceful life in the 20th century. The CPSU will continue to do everything in its power to preserve peaceful conditions for Soviet people's creative labor, to improve international relations, to end the arms race which has swept through the world, and to avert the threat of nuclear war which hangs over the peoples.

To defend and consolidate peace, to curb the forces of aggression and militarism for the sake of the life of the present and future generations — there is no higher, more responsible mission. **A world without wars, without weapons — that is the ideal of socialism.**

III. Relations With Capitalist Countries. The Struggle for Lasting Peace and Disarmament.

The CPSU proceeds from the premise that the historical dispute between the two opposed social systems into which the modern world is divided can and must be resolved peacefully. Socialism proves its advantages not by force of arms but by the force of its example in all areas of social life — by the dynamic development of the economy, science, and culture, by the enhancement of the living standard of the working people, and by the deepening of socialist democracy.

Soviet Communists are convinced that the future belongs to socialism. Each people is worthy of living in a society free of social and national oppression, in a society of genuine equality of rights and genuine democracy. To rid themselves of exploitation and injustice is the sovereign right of oppressed and exploited peoples. Revolutions are the logical result of social development and of the class struggle in each given country. The CPSU has always considered and does consider the "export" of revolution and its imposition upon anyone from outside to be fundamentally unacceptable. But any forms of the "export" of counterrevolution are also a very crude encroachment upon the free will of the peoples, and upon their right to independently choose the path of their development.

The Soviet Union resolutely opposes attempts to halt and reverse the course of history by force.

The interests of the peoples require that interstate relations be directed into the channel of peaceful competition and equitable cooperation.

The CPSU upholds firmly and consistently the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The policy of peaceful coexistence, as the CPSU understands it, presupposes: the renunciation of war and of the use of force or threat of force as a means of resolving disputes, and their solution by negotiation; noninterference in the internal affairs and consideration of the legitimate interests of each other; the right of peoples to independently determine their own destiny; strict respect for sovereignty, for the territorial integrity of states and for the inviolability of their borders; cooperation on the basis of full equality of rights and mutual benefit; and the conscientious

discharge of commitments arising from the generally accepted principles and norms of international law and from international treaties that have been concluded.

Such are the fundamental principles upon which the Soviet Union builds its relations with the capitalist states. They are enshrined in the USSR Constitution.

The CPSU will purposefully promote the ubiquitous firm establishment in international relations of the principle of peaceful coexistence as a generally acknowledged norm of interstate relations which is observed by all. It considers the spread of the ideological contradictions between the two systems to the sphere of these relations to be inadmissible.

The party will strive for the development of the process of the relaxation of international tension, regarding it as a natural and necessary stage on the path toward the creation of a comprehensive and reliable system of security. The available experience of cooperation confirms the feasibility of such a prospect. The CPSU favors the creation and use of international mechanisms and institutions which would make it possible to find an optimal correlation of national and state interests with the interests common to all mankind. It favors the enhancement of the role of the United Nations in consolidating peace and in the development of international cooperation.

Special responsibility for the situation in the world rests with the nuclear powers. The states possessing nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction must renounce their use and threat of their use and refrain from steps leading to an exacerbation of the international situation.

The CPSU favors normal, stable relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, which presuppose noninterference in internal affairs, respect for each other's legitimate interests, the acknowledgment and practical implementation of the principle of identical security, and the establishment of the greatest possible mutual trust on this basis. Differences of social systems and ideology are not a reason for tense relations. Objective preconditions exist for the establishment of fruitful, mutually advantageous Soviet-U.S. cooperation in various spheres. It is the CPSU's conviction that the policy of both powers must be oriented toward mutual understanding and not toward enmity, which entails the threat of catastrophic consequences not only for the Soviet and American peoples but also for other peoples as well.

The CPSU is convinced that all states, large and small, regardless of their potential or geographical location and irrespective of which social system they belong to, can and must participate in the quest for solutions to acute problems, in the settlement of conflict situations, and in measures to relax tension and curb the arms race.

The CPSU attaches great significance to the further development of peaceful good-neighborliness and cooperation among the states of Europe. Respect for the territorial-political realities which came about as a result of World War II is an inalienable condition for the stability of positive processes in this and in other regions. The CPSU is resolutely opposed to attempts to revise these realities on any pretexts whatsoever and will rebuff any manifestations of revanchism.

The party will consistently strive to ensure that the process of strengthening security, trust, and peaceful cooperation in Europe, begun at the Soviet Union's initiative and with its active participation, develops, deepens, and **encompasses the whole world.** The CPSU advocates the pooling of efforts of all interested states for the purposes of ensuring security in Asia, and it advocates a joint search by them for a constructive solution to this problem. Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins can and must become zones of peace and good-neighborliness.

The CPSU favors the development of broad, long-term, and stable links between states in the sphere of the economy, science, and technology on the basis of full equality and mutual advantage. Foreign economic cooperation is of great political significance, promoting the strengthening of peace and of relations of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems. The Soviet Union rejects any forms of discrimination and the use of trading, economic, scientific, and technical relations as a means of exerting pressure, and it will seek to ensure the economic security of states.

The CPSU is an advocate of the broad mutual exchange of genuine cultural values between all countries. This exchange must serve humane goals: the spiritual enrichment of peoples and the strengthening of peace and good-neighborliness.

The party and the Soviet state will cooperate with other countries in solving global problems, which have become especially exacerbated in the second half of the 20th century and are vitally important for all mankind: the preservation of the environment, the energy, raw materials, food, and demographic problems, the peaceful development of space and of the wealth of the world's oceans, the overcoming of the economic backwardness of many liberated countries, the liquidation of dangerous diseases and so forth. Their solution requires the joint efforts of all states. It will be substantially facilitated if the squandering of effort and means on the arms race is terminated.

In the interests of mankind and for the good of the present and future generations, **the CPSU and the Soviet state uphold a broad, constructive program of measures aimed at ending the arms race and securing disarmament and at ensuring the peace and security of the peoples.**

Regarding **general and complete disarmament** under strict, comprehensive international control as a historic task and continuing the struggle for its realization, the CPSU will consistently seek:

— **the limitation and narrowing of the sphere of military preparations**, especially those connected with weapons of mass destruction. Above all, space must be totally excluded from this sphere to ensure that it does not become an arena of military rivalry and a source of death and destruction. The exploration and development of space must be carried out only for peaceful purposes for the development of science and production in accordance with the needs of all peoples. The USSR favors collective efforts in the solution of this problem and will participate energetically in international cooperation of this kind. The Soviet Union will also advocate the adoption of measures which promote the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and the creation of zones free of these and other means of mass destruction;

— The implementation of steps leading to **the total elimination of nuclear arms** and including the ending of tests and the production of all types of these weapons, the renunciation by all nuclear powers of first use of nuclear weapons, and the freezing, reduction, and destruction of all arsenals of these weapons;

— **The cessation of the production and the destruction of other types of weapons of mass destruction**, including chemical weapons, and the prohibition of the creation of new types of such weapons;

— **The reduction of the armed forces of states**, and primarily of the permanent members of the Security Council and of states linked with them by military agreements, the limitation of conventional arms, the ending of the creation of new types of conventional arms which approximate weapons of mass destruction in terms of casualty-inflicting potential, and the reduction of the military expenditure of states;

— **The freezing and reduction of forces and armaments in the most explosive regions of the planet**, the elimination of military bases on foreign territory, the adoption of measures for mutual confidence building and for reducing the risk of the emergence of armed conflicts, including those arising accidentally [v rezultate sluchaynosti].

The CPSU's stance is to seek to overcome the world's split into military-political groupings. The CPSU favors the simultaneous dissolution of NATO and the Warsaw Pact or, as a first step, the dismantling of their military organizations. For the purpose of

reducing the confrontation between military blocs, the Soviet Union advocates the conclusion of a treaty between them on the mutual nonuse of force and on the maintenance of relations of peace, which treaty will be open to all other states.

The CPSU will strive to ensure that questions of arms limitation and of averting the threat of war may be resolved by honest and strictly observed accords on the basis of the equality and identical security of the sides, and that any attempts to conduct negotiations "from a position of strength" or to use them as a cover for building up arms may be ruled out.

The Soviet state and its allies do not strive to achieve military superiority but nor will they allow the military-strategic equilibrium which has come about in the world arena to be disrupted. At the same time, they consistently seek to ensure that the level of this equilibrium is steadily lowered and that the quantity of arms on both sides is reduced while the security of all peoples is guaranteed.

The CPSU solemnly states that there is no weapon that the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or prohibit on a mutual basis with the application of effective control.

The USSR does not encroach on the security of any country, be it in the West or in the East. It threatens no one, does not seek antagonism with any state, and desires to live in peace with all countries. Since the time of Great October, the Soviet socialist state has borne aloft the banner of peace and friendship among the peoples, and the CPSU will continue to preserve its loyalty to this Leninist banner.

CSO: 5200/1076

GENERAL

USSR: SHEVARDNADZE UN JUBILEE SPEECH, GORBACHEV MESSAGE

Shevardnadze Speech

PM251103 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

["UN's Lofty Mission; E. A. Shevardnadze's Speech at the Jubilee Sitting of the 40th Session of the General Assembly"]

[Excerpts]

New York, October 24 TASS -- Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze made a speech today at the jubilee meeting of the 40th session of the UN General Assembly. He read the text of a message from General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to Secretary General of the United Nations Organization Javier Perez de Cuellar and the participants in the jubilee meeting of the UN General Assembly on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the United Nations Organization.

He said further:

Among events in the calendar of international life, the 40th anniversary of the United Nations is a special occasion. While once again bringing back the memory of the tragedy and the great victory of mankind, it makes us take a closer look at the world around us and give deeper thought to what, and how, we can and must do to make this world safer and more just.

The establishment of our organization brings to mind one folk custom: When a man starts to build a new house the whole community helps him. From the basement to the roof the house is built with the combined efforts of men and women, old and young, who rightly believe that only such a house can be a home where peace and happiness will live forever. This custom exists in many countries, carrying a great humanistic meaning and proving a simple truth, namely, that there is a great deal more in life to unite people than divide them.

Four decades ago the world community had the wisdom and the strength to build a house of peace and universal security -- the Organization of the United Nations.

We are proud that the Soviet Union actively participated in laying its foundation, proud of the contribution that our state, together with socialist and other peace-loving countries, has been making to the achievement of the noble goals of the United Nations Charter.

The United Nations was built by people who had gone through the unbearable trials of the most brutal war. The present generations, to whom that war has also caused hardship and suffering, have an obligation to hand over to their descendants a world free from the charges of universal self-destruction. This, as Mikhail S. Gorbachev has emphasized, is the overriding mission of the present generations.

This is precisely how the countries of the socialist community are acting in the international arena. This is evidence by the statement adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty participants, held recently in Sofia.

On an anniversary day, it is only natural to review some of the results of work done in the past years. What is the main result? The answer is simple and short: There has been no world war over that period. The United Nations has made its contribution to this, being a world forum of states, a unique organization that become an indispensable part of contemporary international relations. Whatever is being said, sometimes not without justification, about the shortcomings, failures, and unfulfilled hopes, it is an indisputable fact that the prestige and reputation of the United Nations are great and universally recognized. It is hard for anyone to be alone. This is also true of nations. In the word which is both united and divided, entire nations need support and protection.

The United Nations is the place where they can hope to receive both.

No historic date is merely an occasion to look at the past. And the best way to observe the anniversary is to focus on the unresolved problems. Let us direct our collective attention to the problems which, regrettably, do not allow us to say that all requirements and principles of the United Nations Charter are being implemented completely and everywhere.

The main problem, the problem of guaranteed peace for the present and future generations, is still with us. Indeed, it stands out more sharply than ever before. Today our planet is beset with troubles and anxieties. But the heaviest burden on mankind's shoulders is the arms race which is inexorably bringing us closer to the edge of an abyss. It is our duty to stop and then, to reverse it, to prevent it from spreading to space.

The Soviet Union has countered the concept of "star wars" with the concept of "star peace" and a lasting peace on earth. Recently, Mikhail Gorbachev laid out the Soviet program of resolute steps aimed at curbing the arms race and improving the overall international situation.

The Soviet Union is proposing a world without weapons in space.

The Soviet Union is proposing a world where nuclear arms would be radically reduced and then, eliminated altogether.

The Soviet Union is proposing a world where the USSR and the United States would set an example for other nuclear powers by stopping any nuclear explosions.

The Soviet Union is proposing a world where the USSR and the United States would renounce the development of new nuclear weapons, freeze their arsenals, and ban and destroy anti-satellite systems.

We have proposed a far-reaching solution regarding medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and have removed from operational duty some of our medium-range missiles in the European

zone. If an appropriate agreement is reached, we shall not increase the number of such missiles in the Asian part of our country as well, provided there is no substantial change in the strategic situation there.

We say that radical steps in the field of nuclear disarmament should be combined with a wide-ranging set of concrete measures aimed at easing military tensions and building confidence.

All this should be done under strict and reliable control.

Where verification with national technical means may be inadequate to provide the necessary degree of confidence, we are ready to supplement it with additional mutually agreed procedures.

We state this very emphatically, because there are those who would like to make world public opinion believe the Soviet Union is against verification.

This is being said by those who, while contemplating new technologically sophisticated types of weapons, are deliberately concealing the truth that the more weapons there are in the world, the more difficult it is to carry out verification; this is being said by those who are developing new weapons, designed from the very beginning to make verification more difficult. We ask them in return: Are you ready, as we are, to scrap hundreds of missiles and aircraft, thousands of nuclear charges?

Answer "yes" and we shall certainly be able to agree on verification.

It is no less important to abide by the treaties already signed, or, to use the language of the U.N. Charter, to respect them, which means it is inadmissible to interpret them in a unilateral and arbitrary manner. One cannot, for example, interpret the treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems as permitting the development of a large-scale ABM system, a space-based one at that. In this connection, I will quote the full text of Article 5 of that treaty: "Each party undertakes not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based."

What could be unclear about this? And what is there to interpret?

We hope the United States will adopt a position which will make it possible at the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting to reach an agreement in principle on the questions under discussion at the Geneva negotiations. There is no doubt that this would be the best gift to all in the jubilee year of the United Nations.

This is what people all over the world are eagerly waiting for.

But today, no one has the right to simply wait without taking concrete steps. Each state, and our organization as a whole, can and must contribute to ensuring a stable and durable peace, so as to open to the peoples of the world bright prospects of life in the third millennium. As Mikhail Gorbachev has said: "International developments have approached a line which cannot be crossed unless highly responsible decisions, aimed at setting a limit to the arms race and stopping the slide toward war, are taken.

"These decisions cannot be postponed without taking the risk of losing control over dangerous processes that threaten the very existence of mankind".

Yes, so far we have succeeded in saving the world from the scourge of a "big" war, which is in itself a great accomplishment. But, can this alleviate the suffering caused to the peoples by so-called small wars? Indeed, the suffering they inflict upon the peoples and countries are not small but enormous; they bring them untold sorrow and throw them dozens of years back in social and economic development. This can be seen in Vietnam where neither the people nor the environment have been able to even now to recover from the consequences of the barbarous aggression which maimed the entire country with napalm and chemical agents.

This can also be seen in the Middle East and in southern Africa, where Israeli and South African terror has become a harsh everyday reality for several generations.

This can be witnessed in Afghanistan and Nicaragua where the bullets of hired assassins, the dushmans and the "contras", are killing thousands of people.

The right to security is a universal right. The Soviet Union does not dissociate its security from that of other states. We are resolutely in favor of ensuring peace for all nations, as required by the United Nations Charter. This underlies all our efforts aimed at preventing and stopping armed conflicts in various regions of the world and at reaching a just settlement of explosive situations. As the United Nations enters its fifth decade, it should, in our view, make this problem one of its first priorities.

Security has many dimensions. Aggression, state terrorism, and demonstrations of force are just some of the sources of danger that threaten people, their freedom, their rights, and their human dignity. There is a direct link between a state's external militarism and its internal moral atmosphere. The cult of superiority and brute force, fomenting enmity and hatred towards other peoples, and organized crime inevitably trample the social and economic rights of human beings and their personal security and freedom.

Presumably, I will not be mistaken if I say that everyone present in this hall is asking himself what his country has brought to this forum, and as we come to this rostrum, we are questioning ourselves: How clear is our conscience in the eyes of the international community and of our own countries?

Once again, the Soviet Union has come to this session not empty-handed and with a clear conscience. The country and the people which suffered so much from war that even today, 40 years later, its wounds still hurt, are proposing a large-scale program of constructive and realistic measures which can minimize the risk of a global catastrophe. All our aspirations are oriented toward the future but, for the sake of that future, the risk must be eliminated today. Time does not stand still, and, in the words of Albert Einstein, soon enough the future comes by itself.

The history of our organization has endowed us with a priceless heritage we all share.

It is the new reality which is reflected in the fact that today the tone in the United Nations is set not by a group of states, but by the majority whose will can no longer be subordinated to anyone's diktat.

It is the collective wisdom that can guard us against unbalanced judgements, fatal mistakes, and ill-considered decisions.

It is the well-established institutions for communication among 159 states. And the mere fact that being so different, so unlike one another, the states are nonetheless able to find -- though not on every occasion -- a common language and jointly formulate high moral criteria, is another tremendous asset for our organization.

6 November 1985

Finally, it is an experience that has generally positive impact on the process of solving the problems faced by the United Nations and the world.

This, for us, is a source of optimism, which mankind needs so much today, and the reason to believe in its sound judgement and its future. [applause]

Gorbachev Message

PM251111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 85 First Edition p 1

[Text] To J. Perez de Cuellar, UN Secretary General, and to the participants in the UN General Assembly jubilee session to mark the 40th anniversary of the United Nations.

Esteemed Mr Secretary-General,

I greet you and all attendees at the UN General Assembly's anniversary meeting to mark the 40th anniversary of the United Nations Organization.

The United Nations owes its birth to the victory of freedom-loving peoples over fascism and militarism. It is only natural that the UN Charter proclaims in its very first lines the United Nations' determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, practice tolerance, and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.

The UN Charter which became valid on October 24, 1945, the date recognized as the UN birthday, has stood the test of time and the organization itself has become an important factor in the system of international relations. It has also made a contribution to the fact that mankind has been able to avoid another world war for the past 40 years.

But today it is more essential than ever to say openly and at the top of one's voice that the foremost task set by the UN Charter has still not been resolved: Guarantees of lasting peace have not been created. Today the joint efforts of states and peoples are needed more than ever to deliver humanity from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

What is needed, above all, for the purpose, in practical terms, is to put an end to the arms race on earth and keep it out of space.

What is also required is fresh efforts to quench the regional seats of tension and remove the vestiges of colonialism in all its manifestations.

The United Nations also has many other pressing tasks: to facilitate, through real disarmament measures, the release of resources for constructive aims and to overcome backwardness, hunger, disease, and poverty. These goals should also be served by rebuilding international economic relations on a just and democratic basis and ensuring genuine human rights and liberties, most notably the right to a peaceful life.

We speak about all this because we are deeply convinced that, with the organization's 40th anniversary being an event as important as it is, the prime attention of its member states should be directed to making UN activities still more effective and fruitful.

The Soviet Union, one of the founders of the United Nations and a permanent member of its Security Council, will take every effort, as before, to facilitate a successful fulfillment by this world organization of its lofty mission on the basis of strict compliance with its charter.

M. Gorbachev

CSO: 5200/1076

GENERAL

BRIEFS

'FORMAL' SOVIET ARMS PROPOSAL--Britain has now received a formal proposal from the Soviet Union for direct talks on nuclear weapons. Downing Street aides confirmed today that a letter from Soviet leader Mr Mikhail Gorbachev had been delivered to the prime minister. Officials declined to go into details of the proposal other than to say that it was along the lines of Gorbachev's speech in Paris two weeks ago, when he said the Soviets would like direct talks with Britain and France on their nuclear weapons. President Mitterrand has already turned down the suggestion. At the time the Soviet Embassy in London delivered an extract from the speech to the Foreign Office but made clear that this did not amount to a formal proposal. Whitehall officials said today that the latest message which was handed over by an official of the Soviet Embassy to Mr Derek Thomas, political director at the Foreign Office amounted to a formal proposal. Mrs Thatcher is unlikely to reply until she returns to London at the end of the next week following her meeting in New York with President Reagan and other major leaders. [Text] [London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1051 GMT 17 Oct 85 LD]

CSO: 5240/004

END