

JPRS-TAC-91-014
17 JUNE 1991



JPRS Report

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Arms Control

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

19981120 214

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

N O T I C E

NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENTS REPORT TO BE RENAMED

Beginning with JPRS-TND-91-010, the JPRS REPORT: NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENTS will be renamed JPRS REPORT: PROLIFERATION ISSUES. Its content will remain unchanged except that information on *ballistic missiles* and *biological weapons* will now appear in this report instead of the JPRS REPORT: ARMS CONTROL. This material will be included with other proliferation items under the appropriate geographic heading. Information on treaties governing the production, possession, and use of chemical and biological weapons will continue to appear under appropriate geographic headings in the ARMS CONTROL report.

Subscribers to the NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENTS report will experience no lapse in receipts when this change takes effect. Subscribers to the ARMS CONTROL report who wish to subscribe to the PROLIFERATION ISSUES report should consult the back cover for subscription information.

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-91-014

CONTENTS

17 June 1991

CHINA

Bush Comments on START, CFE Prospects Noted [XINHUA 29 May]	1
Kyoto UN Disarmament Conference Closes [XINHUA 31 May]	1
Bush Comments on U.S.-Soviet CFE Settlement Reported	1
Praises Settlement [XINHUA 1 Jun]	1
Welcomes Agreement-in-Principle [XINHUA 1 Jun]	1

EAST ASIA

JAPAN

Reports on Kyoto UN Disarmament Conference	3
Soviet, U.S. Delegates Cited [KYODO 27 May]	3
'Peace Dividend' Said Being Lost [KYODO 29 May]	3
'New Willingness' Seen [KYODO 30 May]	4
Persian Gulf War Lessons Discussed [KYODO 30 May]	4
Bush Middle East Arms Initiative 'Courageous' [KYODO 30 May]	5
North Korea Pressed To Halt Mideast Missile Sales [KYODO 31 May]	5

NORTH KOREA

Turning Peninsula Into Nuclear-Free Zone Urged [KCNA 29 May]	6
--	---

SOUTH KOREA

DPRK Reportedly To Build New Scud Missiles [YONHAP 3 Jun]	6
Editorial Urges Nuclear-Free Zone on Peninsula [CHOSON ILBO 3 Jun]	7
Seoul Supports Bush's Mideast Arms Proposal [YONHAP 31 May]	7

NEW ZEALAND

French South Pacific Nuclear Test Detected [AFP 29 May]	8
---	---

PHILIPPINES

Foreign Secretary on UN Kyoto Disarmament Conference [Tokyo KYODO 26 May]	8
---	---

EAST EUROPE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Last Regular Soviet Army Unit Leaves Milovice [Prague Radio 27 May]	9
Report on Soviet Troop Withdrawal Corrected [CTK 28 May]	9
Soviet Team To Continue Compensation Talks [CTK 31 May]	9

HUNGARY

Soviet Troop Withdrawal Ahead of Schedule [Budapest Radio 31 May]	9
---	---

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA

Minister To Speak on Armed Forces, Condor-2 [TELAM 28 May]	10
U.S. Mideast Arms Control Initiative 'Welcomed' [Buenos Aires Radio 31 May]	10

BRAZIL

U.S. Chemical Weapon Ban Proposal Supported [Brasilia Radio 24 May] 10

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

EGYPT

Government Welcomes Bush Statement on Arms [Cairo Radio 30 May] 11

ISRAEL

Bush's Mideast Disarmament Plan Draws Reaction 11
 Conventional Arms Stressed [Jerusalem Radio 30 May] 11
 Defense Panel Chairman Responds [E. Ben-Elisar; Jerusalem Radio 30 May] 11
 Newspapers Review Proposal [THE JERUSALEM POST 30 May, etc.] 12
Foreign Minister Reacts to Bush Initiative [D. Levi; Jerusalem TV 30 May] 13
Shamir Urges Dialogue on Bush Arms Proposal [Jerusalem Radio 31 May] 14
Defense Minister Interviewed on Bush Arms Control Plan [M. Arens; Jerusalem Radio 1 Jun] 15

JORDAN

Editorial Criticizes Bush Mideast Arms Control Plan [AL-RAY 31 May] 15

SAUDI ARABIA

Kingdom Supports Bush Mideast Arms Control Moves [SPA 30 May] 16

SYRIA

Foreign Minister Comments on Bush's Arms Control Plan [Damascus TV 31 May] 16
Newspapers View American Arms Control Plan [Damascus Radio 2 Jun] 17

SOVIET UNION

GENERAL

Bush Mideast Arms Control Initiative Cited [TASS 30 May] 19
Karpov on INF, CFE, START, Naval Arms, CW, Military Budgets
 [V.P. Karpov; Moscow Radio 30 May] 19
TASS Cites Bush on Progress on CFE, START [S. Lunev; TASS 2 Jun] 22

START TALKS

U.S. Said Seeking Unfair Advantage in Talks [V. Kozyulin; ROSSIYA No 14, 6-12 Apr] 23

SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

U.S. Said To Consider Ground-Based ABM System [PRAVDA 28 May] 24

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Last SS-20 Launching Pad Scrapped [V. Mazany; TASS 28 May] 24

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Conservatives Threaten To Stop FRG Withdrawal [Berlin ADN 29 May] 25
Norway's Holst Charges Kola Deployments Violate CFE
 [V. Ilyashevich; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 May] 25
Ladygin Rejects Norwegian Claim of CFE Violation [Moscow International 30 May] 25
Withdrawal From Hungary Ahead of Schedule [O. Moskovskiy; TASS 31 May] 25

NUCLEAR TESTING

Debate on Semipalatinsk Nuclear Site [Moscow TV 19 May]	26
Gorbachev To Address Semipalatinsk Test Site Controversy [TASS 28 May]	28
Semipalatinsk Range To Be Reprofiled [TASS 30 May]	28
Official on Joint Tests, Future of Semipalatinsk [V. Pavlov; TASS 30 May]	28

WEST EUROPE

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

NATO's Woerner on Potential Soviet Threat, CFE, CSCM [Madrid ABC 17 May]	29
NATO To Remain Defensive Bulwark in New Era [Paris AFP 29 May]	30

FRANCE

Mitterand Offers Wide-ranging Disarmament Plans	30
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty To Be Signed [AFP 3 Jun]	30
Disarmament Plan Outlined [Paris Radio 3 Jun]	30

GERMANY

Soviet Troop Withdrawals on Schedule for Jan-May [DPA 28 May]	31
Stoltenberg Says Nuclear Arms Still Necessary [Mainz TV 29 May]	31
Genscher Welcomes Bush's Middle East Arms Proposal [ADN 30 May]	31
Genscher Welcomes Baker-Bessmertnykh CFE Accord [DPA 3 Jun]	32

UNITED KINGDOM

CFE Ratification Said 'Stalled' by Soviet Actions [THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, 18 Mar]	32
---	----

Bush Comments on START, CFE Prospects Noted

*OW2905003191 Beijing XINHUA in English
0004 GMT 29 May 91*

[Text] Washington, May 28 (XINHUA)—U.S. President George Bush said today he was optimistic about reaching an arms control treaty with the Soviet Union, which would lead to a summit in summer.

Bush said he hoped that the long-delayed U.S.-Soviet summit would be held "sooner rather than later" if the conditions that both sides recognize are met.

Bush made the remarks during an early-morning game of golf in Kennebunkport, Maine, where he was spending the long weekend.

Bush told reporters that he had called Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev last night and discussed prospects for a summit and reaching final agreement on treaties to limit nuclear weapons.

He said he and Gorbachev agreed that they should get the differences on conventional arms reduction [CFE] worked out, "which are now very narrow," and a treaty on strategic arms reduction (START).

If the Soviet Union will move a little bit on conventional arms reduction, both countries will get agreement on the issue and then move quickly to close the START, Bush said.

"I want to go to Moscow.... I had an opportunity to tell him that we are not moving away from him or the Soviet Union, that we want to do what is right, we want to see their reform continue," he said.

Describing the telephone talk as "a very good conversation," Bush said there was "a little cause for optimism" but "no breakthroughs."

Bush said he did not talk with Gorbachev about his intention to attend the summit meeting by the seven industrial countries, scheduled to be held in London in July.

During the weekend, Bush said, he also called the Amir of Kuwait and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. But, he declined to discuss the content of the phone calls.

Kyoto UN Disarmament Conference Closes

*OW3105144891 Beijing XINHUA in English
1005 GMT 31 May 91*

[Text] Tokyo, May 31 (XINHUA)—The second U.N. Conference on Disarmament closed on Thursday in Kyoto, Japan, with the greater majority of participants sharing the view that disarmament is now a realistic matter for the world rather than a remote objective.

Addressing the conference, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy said the Soviet Union and the United States are heading towards detente, but the trend should not be directed by the United States alone.

Petrovskiy warned that the Soviet Union can only allow the United States to play a leading role within the framework of the United Nations Charter, and will never let it manipulate the world on its own will.

Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu made the opening speech for the four-day conference, which was attended by 110 representatives from 40 nations and regions.

According to the statistics released during the conference, the military expenditure of the world in 1990 dropped by 5 percent from that in 1989, but Japan's spending increased by 3 percent instead.

Bush Comments on U.S.-Soviet CFE Settlement Reported

Praises Settlement

*OW0206002591 Beijing XINHUA in English
2348 GMT 1 Jun 91*

[Text] Washington, June 1 (XINHUA)—U.S. President George Bush today praised the settlement of U.S.-Soviet differences over conventional arms reduction, and expressed the hope that differences over a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) would be resolved soon.

"We think it's a good thing for world peace and I think it's a good thing for U.S.-Soviet relations," Bush said.

Bush reportedly made the remarks when speaking to reporters on Air Force One after delivering the commencement address to West Point graduation.

According to press reports, Secretary of State James Baker said in Lisbon Saturday that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached an agreement on cutting conventional weapons in Europe.

Baker said negotiators of the two countries will resume work immediately to settle the remaining technical issues holding up agreement on the START treaty.

Although the remaining differences may not be "overly easy to solve," Bush said, "nevertheless, we're going forward positively and that'll of course clear the decks for a Moscow meeting that I wanted to see very much."

On the timing of a summit in Moscow, Bush said, "As far as I'm concerned, as soon as we get the remaining details out of the way, the sooner the better, and I think President Gorbachev wants that."

Bush said he felt that the two leaders should at least be able to sign or initial a framework "because that means then that we've worked out some gritty details that still plague us."

Welcomes Agreement-in-Principle

*OW0206002691 Beijing XINHUA in English
2350 GMT 1 Jun 91*

[Text] New York, June 1 (XINHUA)—U.S. President George Bush today welcomed the agreement in principle with the Soviet Union on Conventional Forces in Europe

(CFE), describing it an "important step towards a super-power summit", which is expected to be held in Moscow this month.

At the U.S. military academy at West Point, New York, the President said: "The United States and the Soviet Union resolved (their) differences on the CFE treaty, clearing the way" for a U.S.-Soviet summit.

In his commencement speech, Bush said the agreement "is important (for) the world peace".

The agreement in principle was reached Saturday in Lisbon between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksander Bessmertnykh.

Following the meeting with the Soviet foreign minister, Baker told reporters that "we would like to see a summit in Moscow that would result in the signing of a strategic arms treaty."

Both the United States and Soviet Union will resume work immediately on a "much more intensive basis than before" in an effort to resolve the remaining issues on strategic arms reduction talks (START), Baker added.

JAPAN

Reports on Kyoto UN Disarmament Conference

Soviet, U.S. Delegates Cited

OW2705131491 Tokyo KYODO in English 1239 GMT
27 May 91

[Text] Kyoto, May 27 (KYODO)—Soviet Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Vladimir Petrovskiy said Monday that an era of "Pax United Nations" may be emerging from the ravages of the Persian Gulf War.

In Kyoto to address the U.N. Conference on Disarmament Issues, Petrovskiy welcomed the "completely new political environment" free of east-west ideological confrontation at the four-day forum.

He stressed that recent events have underlined the importance of "multilateralism" in international affairs, especially in dealing with disarmament issues.

Petrovskiy said the world now faces the opportunity for "all nations" to enter into talks covering "all weapons."

He hailed the end of Soviet-American confrontation in the U.N., saying it marks the beginning of an era of "Pax U.N."—or global peace overseen by the United Nations.

James Schear, consultant to the U.N.'s Department for Disarmament Affairs, added later the idea of a "Pax U.N." is much different from earlier notions of "Pax Britannica" or "Pax Americana."

The idea of "Pax U.N." is to speak of a "broad consensus among members of the United Nations" which would be much different than a global power imposing a sense of peace around the world, he said.

Petrovskiy, who attended the first Kyoto conference in 1989, praised the first-day presentations, especially an opening address by Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, who called for stricter controls on international arms transfers.

Nearly 100 disarmament experts and critics are participating in a candid exchange of opinions on challenges to disarmament in the post-cold war and post-Gulf war situation.

'Peace Dividend' Said Being Lost

OW2905135291 Tokyo KYODO in English 1315 GMT
29 May 91

[Text] Kyoto, May 29 (KYODO)—The so-called post-cold war "peace dividend" runs the risk of being consumed by the costs of verifying disarmament agreements or converting military industry to civilian use, participants at a U.N.-sponsored disarmament conference said Wednesday.

The participants, emerging from daylong closed committee sessions, expressed concern that the predicted savings from military reductions following the cold war may be lost to the expense of disposing of obsolete weapons and military hardware or monitoring arms conventions.

Swadash Rana, U.N. Department of Disarmament Affairs Monitoring coordinator, cautioned, however, that this should not deter nations from seeking disarmament and peace.

"People should not be made to feel that peace by itself is not a dividend, and that the costs of disarmament should not make people think disarmament by itself is not a dividend," Rana told reporters at a press briefing following the meetings in Kyoto.

Still, the costs of turning back decades of cold war-driven arms buildup are formidable.

Rana said a participant suggested at one of the meetings that converting a single Soviet military factory may cost 60 billion rubles before it even begins to produce civilian goods.

Alan Shaw, manager of the International Security and Commerce Program Office of Technology Assessment for the U.S. Congress, summarized the costs of disarmament in his paper to Rana's committee.

He pointed to the costs of converting or disposing of weapons, economic dislocations arising from reduced military spending, and monitoring of compliance.

Committee members were told that 400-500 man-hours may be required to destroy a single tank, but that some of the costs might be offset by the sale of scrap metal.

Chemical weapons, which need to be disposed of carefully, will actually cost more to destroy in a safe manner than to make.

Participants challenged as irrelevant a paper presented by Isamu Miyazaki, chairman of the Daiwa Research Institute, in which he explained the conversion of two Japanese firms—Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd. and Hitachi Ltd.—from military to civilian production following World War II.

The committee members did not think that the "peculiar circumstances" surrounding the successful Japanese conversion could be applied to the current attempts, said Rana. Some participants considered Japan's current advantage in some industries has instead complicated conversion elsewhere, she said.

Rana also said her committee was concerned that some obsolete weapons may be dumped on the Third World, rather than being destroyed.

Johan Nordenfelt, chairman of the discussion on arms proliferation and disarmament issues, said his committee noted that a "proliferation of verification measures" to arms conventions threatens to consume entirely the peace dividend.

Nordenfelt said his committee generally agreed the dynamics of the nuclear arms race had dissipated, but nations are now confronted by "residual nuclear arms."

Prvoslav Davinic, chief of the U.N. Disarmament Monitoring, Analysis and Studies Branch, said his committee

agreed that some disarmament was best pursued globally, like the chemical arms convention.

Other types of disarmament are implemented faster regionally, but Davinic said regional measures had to emerge within the region rather than be imposed from outside, since regions have their own unique considerations.

'New Willingness' Seen

OW3005211491 Tokyo KYODO in English 1500 GMT 30 May 91

[By William May]

[Text] Kyoto, May 30 (KYODO)—A UN disarmament conference that ended here Thursday highlighted challenges to the issues of arms reductions but it was the apparent new willingness of Japan to be more actively involved in peacekeeping efforts that overshadowed the forum.

Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, who proposed such a conference be held in Japan shortly after the Persian Gulf war, greeted the world's leading arms control experts Monday with proposals intended to reaffirm this newfound commitment.

In his opening address, Kaifu pledged that Japan is willing to "cooperate fully" with UN efforts to monitor arms sales worldwide and offered assistance to help establish a UN database system for that purpose.

Kaifu also indicated that Japan, for the first time, would submit to the UN this fall a draft resolution calling for increased transparency in the international arms trade.

Outlining proposals that he plans to promote at the London summit in July and before the UN General Assembly in the fall, Kaifu also reaffirmed plans to tie Japanese economic assistance to developing nations to trends in their military expenditures.

Kaifu was not alone in carrying the message of a new commitment to peace efforts to the delegates.

In a separate presentation, Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Hisashi Owada lamented that Japan's security policies since the end of World War II have been "basically passive concepts which do not extend beyond the maintenance of the security of Japan in the narrow concept."

Citing Japan's inability to respond "adequately" to the Persian Gulf crisis, Owada told the forum Japan has recognized the need for greater action and is now seriously considering how to contribute to UN peacekeeping operations while remaining faithful to its peace Constitution.

Throughout the four-day symposium, delegates hailed Kaifu's proposals and encouraged further active Japanese involvement in the peacekeeping arena.

Japanese defense policies were held up as an example of a "defensive defense structure" that would obviate the need for an arms race.

In general, arms control experts and critics here welcomed the new international situation that created a "window of opportunity" for progress in regional measures to global security and enhanced transparency and openness in the transfer of weapons and related technology.

They recognized the need for regional mechanisms to deal with local tensions and the building of confidence between neighbors, while underlining that regional approaches must emerge from within instead of being imposed from outside because of their unique considerations.

While the dynamics of the cold war arms race were declared dissipated, concern was voiced that the obsolete weapons of the cold war powers may now find their way into the Third World.

Others delegates discussed the phantom postwar "peace dividend" and the costs and side-effects of winding down decades of cold war arms proliferation.

The costs of disposing of weapons and hardware, the expense of trying to convert military industry to civilian purposes—with accompanying economic dislocations of labor—and costs of verifying that good faith and agreements are being adhered to all led to the assumption that the "peace dividend" may have only been a ghost all along.

Still, Swadash Rana of the UN Department of Disarmament Affairs reminded those disheartened by these prospects that "people should not be made to think that peace by itself is not a dividend."

Persian Gulf War Lessons Discussed

OW3005085891 Tokyo KYODO in English 0605 GMT 30 May 91

["Disarmament: Views Differ on UN Role After Gulf War (by William May)"—KYODO headline]

[Text] Kyoto, May 30 (KYODO)—Delegates at a United Nations-sponsored disarmament conference here differ on what lessons about the emerging role of the international body were learned from the Persian Gulf war, the head of UN disarmament affairs said Thursday.

Yasushi Akashi, undersecretary general of the UN Department of Disarmament Affairs, told the final plenary session of the conference that some delegates are encouraged by the ability of the UN members to "act in unison in the face of overt aggression."

Still, others fear the Gulf war threatens to pull the UN away from "its time-honored principles of conciliation," Akashi said.

Conference participants wondered if the UN can combine its aspirations to be a democratic institution among nations when it opts to be "an action-oriented, efficient body centering around the five permanent members (of the Security Council)," Akashi noted.

Ninety-eight disarmament experts, scholars, and critics, gathering for the Second UN Conference on Disarmament Issues in Kyoto, exchanged opinions on disarmament

challenges in the post-cold war and post-Gulf war situation, as well as the emerging role of the UN in these circumstances.

In his summary address, Akashi reiterated the optimism surrounding the four-day forum that "real disarmament" in nuclear, chemical, and biological arms "looks more promising now than anyone could have imagined only a few years ago."

The hopes of the delegates, however, are tempered by apprehension that "ethnic, religious, and cultural antagonisms, national and personal ambitions, and excessive means can coalesce together in the most menacing ways," Akashi said.

Discussions at the Kyoto International Hall revolved around three basic themes, and in closing the conference, Akashi praised progress in each of the areas.

He called for better mechanisms to promote interregional discussion and diplomacy in seeking the reduction of military tensions and disarmament.

Akashi also welcomed the Middle East arms control initiative of U.S. President George Bush, announced to the final session by U.S. delegate Ronald Lehman II.

Lehman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, outlined the Bush initiative for the conference participants, underlining the call for a review among the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, who provide some 85 percent of the arms to the Middle East.

Prvoslav Davinic, chief of the monitoring, analysis, and studies branch of the UN disarmament department, reaffirmed the delegates' convictions that global approaches are preferred in seeking bans on the weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical, and biological.

Akashi stressed the search for regional disarmament measures is not to achieve some "narrow mechanical sense" of restraint, but rather "to create more auspicious conditions for the reduction of tensions" and a firmer foundation for global regimes.

"The vast majority" of nations have "adopted the logic and practice of nonproliferation," Akashi said, but noted that problems remained in verifying adherence to international agreements.

Akashi urged enhanced openness and transparency in international arms and related technology transfers, suggesting a formula in which suppliers are more willing to provide science and technology for peaceful development to developing countries, and the recipient nations agree to further openness in how the technology is being implemented.

Responding to a suggestion that the conference was focusing too much on the question of arms transfers, Akashi reassured reporters the UN still considers nuclear nonproliferation a vital issue within the discussions.

Bush Middle East Arms Initiative 'Courageous'

*OW3005100991 Tokyo KYODO in English 0959 GMT
30 May 91*

[Text] Tokyo, May 30 (KYODO)—Japan welcomed Thursday U.S. President George Bush's new initiative on the selling of arms to the Middle East as a "courageous action."

Chief Cabinet Secretary Misoji Sakamoto told reporters that Bush's initiative indicates the United States is "reflecting on the Persian Gulf crisis... and would like to see strict restrictions on arms agreed to at an international forum."

"The Gulf war stemmed from the export of arms to Iraq and we must reflect on this," Sakamoto said.

Bush announced Wednesday a major initiative aimed at curbing the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in the Middle East, as well as ballistic missiles which can deliver them.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Taizo Watanabe said Japan "earnestly welcomes" Bush's proposals.

Watanabe said Japan regards as a "courageous action" the U.S. President's proposal for the establishment of common guidelines and a consultation system among the five major arms-supplying countries on the transfer of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction and missiles to the Middle East.

"Japan expects the initiative will be put into practice quickly by the five countries and deems it important to be strengthened with the participation of other arms-supplying countries," the spokesman said.

The reference was to the United States, the Soviet Union, China, Britain, and France—the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council.

Bush's initiative follows Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu's recent call for increased transparency and openness in the international transfer of conventional weapons and for strengthening of the framework for voluntary export restriction by arms-exporting countries.

Kaifu proposed the U.N. establish a registry of arms sales and purchases and said the five permanent Security Council members have a particularly great share of the task of maintaining international peace.

North Korea Pressed To Halt Mideast Missile Sales

*OW3105162391 Tokyo KYODO in English 1454 GMT
31 May 91*

[Excerpt] Jerusalem, May 31 (KYODO)—Japan will urge North Korea to put a halt to its exports of Scud missiles to Syria and other nations, Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama said Friday. Nakayama made the statement during talks with Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Arens, according to Japanese officials accompanying the foreign minister during his seven-day Middle Eastern tour. Nakayama told

Arens Japan will take up the issue of the missile exports during upcoming diplomatic normalization talks with North Korea.

"Japan is also concerned about the problem," Nakayama was quoted as telling Arens during the talks, which took place at the official residence of Israeli Premier Yitzhak Shamir. He made the remarks in response to a request by the Israeli defense minister that Japan pressure North Korea to contribute to protecting the regional security of the strife-torn Middle East.

Israel does not have any diplomatic relations with Pyongyang, while Japan has held three rounds of normalization talks with country. Pyongyang also has been trying hard to improve its economic and political relations with Tokyo in an apparent bid to attract Japanese technological and financial support for its flagging economy and to avoid being ostracized by the international community.

During the talks, Arens blasted North Korea for increasing the threat to regional security in the Middle East by exporting missiles to Syria and other nations. The Japanese Government has obtained through diplomatic channels information that North Korea has been peddling dozens of Soviet-designed Scud missiles to Syria and Iran since before the Gulf war, Foreign Ministry sources said. Moscow has been Pyongyang's chief ally and major supplier of military aid. During the war in the Persian Gulf, Iraq launched Scud missiles at Israel and Saudi Arabia, in an apparent effort to provoke Israel to retaliate and thereby run the risk of involving Iranian and Syrian troops on the side of Iraq. [passage omitted]

NORTH KOREA

Turning Peninsula Into Nuclear-Free Zone Urged

SK2905073891 Pyongyang KCNA in English 0505 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Pyongyang, May 29 (KCNA)—Turning the Korean Peninsula into a nuclear free zone is not only a vital demand of the Korean people but also a unanimous demand of the progressive mankind to live in a peaceful world free from nuclear threat; it is an inseparable, important part of the international anti-nuke and peace movement, says NODONG SINMUN today in a by-lined article.

The article continues:

Denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula is an inseparable part of the international movement to create nuclear free zones because the Korean peninsula is a zone of the most acute confrontation between nuclear war force and anti-nuke peace force.

The U.S. imperialists are scheming to gain nuclear upperhand while pursuing their invariable strategy of strength to realize their wild ambition for world domination.

Upset by the decrease of the sphere of their nuclear blackmail due to the establishment of nuclear free zones,

they are persistently attempting to hold in check the mounting movement for creating nuclear-free, peace zones in the Korean peninsula and Asia-Pacific region which they regard as the area of their vital interest.

The Korean peninsula has become a "region fraught with the biggest nuclear danger in the world" where the U.S. imperialists' nuclear blackmail is most undisguised and indiscriminate. U.S. Defence Secretary Cheney in his recent utterances babbled that the United States would continue playing a "nuclear protection role" in the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia and keep its huge military forces including nuclear arms. The U.S. imperialists have worked out even a scenario to provoke a new nuclear war on the Korean peninsula.

It is preposterous that the U.S. imperialists are talking about "peace" and "detente" while directly threatening us with nuclear weapons massively deployed in South Korea. This is nothing but a shameless trick to cover up their aggressive nature.

The United States and the South Korean authorities should lend an ear to the voices of peaceloving people of the world for justice, respond to our proposal for converting the Korean peninsula into a nuclear free zone and take a practical step to remove nuclear threat from us.

SOUTH KOREA

DPRK Reportedly To Build New Scud Missiles

SK0306034291 Seoul YONHAP in English 0258 GMT 3 Jun 91

[Text] Seoul, June 3 (YONHAP)—North Korea has secretly signed a contract with Libya on building a new type of Scud missile with a range of 1,000 kilometers, a highly-placed South Korean military source said Monday. Libya will bankroll the costly project on condition that the Scuds and related technology would be given to Tripoli, the source said. North Korea already produces a version of the Soviet Scud-B with a 600-km range.

"North Korea can strike any target in South Korea with the existing 600-km Scuds, which are deployed near the truce line bordering the two Koreas. The new missiles will be an even more serious threat to security in South Korea," the source said.

South Korea lags behind North Korea in terms of missile development as it is under constant U.S. pressure not to build missiles with a range of over 200 kilometers, according to the source. The North Korean Scuds are reportedly capable of carrying nuclear or chemical warheads.

Denying reports that North Korea has already completed the much touted nuclear facilities, the source said the facilities would be finished by the end of 1993 at the latest and would produce nuclear bombs from 1995. He added, however, that there was a possibility North Korea would complete the work by the end of this year and start building weapons from 1993.

Amid widespread reports that North Korea is only a few years away from producing nuclear devices, many nations have called on the communist leadership to open its nuclear facilities to international inspection, but to no avail.

North Korean President Kim Il-song told a visiting group of Japanese journalists on Saturday that inspection should be made of both South Korea and North Korea. "Inspection should be made simultaneously, not only on our side, which does not have nuclear weapons, but in South Korea, which has them," Kim was quoted as telling officials of KYODO NEWS SERVICE over lunch.

North Korea consistently says the U.S. forces in South Korea possess nuclear arms. The U.S. Administration follows a policy of neither denying nor confirming the presence of nuclear weapons.

According to earlier reports, North Korea is capable of producing more than 50 surface-to-surface Scud-B missiles a year with a range of 300 kilometers and has at least 12 launchers near the truce line. There are another 12 mobile launchers 40 to 50 kilometers north of the Demilitarized Zone.

North Korea has reportedly deployed approximately 30 SA-5 surface-to-air missiles with a 300-km range purchased from the Soviet Union, and can produce more than 100 SA-7 surface-to-air missiles with a 5-km range every year.

Production lines for surface-to-surface missiles were built in the vicinity of Pyongyang in 1987 and turn out more than 50 Scud-B's a year. Pyongyang began test firings in 1984 and modified the Scud-B's in 1988 to double the range to 600km.

Editorial Urges Nuclear-Free Zone on Peninsula

*SK0306072291 Seoul CHOSON ILBO in Korean
3 Jun 91 p 3*

[Editorial: "North's Nuclear Development Should Be Stopped"]

[Text] Rarely have our people entered such a dangerous phase as now. By dangerous phase, we mean the nuclear issue. Since 6 August 1945, the day an atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, mankind has maintained that never again must the atomic bomb be used. Despite this antinuclear argument, nuclear bombs have continued to increase in both quality and quantity.

The United States and the Soviet Union have manufactured nuclear weapons on the excuse of providing mutual deterrence while France, China, and India did the same largely driven by national self-respect. Nowhere has there been any deterrence to the nuclear proliferation by these countries. Although the two nuclear superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, have continued negotiations designed to control nuclear weapons since the fifties, nuclear proliferation has never stopped.

Luckily, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty was signed in 1968. However, France, China, Israel, and South Africa

did not sign the treaty on grounds of national security. Later, Korea once assumed nuclear development as its national goal for the purpose of providing national security, but had to give up in the face of international pressure.

North Korea is now trying to join the ranks of nuclear powers. In particular, when former Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze made a visit to Pyongyang last September, Kim Yong-nam, North Korea's vice premier and foreign minister, was reported to have said that North Korea would embark upon nuclear development on its own should South Korea and the Soviet Union normalize their diplomatic relations.

Few believed that North Korea meant what it said. With many saying this and that about North Korea's declaration, the Japanese daily SANKEI SHIMBUN, quoting U.S. intelligence sources, said the other day that North Korea has already completed nuclear reprocessing facilities which enables it to manufacture nuclear bombs and that the United States had strongly demanded that North Korea stop its construction.

We hope these reports are not true. If, however, they turn out to be true, things are more serious than expected. Some other reports say that North Korea, following its declaration that it would apply for a UN seat, is likely to allow a nuclear inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. This notwithstanding, the two nuclear reactors of different sizes in Yongbyon and nuclear reprocessing facilities now in construction weigh heavy on our minds.

Mankind, after making the mistake of having produced and put to practical use nuclear bombs, has made every effort possible not to repeat the same mistake, including the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, reduction and banning of nuclear tests, and the abolition of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces and have attained some minor successes. Since a complete abolition of nuclear weapons is hard to achieve, we can only hope for the creation of nuclear-free zones in regions. The ROK and the United States need to make a first move to keep North Korea from developing its own nuclear weapons on its own, not by way of a preemptive strike, but by way of declaring a nuclear-free zone on the Korean peninsula.

Seoul Supports Bush's Mideast Arms Proposal

*SK3105072691 Seoul YONHAP in English 0618 GMT
31 May 91*

[Text] Seoul, May 31 (YONHAP)—South Korea welcomes U.S. President George Bush's Mideast arms control proposal and hopes it will contribute to securing a lasting peace in the region through effective control and reduction of arms, Foreign Ministry Spokesman Chong Ui-yong said Friday.

Korea has consistently supported international arms control to prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, Chong said.

NEW ZEALAND

French South Pacific Nuclear Test Detected

BK3005011291 Hong Kong AFP in English 2354 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Wellington, May 30 (AFP)—France has conducted one of its largest ever underground nuclear tests in the South Pacific, New Zealand's Department of Scientific and Industrial Research said in a statement Thursday.

The department's seismological observatory in Rarotonga, Cook Islands, detected the explosion in the Tuamotu Archipelago. It said it believed the test was at Fangataufa rather than the usual testing site of Mururoa.

It estimated the yield at 110 kilotons. The test occurred at 9:00 A.M. French Polynesian time (1900 GMT Wednesday).

"This is the third explosion this year and one of the largest since the underground testing programme began in 1975," the department said.

"Last November 14 there was a test which was estimated on the basis of the Rarotonga recording to be 120 kilotons, but these yields are always very approximate."

The Australian Government's seismological centre in Canberra confirmed that an explosion occurred at 1900 GMT Wednesday at Fangataufa.

"We estimate its yield at between 20 and 80 kilotons and its magnitude at 5.7 on the Richter Scale," Chief Seismologist Ken Muirhead said.

Discrepancies sometimes occur in estimates of the size of explosions because the seismic signal takes different paths through the earth's crust from the site of the blast to the various observatories.

Mr. Muirhead said that the explosion was the third this year at the French Pacific site and the first at Fangataufa.

PHILIPPINES

Foreign Secretary on UN Kyoto Disarmament Conference

OW2605114991 Tokyo KYODO in English 1101 GMT 26 May 91

[Excerpt] Kyoto, May 26 (KYODO)—Philippine Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus plans to urge the United Nations to "return to its roots" by encouraging a human rights approach to disarmament.

Manglapus, speaking Sunday to KYODO NEWS SERVICE, said that in addition to global and regional strategies for disarmament, the U.N. must encourage people to speak out for arms reductions.

Manglapus will make his appeal Monday in a speech to the opening plenary session of the U.N. Conference on Disarmament Issues being held for four days at the Kyoto International Conference Hall.

On Sunday, Manglapus said it was healthy that some Japanese voiced their concern about the deployment of minesweepers to the Persian Gulf to help multinational postwar cleanup measures.

"The U.N. should encourage (people to express their concerns) as part of its drive to bring about world disarmament," he said.

He maintained that the decision to deploy the minesweepers was one up to the Japanese Government and people, but said Manila was not "ignoring history" when it cooperated with the minesweepers when they stopped in the Philippines on the way to the Persian Gulf.

In addition to the personal approach to arms reductions, Manglapus stressed the need for regional discussions on security and said that such a forum will be held in Manila next week.

The objective of the talks will be "to arrive at an understanding of what we want to do" to ensure security in Southeast Asia, Manglapus said.

He said it will be the first time an initiative has come from within a region to discuss its own security without pressure from outside, although the participation of the U.S., Soviet Union, China and others in the talks is necessary, he said.

Manglapus first offered the idea of the forum during last year's meeting of ASEAN foreign ministers and is encouraged that the U.N. Disarmament Committee recently urged such regional discussions.

The foreign secretary said he "recognizes and appreciates" broader Asia-Pacific security proposals, such as a call by Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans for an Asian version of Europe's Conference on Security and Cooperation (CSCE), but hints that the arrangements may be too broad.

Evans, like Manglapus, will speak at the opening session on challenges to disarmament in a rapidly changing international outlook, and Japanese observers here expect the Australian minister to voice anew his Asian security proposal. [passage omitted]

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Last Regular Soviet Army Unit Leaves Milovice

LD2805203691 Prague Ceskoslovensky Rozhlas Radio Network in Czech 1730 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Today will enter the history books of Czechoslovakia. The last regular unit of the Soviet Army, the battalion for the defense of the Command of the Central Group of Soviet Armed Forces left Milovice. With the departure of the 71,543 soldiers, the withdrawal of Soviet forces is complete. Only a liquidation group of 350 officers and 450 soldiers remain on our territory. Their task is to hand over all remaining facilities to the Czechoslovak side by 20 June. The signature of the final protocol on the withdrawal of Soviet forces is expected on 26 June this year. The stay of the uninvited guests in the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic will thus end after 22 years. Before the departure of the echelon, I spoke to one of the commanders, General Anatolii Fedorovich Morozhkin.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified reporter, in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] General, what are your feelings on leaving Czechoslovakia?

[Morozhkin, in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] Well, I am leaving with the feeling of having completed my duty. We are soldiers and we carry out our duties. We have now received orders to return home.

[Reporter] And what is your view of 1968?

[Morozhkin] My personal view is that the decision by the Warsaw Pact states was not correct. I think that everything could have been solved without the use of military force. [end recording]

Report on Soviet Troop Withdrawal Corrected

AU3105135991 Prague CTK in English 1508 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Prague, May 28 (CTK)— Czechoslovak Defense Ministry Press Spokesman Lieutenant-Colonel Marian Bozik told CTK today that 1,957 Soviet soldiers still remain in Czechoslovakia.

He was correcting the information given to CTK by the Ministry yesterday according to which there were 350 officers and 450 rank-and-file soldiers in Czechoslovakia on May 27, i.e. 1,157 less than the real figure.

In addition to the 1,957 soldiers, whose only remaining duty is to turn over to Czechoslovakia all buildings used by the Soviet Army, there are 642 Soviet lorries and five aircraft in Czechoslovakia, Bozik said.

When the Czechoslovak-Soviet agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia was signed in February 1990, 73,500 Soviet officers and soldiers were stationed in Czechoslovakia.

Soviet troops have been in the country since August 21, 1968, when the Soviet-led invasion of five Warsaw Pact countries crushed an attempt to reform communist rule in Czechoslovakia.

Bozik said the last group of Soviet troops is to leave Czechoslovakia by rail on June 20.

The final document on the termination of the stay of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia is expected to be signed on June 25, Bozik added.

Soviet Team To Continue Compensation Talks

LD0106043991 Prague CTK in English 2018 GMT 31 May 91

[Text] Prague, May 31 (CTK)—Czechoslovak Deputy Foreign Minister Vojtech Wagner told journalists today that the Soviet side has accepted the Czechoslovak philosophy that all damage caused by the presence of Soviet troops on Czechoslovak territory can be compensated for.

Wagner, who is heading the Czechoslovak delegation at the talks on compensation, said after failing to reach agreement last Friday both sides agreed that a reduced Soviet team will remain in Prague to continue the negotiations. The basic understanding was reached in the last two days.

Wagner estimated that Soviet troops caused damage of 4,000-5,000 million crowns in Czechoslovakia since the August 1968 invasion (30 crowns=one U.S. dollar).

The Soviet Union deployed 73,500 troops in Czechoslovakia for twenty years. They are now being withdrawn and the last Soviet soldier is to be pulled out by June 25.

Federal Assembly Deputy Michael Kocab, who heads the Czechoslovak parliament commission overseeing the withdrawal, said that the agreement on compensation should provide for the creation of Czechoslovak-Soviet joint ventures. The Czechoslovak promise to supply prefab houses to the Soviet Union for the returning troops played an important role in the talks, Kocab said.

HUNGARY

Soviet Troop Withdrawal Ahead of Schedule

LD3105101391 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 0900 GMT 31 May 91

[Text] The Soviet Union will complete the withdrawal of its troops from Hungary before the deadline set for the end of next month.

This has been announced in Moscow by Major General Zhurbenko. The major general disclosed that there are now only 1,500 Soviet soldiers and five pieces of military-technical equipment in Hungary.

ARGENTINA**Minister To Speak on Armed Forces, Condor-2**

*PY2805154691 Buenos Aires TELAM in Spanish
1456 GMT 28 May 91*

[Text] Buenos Aires, 28 May (TELAM)—Defense Minister Antonio Erman Gonzalez stated today that the message he will deliver to the population tonight will be “a political answer to the concerns that have been expressed by the community” on such fundamental topics as the military budget, the role of the Armed Forces, and the issue of the Condor-2 missile.

In remarks made over the national radio and television network from the Olivos Residence, Gonzalez stated: “We believe that, within the framework of a republican government, the community deserves an explanation on these topics.”

He added that “we are going to calm the community,” because “I believe that the message will clarify these controversial topics—the budget, the role of the Armed Forces—that are currently being discussed.”

He explained that his address will be “a call for realism” because he believes that “there is a difficult situation throughout the country in this transition from obsolete structures to the modern country that we want to build, and all sectors are experiencing budget shortfalls.”

Answering a question about the future of the Armed Forces, the minister stated: “We hope they will serve as a deterrent institution.” He also indicated that the process of transforming the Armed Forces is not one in which to expect immediate results, because it will take time to accomplish.

In response to a question on the deactivation of the Condor-2 program, he announced that “as of July, draftees from the class of 1971 will begin to be demobilized.” He stated that in July, 50 percent of the draftees will be demobilized, “while the other 50 percent of the class will be demobilized at the beginning of November 1991.”

U.S. Mideast Arms Control Initiative ‘Welcomed’

*PY3105190291 Buenos Aires Radio Nacional
Network in Spanish 1600 GMT 31 May 91*

[Text] There is satisfaction in Argentina regarding the Bush initiative. The Argentine Government has expressed its satisfaction with the U.S. President’s arms control initiative for the Middle East.

The Foreign Ministry has said that the government welcomed this constructive initiative because it understands that the initiative can help curb the arms build-up in the region.

BRAZIL**U.S. Chemical Weapon Ban Proposal Supported**

*PY2405174591 Brasilia Radio Nacional da
Amazonia Network in Portuguese 1000 GMT
24 May 91*

[Text] Brazil supports a U.S. proposal to eliminate chemical weapon stocks. Brazil also advocates the signing of an international treaty that seeks to set deadlines and mechanisms for implementing this measure.

According to Brazilian Foreign Minister Francisco Rezek, the Brazilian position was expressed by President Collor in a letter to President George Bush. The position upheld by the two countries should be included in a joint declaration to be signed during President Collor’s visit to Washington between 18 and 22 June.

EGYPT

Government Welcomes Bush Statement on Arms

NC3005094591 Cairo Arab Republic of Egypt Radio Network in Arabic 0900 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa has stated that Egypt welcomes U.S. President George Bush's statement on arms control in the Middle East. Egypt, he added, hopes that all weapons of mass destruction are removed from the Middle East and that all states of the region commit themselves to achieving this goal. Musa said that the Foreign Ministry is currently studying all the points contained in the U.S. President's statement.

ISRAEL

Bush's Mideast Disarmament Plan Draws Reaction

Conventional Arms Stressed

TA3005052391 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0405 GMT 30 May 91

[Report by political affairs correspondent Arye Golan]

[Text] Israel will hold contacts with the Washington administration in a bid to begin joint action for stability and peace in the region. Jerusalem's reaction to President Bush's plan emphasizes that huge quantities of conventional weapons have been amassed by countries of the region. These weapons provide a potential means of destruction and ruin, and they demand immediate attention, Jerusalem sources said this morning.

What about Bush's call to stop the production of nuclear weapons in the Middle East? Avi Pazner, the prime minister's adviser, replies: Israel's policy has always stated that Israel will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons to the Middle East.

Israel attributes great significance to the United States' efforts regarding the arms race in the region. Israel and the United States share a concern regarding the destructive potential in the region. To halt the arms race, Israel, immediately after the Gulf war, called for the convening of a conference, notes Pazner. Israel is ready to do its share for the success of that conference, sources in the prime minister's bureau promise this morning.

Defense Panel Chairman Responds

TA3005085591 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0705 GMT 30 May 91

[Telephone interview with Eliyahu Ben-Elisar, Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee chairman, by Razi Barqay on the "It Is All Talk" program—live]

[Text] [Barqay] Good morning Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee Chairman Eliyahu Ben-Elisar.

[Ben-Elisar] Good morning to you.

[Barqay] Let us discuss the new nuclear order that President Bush wants to introduce in our region.

[Ben-Elisar] I hope it does not suffer the fate of the new political order in the Middle East which he had discussed earlier.

[Barqay] You have read the clauses of his proposal. Are there any points about which Israel should or is supposed to express reservations?

[Ben-Elisar] First, there is something very fundamental: The Middle East is literally immersed, drowning in an ocean of weapons, most of which were supplied by the superpowers—the USSR, the United States, France, England, and China. The fact that these countries are the five permanent members of the UN Security Council is no coincidence, because they are, so to speak, in charge of world peace. Naturally, other countries have also supplied weapons, technology, and so forth.

Thus, when the U.S. President speaks of a desire, an aspiration to disarm the region, while representing one of the Middle East's largest arms suppliers—and let us not forget the gigantic deals worth billions of dollars with Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states, and other countries....

[Barqay, interrupting] Then Israel should concur unreservedly?

[Ben-Elisar] Israel should, first and foremost, insist on its basic principles. Were it possible, the first step should be an agreement between the superpowers, the weapon suppliers, that the Middle East already has enough weapons and that there is no need to sell or supply any more. This would be the best start. In other words, I am appealing to the U.S. President to start by introducing a new order not in the Middle East, but among the weapons suppliers, who should stop selling weapons to the Middle East, who should stop exporting their unemployment to us.

[Barqay] With your permission, let us now refer to the so-called foreign sources; this expression is part of our jargon when referring to a certain issue. Well, the Arabs may come to President Bush and say: Hey, what's going on? Israel already has nuclear weapons, while we do not. How then do you expect us to freeze the situation, when Israel has an edge on us?

[Ben-Elisar] Your remarks reflect the precise nature of the difficulties nations have always had on the path to disarmament. Disarmament never began before some sort of a political agreement was achieved. Never. By the way, there have been very few cases of disarmament. Both between the world wars and after World War II, for instance, the world failed to attain such an agreement. It is only recently that the United States and the Soviet Union have been successful, and even that was only after they reached political accords first. There will be no disarmament without political accords; in fact, there will be none without peace in the Middle East.

[Barqay] Does Israel adhere to its traditional statement that it will not be the first to introduce that weapon to the Middle East?

[Ben-Elisar] It is no mere statement; it is a policy. This is patently Israel's line. Why do you say—that weapon? We

will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons to the Middle East: This is a fact; it is our policy.

[Barqay] Referring again to foreign sources, will Israel agree to remove such weapons from its territory, for instance, if international supervisors discover that it has such a thing?

[Ben-Elisar] I do not wish to speak about the State of Israel. Why should I speak about the State of Israel? Why should I again start with the State of Israel? We are always required to be the first to make concessions. Why should it always be us, when no effort is being made to establish peace? Have I threatened Iraq? Am I threatening Syria? Do I covet parts of Syria? Do I doubt Syria's right to exist as a sovereign state? Did I want to conquer Kuwait? Is the State of Israel the one with expansionist ambitions, or are the Arabs?

[Barqay] Then the political path you propose is to start with the easy part, and to move on to the tough things later. You propose to start with conventional weapons; to freeze the supply of ground-to-ground missiles, for instance, and of other sophisticated arms; and to leave the nuclear issue to the end.

[Ben-Elisar] I suggest beginning at the beginning. Nothing—and certainly not international processes—can begin at the end. The process must be launched with a political agreement, with a desire for a political thaw. As a matter of fact, this is what happened with the superpowers, which began by achieving a thaw—they called it detente. They ended the cold war, and this is what should happen here; the cold war should end, as should the boycott, the excommunication, and the hatred reflected in the UN votes. This should be followed by political agreements. However, the major arms suppliers should in the meantime agree to stop supplying weapons to the Middle East. If necessary, this step can include the State of Israel. This can begin with assault weapons and the technology that makes independent manufacturing of nonconventional weapons possible. This can happen in parallel with the quest for political and other accords.

[Barqay] Thank you very much.

[Ben-Elisar] A good morning to you.

Newspapers Review Proposal

TA3005103491

[Editorial Report] The major Israeli dailies carry in their 30 May editions commentaries and editorials on U.S. President George Bush's new initiative to eliminate weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East and to reduce the flow of conventional arms to the region.

All papers assess the potential advantages and drawbacks of the U.S. proposal from the Israeli point of view, with most of them opining that it is regrettable that the United States did not see fit to coordinate its proposal with Israel or to consult with the countries in the area before coming out with its plan.

Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST in English in its page 4 editorial entitled "Bush's Arms Plan" notes the fierce domestic and international pressures President Bush will have to face in attempting to convince foreign governments and the U.S. arms industry to curtail the extremely profitable business of weapons exporting. It points out that "every arms-producing nation on earth—not only the Big Five but all those able and eager to take up the slack—would have to be threatened with economic reprisals if they are to toe the line." THE JERUSALEM POST adds: "Not every nation is vulnerable to American sanctions. One wonders what the U.S. can do about, say, North Korean missile sales to Syria." The POST concludes: "As long as totalitarian, violence-prone regimes like Hafiz al-Asad's in Syria, Saddam Husayn's in Iraq, and Mu'ammar al-Qadhafi's in Libya, and even feudal oligarchies like Saudi Arabia's continue to dominate the Arab world, efforts to curb the arms race and bring lasting peace are doomed to ignominious failure."

Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew in a page A1 commentary by Asher Yaniv entitled "Bush Has Made Some Difficult Demands" recounts that the last time there was a concerted international attempt to impose controls on the type and quantity of weapons reaching the Middle East—by the United States, Britain, and France in 1950—it resulted in drawing the Soviet Union into the region and an exacerbation of the arms race. HA'ARETZ states that Bush's proposal is at once advantageous and dangerous for Israel. The commentary asserts that "if the arms race can be stopped, while the existing balance of power remains the same, Israel's qualitative edge will be maintained and the political process will probably gain momentum." On the downside, HA'ARETZ notes that the proposal contains some extremely difficult demands, including demands to sign an accord on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and an agreement to halt the development of surface-to-surface missiles and eventually to destroy them. HA'ARETZ points out: "On one hand Israel has supported the idea of a nuclear-free Middle East for many years, but, on the other hand, it has so far refused to sign the agreement calling for the nonproliferation of such weaponry, which would mean giving supervisory teams from the International Atomic Energy Agency free access to its various nuclear installations."

Tel Aviv YEDI'OT AHARONOT in Hebrew in an editorial on page 2 by Avi'ezer Golan entitled "Bush's Plan Gets on the Road" criticizes the plan for being "dangerous—mainly because it was clearly put together hastily without any prior coordination with the countries in the region." Another glaring drawback, the editorial claims, is "the lack of a convincing answer to the question of who will supervise the process of dismantling the arms." It questions the capacity of the Security Council to do so because the five permanent members of the Security Council are also the world's major arms exporters, who are responsible for most of the weapons being in the region in the first place. YEDI'OT AHARONOT asks if "Israel would be willing to let the cats guard the cream and to place its security in their hands."

Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew in a page A3 commentary by 'Amos Gilbo'a entitled "A Threatening Stick" writes: "The implications of the Bush initiative for Israel exist on two levels: One level comprises the sphere of Israeli-U.S. relations, and the second level includes fundamental security issues. Bush published his initiative without any prior consultations on the senior level between the two countries.

"Does that mean that the Americans could care less about our opinions? Does that mean the Americans are waving a threatening stick over our heads on such a sensitive security issue?" MA'ARIV states: "The U.S. initiative includes several elements that are very negative for Israel:

"—The major military threat posed to Israel by the Arab world comes from their conventional forces.

"—Israel's nuclear capability, assuming that it exists, counterbalances that Arab advantage.

"—The Bush initiative tilts the strategical balance in the Arab's favor."

Tel Aviv 'AL HAMISHMAR in Hebrew presents a rosier view of the initiative in a page 7 editorial entitled "An End to Weapons of Mass Destruction." The editorial notes the need to free the region of the dangers posed by the nonconventional weapons possessed by the Middle Eastern countries, a danger that threatened to materialize during the recent Gulf War. 'AL HAMISHMAR admits the inherent difficulties and the undeniably long road ahead in reaching any agreement on arms limitations but remains optimistic: "The fulfillment of the dream of a farewell to arms is still a distant vision, but in order to draw closer to it, everything must be done to reach accords on security and peace, which will ease the sense of constant danger endemic to the countries of the region and their residents, and which will increase their sense of security without massive investments in all possible forms of weapons of destruction."

Foreign Minister Reacts to Bush Initiative

TA3005181491 Jerusalem Israel Television Network
in Arabic 1600 GMT 30 May 91

[Interview with Foreign Minister David Levi by Shlomo Ganor and Eli Nisan in the Jerusalem studio on 30 May—recorded in Hebrew with Arabic subtitles; processed from the Hebrew]

[Excerpt] [Ganor] Good evening, Mr. Levi.

[Levi] Good evening.

[Ganor] President Bush announced a plan to control the Middle East arms race and perhaps to impose restrictions on weapons systems. Mr. Foreign Minister, what is Israel's response to that?

[Levi] I think that Israel was the first to say that the Middle East arms race must be controlled, that the transfer of lots of expensive, sophisticated arms and arms deals with countries does not square with a peace effort. On the one hand, there is talk about peace and on the other, there are huge arms deals of billions of dollars. Canada published

very interesting research that 95 percent of Saddam Husayn's arms were supplied by the five permanent members of the Security Council. Those Security Council members are the ones that went to war against that monster. In other words, they created a monster and then went to war against the danger it threatened them with. We also hear and know about arms deals with the PRC and North Korea, and the huge deal of billions of dollars with Saudi Arabia now being talked about in the United States. Israel was the first to call for a halt to arms supplies, or supervision, or a slow down as part of its aspiration to finally achieve peace and end the state of belligerency and violence in the Middle East.

[Ganor] To return for a moment to President Bush's initiative, can the initiative itself change the strategic balance and harm Israel's deterrent capability?

[Levi] No. Look, there is a saying that the enemy of the good is the very good, that you think you are in control but you are not. If you go after lots of things and parameters then you have not started anything. We must first start with what presently endangers the people, the calm, and the future of the Middle East: To cut down arms supplies and control conventional weapons whose enormity is beyond any sort of proportion. Before the world actually learned about what Iraq possesses, nobody would have believed it had such a variegated quantity of arms. That is also the case with Syria and Libya, and even countries closer to the West. How does the supply of billions of dollars worth of arms go hand in hand with peace? Therefore, we must first start with a drastic cut back in supplies so that there can later be control. Israel has aspired to that, it declared an initiative after the Gulf war. I dispatched a demand to all the states with which we have diplomatic relations to put a brake on the Middle East arms race because it endangers the future while at the same time enslaves the economies.

[Ganor] Does Israel welcome the appearance of the initiative?

[Levi] A large part of it we welcome and part of it we are studying.

[Nisan] Mr. Levi, what is the Israeli position on the proposal in the plan to cease the production of materials for nuclear arms in the region?

[Levi] I do not know to whom it refers. I read that the Americans are very concerned about Iraq's capability to produce an atom bomb. We now hear about a reactor being built in Algeria with Chinese aid. Pakistan of course has a capability. The problem is very wide-ranging. We have to see how it can be cut down. I sometimes wonder. Look, what happens is that on every issue the world conscience has an address: Israel. If there is terrorism in some place in the world then Israel is responsible because it is hardline, it is opposed to terror. If there is some difficulty in trade between Europe and the Arabs, it is Israel's fault. If there is unrest in the Maghreb then the finger is pointed at Israel. The atom bomb, which every place in the world is getting and there are facts about a reactor here and there, so what happens? You ask me about Israel. I tell you, you have to

be blind not to see everything that is going on. We are studying the issue, we will learn about it, discuss it with the Americans—we are allies—and find out what is being referred to and how the dangers can be lifted. You hear about missiles that can travel thousands of kilometers, so how can it be assured that all that will be cut back. We have to consider what capability there is, who participates, investigate the intentions about conventional arms held by the various states, for instance, chemical weapons. Syria has an enormous potential in chemical weapons. We have reports that Iraq still has chemical weapons. There are other neighboring states here in the Middle East that have them. That is the easiest issue and it is so terrible. We must therefore start to take action [word indistinct], including missiles and chemicals, and....

[Ganor, interrupting] Does the publication of the U.S. plan without prior coordination with Israel indicate a certain tendency in the U.S. position?

[Levi] No. Sometimes one is astonished by the attempt to mix up two things that have nothing to do with each other. The United States is a superpower, it is independent and decides on its own policy. Does it have to ask Israel first? We are also an independent sovereign country. When a President has his own outlook on how the world should be in a certain number of years, does he need Israel's permission? He presented a plan, we will study it, learn what its effectiveness is, how he thinks of implementing it, the dangers close to us and far off. In general, how the international community, the United States on its own, or perhaps jointly with others, deal with it. All these are very grave issues. Anything that can reduce the danger of war while assuring Israel's security, we will study.

[Ganor] Mr. Levi, from your remarks it seems you are skeptical about the implementation of the plan.

[Levi] No, under no circumstances. It is only that I see the efforts of the states to obtain arms and arsenals over many years and the effort of developed states, including superpowers, to sell and provide arms for billions of dollars. I do not understand how that is explained. I want to study how it can be curtailed, stopped, destroyed. All that has to be learned and understood. Anyway, it is not a matter of fixing everything by pushing a button, and then the wolf will dwell with the lamb.

[Ganor] Will that be a subject for discussion between Jerusalem and Washington?

[Levi] We always discuss subjects relating to balance of forces and arms in the world. It is our concern. We must aspire to a good life. The question of life in Israel has special value and significance.

[Ganor] That leads me to the second issue, which is linked to the first, and that is the peace process. Despite the general view that Secretary of State Baker failed in his efforts, that the political process has been terminated, you believe that the process is still alive and will go on. What is the basis for your optimism?

[Levi] Only months ago, each of us built up hopes, wishes, a prayer in the heart, that the political process would move ahead. I now see a new national sport....

[Nisan, interrupting] It is not only in Israel, it is throughout the world.

[Levi] That is not true, I did not hear about it. I have no official announcement about it, no proof. I know that there are still feelers, meetings, studies into specific issues to which governments must provide answers. I do not know what the point is in getting up each day and saying that the process is dead. I have also heard it from certain Knesset members. I believe it is a mistake. First, Israel has no desire to see the process dying—the contrary is true. It shows that either you want it to die or that you are desperate. Desperation is not a policy. I therefore have no sign that it is dead or dying or stuck or that it has struck a sand bar. There is a study of certain issues. By the way, before leaving here Baker told us he was waiting for answers from Syria and Jordan. The moment he receives them he will update us. These days, we are counting on that. Israel made a huge effort to advance the peace process. We resolved many issues although it seemed that they cannot be resolved. The other side, which must prove that it really wants peace, must provide the answers. We will wait. Why should we say that the process is dead? We did everything to make sure that it lives and gives life.

[Nisan] You said in the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee that several Arab states are due to provide answers to Israel. What type of answers, and what is the dispute centered on?

[Levi] I did not say that they have to provide answers to Israel, but to the U.S. secretary of state. He presented them with issues requiring a reply. We will wait. I am not conducting negotiations with the Arab states, not yet anyway, but I believe it will come. In the meantime, the secretary of state maintains the link with them, the talks with them. I suggest we wait until we hear from him. It will surely be in the coming days or weeks. [passage omitted]

Shamir Urges Dialogue on Bush Arms Proposal

TA3005132791 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew
1300 GMT 31 May 91

[Text] Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir said President Bush's initiative on arms reduction in the Middle East is very important and could have a very powerful influence on the region. Mr. Shamir pointed out that we have several questions on the initiative; therefore, it is vital to conduct a dialogue with the United States on that. We will hold consultations on what he said and discuss in detail all the problems involved in the proposal, the prime minister said. Mr. Shamir expressed the hope that he would have the opportunity to hold discussions with the U.S. Administration on the issue.

Our correspondent Ze'ev Kohen reports that the prime minister made the remarks to a delegation of British Conservative Party activists.

Defense Minister Interviewed on Bush Arms Control Plan

*TA0106101991 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew
0705 GMT 1 Jun 91*

[Interview with Defense Minister Moshe Arens by Dalya Ya'ari and military affairs correspondent Karmela Menashe on 31 May at the VIP room at Ben-Gurion Airport—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Ya'ari] Mr. Defense Minister, just like after every other visit, we hear talk of agreements and disagreements. Karmela Menashe will ask you about defense-related projects, but right now let us discuss the Bush initiative. The statements you made in support of the initiative seemed somewhat reserved. Perhaps you could share your reservations with us?

[Arens] My statements were made to express the fact that not only are we in favor of disarmament in the region, but I imagine that we are more interested in this than any other party, as we are the main victim of the regional arms race, and we have already been forced to go through five wars as a result of the enormous quantities of arms in the Middle East. Nonetheless, this is a very complicated business. It is a matter of survival for us. We cannot permit any mistakes to be made by Israel or by other countries; therefore, this issue must be examined from all sides.

We will conduct talks with the United States. I spent a great deal of time discussing this issue with Secretary of Defense Cheney. We will continue to discuss this with the United States, and I assume that we will eventually reach agreement on how to proceed.

[Menashe] What are Israel's conditions for participating in the Bush initiative? Did you discuss prior conditions?

[Arens] It is not a question of conditions. We declared long ago that we considered the reduction in the quantity of weapons in the region and the calling of a halt to the Middle East arms race to be essential for the furthering of the peace process. Months before President Bush's proposal, Israel had already suggested convening a conference of both the arms-supplying countries and of the Middle East countries, in which they together would discuss limiting conventional weapons imports to the Middle East. We regard this as the most important step, and we also consider it possible. We are currently discussing the peace process, we see how difficult the peace process is and how slowly it is progressing. If we can further the issue of arms control, I believe it will add momentum to the peace process. [passage omitted]

[Ya'iri] The details of Bush's plan have still not been published, and this is actually because of your meeting with Cheney. Did the U.S. secretary of defense give you more details of the plan?

[Arens] I do not think he had to give more details, because Bush's speech was published. To the best of my knowledge, Bush's speech constitutes a declaration of the U.S. policy on this issue.

[Ya'iri] Including all the details?

[Arens] Yes, including all the details.

[Menashe] Is there no contradiction between Bush's call for arms reduction on the one hand, and Cheney's statements pointing to additional arms supplies to Israel on the other?

[Arens] No, there is no contradiction. The Americans understand what we have been saying all the time. They understand that the source of the problems posed by weapons in the region—and by the way, large quantities of conventional weapons are equal to weapons of mass destruction, and one does not have to use biological or chemical weapons—is the dissymmetry in the amount of weapons. It is not as though we have the same amount of weapons that the Arabs have and now the United States is disrupting that balance by giving us 10 F-15's. The Arabs have four, five, and in certain instances seven times the quantity of weapons we have. This constitutes a source of instability and occasionally tempts them to start wars against us. This was the problem with Iraq. Suddenly President Bush found himself facing what he called the fourth largest army in the world. [passage omitted]

[Menashe] There have been reports in recent days about the Iranian military buildup. What is Israel's view of Iran's procurement program? There are reports that Iran is trying to get nuclear weapons with the assistance of the PRC and North Korea.

[Arens] Our experience has taught us that whenever a dictatorial regime manages to accumulate vast amounts of weaponry this constitutes a danger for the world, and if it is in our region then it poses a danger to Israel. Therefore, if a regime such as the Iranian one—which is not a democracy, but rather a very extremist regime—has the means to accumulate a lot of weapons, and the regime does not use these means to raise the standard of living or rehabilitate the populace... [changes thought] And I imagine that there is room for improvement on these fields—but rather to purchase arms, and not only conventional weapons, then we are certainly concerned.

[Ya'iri] Was one of the issues you discussed with the Japanese foreign minister preventing the supply of North Korean arms to Iran?

[Arens] Yes. Japan is one of the few countries, and perhaps the only country with which we have ties—which today are good ties—that also has ties with North Korea, even though I understand that they do not maintain full diplomatic relations. Japan has ties with North Korea, and I assume that it also has some influence there; therefore, I asked Foreign Minister Nakayama to use this influence to persuade the North Koreans not to sell missiles to the Middle East. [passage omitted]

JORDAN

Editorial Criticizes Bush Mideast Arms Control Plan

*JN3105120191 Amman AL-RA'Y in Arabic
31 May 91 pp 1, 16*

[Editorial: "U.S. Plan To Maintain Israel's Strategic Superiority"]

[Text] It seems that the U.S. plan, which Washington claims seeks to control the arms race in the Middle East, is no more than an episode of American intervention in the region, triggered by the Gulf war, whose real objective is to maintain Israel's strategic superiority. The points of the plan on nonconventional weapons do not directly or indirectly refer to the Israeli arsenal, teeming with nuclear and biological weapons, which Israel has been refusing to open to international inspection. Moreover, the plan's points on conventional weapons will not affect Israel thanks to its strategic cooperation with the United States which produced advanced military industries in the Zionist entity with U.S. assistance. There will be no control measure covering these industries. In addition, the announcement of the plan was accompanied by another announcement that contradicts the alleged objectives, as seen in the U.S. decisions to provide Israel with 10 F-15 aircraft and to continue cooperation with Israel to develop Israel's "Arrow" missile, which is said to be an antimissile missile.

It is noted that the U.S. plan took pains to include a call for a region free of missiles with a range able to reach Israel. Hence, it is very clear that the Zionist entity's experience with the Iraqi missiles is the basis for this call!

If this plan is implemented, it will result in preventing Arabs from importing weapons that would enable them to attain strategic balance with the Israeli aggressors. The aggressors' arsenal, however, will remain as it is, or, rather, it will certainly receive more U.S. weapons similar to the 10 F-15 aircraft and others. By this, Washington guarantees Israel's strategic superiority in the region.

We must recall that the U.S. plan follows an Israeli campaign against Syria similar to the propaganda campaign Iraq was subjected to prior to the Gulf war. This recent campaign claims that there can be no security for Israel while Syria continues to possess missiles, and it was accompanied by allegations that Algeria was preparing to manufacture nuclear weapons!

The series of events beginning with the elimination of Iraq's military power, and the current attempts to wipe it out economically, followed by the emergence of the U.S. plan, which seeks to prevent Arabs from acquiring missiles able to reach Israel and which bans the supply of weapons that would enable them to attain strategic balance with Israel, all clearly point to a strong link of these steps and to the real objective, which is to prepare the region for Israeli hegemony.

It is strange that the U.S. plan followed in the wake of the obstacles Israel placed before Baker during his tour of the region, as well as Israel's no's, which prevented the progress of the peace march, as if Washington were rewarding the Israeli aggressors in appreciation of their intransigence and obstruction of the peace process! In light of all this, one may wonder what the situation would be like if Washington imposes its plan, which preserves Israel's strategic superiority, what peace would be established in such a situation, and what trust would the Arabs have in the credibility of the U.S. intentions toward them.

The recent U.S. plan comprises the chains with which Washington wants to shackle the Arab body. Arabs will see a great deal of what is in store for them if they do not shake off the memories of the Gulf crisis and close ranks to confront the challenges that threaten them all.

SAUDI ARABIA

Kingdom Supports Bush Mideast Arms Control Moves

LD3005172991 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1627 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Riyadh, 30 May (SPA)—A responsible source made the following statement to SPA today:

Officials in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia have followed the international efforts aimed at bringing about permanent peace and comprehensive stability in the Arab region. In this respect, they read the text of the initiative announced by U.S. President George Bush on Wednesday in which he called for a freeze on the production and stocking of mass destruction weapons and a ban on the production of materials for nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons.

The source added: Out of its total conviction and its policy known for its support of everything that could achieve security and stability for the states of the Middle East and enable them to continue the march toward growth, prosperity, and development for their peoples, Saudi Arabia would like to express its support for the initiative put forward by President Bush in the speech he delivered yesterday, Wednesday, during a graduation ceremony in the State of Colorado, and the purpose of which is to make the Middle East a region free of weapons of destruction. This is particularly as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia promptly signed the agreement on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons within the UN framework and contributed with intensive efforts in international forums to achieve this humanitarian goal which all of mankind aspires to for the sake of the desired peace.

SYRIA

Foreign Minister Comments on Bush's Arms Control Plan

JN3105181091 Damascus Syrian Arab Television Network in Arabic 1740 GMT 31 May 91

[Text] Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' has stated that Syria is still studying the U.S. ideas on the supervision of armament in the region in spite of the fact that it appears from the very first reading that these ideas will, if implemented, enhance Israel's military superiority generally and the qualitative military superiority more specifically. These ideas will also inflict grave damage to Arab interests. They will also produce far-reaching perils to pan-Arab security now and in the future, especially since the U.S. ideas include the Arab countries from the remotest part of the Arab East to the remotest part of the Arab Maghreb. Al-Shar' added: The world should know and always

remember that Israel produces in its factories all types of weapons—mass destruction or conventional—while the Arabs do not have such a capability. What draws attention are the agreements that Israel has been concluding now and the efforts it has been exerting, particularly these days by importing and stockpiling weapons or in producing and developing them.

The foreign minister added: We seriously believe that the matter will be more realistic and more beneficial and fair to the international community if international efforts are made to attain peace on the bases of UN resolutions, a peace that will, in its turn, bring about a reduction of weapons and a lessening of the threats they pose. In any case, it is logical and of interest that these or other ideas about armament be submitted in an atmosphere of peace, not of war and the continued occupation, as is the case now, because peace constitutes a fertile ground for success. In any event, the Arab nation will not accept what it believes poses a threat to its security and interests.

Faruq al-Shar' will arrive in Lisbon tomorrow, Saturday, where he will meet with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. The two ministers will discuss efforts under way to convene a conference for peace in the Middle East. Al-Shar' will also meet with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who is visiting Portugal.

Newspapers View American Arms Control Plan

JN0206074791 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0330 GMT 2 Jun 91

[Press review]

[Text] Under the headline "Who Works for Peace and Who Works Against It?" the newspaper AL-BA'TH affirms in its editorial today that the Middle East region needs peace much more than weapons. The attainment of peace will provide a suitable climate for eliminating weapons rather than stockpiling them, the paper adds.

AL-BA'TH calls for making serious and real efforts to lay the groundwork that will help the region attain peace, rather than the opposite. AL-BA'TH goes on to say: As is clear to all, Israel does not want a true peace in the region. This is because there is no doubt that it views true peace as something that moves against its objectives and expansionist schemes which it advocates and insists on implementing, the objectives and schemes regarding the establishment of a greater Israel extending from the Euphrates to the Nile. Everybody should know that Israel is currently preoccupied with two key issues—namely, bringing in the largest number of Jews to occupied Palestine and settling them in the occupied Arab territories, and the acquisition of sophisticated weaponry as well as the funds required to manufacture weapons, either individually or through joint endeavors with others. It goes without saying that such orientations can in no way fall in line with what is being said here or there about the need for a convocation of a peace conference that would resolve regional problems once and for all.

Concluding its editorial, AL-BA'TH says: While speaking of peace and the need for it, we should note here that

arming Israel in this open manner certainly does not serve the peace process. This encourages Israel to adopt a more intransigent stand. We do not rule out the possibility that Israel might exploit this situation to launch a new military action against the Arab nation. And here we would like to point out that he who wants a just peace in the region should apply what needs to be applied against Israel to make it succumb to international resolutions and international legitimacy.

The newspaper TISHRIN comments on the same issue and says: Undoubtedly, the attainment of a just and comprehensive peace in the region constitutes a strong and objective foundation for ending all manifestations of tension and turmoil, which if the peace process fails to be advanced, will overpower the quiet and cause the situation to explode and thus increase the chances of war. There can be no middle ground between peace and war. Peace cannot be established as long as the Israeli occupation is maintained and as long as the Israeli complications and no's, which are numerous, are maintained to torpedo the current international efforts, out of a rejectionist approach opposing peace.

In its editorial, TISHRIN points out that the American ideas on arms control consecrate the Israeli superiority and tip the balance of power in favor of the Israeli expansionist drive, especially considering that Israel produces and stores conventional as well as nonconventional weapons. It is clear here that the failure to tackle the crux and essence of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which is the Israeli occupation and its dismantlement on the one hand and the restoration of the Palestinian people's rights on the other, will not ensure the success of the peace process which must consider ways to deter the Israeli aggressor and curb his terrorist and racist practices, the paper adds.

Concluding its editorial, TISHRIN says: Out of a strong eagerness to achieve peace, Syria which espouses the clearest positions, has affirmed that it will be more realistic, fairer, and beneficial for the international community if efforts are made to achieve peace in the region on the basis of UN resolutions, since this would consequently lead to eliminating weapons and the dangers that they pose.

Under the headline "Only Peace Produces Arms Reduction," the newspaper AL-THAWRAH says in one of its commentaries that the American ideas on arms control in the region cause immense harm to Arab interests. Also, these ideas pose long-term dangers to the Arab nation's pan-Arab security at present and in the future. Moreover, these ideas will enhance the Israeli military superiority, quantitatively and qualitatively speaking, the paper adds.

AL-THAWRAH goes on to say: Therefore, everybody believes that these American ideas are ill-timed. This is because the world efforts, especially those made by the United States, currently focus on launching a settlement process in the region to achieve a just, comprehensive, and durable peace for the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestine question on the basis of the relevant UN resolutions in general, and UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 in particular.

Concluding its commentary, AL-THAWRAH says: Therefore, the U.S. Administration should have redoubled efforts and intensified contacts to launch a process aimed at achieving a just regional settlement based on a complete Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and

the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to self-determination. Only a just and comprehensive peace can reduce arms and the dangers they pose.

GENERAL

Bush Mideast Arms Control Initiative Cited

*LD3005084191 Moscow TASS in English 0807 GMT
30 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Aleksey Berezhkov and Pavel Vanichkin]

[Text] Washington, May 30 (TASS)—U.S. President George Bush, speaking before graduates of the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs on Wednesday, proposed several major initiatives on arms control in the Middle East.

“We are committed to stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction,” Bush said.

“But there is a danger that despite our efforts, by the end of this century nearly two dozen developing nations could have ballistic missiles. Many already have nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons programmes,” he said.

“Nowhere are the dangers of weapons proliferation more urgent than in the Middle East,” he said.

The essence of Bush’s proposals was clarified in a White House press release circulated on Wednesday.

The United States called on Israel and all Arab states to introduce a verifiable ban on the production and purchasing of materials used in nuclear weapons production, sign a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and subject all nuclear facilities in the region to international control.

The United States supports the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the region, the document said.

Middle Eastern countries should be among the first to sign a convention banning chemical arms and comply with the ban even before the convention is signed, Washington believes.

The United States called for stepping up the regime banning biological weapons and urged the countries in the region to pass confidence-building measures on the issue.

It suggested that Middle Eastern countries freeze the purchase, production and testing of land-to-land missiles.

The United States called on Great Britain, China, the Soviet Union and France, who together with the United States are the largest exporters of weapons to the region, to hold high level meetings in the nearest future to discuss measures to curb the delivery of conventional weapons and mass destruction weapons and corresponding technology to the Middle East.

Karpov on INF, CFE, START, Naval Arms, CW, Military Budgets

*LD3005203991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program
Radio-1 Network in Russian 1230 GMT 30 May 91*

[Interview with V.P. Karpov, deputy foreign minister, by Vladimir Pasko, from the “Point of View” program—live

or recorded; following is a longer version of the interview with Karpov published on page 1 of the 31 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

[Text] [Pasko] Good day comrades. Tomorrow, 31 May, is the last day of action within the U.S.-USSR treaty on liquidation of medium and short-range missiles.

It is hard to name an agreement in the field of arms control about which as many lofty words have been said as have been pronounced with regard to the treaty on medium- and short-range missiles [INF], from the moment of its signing in December 1987. Unlike all the others, which merely limited the increase in nuclear confrontation, this treaty meant that the numbers of nuclear weapons were cut. The treaty was rightfully described as a breakthrough in the field of nuclear disarmament. We can say today that this breakthrough has happened. More than that, after the Paris treaty on conventional weapons in Europe [CFE], we can also say that this breakthrough was not a one-time, fortuitous, or isolated event.

European countries and the United States, as well as our country, are trying to get rid of an excess of weapons. All this has prompted us to arrange a new meeting with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Karpov, one of the leading experts in the sphere of arms control.

Viktor Pavlovich, the report on the progress of negotiations on arms control evokes many questions. The first question I would like to ask you is about the progress of talks in Vienna and Geneva. Can one expect new breakthroughs in curbing the arms race in the near future? If the answer is yes, then in what directions?

[Karpov] As for Vienna, one must recognize the fact that currently, the center of gravity is not one on negotiations themselves, on their next stage, but the implementation of the Paris treaty on conventional weapons in Europe, which was concluded as a result of the Vienna talks. Differences emerged between our country and other participants of the treaty with regard to Article 3, namely, what is covered by the treaty and what is not. In particular, a question has come up about the armament of the marines of the Soviet Union as part of those ground forces which, in the opinion of others involved in the treaty, should be included in the total balance. There is now a possibility of removing this disagreement, and I think that the forthcoming meeting in Lisbon between the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the U.S. secretary of state will be the very forum at which it will be possible to find mutual understanding with the United States, and then with other signatories of the treaty. The solution of this question will, as it were, clear away the obstructions that have come up on the road to progress at the Vienna talks, and on the road of talks on strategic offensive weapons [START].

There is currently a break in the Vienna talks, but one can say that when talks are resumed, the main attention will be devoted to issues of cuts in the personnel of armed forces of the European states—which are taking place in negotiations—on the one hand, and confidence-building measures on the other, the next stage in confidence-building between 34 participants of the pan-European process. This

is the European area. As for strategic offensive weapons, until recently the failure to agree on some questions connected with the fulfillment of the conventional weapons treaty in actual fact led to the talks being drawn out in Geneva by the U.S. side.

Now in connection with progress in solving issues of conventional arms, we have seen progress there, too—movement toward stepping it up. A qualitatively and quantitatively good start has been made, and discussion now is concentrating mainly on solving questions of a technical nature. These talks could easily be completed in the next month or two, polishing off sections and putting the text—which amounts to over 700 pages; this is not a simple task either—into its final version, get it all to harmonize, and to present it to governments for confirmation.

[Pasko] Viktor Pavlovich, in diplomacy, the practice of linkage is nothing new. As far as I understand, this is one way of putting on pressure, with the aim of solving some question or another for one's own advantage, of insisting on one's own point. The question arises: does this mean that the United States has less interest than we do in this treaty, or are they here gambling on the belief that the missiles aimed toward the United States will never be launched?

[Karpov] In 1971 a treaty was concluded between us on preventing nuclear war from starting by accident. One of the clauses in the first article was precisely this: that the parties have the obligation to take all the necessary measures to see that, (?God forbid), no missile should be launched without the sanction of the leadership. The leadership takes as its starting point the fact that there must not be a war between the United States and the Soviet Union, neither nuclear nor conventional. We agreed on this at the very highest level. Now we are talking about how, at the talks on strategic weapons, we are to guarantee a balance of force and of interests of both sides, such that the very stimulus to increase the number of weapons, to increase their destructive force, and of course to use them, should be ruled out. That is the main idea.

[Pasko] So you rule out the idea that there is some linkage?

[Karpov] There is a linkage, but linkage based not on the fact that the United States has less interest in solving these questions, but a (?statistical) linkage, because the main thing—and here you can understand the interest of the United States and other Western countries—their main interest is to limit conventional armed forces in Europe. Why? Because in Europe, since the end of World War II in its very center, there was the huge armored tank fist of the Soviet Army, which hung over the whole of western Europe. The elimination of this fist, which in essence is an offensive one, is the main interest of the Europeans in discussing the questions of conventional weapons.

We have now started getting rid of this fist. But we are being forced to do this by objective conditions: the unification of Germany, the new spirit in the countries in Eastern Europe, their withdrawal, in fact, from the

Warsaw Pact—and indeed since 1 April the military organization of the Warsaw Pact has no longer existed. All these new factors must be taken into account by us, and we are doing so.

The West sensed that we can come to common agreements with regard to conventional weapons cuts, both on the part of NATO, and on the part of the Soviet Union and countries of eastern Europe which would lead to a more stable Europe, which could actually ensure a situation in the future whereby neither the West nor the East can use their armed forces to start a wide-scale offensive. With this in view one can understand why the West is so interested in implementing this aspect of negotiations first and foremost. We are also interested. You see, we cannot afford to keep the army we have had so far. We must ensure our security in some other ways, based on accords on setting up a system of collective security in Europe, through bilateral agreements with European countries, which would also lead to the improvement of the security system in Europe. Economic integration should also guarantee that there would be no return to a hostile bipolar, so to speak, peace in Europe.

This is where we see the linkage—which exists even objectively—that was used by the West to hold back the question of strategic weapons until the questions on conventional ones had been solved.

[Pasko] We have removed the abcess existing in the ground forces in Europe, but an imbalance remains in the Navy. What is to happen here?

[Karpov] In proportion, as the ground forces are reduced, the role of naval forces of course increases, and the role of the U.S. forces, the Navy first and foremost, as the largest, increases accordingly.

But let us look at the role and aims that the Americans themselves attribute to their naval forces. The United States is integrated into the world economy far more than we are. They have economic interests in many areas of the world. The lines of communication, of sea transport routes, are one of the most vulnerable elements of the U.S. economy. If the sea supply routes to the United States are cut, the U.S. economy could suffocate. So the U.S. Navy, to a great extent, is oriented toward that, toward protecting the interests of the United States in the Third World, and defending its lines of communication. One example is the Persian Gulf, where indeed the U.S. Navy played one of the main roles in that conflict. We will continue our efforts to bring the West into the talks on naval armaments, too, in order to remove some elements that are characteristic of naval forces now, which could threaten peace. First and foremost this means the existence of nuclear weapons, tactical nuclear weapons, on board ships.

We recently proposed such talks to the United States. It is true that their attitude to this was not enthusiastic, but we are ready to remove all tactical nuclear weapons from the navies of the United States and of the Soviet Union, and then to bring in other countries to take part in an agreement of this sort.

With such a measure it would be possible to reduce very greatly the military power of the fleets, which is now a factor in the balance of forces between the USSR and the West. So we will continue our policy here, but it must be said that already now, in connection with the conclusion of the treaty on conventional weapons, interest in increasing the capacity of fleets is decreasing. The United States has already sketched out a reduction in their program for reequipping their fleet. They will cut down the number of naval ships, too. So regardless of the talks, these processes have started unilaterally. I think that in the future we will manage to start talks and solve the issue of cutting fleets on a treaty basis.

[Pasko] Viktor Pavlovich, on the subject of the talks on arms control now being conducted, one cannot leave out what is happening with chemical weapons [CW]—all the more so as here, it seems to me, in literally the last week, new events have taken place. I mean changes in the position of the United States with regard to the question of eliminating their chemical arsenal.

[Karpov] Yes, I think that the statement of President Bush on chemical arms that you are talking about really is a serious step by the U.S. Administration, a step that could now make the talks on concluding an all-embracing convention on the elimination of chemical weapons easier. The fact that the United States has abandoned its demand to keep 500 tonnes of chemical weapons until all other states had destroyed their chemical weapons is a positive step. It lifts the fears of many of those taking part in the talks that the United States wanted to keep a chemical weapons potential regardless of whether there is or is not a convention. So this is a correct step. There remains now really one more element, where the United States should, in our opinion, show an initiative. This is the question of inspection. On this question the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and other countries take a wider-ranging, I would say, position—readiness for a wider range of inspection, inspection without refusal. Here the United States is wavering. They are hedging somewhat. If this hedging disappears, it will be possible to presume that progress in Geneva will become significantly easier.

[Pasko] Viktor Pavlovich, the question of the change in NATO strategy is very interesting. This issue is currently being discussed. There have been no conclusions, but what possibilities do you see opening up here for us, proceeding from what has been said about the new NATO strategy in the post-confrontation period?

[Karpov] I think that the phenomena which could be currently observed in NATO's activities, starting with last year's NATO Council session in London, give us grounds to believe that this process of the revision, so to speak, of the strategy, will not cease. It will continue. It all started with the USSR's announcement of its new defensive doctrine—a tendency toward developing a new strategy, a strategy of nonconfrontation, a defensive strategy. With regard to this I think that the seminar on issues of military doctrine which took place at the beginning of this year, with NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries participating, provided an additional impetus for developing positions in

this regard. I think that the treaty on conventional weapons in Europe is currently a powerful factor in favor of the revision of NATO strategy, and that emphasis on nuclear weapons, which has always been present in NATO strategy, is superfluous, so to speak, in present conditions.

One cannot count on nuclear weapons to the same extent as a counterbalance to the superiority of the Soviet Union in conventional weapons, when this superiority no longer exists. That is to say, there is a need for reconsideration. In this respect the Soviet Union's readiness—and we have already informed NATO of our readiness—to discuss what could be considered by the NATO as a minimum nuclear (?deterrence) is also one of the questions which, in future discussions between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, could help in NATO's future rethink of its strategy. It seems to me nevertheless that this strategy, though it remains basically a strategy of deterrence, including nuclear deterrence, in its gradual transformation makes it possible to hope that there will indeed be a transition from the confrontation of the above-mentioned doctrine between NATO and the Warsaw Pact to a doctrine of cooperation between two alliances, or between NATO and the Soviet Union, in the business of constructing a new European security system. In this regard it seems to me that the NATO structures, which are quite widespread, and which make it possible to function efficiently not only as a military machine but also as a political instrument for consultations, could be used, should the situation develop favorably, also as one of the instruments for constructing a new system of European security.

[Pasko] Speaking about negotiations on disarmament, we would like to see the possibilities of reductions of arms expenditure, so that they do not amount to 18 percent of gross national product, according to our press, and that this expenditure is brought down to the level maintained in the West in the 1 to 6 percent bracket. What, in your opinion, are the possibilities of our military spending being reduced to such a level?

[Karpov] I think this will depend on the progress of implementation of treaties, first and foremost, on conventional weapons, and then on strategic forces. Possibilities of reducing military spending will also depend on the general atmosphere of relations between the West and the East, since there must be guarantees that there will be no revival of the cold war and that there will be no return by NATO to the doctrine of aggression. There are many factors here. I think that one can say already that the tendency toward the reduction of military spending has begun.

Even in the current fiscal year the United States has cut its military budget, and they intend to make systematic reductions in their military budget in the next five years. So a trend in this regard has already begun.

We have in mind consultations between NATO and the Soviet Union with regard to military budgets. Such a conference, or seminar, is meeting in Brussels on 12 June, attended by our specialists and ones from NATO, and it will analyze the military budgets and methodology and

compare military budgets. This will make it possible for us to raise more actively in the future the question of cutting military spending in both the NATO countries and our own, when we are going along the path of cutting the armed forces of NATO and the Soviet Union.

[Pasko] Viktor Pavlovich, its own interests lie at the basis of the policy of any state. Of course we would like to peer ahead, into the future, and see how things will progress with us and the United States, and the West as a whole, in the area of disarmament. How far do the interests of the United States and of the West now coincide with our own?

[Karpov] Well, I think that first of all we and the United States, and the West as a whole, have a common interest in maintaining stability in the world, and ruling out the sort of crisis phenomena that could threaten peace. It was for precisely this reason that the crisis in the Persian Gulf aroused such a unanimous reaction from both the West and from us. This crisis situation, and the methods that were found to solve it, in the framework of the United Nations, are indicative of the fact that the interests of preserving stability in the world, of excluding dangerous crises fraught with the threat of war, is a common interest, ours and the West's.

This interest dictates new factors in cooperation, too—for example, in the military sphere, between the United States and the Soviet Union. We have an agreement on averting dangerous military activity by the armed forces of the United States and Soviet Union that could give rise to incidents. We intend to develop our cooperation through our general staffs, and through our armed forces as a whole, so that our military men should know each other better, be able to understand what is happening in the United States and—vice versa—what is happening in the Soviet Union. This process has started. We have a common interest in preserving peace and security. This is probably the main thing.

As for disagreements, of course we do have such disagreements. They are there as a result of objective causes. In some places—in third countries—they even clash. But it must be said that recently the main spring, I would call it, has been removed: the thing that pushed both the United States and the Soviet Union into contradiction, into confrontation. This is ideology. After all, previously we used to take our ideological positions as a starting point. The United States was the citadel of imperialism, and the Soviet Union was the bulwark of socialism, and confrontation between the two was inevitable. Now we have abandoned this ideological position, and really we no longer regard the United States as some sort of ideological opponent. The United States, too, now takes as its starting point the fact that there is no point in getting involved in ideological confrontation. Achieving normal interstate relations, normal economic relations, is the factor that makes it possible to remove the extraneous baggage that used to exist in our relations with the United States, and with other countries of the West, too.

[Pasko] Both the Western press and some of our publications have been noting that Soviet-U.S. relations have

experienced a period of stagnation over recent months. It was explained by the fact that the situation in the Soviet Union is not clear to Americans. A question arises here about the link between the progress in the sphere of disarmament and the situation in our country. How strong is the influence of the situation in our country on the progress of talks, from your point of view, the person who is directly involved in talks daily?

[Karpov] There is of course a direct link between the two. The West closely watches the development of the situation in the Soviet Union, and notes the slightest nuances of changes in any direction. The period of uncertainty you mentioned did not remain unnoticed in the West. I think that it is this uncertainty, and the uncertainty from their point of view of the position of the president of the Soviet Union, that showed. Their question, and which they kept asking us, was whether Gorbachev has the necessary powers to conclude treaties and ensure their implementation. At present, I think the situation has changed. I think that the Nine plus One statement that was recently achieved can be a crucial moment in the development of our own interpolitical situation. The West, I think, assesses it exactly the same way. So one can count on animation—of contacts, animation of talks—though I think there is still an element of waiting to see whether Gorbachev will succeed in stabilizing the situation in the country. This is a very serious factor, which is taken into account in the West.

[Pasko] That is to say, our foreign affairs now are being decided more here, inside the country?

[Karpov] Well, I would put it like this, that there is an objective relationship. On the one hand our foreign policy gives us the chance to ensure the backup as far as our internal life is concerned, and on the other hand a stable situation inside the country ensures the backup which is essential for foreign policy. That is the interconnection between them. It has objectively always existed, and we cannot get away from it.

[Pasko] Thank you very much.

TASS Cites Bush on Progress on CFE, START

*LD0206095891 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT
2 Jun 91*

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev]

[Text] Washington, June 2 (TASS)—The resolving of differences between the United States and the Soviet Union on the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) treaty is an important step towards a superpower summit, President George Bush said in an address to the graduating class of West Point, the Army's academy, on Saturday.

He highly appreciated the talks in Lisbon between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, during which a wide range of issues, including arms control, were discussed.

Later, the President told reporters aboard Air Force One that the U.S.-Soviet work in Lisbon was important for both world peace and for the entire spectrum of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Touching upon the preparation of a Soviet-U.S. treaty on reducing and limiting strategic offensive arms, known as START, Bush noted very close positions of the negotiating sides and that he intended to tell his negotiators to "lean forward as far as possible." He said he understood Gorbachev had told his team the same.

"We have seen that we can overcome difficulties. Our experts now can go forward and I can assure the Soviets that I will instruct our experts to lean forward as far as possible and I think, as I remember, he told me the same thing," Bush said.

He voiced hope that the START treaty would be signed during the forthcoming summit.

START TALKS

U.S. Said Seeking Unfair Advantage in Talks

91WC0111A Moscow ROSSIYA in Russian No 14, 6-12 Apr 91 p 6

[Article by Vadim Kozyulin: "In the Shadow of Events: Small Large Suspicions." ROSSIYA identifies itself as the "newspaper of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium."]

[Text] *Agreement on Strategic Offensive Arms [START]*

The parties are discussing a 50 percent reduction in the strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the United States over a five-year period: In terms of delivery systems to a level of 1,600 units and in terms of nuclear weapons to a level of 6,000 units. The agreement covers several strategic weapons systems: Land-based, air-launched and sea-launched, and also presumes a broad system of control.

The parties have agreed to establish marginal limits of 4,900 units for the total number of warheads for intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles within the framework of a total level of 6,000 warheads. Sublevels on heavy missiles have also been coordinated (1,540 warheads on 154 heavy missiles).

Marginal levels have been set for sea-launched long-range cruise missiles with nuclear capability outside the limits of the 6,000 warheads and 1,600 delivery systems units.

The treaty, which contains around 600 pages of text, includes the application of national technical means of control, on-site inspection, and measures based on cooperation.

START does not prohibit modernization of strategic weapons, and evidently will not contain any prohibitions against the placement of strategic defense systems in space.

The future of the Soviet-American agreement on strategic offensive arms is cloudy. Baker's last visit to Moscow introduced no clarity. When the Secretary of State departed, he left behind more questions than answers. "The main thing is that we have not rejected the efforts to

try and find a solution to the existing problems," he said to journalists. Baker has left, and the ensuing pause is evidently supposed to let Moscow understand that now, according to theatrical laws, it is [Moscow's] turn to prove its desire for disarmament. They are awaiting actions from Moscow. Moreover, they are awaiting them at the very moment when in the Kremlin, it seems, they have stopped to think: Could it be that we have gone too far?

From the very beginning of the START talks, the Soviet side viewed them sooner as an arena for winning propagandist points. The Soviet peace initiatives were aimed toward this, and it was not viewed as a great loss if they were not realized.

Progress in the talks was outlined with the birth of the "new thinking", whose promulgator on the international scene became Eduard Shevardnadze. The desire to prove our affinity to all-human interests, almost to the point of altruism, convinced the world that the plan of building a world without nuclear weapons by the year 2000 was not a utopian ideal, and that the USSR's intentions were serious. On a wave of rebirth of Soviet-American relations, and not without the influence of the personal friendship of the leaders of the two countries, the INF Treaty was signed, and the START talks received a strong impetus.

At the present moment, despite the fact that the treaty is practically unprecedented in its complexity, about 98 percent of it is ready for signing. The director of the U. S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Ronald Lehman noted recently that the United States "is close to the realization of its goals in the START talks". Only a few questions remain to be resolved, and it is unlikely that they specifically have become the reason for the hold-up. In principle, if both sides wanted, the treaty could already be signed tomorrow.

What, then, is hindering the signing of the almost finished document? Baker admitted that it is not Moscow, but Washington which is blocking the conclusion of the agreement. Washington has an entire set of reasons for this. On 6 February, speaking before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on International Affairs, Baker noted that although the agreements on conventional weapons in Europe and on START are not formally tied together, the problems arising with the fulfillment of the former undermine the trust and "significantly hinder the conclusion of the other treaty".

Ratification of the Paris agreement is today under threat of a breakdown: The United States is presenting serious pretensions to the USSR. First of all, the West views the shift of military technology from Europe to the Urals as a treaty violation. Secondly, the transfer of three divisions of Soviet land forces, which are subject to reduction, to the coastal defense, which is not subject to reduction, also supposedly contradicts the letter of the agreement. Moscow explains this as a difference in the interpretation of the treaty. However, the USSR is not supported by a single participant in the Paris conference, including the former members of the Warsaw Pact Organization.

Therefore, recalling other "little tricks" by the USSR and considering the fact that it will be much more difficult to control the START than the Paris agreement, the United States justly expects proof of the fact that the Soviet Union can be trusted. Especially since, evidently, the agreement will be based largely on word of honor.

Bush himself has lost interest in START after the difficulties in the USSR became obvious, and the test launches of anti-missile systems showed that the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] promises to become a reliable shield against any missile aggression. The successful downing of the Soviet-made Iraqi missiles will evidently shatter the last Soviet arguments against development of the "Star Wars" program. The "Patriot" is the President's trump card on this question, and it covers the objections of those who are most disagreeable.

Today Bush is backed not only by NATO, but also by the anti-Iraqi coalition, and this allows him not to agree, but to dictate. The Soviet side today also has many reasons for thoughts of a geopolitical scale. The basic principles of START were discussed at a time when there was still opposition between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Today, when the Warsaw Pact no longer exists, we should hardly count the armaments of our former allies as a plus for our side. The balance of power has changed significantly, but the draft of the agreement remains the same. In concluding the INF Treaty, the Soviet side agreed to significant concessions. Since that time, the Americans have used this precedent and insist on asymmetrical reduction: That was the case with conventional weapons in Europe, and this principle is laid down as the basis for START.

In fulfilling the Paris agreement, the United States sold Turkey, a NATO partner, 3,000 tanks which were being withdrawn from Europe. The Soviet military tried to hide its technology beyond the Urals, but instead received an international scandal. Moreover, after the realization of the Paris agreement, NATO will surpass the USSR in aviation by three times, and in the size of its navy—by five times. And now, when by a new agreement we are preparing to destroy our best weapons and are expanding a program of conversion, in the U.S. Congress there are remarks such as: "The benefits of START will not be realized if we do not implement modernization of each type of weapon in our strategic triad".

This concerns not only military men, but also politicians. Our international authority has long been upheld by our military might. While we were strong, we were a force to be reckoned with. Today almost three-fourths of the Americans believe that the Japanese military might presents a greater danger to the United States than the "Soviet threat". This is evidenced by the results of a public opinion survey conducted by the Louis Harris Service for the American weekly BUSINESS WEEK.

They are not afraid of us anymore. We have long fought for this, but now that this fact has come to pass, it frightens us. The American President is too cool, and world public opinion is just as critical as before. And the long-forgotten

doubts spring from the depths of our soul: Did we make a mistake with the "new thinking"? Did we depend too much on mutuality?

However, the West does not wish to disperse our doubts and pedantically points a finger at the paragraph. "We will continue to exert pressure on the Soviet Union for the purpose of forcing it to fulfill Article III of the treaty", Ronald Lehman announces in Congress.

The United States is cautiously observing the growth of conservative sentiments in the USSR. Yet the Soviet leaders painfully sense that Soviet influence in the world is melting away, and that their American colleagues are acting ever more forcefully.

The shadow of mistrust has fallen between the agreeing parties. "Perhaps it was an illusion?", they both thought.

SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

U.S. Said To Consider Ground-Based ABM System

*PM3005113091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 May 91 First Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "1,200 Missiles to the Launch Pads!"]

[Text] New York, 27 May—The White House and influential U.S. legislators are discussing a plan to create a land-based ABM system capable of defending U.S. territory against a limited missile strike, NEWSWEEK reports. Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and L. Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, support this.

It is envisioned that 1,200 ground-launched interceptor missiles would be sited at six complexes in various regions of the United States. It is planned to deploy the first such complex at Grand Forks (North Dakota). And, as the magazine points out, the 1972 ABM Treaty will have to be amended if the new plan is to be implemented.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Last SS-20 Launching Pad Scrapped

*LD2805191591 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT
28 May 91*

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Viktor Mazany]

[Text] Kiev, May 28 (TASS)—The last RSD-10 launching pad has been scrapped in the city of Sarny in the western Ukrainian Rovno region. According to the Soviet-American Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter range missiles, Soviet troops dismantled launching pads and means of transportation of Soviet missiles called SS-20 in the West. A total of 509 installations have been scrapped under the watchful eyes of U.S. inspectors.

The last operation was watched with great interest by American and Soviet servicemen and members of the

public who converged on Sarny to see Soviet soldiers detach parts from the last launching installation and despatch them for further dismantling, and then use a plasmatron, developed at the Paton electrical welding institute in the Ukraine, to cut off within minutes that part of the six-axial truck which carried the device for putting missiles in a starting position. The truck was thus turned in a common tractor, capable of supporting a heavy crane. Small-size diesel electricity generators removed from the launching installation will also be used for peaceful purposes in the economy.

"We have no regrets in scrapping the installation," Colonel Yevgeniy Kozlov, who supervised the operation, told TASS. "We understand that what we are doing brings relief to the whole world. What we are doing is also setting a pattern for further actions in the disarmament field."

This view is shared by U.S. Major-General Robert Parker, who heads the U.S. local [as received] inspection agency. Parker pointed out that the act could be regarded as a historic event in the movement of both nations towards the elimination of the threat of war. He said he was proud to see that the elimination process was proceeding in strict accordance with the INF treaty provisions. He called it the two countries' joint victory. He said the two countries showed most vividly that agreements of this kind were plausible and effective. They are a tool with which to strengthen confidence in a peaceful future.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Conservatives Threaten To Stop FRG Withdrawal *LD2905090491 Berlin ADN in German 0300 GMT 29 May 91*

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—Right-wing members of the Russian military, the KGB, and nationalists demand not DM13 billion, as agreed in the treaty, but DM35 billion to finance the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Germany, the Berlin magazine EXTRA MAGAZIN reports in its latest edition. According to "Soyuz" Movement Chairman Colonel Viktor Alksnis, this figure is reached by adding the value of the barracks, exercise areas, and air bases that the troops will vacate. If Bonn does not want to pay, the military's archconservative members threaten to stop the withdrawal. According to EXTRA MAGAZIN, Viktor Alksnis, who is regarded by his opponents as a Pinochet of the East, believes there was a conspiracy against Honecker which brought about his fall. He demands a trial against former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Aleksandr Yakovlev, formerly responsible for international affairs in the Politburo.

Norway's Holst Charges Kola Deployments Violate CFE

PM3005141091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 May 91 First Edition p 5

[IAN correspondent V. Ilyashevich report: "Demarche Before the Visit—Will the Norwegians Sign the Treaty on Arms Reductions?"]

[Text] Helsinki—Norway will not sign the Conventional Forces in Europe [CFE] Treaty if the Soviet Union continues military preparations in the Kola Peninsula. As the Finnish newspaper HELSINGIN SANOMAT reports, such is the view of Norwegian Defense Minister Jorgen Holst. In the minister's opinion, the Soviet Union is allegedly participating in talks on arms reductions in Europe while at the same time increasing its military presence in the Kola Peninsula near the Norwegian and Finnish borders. The issue centers on the USSR's alleged efforts to exempt some of its ground forces from the agreement by putting them under naval command. What is more, as the Norwegians see it, amphibious assault force units should also be the subject of talks and be reduced. If the United States and the Soviet Union do not arrive at a common decision soon on the question of existing differences of opinion then, in Holst's words, Norway, which is a member of NATO, will itself raise these questions during USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Oslo. As we know, the Soviet leader intends to visit the country 5 June to participate in the Nobel Peace Prize awards ceremony.

Evidently the Norwegian Government member thought it appropriate to express "military" grievances on the threshold of the visit by the Nobel Prize winner, M.S. Gorbachev. Incidentally, very recently the Scandinavian and Finnish media recounted in detail the facts that have become known regarding secret activities by Norway's Armed Forces on Finnish territory in the postwar years. In Urho Kaleva Kekkonen's unpublished diary notes, information was discovered relating to the fact that at the end of the 1940's and beginning of the 1950's the Norwegians established a network of secret weapons and ammunition dumps in Finnish Lapland and also recruited Finnish servicemen to spy in USSR regions adjacent to Norway.

Ladygin Rejects Norwegian Claim of CFE Violation

LD3005133791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] A spokesman for the Soviet General Staff, General Fedor Ladygin, has told a Radio Moscow correspondent that there are two Soviet tank battalions in the regions bordering on Norway. There are no T-80 tanks in mothballs around Pechenga. In all, there are 171 Soviet tanks in the border area compared to 205 Norwegian tanks.

These figures give the lie to claims in the Norwegian news media that the Soviet Union refuses to observe the treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe [CFE] and to keep the proper levels.

Withdrawal From Hungary Ahead of Schedule

LD3105111291 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 31 May 91

[By correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, May 31 (TASS)—The Soviet Union will complete the withdrawal of its troops from Hungary several days before the deadline of June 30, according to

Deputy Chief of the Main Department of the Soviet General Staff Major General Vladimir Zhurbenko.

A little more than 1,500 Soviet troops and five weapons systems remain in Hungary, Zhurbenko told TASS today, commenting on the beginning of the final stage of the pull-out.

More than 14,000 troops, 214 tanks, 189 armoured vehicles, 683 artillery systems and 111 aircraft have been withdrawn from Hungary since January 1, 1991, he said.

The Soviet pull-out from Czechoslovakia is also proceeding on schedule.

"There is practically no combat hardware left there and just 1,400 troops who will leave the country by June 30," Zhurbenko said.

NUCLEAR TESTING

Debate on Semipalatinsk Nuclear Site

OW2905082591 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 19 May 91

[Video report by G. Sytykh; from the "Utro 120 + 30" program]

[Text] The Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Site has been silent for the past year and a half. Testing has been discontinued temporarily, by popular demand. To be more exact, suspended. But, the acute problems connected with this test site remain unresolved. They are the subject of our correspondent Gennadiy Sytykh's report. [video shows an open grassy field and some rusting girders]

[Begin recording] [Sytykh] This land has known no peace since 1949. Initially, the detonations were in the open, on the surface and in the air. This was particularly dangerous, like Hiroshima, only considerably more powerful. What about the people who lived nearby? [video cuts to Sytykh standing beside a truck in the open field, reading from several sheets of paper]

Here is a statement by an eyewitness, Selimbekov: On the eve of the test, the population of the Abayskiy and (Abrolinskiy) rayons were evacuated 200 to 250 kilometers from the test site. Forty of us were separated from the rest and left in the village of Karaul—this is not far from the test site. We saw the flash of the nuclear bomb, the huge mushroom-shaped cloud, felt the shock wave, and never even suspected how harmful it could be to our health. Two hours after the blast, the military took us to the mountains. There, they examined us with instruments. We were kept under observation for a long time." [video cuts to an open field with cables running to, and disappearing into, what appears to be an underground entrance; a short mast-like object protrudes from the ground]

Now that a more or less safe technology has been found, for nearly three decades, nuclear devices have been detonated at a great depth underground. Here is the site of one such test blast. [video shows close-up of the mast-like marker, then cuts to the city of Kurchatov and Sytykh

talking with Major General Fedor Fedorovich Safonov, deputy chief of the test site, examining a radiation dosimeter in city surroundings]

Not far away is the city of Kurchatov, where the researchers themselves live. The radiation level is normal. The instrument shows normal background radiation levels, 10 micro-roentgens per hour. [Video cuts to Sytykh interviewing Maj. Gen. Safonov at the test site]

Well, Fedor Fedorovich, we are at the test site. What reading does the dosimeter show?

[Safonov] Fourteen micro-roentgens.

[Sytykh] Let us equate it with the standard, what would that be?

[Safonov] Well, if we speak of standards, then in the territory of the Soviet Union, 4 to 20 micro-roentgens is considered normal.

[Sytykh] In other words, that is a safe level of radiation.

[Safonov] Yes, a safe level of radiation. Now, in principle, in accordance with radiation safety standards, living is permitted in territories with levels of up to 60 micro-roentgens per hour.

[Sytykh] When the test site is in operation, does this level remain constant, or are there peaks from time to time when the radiation level rises?

[Safonov] There are occasions when the radiation level increases when gasses are released, but that is for short distances, and in very small quantities.

[Sytykh] Is it dangerous to health?

[Safonov] No, of course not. [video cuts to Sytykh interviewing B. Gusev, chief physician of the Semipalatinsk Radiation Dispensary, candidate of medical sciences]

[Gusev] I can agree with General Safonov—I respect him and his opinions very much—that the majority of underground nuclear explosions, from the standpoint of radioactive contamination of the area, do not upset the radiology or have any kind of harmful effect on the health of the people. But I must point out that this concerns the majority of explosions, not all of them.

[Sytykh] How do you explain the fact that statistics tell us that, in certain categories of serious illness, Semipalatinsk Oblast ranks only fifth, and that everything here is supposedly alright?

[Gusev] An interesting question. The fact is that there was, and continues to be, controversy over this issue. So much so, that the Institute of Biophysics is even developing alternative concepts of our view that cancer—carcinogenic diseases are the gravest, the most serious long-term consequences of radiation damage—has not been affected by radiation. The fact is that ordinary statistics to which Fedor Fedorovich Safonov refers, take into consideration the aggregate population living in the region of Semipalatinsk Oblast.

If we separate the wheat from the chaff, so to speak, form separate groups of the irradiated population—children born from irradiated parents and who themselves have been irradiated, children born from irradiated parents who have not been irradiated themselves—and control groups, then the picture of carcinogenic diseases—let us speak only about this illness—changes drastically. Among people who were irradiated—true, these investigations covered only a small category of people, a small contingent of people—the cancer rate, over 30 years of our observation, was 40 percent higher. [Video cuts to Sytykh interviewing Maj. Gen. Safonov]

[Safonov] I consider underground testing is ecologically harmless. The only thing which should be done here is to reduce the yield of warheads being tested. They should be less than 150 [kilotons]. [Video cuts to Sytykh interviewing K. Boztayev, chairman of the Semipalatinsk Oblast Soviet and first secretary of the oblast committee of the Kazakhstan Communist Party]

[Boztayev] This issue has been examined for the past two years. I can say that we are now at the final stage. Currently, the republic on the one side, and the military industrial complex on the other, are examining schemes to stop nuclear testing at the Semipalatinsk Test Site. I think this will be acceptable to us and to the military industrial complex. True, we are still divided on details. I think the near future will show... [changes thought] that this issue will be finalized in the near future. Now, I consider the issue of ending nuclear testing, has been predecided. There is another issue now. That is the elimination of the consequences of nuclear testing and the health of the population.

[Sytykh] Do you consider more investigative work and more commissions are needed to clarify, once and for all, the consequences of nuclear testing, its effects on health, and to specify measures to somehow eliminate them?

[Boztayev] No commissions are necessary. Six commissions have worked over the past two years. The materials are available. What we need to do now is to develop a program on the basis of the material we have now, and material which the military industrial complex must yet provide. [Video cuts to Sytykh interviewing T. Guseva, first secretary of the Kurchatov City Committee of the Kazakhstan Communist Party and an unidentified man]

[Sytykh] The test site has been silent for the past one and a half years. I think there must have been some changes wrought in the collective?

[Guseva] Naturally, and quite substantial ones. The number of people is being reduced. There are organizations which have been reduced to where only 30 percent of the people remain in them.

[Sytykh] What is the fate of the people who have left?

[Guseva] Complicated. Many of those who have left here now are scattered in many places in the Union and are working in jobs outside their fields. Those who have remained—highly qualified specialists, for example,

involved in electrical engineering—are making cages for fur breeding farms. We have cases like that.

[Sytykh] It is disappointing...

[Guseva, interrupting] Yes, very disappointing.

[Sytykh] ...to use people in such a way.

[Guseva] Very disappointing; therefore, the quicker the issue of the test site is decided—what will happen to it, and where it goes—the quicker the fate of these people will be decided. [Video cuts to Sytykh interviewing Maj. Gen. Safonov]

[Safonov] Two rayons of the Semipalatinsk Oblast have been subjected to radiation [dozovaya nagruzka] from the first nuclear explosion in 1949, and from the first thermo-nuclear blast. I think these people should receive the larger part of compensation. Compensation could be in rubles, or it could be mainly in the form of improving the standard of living of these people. [video cuts to a diagnostic laboratory, containing a variety of modern medical equipment]

[Sytykh] Of course, a program of compensation and health measures demands substantial expenditure. Since the nuclear shield was created for the whole state, the expenditure for this program, particularly for the improvement in medical services, must be borne mutually and not only by Semipalatinsk Oblast. As elsewhere, there is a shortage of treatment facilities here. However, at the initiative of the oblast leadership, all possible measures nonetheless are being taken and health work has begun. A children's rehabilitation center and a diagnostic center have been built in Semipalatinsk. [video cuts to Sytykh interviewing an unidentified official]

[Official] Our resources are not infinite. Of course, we pay more attention to the child population. Physically, we simply cannot offer such help to adults, because, what hinders us at present is that we do not have sufficient resources to allow us to provide additional rooms where we could have an outpatients' service. Out-patients' services would be particularly useful for this category of patient. So, the question of constructing an additional building for us is currently being decided. [video cuts to medical personnel examining a child with the aid of electronic equipment]

We find that practically every one coming to us for examination is ill. Unfortunately, there is a high percentage of malignancies among them, and a weakening of the immune system among children. [end recording]

Such is the bundle of military, scientific, social, and medical problems surrounding the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Site. Of course, these problems are complex, but they need to be solved. You are aware that there is a Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement. This movement is headed by writer Olzhas Suleymenov, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. So, the representatives of this movement intend to appeal to the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet with a proposal to organize a regional referendum among the populations of rayons which adjoin the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Site, on the issue of the three remaining

nuclear explosions planned for this test site. The proposal to conduct the explosions came from Dmitriy Yazov, the USSR minister of defense, and Vladimir Konovalov, the USSR minister of atomic power and industry. This was announced by Olzhas Suleymenov, president of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement.

Gorbachev To Address Semipalatinsk Test Site Controversy

LD2805165891 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 28 May 91

[Excerpts] Moscow, May 28 (TASS)—President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Kazakhstan, which began today, is a "very businesslike" visit, which "completes the analysis" of the state of the country's agriculture and "the current stage of agricultural work in Kazakhstan," presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today. [passage omitted]

Ignatenko said the Kazakhstan parliament decided to close the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site, and the centre has so far failed to react to this decision.

Addressing Gorbachev's position on the issue, Ignatenko confirmed that this is a "very important and alarming issue." Ignatenko said he expected that during the visit, "there will be time and reasons for discussing the issue seriously."

Semipalatinsk Range To Be Reprofiled

LD3005150191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Alma-Ata, 30 May (TASS)—On his visit to Kazakhstan, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has revealed that the Soviet leadership plans to reprofile the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing range into a scientific research center.

Answering questions from the participants in the meeting, the Soviet leader recalled that nuclear tests have not been

carried out at this testing range for one and a half years. "We have a plan to reprofile this testing range and turn it into a scientific research center," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "We shall do everything to avoid a blast at this testing range," he continued. At the same time the USSR president pointed out that "if the situation requires this we will limit ourselves exclusively to one or two tests."

Official on Joint Tests, Future of Semipalatinsk

LD3005142191 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 30 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Pavlov]

[Text] Barnaul, May 30 (TASS)—Soviet Deputy Minister of the Nuclear Power-Generating Industry Viktor Mikhaylov did not rule out the possibility of conducting, jointly with the United States, two small-scale nuclear explosions to test verification methods. "However, the final decision on this issue is yet to be made. Normal and businesslike negotiations are being conducted in the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR," Mikhaylov told a group of journalists from Altay, a region of Russia bordering on Kazakhstan, in a telephone interview.

In any case, Mikhaylov said, "nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test range will be halted" starting from January, 1992 and explosions planned for this year cannot be considered as nuclear weapon tests.

"Under the treaty limiting underground nuclear weapon tests, we should carry out two experiments with measurements both in the United States and by our specialists to test verification measures as a step towards further limiting and halting nuclear tests," Mikhaylov stressed.

Faced with pressure from public organisations, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the decision to terminate nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk range. The international antinuclear organisation Nevada-Semipalatinsk has been one of the most active organisations that has been pressing for the closure of the Semipalatinsk test range for several years.

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

NATO's Woerner on Potential Soviet Threat, CFE, CSCM

*PM2705081191 Madrid ABC in Spanish 17 May 91
pp 46-47*

[Interview with NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner by Ramon Luis Acuna; place and date not given]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Acuna] Mr. Secretary General, do you believe that the potential threat which the Soviet Union once constituted is a thing of the past, or do you believe that NATO should still remain alert?

[Woerner] I am tempted to reply in the affirmative to both parts of your question. On the one hand, there is no doubt that the threat of a direct attack on Europe, on the center of Europe, has virtually disappeared and is not expected to return. The withdrawal of Soviet troops will continue, and the military dissolution of the Warsaw Pact is irreversible. I can see no belligerent or hostile attitude in the Soviet hierarchy. However, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the USSR has a dominant military machine. The Soviet Union remains and will remain the strongest military power on the Eurasian continent. In view of its current—I would say almost total—state of instability, the balance of forces must continue to be maintained in order to be certain that Soviet troops will never be used against us, even if there are radical political changes in Moscow. That is, let us continue with the policy of cooperation, and even of friendship, but let us remain prudent and vigilant.

[Acuna] And the West should hasten to sign the nuclear and conventional arms reduction agreements before a turnabout occurs in the USSR. Is this not so?

[Woerner] Of course. The ratification of the nuclear agreements has not yet been completely negotiated or signed, nor has that of the conventional forces reduction [CFE] treaty, but the Soviets must respect the latter treaty and comply with its terms.

[Acuna] Were they cheating? Is it true that they moved heavy equipment to the other side of the Urals so that it would not come under the treaty and that they transferred tanks to the Navy for the same purpose?

[Woerner] Yes. They themselves have admitted this.

[Acuna] Are they prepared to retract?

[Woerner] They have proposed a compromise solution. It is not yet sufficient, but I trust and hope that we will soon surmount these obstacles. General Mikhail A. Moiseyev will be going to Washington to this end, and I am convinced that Gorbachev himself will help us reach a settlement in order to be able to ratify this nonnuclear arms reduction treaty, which seems to me extremely important. We, too, have made our negotiating proposals. [passage omitted]

[Acuna] What is your opinion of the Spanish-Italian proposal for setting up a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean [CSCM]? Could it help keep peace in the area?

[Woerner] Yes, I firmly believe so. It is a very constructive initiative which I wish success. The whole area which this body will cover is of increasing importance for the security of the whole of Europe. North Africa, the Maghreb, and the Middle East are an area in crisis, as the Gulf war showed us. It could create a threat, and we are not at all interested in waging wars or in having to defend ourselves; instead we are interested in preventing conflicts and in stabilizing this region by political, economic, and social means. That is why I give Italy and Spain's idea my full support.

[Acuna] What specific role do you assign to it?

[Woerner] It will not be a collective security organization parallel to NATO, and, moreover, it could never operate as such because the states' structures and interests are very different. It is much more useful in its cooperative aspect and in its role of resolving problems by discussing them, contributing financial aid and social plans to them, or else by establishing cultural ties and exchanges in order to prevent them. The Mediterranean should be not something that divides us but something that unites us.

[Acuna] As it happens, NATO is indeed now looking more to the south than to the east. The Mediterranean has become a hazardous place. You earlier saw dangers in it. To what are you referring?

[Woerner] The political danger par excellence is instability. There are others, such as religious fundamentalism, population growth, and the explosive social problems and inequalities. The gravest danger is the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. If you combine them all, the result causes great concern. We must work in order to defuse these dangers, but we must also put ourselves on guard and adopt the necessary measures to prevent anyone from attacking or threatening one of our member states.

[Acuna] The United States has said in the past that Libya is a potential danger. What is your opinion?

[Woerner] Let us hope that the Libyan leaders have realized that an aggressive policy will do them no good, and that they instead will display an attitude of restraint in their external relations. Let us also hope that Libya will join in the efforts made against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. [passage omitted]

[Acuna] When will the tanks which Spain has purchased in NATO countries arrive? How much do they cost? How would you describe this equipment, and what roles will it have within this organization?

[Woerner] As a result of the treaty on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe, some countries of the alliance will have to destroy a number of tanks which exceed the stipulated limits. The plan is to transfer the most modern tanks from Central Europe to the countries which have older models and for the latter to be destroyed. NATO has agreed to set up a joint fund to which all the countries will contribute in order to meet the necessary transfer and destruction costs. As regards the arrival of these new models in Spain, it will be necessary to wait for these reductions to begin. [passage omitted]

NATO To Remain Defensive Bulwark in New Era*AU2905152691 Paris AFP in English 1406 GMT
29 May 91*

[Graham Brown report]

[Text] Brussels, May 29 (AFP)—NATO will remain the bulwark of Western European defence despite plans for large troop cuts, defence ministers of the Western alliance said after a two-day meeting here Wednesday [29 May]. They said in a joint statement that a peace dividend arising from the end of the cold war would be slow in coming because of the costs of streamlining forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO).

The ministers said that European-based nuclear weapons still had an essential role in preserving peace, although a strategy was still being devised to cut their numbers to the "lowest possible level". The statement warned that the former Soviet satellite states of Eastern and Central Europe were subject to "political, social, economic and ethnic pressures" that could threaten European stability.

Addressing a press conference, U.S. Secretary of Defence Dick Cheney said: "The Soviet Union will still be the dominant threat in Europe, with thousands of nuclear weapons targeted on the United States and its European allies." He said there could be "enormous instability" in the Soviet Union, where it was not yet clear whether the government would be able to undertake necessary reforms.

NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner warned that efforts by European Community (EC) countries to build up their own security structures should not be allowed to undermine the trans-Atlantic alliance between North America and Western Europe. Much of the two-day meeting was spent on plans for setting up a new British-led Rapid Reaction Corps (RRC) of between 70,000 and 100,000 men, to handle flash-points throughout the 16-nation alliance.

The ministers also agreed on a new structure for a main defence force comprising another seven multinational corps under German, Dutch, U.S. and Belgian commanders. NATO diplomats were reluctant to give details of planned troop reductions, but some officials say troop strengths in NATO's central region, mainly Germany where alliance forces have been poised for decades to stop a Soviet attack, will be cut by half by the mid-1990's. However, the ministers stressed that "a continued presence of forces from North America in Europe is indispensable".

German Defence Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg told journalists: "We need a minimum stock of nuclear weapons in Europe because the Soviet Union is still modernising its nuclear weapons and there is still a threat of proliferation." He gave no details.

The NATO ministers called on the Soviet Union to remove obstacles in the way of ratifying a major treaty on conventional arms reductions in Europe. Mr. Cheney said the gap between the two sides had narrowed "significantly" and could be resolved soon.

The NATO secretary-general repeated frequent warnings that the European Community's ambitions to take more responsibility for its own defence should not be allowed to weaken the trans-Atlantic nature of the alliance. Mr. Woerner said it should also not lead to wasteful duplications nor to the "marginalisation" of NATO's non-EC European members—particularly Norway and Turkey. He said that this controversial question of a "European pillar" within NATO would be examined at a NATO leadership summit later this year.

The other major issues at the summit would be closer relations with the formerly communist countries of Eastern and Central Europe, and NATO's new "strategic and force postures", he said. Countries represented at the two-day meeting were the United States, Germany, Canada, Britain, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, Greece and Luxembourg. Two NATO members were absent—France, which is not part of the alliance's military structures, and Iceland, which has no military.

FRANCE**Mitterand Offers Wide-ranging Disarmament Plans****Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty To Be Signed***AU0306103591 Paris AFP in English 0955 GMT
3 Jun 91*

[Text] Paris, June 3 (AFP)—France published a series of proposals for world-wide disarmament on Monday and announced that it would sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The presidential press office said the plan included decisions at national, regional and world level and covered both conventional and so-called weapons of mass destruction.

The presidency said France would sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, which up to now it had refused to do, and "hopes that all states will do likewise".

The French plan calls for a ban on chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stocks and urges the Geneva Conference on Disarmament to conclude a ban treaty by the end of this year.

France urged all states to adhere to such a ban "from the outset".

Disarmament Plan Outlined*LD0306141291 Paris France-Inter Radio Network
in French 1100 GMT 3 Jun 91*

[Ralph Pinto report]

[Text] [Announcer] The Elysee made public this morning the global plan for disarmament presented by France. Francois Mitterrand has decided to sign the nuclear arms nonproliferation treaty. In this plan, France also comes out in favor of banning and eliminating all chemical arms.

[Pinto] Yes, here before us is the plan for arms control and disarmament. Only five pages long, it may look rather modest, but in reality it is not so much an extraordinarily detailed and methodical plan as a kind of codification for what should be done. The first thing to be noted is the fact that armaments are treated categorically. It is quite interesting, because the plan does not pretend to immediately impose a general and complete global disarmament. There is interest paid to the regional aspect of things, that is, regions of the world which are more troubled than others. Finally, this plan will be handed over to the UN secretary general. It is therefore an essentially political plan.

Armaments are going to be treated category by category, a ban will be imposed, as you said, on chemical arms, people are besought not to make dirty bombs any longer. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the plan tries to institute an international register of arms sales, a register which lists the nations which supply [arms] to the whole planet. I bring to your attention that the five biggest arms selling nations in the world are, as if by chance, the five Security Council nations. The UN secretary general holds a register and knows who makes what for whom.

There is also an interesting phase: ballistic surveillance. That is, the whole world—those who own satellites in any case—is going to put them at the disposal of those do not, in order to know what is going on here and there. It is interesting, too. This is a pious hope in my view because some will have to be convinced, and those who are trying to make bombs are rather numerous.

Finally, as you said, measures of trust are put forth, measures of the same kind as those of the CSCE, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. This means that as a proof of goodwill, others are allowed to come and see what is going on. The Pakistanis, for instance, who are in the process of making a bomb, will then have to understand the concern of these trust measures and the meaning of the desire to go and see what they are doing to this effect.

[Announcer] So when France says that it is ready to sign the nuclear arms nonproliferation treaty, what does this mean? Does this mean that it is going to stop?

[Pinto] No, no, this does not mean that it is going to stop making bombs. This means that this kind of Gaullist citadel which was the nuclear nonproliferation treaty is completely outmoded. The debate has completely changed, anyway. Debate has changed because national independence in 1963, with all that it presupposed in order to break the bipolar balance, is also outdated. This means that a text is to be signed, but France will continue to possess the bomb, of course. One has become well convinced, however, that proliferation vis-a-vis those which are poorest is a real danger for the whole planet, and that one will have to be able to deprive those who are likely to divert technology from this too-modern technology without so much depriving them from a nuclear technology for civilian and development purposes.

GERMANY

Soviet Troop Withdrawals on Schedule for Jan-May

*LD2805172291 Hamburg DPA in German 1656 GMT
28 May 91*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Over the first five months of this year, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the former GDR went in accordance with the schedule agreed by the two sides. According to the Foreign Ministry in Bonn on Tuesday, the German-Soviet commission noted this at its third session in Berlin.

From January to May 1991 about 50,000 men were withdrawn into the Soviet Union—30 percent of the planned figure for 1991. In addition there were about 12,500 units of different types of military technology and weapons, as well as more than 260,000 tonnes of other material. The commission also discussed other questions relating to the handing over of deserters and to the security of Soviet soldiers and their families.

Stoltenberg Says Nuclear Arms Still Necessary

*AU2905184591 Mainz ZDF Television Network
in German 1700 GMT 29 May 91*

[Interview with German Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg by Udo van Kempen in Brussels on 29 May—recorded]

[Text] [Van Kempen] Mr. Minister, does the new NATO strategy mean that we will need fewer nuclear weapons in the future?

[Stoltenberg] Yes, this is clearly the objective. We now expect the Americans and the Soviets to negotiate on this. The short-range systems, the so-called nuclear artillery, as well as, according to our ideas, the other short-range systems, are to disappear completely.

However, the Soviet Union remains the greatest nuclear power. Dictators like Saddam Husayn nearly got hold of nuclear weapons. Therefore, we continue to need a certain minimum of nuclear weapons in Western Europe.

Genscher Welcomes Bush's Middle East Arms Proposal

*LD3005103591 Berlin ADN in German 0927 GMT
30 May 91*

[Text] Bonn (ADN)—Today Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher welcomed the disarmament proposals made by George Bush for the Middle East as a "significant, peace-promoting initiative." In a statement from Bonn, emphasis is put on the fact that the U.S. initiative, which is directed against weapons of mass destruction as well as conventional weapons, deserves worldwide support.

Genscher said it is particularly important that the appeal is also directed at arms-exporting countries. The foreign minister described the arms export policy of the Federal Republic as restrictive and expressed the hope that all the countries of the world will adopt this policy.

Genscher Welcomes Baker-Bessmertnykh CFE Accord

*LD0306101691 Hamburg DPA in German 0948 GMT
3 Jun 91*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher welcomes the U.S.-Soviet agreement over the quarrel about conventional disarmament in Europe. The solution agreed to by Foreign Ministers James Baker and Aleksandr Bessmertnykh to include Soviet naval infantry weapons is acceptable and corresponded fully to the Federal Government's expectations, says a statement by Genscher published in Bonn today. The preconditions for further successful cooperation with the Soviet Union are thereby created—not only in the area of arms control, but also for the swift continuation of the development of cooperative security structures in Europe. Genscher also views the agreement as being a "particularly favorable starting position" for the forthcoming first CSCE foreign minister meeting in Berlin.

UNITED KINGDOM**CFE Ratification Said 'Stalled' by Soviet Actions**

*91WC0097A London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in
English 18 Mar 91 p 16*

[Unattributed editorial: "Arms Control Stalled"]

[Text] Uncertainty about the future of the Soviet Union following yesterday's referendum is reflected in a worsening relationship between the two superpowers. A meeting of their foreign ministers, Mr Baker and Mr Bessmertnykh, in Moscow last week confirmed that they have reached a deadlock over implementation of the treaty signed in November by NATO and the Warsaw Pact for a drastic reduction in conventional forces in Europe [CFE]. This is holding up talks on a second stage of cuts, and

delaying progress on a separate treaty to halve the superpowers' long-range nuclear arsenals. In recent weeks, attention has focused on Soviet-American differences over the Gulf. But those over arms control are of potentially much greater significance.

The trouble started when the Russians moved tanks and artillery east of the Urals before the signing of the conventional forces treaty. This was legal, but hardly in the spirit of the agreement. In addition, they have provided seemingly inaccurate information about their forces west of the Urals and, most important, have transferred three divisions, including tanks, to the navy, which is not covered by the treaty. The present impasse comes after the resignation of Mr Shevardnadze, and amid growing evidence that it is the military, rather than the Foreign Ministry, which is now dictating arms control policy. In other words, the Russians are up to their old tricks of signing agreements and then cheating on their implementation.

In these circumstances, the West is right to insist that the treaty cannot be ratified until Moscow agrees to submit the transferred units to its provisions. As the last-minute delay in 1988 over ratification of the intermediate nuclear weapons treaty made clear, there is no hope of getting conventional forces agreement past Congress unless the Russians back down. Whether they will is impossible to predict. First, we need to know the full results of the referendum, then to see how the Kremlin reacts. The economic pressures on Mr Gorbachev's government to cut arms spending are greater than ever. But it is quite likely that, as chaos increases in the Soviet Union, it will prove impossible to conduct a coherent dialogue with Moscow. Leaders of NATO countries should therefore be prepared for renewed East-West tension and to persuade their electorates of the need to maintain strong defences. A large reduction of American forces in Europe means that those defences must be based on a strengthening of the European pillar of NATO, in particular through the Western European Union, which can act as a bridge between the European Community and the alliance.

NTIS
ATTN: PROCESS 103
5285 FORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD, VA

2

22161

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

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

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

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

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

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