

JPRS-TAC-91-016
9 JULY 1991



JPRS Report

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Arms Control

19981120 216

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

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-91-016

CONTENTS

9 July 1991

CHINA

Emphasis on Revised Star Wars Technology Analyzed [JIEFANGJUN BAO 27 May]	1
Reports, Comments on DPRK Call for Korean NFZ	2
Organizations' Joint Statement Reported [XINHUA 12 Jun]	2
Embassy Briefing on Statement [XINHUA 12 Jun]	2
Politburo Member Kye Cited [XINHUA 13 Jun]	2
NODONG SINMUN Article Noted [XINHUA 18 Jun]	3
Responses to Bush Mideast Arms Control Plan	3
Commentary Urges 'Balance' [XINHUA 12 Jun]	3
Foreign Ministry Spokesman Comments [Hong Kong HSIN WAN PAO 14 Jun]	4
BEIJING REVIEW Foresees 'Bumpy Road' [XINHUA 14 Jun]	5
Border Troop Cut Talks With USSR Reopen [XINHUA 14 Jun]	5

EAST ASIA

AUSTRALIA

France Conducts Nuclear Test at Mururoa Atoll [Melbourne International 15 Jun]	6
Foreign Minister Disappointed on Continued Tests [Melbourne International 17 Jun]	6

NORTH KOREA

Organizations Issue Joint Statement Urging NFZ [KCNA 11 Jun]	6
Envoy in Geneva Urges Removal of U.S. Nuclear Arms From South [Tokyo KYODO 12 Jun]	6
Ambassador to PRC on Nuclear Issue, NFZ [Pyongyang Radio 12 Jun]	7
Central Committee Secretary on NFZ, U.S. Stance [Pyongyang Radio 13 Jun]	7
Ambassador to USSR on Nuclear Inspections Issue [Pyongyang Radio 14 Jun]	9
Social Democratic Party on Nuclear Inspection Stance [KCNA 14 Jun]	10
Peace Committee, Japanese Group Issue NFZ Statement [KCNA 14 Jun]	10
TASS Said To Link Nuclear Inspections, U.S. Withdrawal [KCNA 14 Jun]	11
Conferees Said To Urge U.S. Nuclear Withdrawal [KCNA 15 Jun]	11
Further Statements Urging Korean Nuclear-Free Zone	11
Korean Residents of Japan Group [KCNA 15 Jun]	11
Reunification Official [Yu Ho-chun; KCNA 19 Jun]	11
Japanese Peace Group Backs Nuclear-Free Korea [KCNA 15 Jun]	12
Reunification Group's Statement on Nuclear Issue [KCNA 15 Jun]	12
Party Official Hits U.S. Inspection Demand, Urges NFZ [KCNA 16 Jun]	12
Peace Committee Statement Urges Nuclear-Free Zone [KCNA 17 Jun]	13
Reunification Aide: 'Sustained, Patient Efforts' for NFZ [KCNA 18 Jun]	14
Party Official: North To Listen to U.S. Views [Tokyo TV 17 Jun]	14
South Minister's Inspection Remarks Assailed [KCNA 17 Jun]	15
Daily Stresses Withdrawal of Nuclear Weapons [KCNA 18 Jun]	15
Southern Group Condemns U.S. Nuclear Stand [KCNA 20 Jun]	15

SOUTH KOREA

U.S. Nuclear Policy on Korea Termed 'Arrogant'	
[Chong Yon-chu; HANGYORE SINMUN 16 Jun]	16
Opposition Leader Kim Urges Withdrawal of U.S. Arms [KYODO 18 Jun]	17

MALAYSIA

Commentary Hails Regional Security Conference [Kuala Lumpur International 13 Jun]	17
---	----

TAIWAN

PRC Role in Mideast Arms Control Linked to MFN [CNA 8 Jun]	18
--	----

EAST EUROPE

POLAND

'No Progress' in Talks on Soviet Pullout [D. Fedor; GAZETA WYBORCZA 17 Jun]	19
---	----

HUNGARY

Officials Comment on Soviet Troop Withdrawal	19
Remarks by Goncz, Soviet General Shilov [Budapest Radio 13 Jun]	19
Goncz Interviewed [Budapest Radio 13 Jun]	20
Antall Receives Shilov [MTI 13 Jun]	21
Defense Minister Receives Shilov [MTI 13 Jun]	21
Financial Problems Assessed [Budapest Radio 13 Jun]	22
Defense Spokesman on Soviet Troop Withdrawal [NEPSZABADSAG 14 Jun]	23
Further Reports on Withdrawal of Soviet Forces	23
Withdrawal Reported Complete [MTI 16 Jun]	23
Defense Ministry Views [Budapest Radio 16 Jun]	23
Economic Issues Discussed [MTI 14 Jun]	24
Payment Issue Unresolved [Budapest Radio 15 Jun]	24
Further on Financial Disputes on Soviet Troop Presence	24
Disagreements Over Damages [MTI 18 Jun]	24
Defense Official Comments [Budapest Radio 19 Jun]	24
'Last' Departure Reported [MTI 19 Jun]	25

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

IRAN

U.S. Claims on Area Missiles, Disarmament Viewed [SALAM 1 Jun]	26
--	----

SOVIET UNION

GENERAL

Petrovskiy on Disarmament Process Evolution [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Jun]	27
Bush Middle East Proposals 'Under Consideration' [INTERFAX 7 Jun]	29
Spokesman Views Mitterrand Disarmament Plan [TASS 10 Jun]	29
Citizens Polled on Nuclear Disarmament [INTERFAX 14 Jun]	30
Reaction to Bush Mideast Arms Race Remarks [PRAVDA 18 Jun]	30

START TALKS

U.S. Finalizes New Stance on Strategic Arms [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Jun]	30
Bessmertnykh on Prospects for START Completion [Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG 9 Jun]	31
Bessmertnykh on START, Soviet-U.S. Summit [Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG 12 Jun]	31
U.S. Observers Cited on Summit, START Prospects [V. Linnik; PRAVDA 17 Jun]	32
Bessmertnykh Cited on START, Summit Timing [IAN]	33
Commentator Expects Further START Progress [Moscow International 18 Jun]	34

SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

Krasnoyarsk Radar Destruction Criticized on Economic Grounds [V. Nelyubin; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Jun]	34
--	----

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Reports, Comments on Completion of Pullout From Hungary	35
SGF Commander Interviewed [V. Shilov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jun]	35
Hungarian President Welcomes Pullout [Moscow Radio 17 Jun]	36
Withdrawal Completed [S. Zhirnikhin; TASS 19 Jun]	36
Preserving Military Stockpiles Proves 'Useless' [Moscow International 10 Jun]	37
'Outstanding Differences' Removed in CFE Talks [V. Smelov; TASS 14 Jun]	37
Foreign Ministry Spokesman Foresees CFE Ratification [TASS 17 Jun]	37
Reports on Completion of Withdrawal From Czechoslovakia	38
Last Troop Train Due 'Today' [Prague CTK 18 Jun]	38
Further on Withdrawal [S. Andreyev; Moscow TV 19 Jun]	38

NUCLEAR TESTING

Test Sites To Close if U.S. Takes Similar Step [INTERFAX 18 Jun]	38
--	----

CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Chemical Troops Officer Questions CW Convention	
[I. Yevstafyev; NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 23 Mar]	39
Environmental Concerns in CW Destruction [S. Yufit; ROSSIYA No 17, 3 May]	41
Spokesman Lauds U.S. Chemical Arms Proposal [TASS 10 Jun]	41

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES & PEACE ZONES

Kim Il-song Cited on Nuclear Arms, NFZ [IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]	42
AAPSO Official Interviewed on Nuclear Inspection [V. Tolstikov; Pyongyang KCNA 13 Jun]	42

ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES

Discussions on Sino-Soviet Border Arms Cuts	43
Delegation Leader Interviewed [Moscow International 10 Jun]	43
Commentary on Issues [NOVOYOE VREMYA No 19, May]	43

WEST EUROPE

FRANCE

Military Announce Nuclear Test at Mururoa [AFP 14 Jun]	45
--	----

GERMANY

Kohl, Mulroney Discuss Arms Export Controls [DPA 13 Jun]	45
Defense Minister: 'No Evidence' of Chemical Arms in East [ADN 19 Jun]	45
Swift Talks on Short-Range Missiles Desired [ADN 19 Jun]	45

Emphasis on Revised Star Wars Technology Analyzed

*HK1406114991 Beijing JIEFANGJUN BAO
in Chinese 27 May 91 p 4*

[Article by Xia Liping (1115 4539 1627) and Wang Dongming (3769 2639 2494): "New Emphasis in U.S. 'Star Wars' Program"]

[Text] Since former U.S. President Reagan presented the "Star Wars" plan (SDI) in 1983, a primary objective of the plan has always been to establish a U.S.-based antimissile defense system to counter a full-scale nuclear war and render the Soviet Union's nuclear weapons "ineffective and a thing of the past." However, in line with instructions from President Bush, the U.S. Department of Defense early this year asserted that the emphasis in the future development of the plan was to establish "a system of global protection against limited strikes" (GPALS). Compared with the original concept of the "Star Wars" plan, this system has three distinctive features: One is a change in the objective: a shift from dealing purely with nuclear missile threats from the Soviet Union to dealing not only with possible missile attacks from the Soviet Union but also guided missile attacks from Third World countries. Two is a scale reduction: a shift from the original concept envisaging the creation of a comprehensive protective system impenetrable even in a large-scale nuclear missile attack to the creation of a limited defense system which will deal with small-scale nuclear and guided missile attacks. The cost will also fall from the original "Star Wars" plan's initial estimate of \$146 billion to \$41 billion. Three is the expansion of the operation sphere: a shift from a security umbrella provided for primarily from U.S. territory to "protection against guided missile attacks for U.S. troops stationed overseas, reinforcement troops sent overseas, U.S. allies, and the United States itself."

The "system of global protection against limited strikes" is made up principally of three parts:

Deployment of 1,000 small programmed interception missiles known as "smart bombs" on the lower orbit of outer space. This part is expected to cost \$10 billion. Last year, the U.S. Department of Defense carried out 13 simulated interception tests using the "smart bombs" and achieved fairly good results. It is expected that mass production of "smart bomb" interception missiles will commence in 1993-94.

Deployment of one or two land-based anti-guided missile systems on U.S. soil (including 750 land-based antimissile missiles and a corresponding set of 50 surveillance satellites and a land-based radar system). This part is expected to cost \$22 billion. The United States' Lockheed Corporation is presently developing an antimissile missile tagged "Ares" [elisi 0618 6849 2448]. The company calculated that this anti-guided missile system will be deployed in the state of North Dakota within the next five years. Meanwhile, MacDonnell-Douglas of the

United States is also developing a high altitude-dense atmosphere defensive interception system which will use high-speed nonnuclear rockets to intercept incoming missiles in the atmosphere. The U.S. Department of Defense estimated that the "smart bombs" and land-based anti-guided missile systems will protect the United States against casualties in the event of a siege by 200 missiles.

Develop antitactical missile system in battle zones. This system's principal task is to deal with tactical guided missiles like "Scud" missiles and protect U.S. troops stationed in battle zones. This part is expected to cost \$9 billion. At the moment, the United States and Israel have joined hands to develop an antitactical missile tagged as "Arrow." Research and development work will take three years. Furthermore, the U.S. Army has recently signed contracts with some companies to study the possibility of manufacturing an antiguided missile system similar to the "Arrow" antitactical missile system. Such a system may be used to protect Europe.

The reasons behind the U.S. Government's proposal for establishing a "system of global protection against limited strikes" are multifaceted:

First. The United States maintains that the current degree of military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union is gradually declining, and that the danger of a nuclear war erupting between the two countries has also receded vastly. But the Soviet Union continues to boast of a large amount of advanced strategic nuclear weapons, and the unstable Soviet domestic situation has raised the possibility of it launching an accidental missile attack on the United States.

Second. The United States maintains that guided missiles in the hands of Third World countries pose an increasingly bigger threat to U.S. interests. According to estimates by U.S. arms control experts, there are presently 18 Third World countries which have guided missiles, and the number will rise to 24 by the end of the 1990s, including six countries which may possibly possess missiles boasting a range of at least 2,400 km. These countries' guided missiles could pose a threat to U.S. troops overseas, U.S. allies, and even U.S. soil.

Third. The original concept of the "Star Wars" plan entailed a huge expenditure which the U.S. economy would find hard to absorb. Hence, the U.S. Government tried to look for a new antimissile defense system which was both economical and practical. The concept of a "system of global protection against limited strikes" suited this need adequately.

Owing to the aforementioned reasons, the United States is stepping up research and development on a "system of global protection against limited strikes." The U.S. Department of Defense has proposed that the 1992 budget for the "Star Wars" plan be raised 60 percent over that of 1991, or 4.6 billion dollars, with the bulk

devoted to research and experiment of the weapons needed in the "system of global protection against limited strikes."

However, the plan to establish the "system of global protection against limited strikes" has met with different views in the United States. Some experts pointed out that the system's estimated cost of 41 billion dollars was extremely unreliable, adding that inflation and other factors could double the cost. Some U.S. Congressmen maintained that given the growing pressures from U.S. budgetary deficits, it would be difficult for the U.S. Congress to approve the entire funding needed to establish this system. Other experts have expressed concern over a possible escalation of the arms race in terms of quality as instigated by the creation of the "system of global protection against limited strikes."

Reports, Comments on DPRK Call for Korean NFZ

Organizations' Joint Statement Reported

OW1206104491 Beijing XINHUA in English
0831 GMT 12 Jun 91

[Text] Pyongyang, June 11 (XINHUA)—Twenty political parties and public organizations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) appealed to the United States to unconditionally and promptly withdraw all nuclear weapons from South Korea.

According to the DPRK newspaper "NODONG SINMUN" today, the DPRK Workers' Party and 19 other political parties and public organizations issued a joint statement here on Monday to expound their position on nuclear weapons.

The statement said DPRK has worked out its anti-nuke and denuclearization policy and has consistently advocated prohibiting the development, production and storage of nuclear weapons and abolishing them.

The DPRK Government has declared more than once that it has neither intention nor capability to manufacture nuclear weapons, that it is ready to sign a nuclear safety accord any time according to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and that it does not oppose nuclear inspection.

The statement said more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear weapons deployed by the United States in South Korea create dangers not only to the existence of the Korean people, but also to peace and security in Asia.

When deploying the nuclear weapons in South Korea, the United States claimed that it was aimed at "detering the Soviet Union from downward thrust." Today when the U.S.-Soviet relations have moved from confrontation to detente and the Soviet Union and the United States do not regard each other as the "enemy," there is no need to keep these weapons there.

The statement stressed that the DPRK "will make every possible effort to get the U.S. troops and nuclear weapons withdraw from South Korea, make the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free peace zone and ensure peace and security in Asia and the world."

Embassy Briefing on Statement

OW1206103091 Beijing XINHUA in English
0801 GMT 12 Jun 91

[Text] Beijing, June 12 (XINHUA)—Chu Chang-chun, ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) to China, gave a press conference at the embassy here this afternoon to brief Chinese and Beijing-based foreign correspondents on a joint statement issued by 20 DPRK political parties and public organizations calling for the removal of nuclear threat from the Korean Peninsula.

Politburo Member Kye Cited

OW1306175691 Beijing XINHUA in English
1551 GMT 13 Jun 91

[Text] Pyongyang, June 13 (XINHUA)—Kye Ung-tae, Politburo member of the Workers' Party of Korea, today urged the United States to remove all of its nuclear weapons from South Korea [ROK] to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

Kye made the remarks in support of a June 11 joint communique by the Korean Workers' Party and other 19 political parties and social organizations.

The joint communique demanded the United States remove its nuclear threat against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and pull unconditionally all of its nuclear weapons out of South Korea.

The deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons has posed a threat to not only the existence of the Korean people but also peace and security in Asia, Kye said.

The United States had once claimed that it deployed nuclear weapons in South Korea "to deter the Soviet Union from downward thrust," but the Soviet-U.S. relations have now shifted from confrontation to relaxation while Washington and Moscow are working to cut or eliminate their overseas tactical nuclear weapons, respectively, Kye said.

Under such circumstances, the United States has no reason not to withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea, he added.

It's even untenable of U.S. claim that deployment of its nuclear weapons in South Korea was to protect the latter from "threats from the north," as the north side of Korea has repeatedly declared that DPRK has no intention to "invade the south side," nor has it possessed any nuclear weapons, nor has it had any intention and capability to manufacture nuclear weapons, Kye said.

He stressed that U.S. should remove its nuclear weapons from South Korea and accept DPRK's proposal to make the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone if Washington really does not intend to threat Korea and Asia with its nuclear weapons.

The north side of Korea is always ready to accept international nuclear inspection, and the core of the problem is to remove U.S. nuclear threat against the DPRK, Kye said.

The north side of Korea will never accept U.S. demands of a unilateral international nuclear inspection of the north side, he added.

NODONG SINMUN Article Noted

*OW1806084491 Beijing XINHUA in English
0640 GMT 18 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 18 (XINHUA)—The precondition for peace and stability in Asia is that the United States should withdraw its troops and nuclear weapons from the Asian and Pacific Region, said an article published in the Korean newspaper "NODONG SINMUN" today.

The Asian people hope to bring about peace and stability in Asia, but their desire has been shadowed by an increasingly tense situation, the article said.

The article pointed out that the United States has deployed more than 1,000 nuclear weapons in South Korea, directly threatening the peace in Asia and the Korean peninsula.

It added that these nuclear weapons could lead to war at any time, so the northern part of Korea has struggled for the withdrawal of the U.S. weapons to maintain peace in Asia.

The article said that the northern part of Korea was willing to negotiate with the United States for an honorable and decent withdrawal of all U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from the Korean peninsula. Korea has put forward a reasonable proposal on this issue, but the United States has not made appropriate efforts in response to the proposal, it added.

Responses to Bush Mideast Arms Control Plan

Commentary Urges 'Balance'

*HK1306143191 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service
in Chinese 0938 GMT 12 Jun 91*

["Full text" of LIAOWANG commentary entitled "Arms Control in Middle East Should Be Inclusive, Balanced"]

[Text] The 24th issue of LIAOWANG weekly, to be published on 17 June, carries a commentary entitled "Arms Control in the Middle East Should Be Inclusive and Balanced." Following is the full text:

Following the Gulf war, before a truly peaceful and stable situation has taken shape in the Middle East, a tendency to vie with each other in selling and buying advanced weapons has emerged.

Out of consideration for its economic and strategic interests, the United States suggested holding a meeting on arms control in the Middle East between China, the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France, formulating principles for restricting the selling to the Middle East region of such conventional weapons as surface-to-surface missiles, aircraft, and tanks; weapons of mass destruction; and relevant technologies.

This will play a positive role in the peace and stability of this region if the principle of inclusiveness and balance is adopted to achieve arms control in the Middle East appropriately and justly.

People hope that the convening of the meeting on arms control in the Middle East will contribute to the peace and stability in the region. For this reason, a favorable atmosphere and conditions should be created and prudence practiced.

In the Middle East, Israel is in an advantageous position in armaments. This is a reality which became evident a long time ago. But the U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney announced, following President Bush's arms control proposal, that the United States would provide 10 F-15 fighter planes for Israel and would cover 72 percent of Israel's expenditure on its research into, and production of, Arrow [jian shi 4628 1709] antiballistic missiles. He also revealed that the United States would "lay up" some of the weapons and equipment used in the Gulf war in Israel. How can one understand this situation?

The U.S. proposal mentions that the Middle East countries, while being monitored, should be forbidden to produce or purchase materials, enriched uranium or separated plutonium that can be used to produce nuclear weapons. Then how should the nuclear weapons already in Israel's hands be handled? It has made no mention of it so far. According to an estimate by the International Strategic Studies Institute in London, Israel possesses 100 nuclear warheads and their carrier missiles.

The problem in this issue has also been spotted by some people in the United States. William (Quandt) [kuang te 0562 3676] of the Brookings Institute said: "Israel will be able to preserve the nuclear weapons it has stored. Since no Arab state possesses nuclear weapons and what Iraq had has been destroyed, this will be very favorable to them (the Israelis)."

Syria, as Israel's neighbor, is more sensitive because its Golan Heights are still occupied by Israel and the state of war between them has not been ended. Syrian Foreign Minister al-Shar' held that the U.S. arms control proposal would only be favorable to Israel at the expense of the interests of Arab states, because "according to this proposal, Israel can produce all kinds of weapons,

including weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons, whereas the Arabs have no such possibility."

Al-Shar' proposed that the best way to reduce the weapons in the Middle East is to reach a peace agreement in this region. Jordan endorsed this viewpoint. A commentator on Jordan's state radio said: "Unless the Arab world and Israel arrive at a peaceful solution first, any control on weapons will be very difficult."

This brings up an even more profound question: Which is better, to scoop up the water or to take away the firewood to prevent the water from boiling? If arms control is realized, though it will be conducive to the establishment of peace and stability in the Middle East, a thorough settlement of the conflicts and clashes in this region will be very difficult before the Arab-Israeli conflict is settled.

The United States once suggested holding Middle East peace talks to settle the Arab-Israeli dispute. For this purpose, U.S. Secretary of State Baker paid four visits to the Middle East. However, there was not much progress. Procedural issues still remain unsettled, let alone there being any substantial steps. The Arab media maintain that the crux of the problem lies in the support and partiality of the United States for Israel. Even on 2 June, Cheney said in Cairo: "As far as we are concerned, I do not think that threatening our Israeli friends by reducing the supply of weapons so as to force them to do something in the diplomatic arena will lead to any desired results."

Water will inevitably spill from a bowl if it is not held level. For the same evident reason, the settlement of the Middle East problem should also be inclusive, just, and rational.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Comments

*HK1406111391 Hong Kong HSIN WAN PAO
in Chinese 14 Jun 91 p 2*

["New Talk" Column: "China's Stand on Arms Control in Middle East"]

[Text] Yesterday there were two new developments in the establishment of a nuclear-free and large-scale-destructive-weapon-free zone in the Middle East as proposed by U.S. President Bush. One development was that in answer to foreign reporters' questions, a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman explained the Chinese Government's attitude. The other was that U.S. Secretary of State Baker announced that all five permanent member states of the UN Security Council (that is, the five main states that supply munitions to the Middle East region) had already promised to attend an ad hoc international meeting to be held in Paris in the middle of next month.

Regarding Bush's relevant suggestion, China first expressed approval of it and later expressed its willingness to attend the meeting. The Soviet Union has all

along not made a positive reply. Yesterday, Baker mentioned at the Senate Appropriations Committee that the five countries would attend the meeting. This indirectly proves that the Soviet Union has replied that it will attend the meeting.

Although the meeting will be held soon, their stands differ. A dispute also exists between China and the United States on China's selling arms to Syria and Pakistan, and some in the United States have even attempted to link this dispute with the continuation or suspension of most-favored-nation status. Therefore, it can be imagined that although the meeting on a Middle East nonnuclear zone can be held on schedule, there is not much certainty whether or not an agreement can be reached after one meeting.

Yesterday's declaration by Duan Jin, a spokesman of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, consists of three points: 1) The Middle East is a hot-point region whose situation has been tense for a long time, and making this region move toward stability is indeed necessary. 2) On the one hand, China supports this region's stability; on the other, it also maintains that the countries in this region must maintain self-defense capability at a comparatively low level. Therefore, a large amount of arms must be prevented from flowing into the Middle East. This requires those countries exporting large amount of weapons to the Middle East region to adopt a responsible attitude and to seriously restrict themselves. 3) China also endorses, in principle, that on the foundation of equal consultation the countries concerned completely and evenly adopt impartial and rational measures and exercise necessary and suitable control over the flow of arms and weapons into the region.

Although Duan Jin's statement is not explicit, it includes two points. 1) Although the countries supplying weapons to the Middle East region differ in the amount they supply, it is necessary to avoid picking up sesame seeds to the neglect of mung beans [concentrating on minor matters to the neglect of major ones], and it is imperative to first demand action from the countries exporting a large quantity of weapons. For instance, the U.S. supply of weapons to Israel and U.S. support of Israel merit great attention. After the United States proposed this meeting, it even announced that it would supply fighter planes to Israel and help it produce a new type of guided missiles. 2) Since the United States proposed this meeting, it must conduct consultations on an equal basis and have complete and even restrictive measures but cannot be insufferably arrogant and require other countries to do this or that. It is free to burn down houses while the other people are forbidden even to light lamps.

According to U.S. Secretary of State Baker, the United States will send a delegation led by Under Secretary Reginald Bartholemew to attend the meeting. Bartholemew will go to Beijing this weekend and "dissuade China from signing an agreement on selling ground-to-ground guided missiles to Syria and Pakistan."

"Should China reject this demand, Sino-U.S. relations might have serious consequences."

In fact, Duan Jin's statement has already indirectly made known China's position. The ground-to-ground guided missiles that China is prepared to supply to these two countries are of a comparatively low standard. Furthermore, although China is one of the countries supplying munitions to the Middle East, it ranks only fifth among the five countries supplying munitions. This problem should be solved impartially and rationally on the basis of overall consideration but not dealt with independently as an individual problem.

BEIJING REVIEW Foresees 'Bumpy Road'

*OW1406165591 Beijing XINHUA in English
1536 GMT 14 Jun 91*

[Text] Beijing, June 14 (XINHUA)—Arms control in Middle East is facing a bumpy road as both Western arms peddlers and local recipients show reluctance in cutting off the flow of weaponry into the war-torn region, according to a Chinese periodical "BEIJING REVIEW."

The English language weekly, in its latest issue dated June 17, points out that U.S. President George Bush once said arms control did not mean a stop of all weapons sales. A round of acute competition among major arms-exporting countries has already started in the Middle East, it adds.

The U.S. wants to sell 18 million dollars worth of weapons, including F-16 jet fighters, the Patriot anti-missile systems and M-1 tanks, to six Mideast nations, it says.

Germany also has agreed to sell two diesel-powered submarines, the most advanced of the kind in the world which can launch torpedoes and cruise missiles; and meanwhile, it is ready to sell armored personnel carriers to Israel and Saudi Arabia, the weekly says.

It cites France, Britain and some other nations as are following the U.S. suit in continuing arms sales to the Middle East region.

The periodical attributes Western countries' reluctance in disarmament to their increased dependence on arms sales due to financial strains in the development of weapons systems.

For example, it says, the U.S. 1990 budget had prescribed a 25 percent cut in defense spending in the next five years, leading to a sharp decrease in the Pentagon's arms orders.

General Dynamics Corporation, it continues, a company producing tanks, revealed that more than 4,000 workers would lose their jobs, 15 percent of its parts supply factories would be forced to suspend production and 30 percent of ammunition production units would close if tank contracts could not be fulfilled.

It quotes a French official as saying that the French defense industry would be unable to survive unless France sells arms to other countries.

The magazine also indicates that the arms race among the countries in the Middle East, especially between Israel and the Arab nations is mounting, because the Arab-Israeli conflict is not likely to be resolved soon.

If Arab countries re-arm themselves, Israel will upgrade its defense system; on the other hand, faced with a potentially nuclear-armed Israel, the Arab nations will inevitably seek a kind of balance through achieving an edge in conventional weapons, it says.

At present, Middle Eastern countries are showing a willingness to buy advanced weapons, and advanced countries are willing to sell them, the magazine notes.

It predicts that future arms sales to the Middle East would proceed on the basis of limiting the proliferation of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons and launching vehicles and seeking a general balance of power, especially between Israel and the Arab countries.

Border Troop Cut Talks With USSR Reopen

*OW1406013391 Beijing XINHUA in English
0119 GMT 14 Jun 91*

[Text] Beijing, June 14 (XINHUA)—The fourth round of the second phase negotiation to discuss the principles guiding reduction of military forces on the Sino-Soviet border was opened here today.

The Soviet delegation headed by Ambassador G.V. Kireyev arrived here yesterday. It was greeted at the airport by head of the Chinese delegation Liu Guangzhi.

AUSTRALIA

France Conducts Nuclear Test at Mururoa Atoll

*BK1506065191 Melbourne Radio Australia in English
0500 GMT 15 Jun 91*

[Text] France has conducted its first underground nuclear test so far this year in French Polynesia. An armed forces statement released in Paris said the blast at Mururoa Atoll had a yield of less than 30 kilotons. A previous blast on 30 May had a yield of more than 100 kilotons, one of the most powerful so far in the 15-year old nuclear testing program in the Pacific territory.

Foreign Minister Disappointed on Continued Tests

*BK1706065891 Melbourne Radio Australia in English
0600 GMT 17 Jun 91*

[Text] Australia's foreign minister, Gareth Evans, has expressed disappointment at France's continuing nuclear program in the Pacific. A French test at Mururoa Atoll on Saturday [15 June] has prompted another protest from the Australian Government.

The Australian Seismological Center registered a blast in French Polynesia of around 10 to 40 kilotons—the fourth test this year. Senator Evans said the test came in the face of strong regional opposition.

NORTH KOREA

Organizations Issue Joint Statement Urging NFZ

*SK1206004091 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1535 GMT 11 Jun 91*

["International Inspection of U.S. Nuclear Bases in South Korea Must Be Made at the Same Time"—KCNA headline]

[Text] Pyongyang, June 11 (KCNA)—20 political parties and public organizations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea including the Workers' Party of Korea, the Korean Social Democratic Party, the Chondoist Chongu Party and the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of the Fatherland on June 10 issued a joint statement, which says in part:

In order to remove the danger of nuclear war from the Korean peninsula and the rest of Asia, it is necessary, above all, to withdraw from South Korea the U.S. nuclear weapons, the source of nuclear war, and make the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone [NFZ].

The DPRK Government has declared more than once that it has neither intention nor capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons, that it is ready to sign the nuclear safeguards accord any time according to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and that it does not oppose nuclear inspection.

The question lies in the removal of U.S. nuclear threat to our republic and Asia.

If the nuclear inspection should be made it must not be forced upon us alone with no nuclear weapons but the U.S. nuclear bases in South Korea must be opened to the public and an international inspection of them be made at the same time.

This is fair and is necessary not only for our country but also for the Asian countries.

Loud voices are ringing out from South Korea, Asia and the rest of the world, demanding that the United States open to the public the nuclear weapons which it has deployed in South Korea and agree to the simultaneous nuclear inspection in the North and the South of Korea, the statement stressed.

Envoy in Geneva Urges Removal of U.S. Nuclear Arms From South

*OW1206040291 Tokyo KYODO in English 0333 GMT
12 Jun 91*

[Text] Geneva, June 11 (KYODO)—The United States must remove all nuclear weapons from South Korea, even if North Korea signs an international accord on nuclear inspection, the North Korean ambassador to Switzerland said Tuesday.

Li Chol, also ambassador to Geneva-based international organizations, told KYODO NEWS SERVICE the U.S. will remain a threat to Pyongyang even after North Korea concludes the safeguards treaty allowing international inspections of nuclear facilities.

North Korea signed the nuclear nonproliferation treaty in 1985 but has not allowed international inspection, saying that can come only after the U.S. removes the 1,000 nuclear weapons North Korea says are in South Korea.

The North Korean ambassador demanded Washington remove the weapons from South Korea, saying, "one should not look at this issue unilaterally. We are showing goodwill. We are also hoping the United States will move."

Li said the U.S. has explained the existence of nuclear arms in South Korea as a deterrent to the Soviet Union, but he rejected the idea because the Soviet Union is no longer an enemy of the U.S.

Li said the removal of U.S. nuclear arms from South Korea is an urgent issue and added that the issue over nuclear and nonnuclear weapons carried by U.S. warships should be solved through security discussions among Asian countries.

He also said his country hopes to build mutual confidence through negotiations between Pyongyang and Washington.

Li said Paul Wolfowitz, a senior U.S. Defense Department official, has discussed with North Korean officials in his recent visit to North Korea on nuclear inspection and U.S. soldiers still missing after the 1950-1953 Korean war.

Ambassador to PRC on Nuclear Issue, NFZ

*SK1506051091 Pyongyang Korean Central
Broadcasting Network in Korean 2300 GMT 12 Jun 91*

[Text] In conjunction with the fact that our country's political parties and public organizations released a joint statement calling for the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from South Korea, the DPRK Embassy in China held a news conference on 12 June.

Attending the news conference were reporters from Chinese newspapers, news agencies, and broadcasting stations and many foreign correspondents stationed in China.

Our country's ambassador to China, Chu Chang-chun, spoke at the news conference. First, he spoke of the fact that our Republic, after declaring its antinuclear, denuclearization policy, has made every possible effort to ban the developing, manufacturing, and storing of nuclear weapons, and has consistently called for their abolition. He also spoke of the consistent and sincere effort made by our Republic to have U.S. nuclear weapons withdrawn from South Korea and to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone [NFZ]. He noted: "Even when the Soviet Union and the United States took the measures for the partial abolition of nuclear weapons, our Republic supported them and hoped that the abolition of nuclear arms as such would also be relayed to the Korean peninsula. The U.S. nuclear threat toward us, however, has become more serious with the passage of time. It has now become more clear that the presence of 1,000 units of nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea by the United States is the main source of misfortune threatening the survival of the Korean people and peace and stability in Asia and the world at large."

Chu Chang-chun revealed: "Lately, however, the United States and the South Korean authorities have made the situation more tense by clamoring about our nuclear development capabilities and then have developed a plan for an operational exercise for removing our nuclear facilities. All this stems from a goal to divert global attention from the nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and to cloak U.S. policy, which is based on nuclear blackmail being enforced in Asia, with the Korean peninsula as its center, under the pretext of an inspection of our nuclear facilities."

After stating that it is imperative to withdraw U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea, the source of a nuclear war, before anything else, and to convert the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone in order to remove the danger of nuclear war on the Korean peninsula and in Asia, Chu Chang-chun said: "Our Republic

has made clear on many occasions that it has no intention or capabilities to make nuclear weapons. It has been ready always to sign the nuclear safeguards accord according to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and is not opposed to nuclear inspection. What matters is to remove the U.S. nuclear threat posed to our Republic and to Asia. International inspection, should there be any, should be conducted simultaneously in our country, which has no nuclear weapons, as well as in South Korea, where U.S. nuclear bases exist. Not only that, the bases must be opened to the public.

In concluding, Chu Chang-chu stressed that "our Republic, proceeding from national dignity, from the vital demand for our right to existence, and from a lofty sense of responsibility for the cause of peace in Asia and the world at large, will make every possible effort to have U.S. troops and nuclear weapons withdrawn from South Korea, turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free peace zone, and attain peace and stability in Asia and the rest of the world. He then demanded that the United States withdraw its troops and all the nuclear weapons from South Korea, without delay and without any conditions.

Following this, he answered questions put by reporters.

Central Committee Secretary on NFZ, U.S. Stance

*SK1306122691 Pyongyang Korean Central
Broadcasting Network in Korean 0800 GMT 13 Jun 91*

[Statement by Kye Ung-tae, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers Party of Korea, "attesting to the justness of the DRPK's stance set forth in the joint statement issued by DPRK political parties and public organizations"; place and date not given]

[Text] In connection with the fact that U.S. nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from South Korea and thus the Korean peninsula should be turned into a nuclear-free zone [NFZ], which is an urgent demand that brooks no further delay, the political parties and public organizations of our country issued a joint statement.

Today, the danger of nuclear war hovers over the Korean peninsula, and, still worse, it increases as days go by. This cannot but pose a great danger not only to our people but also to the entire Asian people.

In fact, the nuclear weapons currently deployed in South Korea are the main cause of danger not only to the existence of our people but also to the peace and security in Asia.

As is noted in the joint statement, if the United States had deployed nuclear weapons in South Korea to deter the Soviet Union from a downward thrust, there would be no grounds for it to refuse to withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea today when Soviet-U.S. relations have moved from confrontation to detente and,

accordingly, tactical nuclear weapons deployed overseas are being reduced and abolished.

If the United States has deployed nuclear weapons in South Korea to protect it from the so-called danger of a southward invasion, it is still more unreasonable.

Our Republic, on more than one occasion, has declared that it has no intention to invade the South, that it does not possess nuclear weapons, and that it has neither the intention nor the capacity to make them.

If the United States had deployed its nuclear weapons in South Korea to oppose only us, it would not have deployed the large number of nuclear weapons totaling approximately 1,000 there. And, if the United States had deployed its nuclear weapons there because it distrusts us, there would be no reason for it to oppose the adoption of a North-South nonaggression declaration; the signing of a peace agreement between the DPRK and the United States; and the proposal to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free peace zone—which have been proposed by our Republic Government several times.

It is, in the long run, clear that the U.S. deployment of approximately 1,000 nuclear weapons in South Korea is aimed not only at dominating all of Korea but also at dominating Asia.

The United States has set up the policy of attaching importance to the Asian-Pacific region. Accordingly, if there takes place a situation which stands in the way of establishing its domination and of maintaining it, the United States, under the stereotyped pretext of defending the U.S. interests and security, will threaten and gain supremacy over the Asian countries with nuclear weapons.

Recently, the United States babbled about our nonexistent nuclear facilities, it is precisely intended to cover up the danger of nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and justify the nuclear policy it is pursuing in Asia with the Korean peninsula as the base.

The United States demands that we allow an international inspection of nuclear facilities according to the obligation under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, while threatening us with nuclear weapons. This is shameless arbitrariness reminding us of a thief crying stop thief.

We are always ready to accept the international nuclear inspection, proceeding from our policy of denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. The question lies in the removal of the U.S. nuclear threat. Every state should sign the international treaty and carry out their obligation set forth in the treaty. This will be done for their countries' dignity and their own interest, but not for harm.

The unilateral and superpower arbitrariness of the United States in demanding that only we undergo nuclear inspection, while threatening us with nuclear

weapons, can never be accepted by us who regard the dignity of the country and the nation as life and soul.

As for obligations stipulated in the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, it is the United States that refused strongly the mediation of the nuclear armament race set forth in the treaty. It is the United States that violates the obligation of the treaty of not posing threats to nor attacking with nuclear weapons, the countries which have no nuclear weapons, in accordance with the spirit of the obligation. This violation by the United States makes us not sign the nuclear safeguards accord.

If the United States truly has no intention of threatening our country and other Asian countries with nuclear weapons and intends to observe the nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. It should stop threatening us with nuclear weapons, withdraw all its nuclear weapons from South Korea, and immediately respond to our proposal for turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

In defiance of such a fact, these days, some other countries, including Japan, make a commotion over our nonnuclear facilities while memorializing what the United States says. This cannot be regarded as fair. It will not be helpful even to themselves.

If they are interested in denuclearization, they should stop babbling about us who do not have nuclear weapons. However, they should babble about the U.S. nuclear weapons actually deployed in South Korea.

As long as there are nuclear weapons on the Korean peninsula, not only our people but also our neighboring and all Asian countries cannot be safe.

The Asian countries will be unable to avoid a nuclear calamity if nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea are exploded against us or against any Asian country. This nuclear calamity will be larger than that of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

We think that all the Asian countries should keep a high vigilance against the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and positively try to make the United States withdraw them.

Proceeding from the vital interests of our nation and the noble sense of responsibility for the cause of peace in Asia and the world, our party will struggle resolutely to make the United States withdraw its troops and all the nuclear weapons from South Korea and turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone and peace zone.

The United States should immediately withdraw all its nuclear weapons from South Korea, bearing in mind that it cannot avoid facing the curse and denunciation of the Asian people, including our people, and the peace-loving people of the world as long as its nuclear weapons remain in South Korea.

Ambassador to USSR on Nuclear Inspections Issue

*SK1606071291 Pyongyang Korean Central
Broadcasting Network in Korean 2200 GMT 14 Jun 91*

[Text] In connection with the joint statement issued by our country's political parties and public organizations, on 13 June, a news conference was held in our country's embassy in the Soviet Union.

Functionaries concerned with Soviet Foreign Affairs and Defense Affairs, and reporters of the Soviet newspapers, news agency, and radio attended the news conference.

In the news conference, Son Song-pil, our country's ambassador to the Soviet Union, made remarks.

To begin with, he notified them of the joint statement issued by the DPRK political parties and public organizations on 10 June. Saying that the joint statement clearly reveals our stance in connection with removing the nuclear danger on the Korean peninsula, he went on to say as follows:

The nuclear danger on the Korean peninsula is entirely attributed to the approximately 1,000 U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea. The entire world knows that U.S. nuclear weapons have been deployed in South Korea. In addition, the U.S. authorities do not deny this fact.

Still worse, the U.S. authorities openly babble about the possibility of using nuclear weapons in an emergency situation on the Korean peninsula. The U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea clearly pose a threat not only to our country but also to the safety of the nation. In addition, they are a main cause threatening all of Asia.

The U.S. authorities said that the deployment of many nuclear weapons in South Korea is aimed at deterring the Soviet Union from downward thrust. Today, the Soviet-U.S. relations, however, move toward detente. Both sides of the Soviet Union and the United States do not mutually regard the one as an enemy. Therefore, it is no longer necessary for the United States to station its nuclear weapons in South Korea.

In spite of this fact, the United States does not try to withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea. This clearly shows that the deployment of its nuclear weapons there is aimed at dominating all of Korea and the rest of Asia. It is also clear that the deployment, if any incident takes place against the U.S. interests and concerns in Asia, is aimed at threatening and gaining supremacy over Asian countries with nuclear weapons.

Exposing that the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea can be utilized for a real war in an emergency time, he said that the nuclear weapons will bring immeasurable holocausts to the Korean peninsula, to its

neighborly countries, and even to the entire Asian region. He went on to say the following:

To remove nuclear dangers hovering on the Korean peninsula and on the entire Asian region, the U.S. nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from South Korea, and accordingly the Korean peninsula should be turned into a nuclear-free zone.

However, the U.S. and Western publications, while kicking up a fuss about our developing nuclear weapons, are moving to give the U.S. authorities an opportunity of refusing to withdraw the nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Our Republic neither has an intention to make nuclear weapons, nor does it have the capability to make them. In addition, on more than one occasion, our Republic has declared that it is ready to sign the Nuclear Safeguards Accord according to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and that it does not oppose inspection of nuclear facilities.

The point is to remove the danger of the U.S. nuclear weapons against our country and the rest of Asia. If the United States carries out inspection of nuclear facilities, it should open its nuclear base in South Korea and should simultaneously carry out international inspection of its nuclear bases, instead of trying to force us to accept inspection of nuclear facilities.

The United States tries to unilaterally maintain nuclear facilities in our country, while turning a deaf ear to the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea. This is an unfair step.

In connection with this, I cannot help but talk about the stance of Japan unconditionally siding with the United States. As a country which suffered nuclear holocausts first of all the countries, Japan is very sensitive to the issue concerning nuclear weapons in other regions. Why does Japan try to frustrate the hard-won talks to normalize diplomatic relations between the DPRK and Korea, while talking about a forcible inspection of our nonexistent nuclear facilities, even without uttering a word about the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in its nearest place. I do not understand this. Japan, above all, should notice the danger of the approximately 1,000 nuclear weapons deployed just before its eyes.

As for a row over the protecting of the U.S. allied and friendly countries by the U.S. nuclear umbrella, he exposed the danger of a nuclear umbrella, by noting that just as an umbrella leaks when it is old, so will a nuclear umbrella leak when it becomes old, thus nuclear rain will fall on our earth.

In conclusion, he expressed the expectations that the Soviet publication and radio will support our just stance in connection with nuclear danger.

Next, he gave answers to questions raised by reporters.

Social Democratic Party on Nuclear Inspection Stance*SK1406154191 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1506 GMT 14 Jun 91*

["U.S. Nuclear Arms in South Korea Must Be Opened to the Public and Inspection of Them Be Made, States KSDP (Korean Social Democratic Party) Chairman"—KCNA headline.]

[Text] Pyongyang, June 14 (KCNA)—Yi Kye-paek, chairman of the Central Committee of the Korean Social Democratic Party, issued a statement to the press today, clarifying the justness of our stand made clear in the joint statement of the political parties and organizations of the DPRK.

If the United States persistently wants "nuclear inspection" of our side, it must, above all, open to the public the nuclear arms in South Korea, allow inspection of them and guarantee that it will not attempt a nuclear attack on us, he said, and went on:

Only on the condition that such principle of impartiality and reciprocity is kept, the DPRK will allow the nuclear inspection. These stands and demands manifested in the joint statement, are, indeed, fair and aboveboard.

The joint statement most correctly reflects the unanimous desire of the Korean people and mankind to fundamentally remove the danger of a nuclear war and safeguard peace and security on the Korean peninsula and in Asia.

The United States is recently forcing unilateral "nuclear inspection" on the DPRK, clamouring about nonexistent "nuclear facilities of the North", which won't go down with anyone.

The United States is advertizing its nuclear weapons in South Korea as "deterrent" for "ensuring peace" in the Korean peninsula and Asian region. But these are, in fact, means of military threat and aggression to gratify its wild ambition for domination over the whole of Korea and the Asian region. The nuclear weapons in South Korea are levelling at the DPRK as well as other countries in Asia and other regions within range.

The United States should not resort to anachronistic nuclear blackmail arrogantly forcing unilateral "nuclear inspection" on the DPRK which has no nuclear weapon but withdraw its nuclear weapons which have been deployed in South Korea without reason.

It must clearly know that its arrogant act of pressing its brigandish will upon others with nuclear blackmail can not go down with anybody, and give up its sinister plots at once.

Yi Kye-paek expressed the expectation that governments, political parties, organizations and peoples of all the peaceloving countries in Asia and the rest of the world will, in response to our peaceloving efforts, lift up

their voices demanding the withdrawal of the U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Peace Committee, Japanese Group Issue NFZ Statement*SK1506004391 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1541 GMT 14 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 14 (KCNA)—The Korean National Peace Committee and the Japan Congress Against A-and H-Bombs made public a joint statement in Pyongyang on June 14.

The statement pointed out that during its stay in Korea, the delegation of the Japan Congress Against A-and H-Bombs toured Pyongyang, Panmunjom and other places and met Korean A-bomb sufferers who repatriated from Japan.

Noting that the Korean National Peace Committee and the Japan Congress Against A-and H-Bombs vowed to further intensify a joint struggle for peace in Asia and the world, the statement said:

Our two peace organisations hold that foreign military bases and nuclear weapons must be removed from northeast Asia including South Korea and Japan and this region be turned into a nuclear-free, peace zone [NFZ].

The Japan Congress Against A-and H-Bombs considers that the withdrawal of the nuclear weapons of the U.S. troops from South Korea is an important task to eliminate the danger of a nuclear war from Asia.

Proceeding from this stand, we consider that it is not fair to demand a unilateral nuclear inspection of the DPRK and it is necessary to conduct an inspection of the whole of the Korean peninsula.

The Korean National Peace Committee expresses solidarity with many peaceloving people of Japan in the struggle to adhere to the three non-nuclear principles.

The Japan Congress Against A-and H-Bomb expresses sympathy with the demands for the conversion of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free, peace zone and for the withdrawal of the nuclear weapons from the south of the Korean peninsula which were set out in the joint statement released by the political parties and public organisations of the DPRK on June 10 during its stay in the DPRK.

Our two peace organisations consider that talks between the governments of the two countries for the "normalisation of diplomatic relations between the DPRK and Japan" should be held honestly and quickly on the basis of the statement signed by leading political parties of the two countries.

It is our view that to this end, acts against the interests and desires of the two peoples must be strictly avoided.

Our two peace organisations will take all opportunities to strengthen mutual interchanges and cooperation and

solidarity on the basis of independence, peace and friendship and strengthen a joint struggle to build a free and peaceful new Asia, the statement declared.

TASS Said To Link Nuclear Inspections, U.S. Withdrawal

*SK1406043991 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0411 GMT 14 Jun 91*

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (KCNA)—TASS June 12 quoted the Japanese paper NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN June 12 as saying that the United States unofficially informed Japan that it started studying a possibility of withdrawing its nuclear weapons from the territory of South Korea.

The DPRK does not oppose the inspection of its "nuclear targets", and the problem is the deployment of the U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea, TASS said, adding: accordingly, an international inspection of the "nuclear targets" in the territory of the DPRK must be conducted simultaneously with the withdrawal of the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Conferees Said To Urge U.S. Nuclear Withdrawal

*SK1506120891 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1006 GMT 15 Jun 91*

["Participants in Asia-Pacific Roundtable Conference Demand Withdrawal of U.S. Nuclear Weapons From South Korea"—KCNA headline]

[Text] Pyongyang, June 15 (KCNA)—Delegates from different countries at the Asia-Pacific roundtable conference on confidence-building and conflict reduction in Asia and the Pacific held in Malaysia on June 10 urged the withdrawal of the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Andrew Mack, chief of the Peace Study Centre of the National University of Australia, in his speech said that the United States must withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea and give assurance on the non-use of nuclear weapons against North Korea.

Robert Scalafino, former chief of the East Asia Institute of California University of the United States, said that the U.S. nuclear weapons must be withdrawn from South Korea.

Vladimir Fedotov, ambassador in charge of special issues to the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union, said that the United States must give assurances that it will not use nuclear weapon against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and remove its nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Further Statements Urging Korean Nuclear-Free Zone

Korean Residents of Japan Group

*SK1506153491 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1457 GMT 15 Jun 91*

["Chongnyon Urges the United States To Remove Nuclear Threat to DPRK"—KCNA headline]

[Text] Tokyo, June 14 (KNS-KCNA) - We strongly demand that the United States remove the nuclear threat to the DPRK and withdraw its nuclear arms and troops from South Korea.

The Central Standing Committee of the General Association of Korean Residents in Japan (Chongnyon) said this in its statement published in Tokyo on June 12 in support of the joint statement of the political parties and organizations of the DPRK.

Noting that the U.S. imperialists are pressing for "nuclear inspection" like a thief crying "stop thief," the statement said that should "nuclear inspection" be made they must not insist on doing it in the DPRK alone which has no nuclear weapon but the U.S. nuclear bases in South Korea must be opened to the public and an international inspection of them be made simultaneously.

To prohibit a nuclear threat to the DPRK is an unavoidable obligation of the United States, a nuclear state, under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, it said, and went on:

Japan, the first victim to nuclear weapons in the world, must not follow the United States but look straight at the danger of the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea.

We demand that the Japanese authorities pay due attention to the prevention of a nuclear war and the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and Asia and take sincere attitude toward DPRK-Japan negotiations.

We express the firm belief that all the peaceloving people in Asia and the rest of the world as well as the Japanese people will join us in removing the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free, peace zone, squarely looking at their dangerous nature, the statement said.

Reunification Official

*SK1906104691 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1015 GMT 19 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 19 (KCNA)—The U.S. imperialists must not resort to the "policy of strength" but go home, taking along their nuclear weapons and aggression forces deployed in South Korea as demanded by the Korean people and the peaceloving people of the world, demanded Yu Ho-chun, director of the Secretariat of the

Central Committee of the Democratic Front for the Reunification of the Fatherland.

In a statement issued today to support the just stand set out in the joint statement of the political parties and public organisations of the DPRK, Yu Ho-chun said [word indistinct] the way of tiding over the grave difficulties created on the Korean peninsula is to get the U.S. nuclear weapons, the source of nuclear war, withdrawn from South Korea.

Although the U.S. imperialists are trying to threaten others and mislead public opinion with the blackmail of strength and poor sophism, they must clearly know that it will go down with no one.

If Japan is truly concerned over nuclear threat, it must clearly see the danger of the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and play a due role in removing them, instead of crying for "forced inspection" on the "nuclear facilities" of the DPRK.

Proceeding from the vital demand of our nation and our sense of heavy responsibility for the cause of peace in Asia and the world, we will do all we can to get the U.S. troops and nuclear weapons withdrawn from South Korea, convert the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free, peace zone and preserve peace and security in Asia and the world.

Japanese Peace Group Backs Nuclear-Free Korea

*SK1506070791 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0603 GMT 15 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 15 (KCNA)—Kim Yong-sun, secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, Friday separately met and had friendly talks with a delegation of the Japan Congress Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs led by a member of the House of Councillors Yasuko Takemura, its representative member, and an advance party of the youth friendship visiting group of "Peace Boat" of Japan led by Kiyomi Tsujimoto.

Members of the delegation of the Japan Congress Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs said they, as Japanese, sincerely apologized for the crimes Japan had committed against the Korean people in the past.

Recalling that they had met Korean A-bomb sufferers from Hiroshima and Nagasaki during their visit, they said still today the Japanese people could not repress resentment at the bestial outrages of U.S. imperialism.

The more than 1,000 pieces of U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea pose a great threat to peace and security on the Korean peninsula and Asia, they said, stressing that they would take an active part in the joint struggle to establish a nuclear-free, peace zone in North-east Asia.

Members of the advance party of the youth friendship visiting group of "peace boat" of Japan outlined the aim

of their Korean visit, saying. Taking advantage of this opportunity the Japanese young people will have a clear understanding of the crimes committed by Japanese imperialism against the Korean people in the past.

Noting that voices demanding the withdrawal of U.S. Armed Forces from Japan and South Korea are ringing out louder, they said they would wage a more valiant struggle to achieve denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula and Asia.

Reunification Group's Statement on Nuclear Issue

*SK1506054091 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0518 GMT 15 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 15 (KCNA)—The International Liaison Committee for the Reunification and Peace of Korea released a statement on June 11 supporting the joint statement of the political "parties and public organisations of the DPRK as regards the nuclear threat of the United States."

The joint statement of the political parties and public organisations of the DPRK said that if the detente and durable peace is to be guaranteed on the Korean peninsula and in Asia, the United States must not demand the unilateral inspection in the DPRK but naturally allow the inspection of its nuclear weapons in South Korea, too and unconditionally and immediately withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea, the statement said, and continued:

The joint statement clearly revealed the truth of the moves of the United States to evade its responsibilities for the tensions obtaining on the Korean peninsula and the continued division of Korea and clarified the ways for creating a favourable environment for the peaceful reunification of Korea in accordance with the aspirations and desires of the entire Korean people and peace-loving peoples of the world.

The statement expressed full support to this and extended solidarity to the Korean people in their struggle for the independent and peaceful reunification of the country.

Party Official Hits U.S. Inspection Demand, Urges NFZ

*SK1606084691 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0806 GMT 16 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 16 (KCNA)—Chong Sin-hyok, chairman of the Central Committee of the Chondoist Chongu Party, in a statement released on June 15 strongly demanded that the United States give up at once such arrogant and insolent acts as trying to force unilateral "nuclear inspection" on us who have no nuclear weapon, keeping mum about the nuclear weapons in South Korea, and immediately withdraw its nuclear weapons and troops from South Korea.

In a statement issued to prove the justness of our stand which was clarified in the joint statement of the political parties and public organisations of the DPRK, Chong Sin-hyok said:

As correctly pointed out in the joint statement of the political parties and public organisations of the DPRK, if the danger of a nuclear war is to be removed from the Korean peninsula and Asia, it is imperative to eliminate the root cause of it before anything else and, to this end, the U.S. nuclear weapons must be forced out of South Korea and the Korean peninsula be turned into a nuclear-free, peace zone [NFZ].

The government of our Republic, proceeding from the consistent stand that the Korean peninsula should be turned into a nuclear-free, peace zone, put forward reasonable proposals and has made every possible effort to put them into practice.

The danger of a nuclear war is gradually increasing on the Korean peninsula. This is wholly because the U.S. imperialists have continued their moves for provoking a nuclear war, ignoring peace proposals and overtures of our Republic.

It is as clear as noonday that if a nuclear war is unleashed by the U.S. imperialists on the Korean peninsula, its holocaust will inevitably spread to other parts of Asia beyond the boundary of Korea.

The United States is carrying on an anti-DPRK campaign over the "issue of nuclear inspection" in the DPRK with the mobilisation of their followers and puppets. This shameless and dastardly campaign was started concocted as the United States was unable to find an excuse to defend the unjustifiable deployment of nuclear weapons in South Korea.

Japan, the first victim to U.S. nuclear bombs, must not involve itself in the nuclear blackmail and anti-DPRK smear campaign of the United States but behave with reason, looking squarely at the practical danger of the U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea nearest to Japan, Chong Sin-hyok stressed.

Peace Committee Statement Urges Nuclear-Free Zone

*SK1706051691 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0440 GMT 17 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 17 (KCNA)—Kim Yong-sun, chairman of the Korean Anti-Nuke Peace Committee, issued a statement to the press on June 16 to clarify the justice of the DPRK's stand which was laid down in a joint statement of the political parties and public organisations of the DPRK.

Warning that the nuclear weapons of the United States in South Korea gravely threaten not only the Korean people but also their neighbouring countries and other Asian nations, he says: If a war broke out in Korea or any

other region from whatever causes, the Korean peninsula and its neighbouring countries including Japan and the Asian nations would not be safe.

He continues:

The United States is these days making much ado about "nuclear inspection", vociferating about our non-existent "nuclear facilities". This is a queer outcry reminding us of a thief crying "stop a thief!"

More than once have we declared that we have neither intention nor capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons and do not oppose nuclear inspection.

The question boils down to the removal of the nuclear threat of the United States against our country and Asia.

The United States must not cry only for "nuclear inspection" in our area where there is no nuclear weapon, but, first of all, must open its nuclear weapons in South Korea to public and allow their inspection, too.

When it began deploying its nuclear weapons in South Korea, it announced that they were intended to deter the "southward thrust" of the Soviet Union. But, today, it makes a secret of the more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and keeps mum about them, neither confirming nor denying their presence.

This itself means a great threat to our country and its neighbouring countries.

Making an excuse about the firing-range of the nuclear weapons in South Korea, the United States contends that they pose no threat to other regions. But this is also a sophism.

The United States today possesses all kinds of military means to carry nuclear warheads to any spot on the waters, ground and in the sky.

Foolish, indeed, are those people who refuse to correctly assess the realistic danger of the nuclear weapons in South Korea, thinking that they are to "protect" them.

The Korean peninsula is the only place in the world where the nuclear weapons deployed by the United States overseas are directed against its very people.

It is only too natural that we resolutely oppose the nuclear weapons brought by the United States to our land for the purpose of opposing our nation and demand their removal.

Would the United States remain silent, if a country brought nuclear weapons to its land against its people?

It is the United States that produced the first nuclear weapons in the world and used them against Japan and it is again the United States that gave rise to a nuclear arms race and opposed a halt to it, Kim Yong-sun stated, adding:

There is no assurances that the United States will not use the nuclear weapons.

The A-bomb victims of Japan which was the first to suffer the nuclear holocaust at the hand of the United States are still undergoing distress today when nearly half a century has passed and their descendants are also affected by its influence. And there are many Koreans who fell victims to U.S. A-bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Kim Yong-sun further said:

This is why the Korean Anti-Nuke Peace Committee has sympathized with the appeals of the Japanese A-bomb victims and people at the world conferences against A-H bombs and actively supported and encouraged their anti-nuke movement, merging our voice into theirs.

It is needless to say that the withdrawal of the nuclear weapons from South Korea and the conversion of the Korean Peninsula and northeast Asia into a denuclearized zone is the only way of preventing in this region such nuclear holocaust as in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

To convert the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia into a denuclearized zone means to turn the North and South of Korea and Japan into areas without nuclear weapons.

Our Anti-Nuke Peace Committee will firmly unite with the anti-nuke peace forces of South Korea and closely cooperate with the broad anti-nuke forces of Asia and more resolutely struggle to turn the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia into a nuclear-free, peace zone.

Reunification Aide: 'Sustained, Patient Efforts' for NFZ
SK1806105391 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1025 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] Pyongyang, June 18 (KCNA)—The U.S. imperialists are trying to force "nuclear inspection" on us, keeping mum about the nuclear weapons they have stockpiled in South Korea, and this vividly shows the brigandish nature of those who are accustomed to threatening and blackmailing all countries with "strength," said Paek Nam-chun, director of the Secretariat of the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of the Fatherland, in a statement issued today to testify to the justice of the DPRK's stand clarified in the joint statement of the political parties and organizations of the DPRK.

He strongly urged the United States to show its sincerity toward peace by withdrawing nuclear weapons without delay.

He referred to the U.S. imperialists' military threat and nuclear war preparations as the fundamental factor of the growing tensions and aggravating North-South relations on the Korean peninsula.

Turning deaf ear to the DPRK's just demand, the U.S. imperialists are deploying in South Korea for a real war

even the nuclear equipment dismantled from other regions of the world, thereby leading the situation nearer to the brink of war, he said.

If a nuclear war broke out on the Korean peninsula, not only the DPRK but also her neighbouring countries in Asia would be unable to escape a nuclear scourge, he warned, contending that the withdrawal of the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea is a serious vital matter related to the survival of the Asian people.

We will make sustained, patient efforts to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone [NFZ] and thereby remove the danger of nuclear war and create an environment favorable to peaceful reunification, he stressed.

He expressed the expectation that all the peaceloving countries, political parties and organizations of the world, the Asian people in particular, would heighten vigilance against the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea wage a widespread struggle for their withdrawal.

Party Official: North To Listen to U.S. Views

OW1706145391 Tokyo NHK General Television
Network in Japanese 1300 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Remarks by Kim Yong-sun, secretary and International Department director of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee, in interview with an NHK camera crew at WPK headquarters in Pyongyang in "spring 1991"—recorded; Kim speaks in Korean with Japanese translation provided in subtitles; following is from the Korean]

[Text] Especially today, when many Asian countries aspire for independence and when aspirations for building Asia are rising higher as each day passes, I think it is important that we strengthen ties with Asian countries. Asia has a long history and culture dating back to time immemorial; it is a region where numerous, fine scientific and technological discoveries have been made. I think that Asia abounds with manpower and natural resources as well. I think that now is the time for Asian countries to raise their voices and exert efforts to build a new Asia.

We have proposed on many occasions that we discuss nuclear inspections, conclusion of a peace treaty, and other questions with the United States. It is not that we proposed to consult on only the contents of our proposals at our talks with the United States. We think that the U.S. side also has many questions which it wants to raise. Therefore, when good contacts are made and when the talks materialize, we will listen to the views of the United States. We will also express our own views.

South Minister's Inspection Remarks Assailed

*SK1706060991 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0518 GMT 17 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 17 (KCNA)—South Korean "Foreign Minister" Yi Sang-ok June 13 had the impudence to blab that the North "should sign the nuclear safeguard accords without delay" to "dispel the concern of the world community" over the nuclear development.

Commenting on his remarks, a NODONG SINMUN analyst today says:

In this he sang a duet with the U.S. imperialists who are demanding a unilateral "nuclear inspection" in our area. This arouses due indignation not only from our people but also from the world peace-loving people.

As for the "nuclear inspection" which the U.S. imperialists are trying to impose upon us unilaterally, it is, in fact, an arrogant and gangster-like demand.

It is our stand that, if a nuclear inspection is to be made, it should not be made only in our area where there is no nuclear weapons but the U.S. nuclear bases in South Korea should be opened to the public and international inspection of them be made simultaneously.

Yi Sang-ok's impudent remarks on the problem of nuclear inspection must not be attributed only to the ignorance and shamelessness of this wretch who does not know yet how to behave after he was put at the post of "foreign minister".

This is a manifestation of the flunkeyism of the South Korean puppets who are accustomed to parrot what their U.S. master says. It is an expression of the criminal attempt to gratify their wild ambition for "unification by prevailing over communism" by leaving South Korea a U.S. nuclear base for an indefinite period and igniting a nuclear war in league with their master, and an extremely mean criminal move to impair the authority of our Republic and secure its "superiority" in the international arena with the pressure of "nuclear inspection".

The South Korean ruling quarters would be well advised to act with discretion, discarding their dream of gaining something in supporting the United States, the aggressor.

Daily Stresses Withdrawal of Nuclear Weapons

*SK1806101991 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0957 GMT 18 Jun 91*

["Prerequisite To Peace and Security in Asia"—KCNA headline]

[Text] Pyongyang, June 18 (KCNA)—NODONG SINMUN today stresses that the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from South Korea is a prerequisite to peace and security in Asia.

The paper says in a signed article:

Tension is growing acute and peace is gravely threatened in Asia due to the imperialist moves of aggression and war contrary to the Asian people's desire for peace and stability in this region.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Cheney said the U.S. strategy of forward deployment would be maintained and the U.S. military presence would not change in Asia.

South Korea is a base of the U.S. imperialists' moves to execute their Asia strategy.

The U.S. imperialists, converting South Korea into a nuclear base, deployed nuclear weapons capable of controlling the DPRK and, furthermore, striking other countries in Asia. This is proved by the fact that many of the nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea have a range far beyond the boundary of the Korean peninsula.

The United States deployed more than 1,000 nuclear weapons in South Korea in order to dominate the whole of Korea and Asia and threaten and contain with nuclear weapons any country in Asia in case anything going against the "interests" of the United States or hurting its "feelings" occurs in this region.

The nuclear adventures of the U.S. imperialists swollen-headed after the Persian Gulf war have been carried into extremes. The U.S. rulers openly blared that they would use nuclear weapons in "case of emergency" on the Korean Peninsula.

The U.S. imperialists intend to mount a nuclear attack on the North under a certain pretext and make a nuclear blackmail against the Asian people with it as the fuse.

If a war broke out in Korea and no matter where the nuclear weapons present in South Korea may explode, our Asian people will suffer from it. Those who desire their own existence and peace and security in Asia should clearly see the graveness of the nuclear threat to the Korean peninsula and in its vicinity and lift up voices demanding the withdrawal of the nuclear weapons, the source of the threat, from South Korea.

Southern Group Condemns U.S. Nuclear Stand

*SK2006055491 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0423 GMT 20 Jun 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, June 20 (KCNA)—The Central Committee of the South Korean National Democratic Front [SKNDF] (Hanminjon) issued a statement on June 18 in support of the joint statement of the political parties and public organizations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, according to radio Voice of National Salvation from Seoul.

It says:

The joint statement condemned the United States and the No Tae-u group for stubbornly trying to force unilateral "nuclear inspection" on the North and strongly

demanding a simultaneous inspection of the U.S. nuclear bases in South Korea. This is a manifestation of its fair and peace-loving stand which correctly reflects the demand and desire of all the fellow countrymen in the North and the South and the world's peace-loving forces to remove the source of nuclear war from the Korean peninsula and defend peace in Asia.

Noting that the very one who is creating the danger of nuclear war on the Korean peninsula today is the United States which has deployed more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear arms for a real war, the statement says if the danger of nuclear war is to be removed from the Korean peninsula and Asia and peace be guaranteed, the U.S. nuclear bases in South Korea must be dismantled, to begin with, and the U.S. nuclear blackmail be ended.

It goes on:

The United States is now trying to force a unilateral "inspection" upon the North, while refusing to accept its overture for simultaneous nuclear inspection and commitments to the guarantee of non-use of nuclear weapons. This is a shameless, brigandish behavior.

The United States' clamour for unilateral "nuclear inspection" of the North is nothing but a heinous ruse to conceal its moves to provoke a nuclear war and justify its policy of reinforcing the nuclear bases in South Korea.

Hanminjon resolutely denounces with bitter national indignation the U.S. imperialists' criminal acts in bringing dark clouds of another war, a nuclear war, over the Korean peninsula on the pretext of "nuclear inspection" of the North.

The U.S. nuclear bases are not a "war deterrent" meant to protect South Korea and Asian countries but they are intended to hold our nation in nuclear hostage and realize its strategy for domination over the world.

The United States must totally open to our people its nuclear arms and bases, the source of national ruin, it has deployed in this land and accept an international nuclear inspection and withdraw them without delay.

SOUTH KOREA

U.S. Nuclear Policy on Korea Termed 'Arrogant'

SK1706051591 Seoul HANGYORE SINMUN in Korean
16 Jun 91 p 2

[Article by correspondent Chong Yon-chu in Washington from "Fluoroscope" column, entitled "'Extraterritorial' Nuclear Weapons in South Korea"]

[Text] The United States is applying the so-called policy of no confirmation and no denial (NCND) pertaining to the existence of nuclear weapons in certain areas.

The policy, which neither confirms nor denies the existence of horrible weapons that can kill all life and are deployed in another country, not U.S. territory, is indeed

a preposterous playing with words, thus fully exposing the arrogance of a powerful country.

There is no need for the United States to conceal nuclear weapons, if the people in that land truly want the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons. However, the United States is attempting to prevaricate their existence by playing with words. The reason for this is not the strategy it put forward externally; the deployment of nuclear weapons itself is neither justifiable nor fair.

Prompted by the nuclear issue in North Korea, the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula has emerged as a matter of interest, particularly the withdrawal of the U.S. forces' nuclear weapons in South Korea has attracted people's great attention. Amid this situation, in an interview with THE NEW YORK TIMES on 14 June, President No Tae-u revealed his position of "opposing the demand for the withdrawal of the U.S. forces' nuclear weapons in South Korea."

The remarks opposing the demand for the withdrawal of nuclear weapons assume the existence of nuclear weapons as a precondition. Unless one admits their existence, one cannot oppose nor comment on this.

From this standpoint, President No's remarks can be construed as a denial of the arrogant policy of the United States and, at the same time, can be regarded as a "declaration" of "independence" in terms of the form of remarks, apart from their content.

However, the TIMES article concludes that President No reviewed various possibilities "on the assumption that there are nuclear weapons." Thus, his remarks do not necessarily mean denial of U.S. policy, but were made within the framework of such policy.

How can the expression "the assumption of existence of nuclear weapons" give one such bad, humiliating, and shameful feelings? With regard to horrible weapons linked to the existence of the entire Korean peninsula, can the highest responsible ruler of the nation talk about the destiny of this land only "hypothetically"? Does the U.S. nuclear policy have such absolute supreme power as to make the president of a nation use hypothesis?

In an interview with Korean reporters in Washington after the ROK-U.S. summit in June last year, President No Tae-u said:

"Speaking about North Korea's demand, President Gorbachev mentioned nuclear weapons of the United States. I told him that I am not in a position to comment on this issue and that this issue should be resolved between the United States and the Soviet Union."

Looking at the nuclear issue of the Korean peninsula, I witnessed once again the arrogant U.S. policy of neither confirming nor denying, as well as the miserable shape of our own rulers who are not able to talk about our own destiny openly and frankly, being suppressed by such arrogance.

Opposition Leader Kim Urges Withdrawal of U.S. Arms

*OW1806115891 Tokyo KYODO in English 1010 GMT
18 Jun 91*

[Text] Seoul, June 18 (KYODO)—Opposition leader Kim Tae-chung urged the South Korean Government Tuesday to respond to North Korea's pledge to accept international inspection of its nuclear facilities by negotiating the withdrawal of the U.S. nuclear arms allegedly deployed here.

Kim, calling North Korea's recent agreement to join the United Nations another sign of a historic departure from Pyongyang's long years of isolation, said the South Korean Government should take "commensurate" measures.

Pyongyang "is removing stumbling blocks in normalizing ties with Japan and upgrading relations with the United States," Kim told KYODO NEWS SERVICE, adding that the "No Tae-u administration should take steps to help the North speed its approach to the international community."

As one of those steps, Kim said, Seoul "should talk with Washington on the pullout of the U.S. nuclear arsenal which we all believe to be here."

But Kim, president of the leading opposition New Democratic Party, questioned the "undemocratic" No government's commitment to making the most of recent developments to promote inter-Korean reconciliation.

"An undemocratic government that is stern even toward its own people will not cherish reunification, which might not be in the interests of its 'dictatorship,'" he said.

North Korea said last week that it is prepared to sign an accord allowing international inspection of its nuclear facilities.

Pyongyang repeated its demand that the U.S. remove the 1,000 nuclear weapons it is suspected to have in South Korea, but did not explicitly link that call to inspection of its nuclear facilities, leaving it unclear whether North Korea is dropping its traditional linkage of the two issues.

Kim, meanwhile, said he is confident of victory in Thursday's elections for local councils in six large cities and nine provinces.

He said the people will deliver a "stern judgment to the No administration, which has tried to compensate for its failures in domestic politics" through active diplomacy.

"What has it accomplished during the past three years? The number of political prisoners has increased to 1,500 and opposition parties have been put under surveillance by intelligence agencies.

"Prices are soaring and housing problems worsening," he said.

MALAYSIA

Commentary Hails Regional Security Conference

*BK1306094491 Kuala Lumpur Voice of Malaysia
in English 0800 GMT 13 Jun 91*

[Station commentary]

[Text] One-hundred and fifty participants from 27 countries in the Asia-Pacific region are currently attending the fifth Asia-Pacific roundtable conference in Kuala Lumpur. Organized by the Institute of Strategic and International Studies or ISIS, the theme of this conference is confidence building and conflict reduction in the Pacific. Speaking at its opening two days ago, Deputy Prime Minister Ghafar Baba said that prospects for peace and prevention of conflicts in the region around the [South] China Sea were now looking bright. Relations between the surrounding states, especially between China and Vietnam and Vietnam and ASEAN have shown a marked improvement. They are all now placing importance on the pursuit of their respective economic growth.

Mr. Ghafar Baba's assessment of the present situation in the region is indeed in a right perspective. Southeast Asia except for the unsettled problem of Cambodia is now experiencing its best ever period without any form of threats from outside. They are now in a position to enjoy the fastest economic growth in comparison with other regions around the world. This situation has come about because of their aversion to conflicting with each other and their desire to concentrate on providing their people with healthier and better standards of living. There is now a greater spirit of togetherness and a willingness to create a network of ties between and among the countries of the Asia-Pacific region.

However, the negative side cannot be ignored. There are conflicting interests and claims [words indistinct] in the countries. Mr. Ghafar Baba urged the contending parties not to resort to the use of force and disrupt the prevailing atmosphere of peace. They should not use any provocative measures that can be construed by others as being of a hostile or aggressive nature. Still, we are reminded of various unresolved territorial claims, including the Spratly and Paracel Islands. Some claims or disputes, if left to persist, can lead to the creation of tension and hinder the peace in the region. As Mr. Ghafar Baba stressed, the parties involved should refrain from taking any action that can lead to bitter conflicts.

ISIS, the organizer of the roundtable, is a constructive body that seeks avenues for the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of conflicts and tension. Being a nongovernmental forum, it serves the useful purpose of guiding government and people on what steps are the most effective in preventing friction among countries. It

is an organization that advocates cooperation and healthy competition and promotes the use of compromise instead of conflicts. We can consider ISIS as an important agency in the promotion of the interaction among countries of the region.

TAIWAN

PRC Role in Mideast Arms Control Linked to MFN

*OW0806163091 Taipei CNA in English 1425 GMT
8 Jun 91*

[Text] Washington, June 7 (CNA)—The Bush administration Friday played up Beijing's decision to attend a five-nation conference on arms control, calling it an indication of the positive effect of "staying engaged with China through MFN and other means."

White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater announced at his briefing Friday that President George Bush has received a letter from Beijing's President Yang Shangkun agreeing to attend the conference.

The conference was proposed by President Bush on May 28 as an initiative to control arms supplies to the Middle East. Invited to the conference were five major arms suppliers to the region, namely, the United States, Great Britain, France, red China and the Soviet Union. It is scheduled to take place in Paris in mid July.

According to Fitzwater, Yang in his letter also welcomed the June 16-18 visit to Beijing by Reginald Bartholomew, undersecretary of state for international security affairs, to discuss with Chinese communist officials weapons non-proliferation and other security issues.

"We are pleased with China's decision to attend the conference," said Fitzwater after announcing Yang's letter.

"This is a positive step that will strengthen international non-proliferation efforts, and indicates China's resolve to contribute to efforts to attain stability in the Middle East," he said, adding, "it also indicates the positive effect of staying engaged with China through MFN and other means."

Fitzwater described Yang's letter to Bush "an important letter," which, he said, showed that "they are responsive to the proposal, and that it does pay to stay engaged with China, that choosing to isolate them probably would have elicited a different response in this case."

"And so we think it does have a relationship to the MFN question," he said.

Beijing's sales of ballistic missiles to Pakistan and Syria and its exports of nuclear technology to Algeria have been criticized by members of the U.S. Congress and cited as one of the reasons that the U.S. should not renew the most-favored-nation trade status for red China.

POLAND

'No Progress' in Talks on Soviet Pullout

AU1906132991 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA
in Polish 17 Jun 91 p 2

[Dariusz Fedor report: "They Only Agreed On Transit"]

[Text] No progress has been achieved in talks on the withdrawal of some 50,000 Soviet troops from Poland, we were told by people close to the government on Saturday 15 June].

The eighth round of talks in Moscow failed to establish a deadline for the end of the pullout, nor was any agreement reached as to the conditions for transferring to Poland the assets that the Soviet troops will leave behind. The greatest amount of progress so far has been achieved concerning the transit through Poland of some 1.5 million Soviet troops from the former GDR.

Talks on the transit and pullout of Soviet troops are already into their eighth month. The greatest success in these talks so far is that on 23 February, Polish State Railways and the Soviet Ministry of Transportation concluded an agreement on the cost of the rail transit.

We were told that Poland is expected to earn about \$600 million from the rail movement of 350,000 troops, 100,000 civilians, and 6 million tonnes of military equipment, and that the statement by General Viktor Dubynin, commander of the Soviet forces in Poland, that this operation will cost the USSR about \$3 billion is nonsense.

Thanks to the above agreement, a restricted transit (restricted because no troops are being moved, only equipment) has already been in operation for three months.

No actual schedule for the evacuation has been agreed yet, nor has it been decided what will happen to the Soviet facilities left behind. Most important of all, no date for the end of the entire operation has been fixed. At the start of the talks the Polish authorities said they wanted the pullout to be completed by the end of this year, but the Soviet side insisted this could occur no sooner than 1994. According to our unofficial sources, the stances of both sides are now closer to each other; Poland has said the troops may now pull out by the middle of 1992, and the USSR wants them to do so by the end of 1993.

The problem of Soviet military property in Poland has still not been resolved. Poland has suggested that this property be valued by a firm of Western consultants or bank, but there has been no reply to this.

Neither has the problem of Soviet damage to the Polish environment been resolved, but we understand that Poland is ready to abandon claims for compensation in exchange for the Soviet assets left behind by the departing troops.

The next, ninth round of talks will take place in Warsaw on 9 July.

HUNGARY

Officials Comment on Soviet Troop Withdrawal

Remarks by Goncz, Soviet General Shilov

LD1306190391 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 1630 GMT 13 Jun 91

[Excerpts] As you have heard several times in the news, the president of the Republic, the prime minister, the speaker of the National Assembly, and representatives of the legislative parties received farewell visits from the commander of the Soviet Southern Army Group. In six days, on 19 June, the last Soviet soldier will leave our country's territory. This will be the topic of the first part of "Extra." [passage omitted]

It is hardly possible to say anything other than that today is of historical significance. Early in the week, the tanks that were called fraternal rolled out of the country on railway cars without attracting attention. The officers who remained to the end will board their airplanes next Wednesday. [passage omitted]

We rarely broadcast speeches in the program, especially not their full text. But today we shall make an exception. In the following six minutes you will hear President Arpad Goncz and Lieutenant General Viktor Shilov—the short speeches after the long farewell. Let me add something. We shortened somewhat the original Russian text, but the Hungarian interpretation renders a full and accurate translation.

[Begin recording] [Goncz] Esteemed Mr. Lieutenant General, Mr. Ambassador: Today is significant both for our country and for your country, and I can rightly say for Europe, too. This is the day when we, with a sincere, friendly handshake, say farewell to you, the commanding staff and troops of the Soviet Armed Forces stationed in Hungary. We give thanks because the Soviet Union, on the basis of bilateral agreement, is of its own decision withdrawing its troops from Hungary. Thereby, Hungary's full sovereignty is being restored.

Today is part of a long process. Also part of this was 1956, as well as the collapse of the Berlin Wall. This is indicated by Gorbachev's activity in the Soviet Union.

A country that has stepped onto the path of democracy is saying farewell to the members of the army of another country, which has also stepped onto the path of democracy. The Soviet Army entered Hungary's territory in pursuit of troops from Nazi Germany. We must tell the truth, that it was not the Soviet Union that declared war on Hungary, but Hungarian soldiers who beforehand entered Soviet territory.

The battles of the Soviet Army in Hungary constituted the final phase of the war that, at the cost of enormous

sacrifices by the Soviet Union, helped to shape the face of the new Europe, that now has stepped onto the path of unification. The period between the end of the war and the dawn of our new era in Europe constituted years of immobility, years of the Cold War, years of nuclear silence, nuclear peace. We very much hope that the years ahead will also be years of peace, yet years of unification and democracy.

The Army that is leaving Hungary is not the same one that entered Hungary's territory in 1945. These young people who are returning to their homeland obviously feel joy in their hearts that they do not have to fulfill their military service at a distance from their country, do not remember the war any more, and are acquainted with the years of the war only from the accounts of their grandparents.

These youths were ready at any time if the Hungarian economy or the local producers' cooperative called on them for help; they were ready at any time to sacrifice their leave, their rest time, if at the time of floods they had to offer a helping hand to the local inhabitants.

The Soviet people are rightly proud of their Army, of the Great Patriotic War. It rightly mourns its heroes, many of whom lie in Hungarian soil. The least I can promise, when saying farewell, is that we shall respect and care for the heroes' graves.

Now, when I say farewell to you, and I give thanks for your work here, for the disciplined, scheduled pull-out of the Soviet troops, I also should ask you to preserve a good memory of Hungary, to remember with friendship your time spent here as a soldier. I also voice my hope that the two countries in the future, shoulder to shoulder, in friendship, side by side, will endeavor for a joint objective, for a common and peaceful Europe.

[Shilov, in Russian, with passage-by-passage translation] Esteemed Mr. President: Let me thank you for finding time to receive me, despite your extraordinarily heavy schedule.

The withdrawal of the Soviet Southern Army Group will be completed on 19 June. [passage omitted] The Soviet side has completely carried out the provisions of the intergovernmental agreement of 10 March 1990.

Esteemed Mr. President, esteemed gentlemen. I regret that certain issues of accounts and economy are unresolved. The seventh clause of the intergovernmental agreement that provides that all issues regarding the settling of accounts should be resolved by the time of withdrawal of the Soviet troops has not been implemented. I think, gentlemen, that you agree with me that the Soviet people are not rich enough to hand over the military housing estates without change, and the Hungarian gentlemen are not rich enough, either, to give them up. At the moment, working groups of experts are working to settle the issue. We hope that a positive decision will be reached.

The generals, the officers, and the effective force of the Soviet Army are leaving Hungary with the feeling that they have carried out their duties. We have had friendly relations in the past, we have them at present, and we will have them for long centuries. On this, I will report to the president, the Supreme Soviet, and the minister of defense of the USSR. Thank you very much. [end recording]

Goncz Interviewed

*LD1306164391 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 1600 GMT 13 Jun 91*

[Interview with President Arpad Goncz by Julia Torda; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] According to the president of the republic, Arpad Goncz, how should we say farewell to the departing Soviet soldiers?

[Gonc] With friendship and a warm handshake. The Soviet withdrawal is part of a process. In another sense, it is based on a mutual political agreement that they have kept extraordinarily correct. The third point is that we would not have had any means of forcing the Soviet Union, so the Soviets are withdrawing of their own free will. These three facts together provide the opportunity to build on this day and preserve our relations at the highest level as well, not only as correct but also as friendly.

The two countries need each other; they are progressing on the same road, even if the Soviet Union is at a delayed phase compared to us. But their problems are also much greater than ours.

Concerning Hungary, our position now is similar to when a bird is let out of the cage. While it is in the cage, its space for movement is very restricted. It had an excuse for whatever mistakes it made because it was not allowed out of the cage. Now we are outside the cage, we will have to learn to fly, and we also have to know when and where we are going to land, and how long we will stay there.

How many centuries can we go back and from when can we count the loss of our sovereignty is a historical question that can be debated. Today, we are, in any case, formally regaining sovereignty, which of course means that from now on, voluntarily, within the framework of international cooperation, we also have to restrict our own sovereignty. But we have to restrict it ourselves, voluntarily.

[Torda] What is your opinion regarding various events, celebrations being planned on the occasion of the withdrawal?

[Gonc] Look, the country cannot be deprived of the happiness of regaining its sovereignty. This farewell must be dignified. Shall I say, we have to see them off politely, like at home, saying goodbye at the door in a friendly manner. Let us say goodbye to them in such a

way as to leave them with good memories of Hungary. We owe this to ourselves, and thus honor ourselves as well as them.

Antall Receives Shilov

*LD1306211191 Budapest MTI in English 1215 GMT
13 Jun 91*

[Text] Budapest, June 13 (MTI)—“The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary implies a moral renewal of the Soviet Army as well. This event, in the course of which Hungary will become independent, will bring great prestige for the Soviet Union in international politics,” Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall stated in parliament on Thursday, when he received Lieutenant General Viktor Shilov, commander of the withdrawing South Army Group.

Also present at the reception were Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament Gyorgy Szabad and several government members and MPs.

Expressing his appreciation of Lieutenant General Shilov's merits, Antall said Shilov could be proud of having been able to fulfill such an important task in the service of his country.

Antall expressed his conviction that Hungary and the Soviet Union would continue to co-exist peacefully, maintaining good-neighbourly ties. “It is Hungary's intention to preserve all ties that can be preserved from the human, economic and cultural aspects, in accordance with the regulations of international law, and that are useful for both countries,” Antall said.

Reform processes in the Soviet Union have contributed to democracy and the restructuring of Hungary. “We highly value this opportunity,” Antall stressed.

Antall called attention to the difference between the feelings of the Hungarian nation and those of the Soviet Army over the troop withdrawals. “For us, this day is one of national delight,” he said, adding that Hungary understands the grave troubles and difficulties implied by the troops returning home.

Antall assured Shilov that the Hungarian Government and parliament would do everything possible to respectfully preserve Soviet heroes' tombs in Hungary. At the same time, the Hungarian side hopes that the tombs of Hungarian soldiers will also be preserved in the Soviet Union.

Antall expressed his hope that the Soviet parliament would soon respond to the Hungarian parliament's request and would revise its judgement of the 1956 revolution in Hungary as it had revised that of the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

In his answer, Shilov confirmed that the Soviet troop withdrawals will be completed by June 19, and with this, the Soviet side will have fulfilled the requirements of the inter-governmental agreement. At the same time, he

termed it “unfortunate” that no agreement has yet been reached on financial matters. Nevertheless, he said, he hoped that a solution could be found by the June 30 deadline.

Antall agreed with Shilov on that point, adding that he hoped an inter-governmental agreement would be reached on the outstanding balance by the deadline.

Finally, the Hungarian prime minister presented Lieutenant General Shilov with a Herend vase as a token of esteem, together with one of his works on the history of science published in Russian.

Defense Minister Receives Shilov

*LD1306211591 Budapest MTI in English 1306 GMT
13 Jun 91*

[Text] Budapest, June 13 (MTI)—Hungarian Minister of Defence Lajos Fur received Lieutenant General Viktor Shilov, government commissioner in charge of the Soviet troop withdrawals, in his office on Thursday.

“It is not only the friendship we have established in the past 40-45 years that makes us further want to continue our relationship but also the fact that after the dismantling of the Warsaw Pact, the armaments in the region still come from Soviet sources. It will be disadvantageous for the armies of smaller countries if good military co-operation is not established with the Soviet Union in the future. It is, therefore, in the interests of the Hungarian Army to develop good ties with the Soviet Union,” Fur stressed.

Lajos Fur expressed his opinion that until a pan-European security system has been formed, naturally, with the participation of the Soviet Union, the security of the region could be guaranteed by bilateral inter-state and military agreements.

Lieutenant General Shilov thanked the Hungarian Army and the defence minister for their contribution with respect to the troop withdrawals. He said the Soviet side was doing its best to hand over the facilities in a good condition. The Hungarian Army is to take over the last building on June 14.

Shilov stressed that there was disagreement on financial issues and asked Lajos Fur to help resolve the problems. “We should part on just and honourable terms,” Shilov said.

He also stressed that in his opinion, a good relationship between the armies should also be maintained in the future, as the two countries are in any case neighbours. In spite of the dismantling of the Warsaw Pact, friendship should be preserved, he said.

The South Army Group is to leave for Munkachevo (Munkacs) on June 19 and the final dismantling of the group will be completed in Krasnodar. Shilov is to report on the issue to the Soviet minister of defence on June 28.

Financial Problems Assessed

*LD1306193891 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 1630 GMT 13 Jun 91*

[Interview with Antal Annus, state secretary for defense,
by Julia Torda, in Budapest on 13 June—recorded]

[Text] [Torda] Lieutenant General Shilov confirmed again this morning, as we heard, that the withdrawal of troops from Hungary will be completed some 10 days earlier than scheduled. This is taking place, although there has not yet been any success in reaching an agreement over questions of financial accounting. Why did Lieutenant General Shilov name this earlier date, if the discussions are still a long way from completion?

[Annus] We must distinguish between the military-technical tasks of troop withdrawal and the resolution of the economic and financial questions involved. That the actual withdrawal can be completed earlier is certain.

[Torda] At the same time, according to the seventh article to which he [Shilov] also referred, the economic negotiations should also be completed by the time the withdrawal is carried out, and he expressed concern that this had not happened.

[Annus] We too are concerned, just like Mr. Shilov. There are several reasons why this did not happen. One is that buildings, groups of buildings that had been used by the Soviet Army—some are still being used by them—must be taken over. I think that, before we took them over, it was not possible to establish—we did not have the opportunity to do so—the conditions of these buildings. We did make some preliminary, detailed assessments, but naturally, further damage may occur until they are evacuated, so only at the hand over of the buildings can exact assessments be made and valuations be carried out.

[Torda] At the intergovernmental negotiations which began on Monday, the preparation of the documents to be signed on 17 June also started at the expert level. I understand these documents will state the tasks and demands that have already been agreed upon and also those which are still outstanding?

[Annus] At present, the documents themselves are in dispute. At present, it seems there is agreement that detailed examinations must be carried out and that every item must be examined. More time is needed for this. Therefore, it is possible that the documents will not be signed on the 17th. It may happen that the experts will require more time for their work. Very hard and very strenuous work must continue until 30 June, so that the two partners can resolve every detail together.

[Torda] In connection with the discussions, it has also been suggested that the Soviet partner almost tried to blackmail the Hungarians by saying that they should maintain a positive balance in Hungarian-Soviet trade and should be good enough to accept that this may even be the starting point of the negotiations on Monday.

[Annus] Yes, such hints had already been dropped earlier as well. We were always very decisive when we expressed the view that these two questions have nothing to do with each other in this context. There are two different issues here, so let us stay with the implementation of the agreement signed on 10 March of last year.

[Torda] If the Soviet partner wants to link these two, how can we prevent it?

[Annus] We cannot prevent it because there is a substantial Hungarian trade surplus; the solution of the problem does not rest with us.

[Torda] The Soviet demands started at 50 billion forints; they had started from there. How does it stand now in the negotiations?

[Annus] The Soviet demand is for 48 billion forints, obviously without the Hungarian demands. The Hungarian demands must be set against this.

[Torda] The assessment of environmental damage has been completed in the past few days. Did the Soviet partner agree to deduct the environmental damage costs from this?

[Annus] The Soviet partners repeatedly emphasized that they are willing to examine environmental damage and pay for it. Mr. Shilov confirmed this when he agreed to the methodology of assessing the environmental damage. The damage to the environment and to nature is very serious. What responsibility the Soviet partners will or will not accept has not yet been fully discovered. It is obvious that they will endeavor to make this damage appear as minimal as possible, but the damage itself can hardly be disputed.

[Torda] The discussion will begin between B. Kadar and his Soviet colleague C. Katushev at the weekend. From your words, I deduce that a great majority of the questions are still very much disputed. The Soviet troops will be withdrawing by 19 June, but the discussions over economic settlements could last for years.

[Annus] It is a fact that there are many unresolved, disputed questions. There are significant conflicts of interests; therefore, some very difficult negotiations are still to follow. During these discussions, almost everything will be disputed. Both sides are defending their own interests. The fact that the withdrawal of Soviet troops will be completed before the deadline and that on 19 Jun the last Soviet soldier—in the person of Mr. Shilov—will leave the country is not disputed. I can say with full conviction that we have been acting very correctly all along. It would be good if the solution is not prolonged for too long.

Defense Spokesman on Soviet Troop Withdrawal

AU1706144991 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG
in Hungarian 14 Jun 91 p 5

[Interview with Defense Ministry Spokesman Gyorgy Keleti by Oszkar Fuzes; place and date not given: "Lieutenant Keleti on Military Agreement"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] Gyorgy Keleti told NEPSZABADSAG that the Hungarian-Soviet military cooperation agreement was ready for signing.

[Fuzes] Now that the withdrawal of troops has been completed, what are the chances of settling the debate on payments?

[Keleti] The debate will be concluded as scheduled because both the withdrawal agreement and the actual completion of the withdrawal oblige the government commissioners to settle their debates on payments too. The question is how many settled issues and open questions the final protocol will contain. We would like to have more settled issues in this protocol. We can find a solution in an objective way by taking into consideration both sides' justified demands. Other bodies will have to find a solution to problems that are left open today, because the mission of the government commissioners will end. Optimists think that full agreement could be achieved before the end of the year; others think that it could take years.

[Fuzes] How will Hungarian-Soviet military relations develop from now on?

[Keleti] The Soviet Union remains our neighbor and, irrespective of its domestic changes, it is vitally important for us to have correct relations with it. A bilateral military agreement is almost ready, and experts in Moscow and Budapest agree with the formulation. The Soviet side asked us to postpone the signing of this agreement until after the intergovernmental basic agreement is signed.

[Fuzes] Does this mean that the security policy provisions debated do not affect the military agreement?

[Keleti] They do not affect the military agreement. These provisions are about guaranteeing spare parts for the Hungarian Army's weapons, which are mostly planned and manufactured in the Soviet Union, as well as some training possibilities, for example, for fighter pilots. Naturally, we will pay in U.S. dollars for all this. It is very important that we agreed on confidence-building measures that eliminate distrust, proving that we can trust each other and that neither of us has any intention of attacking.

Further Reports on Withdrawal of Soviet Forces

Withdrawal Reported Complete

LD1606192591 Budapest MTI in English 1740 GMT
16 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 16 (MTI)—The withdrawal of the units of the Soviet South Army Group from Hungary has been completed with the last train leaving the country's territory on Sunday.

The units left Hungary two weeks earlier than scheduled. According to the inter-governmental agreement, the deadline of the withdrawal's completion was June 30.

The South Army Group started the pull-out in March 1990. The units have boarded and loaded one train every day. During the past 15 months, nearly 35,000 carriages have transported equipment and 100,000 soldiers to the Soviet Union.

Lieutenant General Viktor Shilov is still in Hungary because financial issues concerning the troop withdrawal have not yet been settled.

Defense Ministry Views

LD1606204691 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 2000 GMT 16 Jun 91

[Studio interview with Hungarian Defense Ministry spokesman Gyorgy Keleti by unidentified announcer—live]

[Text] [Announcer] After repeated changes in the deadline, if all this is true, the last Soviet military train will leave Hungary's territory today. Our studio's guest is Colonel Gyorgy Keleti, spokesman for the Defense Ministry. Have the soldiers now really set off for home?

[Keleti] According to our latest information, the train that was placed at the Soviets' disposal—which is the last military train—left Mandok at 1815 on Sunday evening in the direction of the border. According to railway staff and the military railway experts there, this train will cross the Hungarian border at around 2300. I am very confident that this schedule will be met, and we will be able to say that the last military train left Hungary's territory shortly before midnight on 16 June 1991.

[Announcer] Is there not some contradiction in the fact that the politicians and soldiers said that the last soldier would leave the country on the 19th—that is, next week?

[Keleti] Today, those conscripts, officers, and NCO's who were in the Soviet military camp near Mandok left, who up until now were performing the reloading work that is connected with the troop withdrawal. As for the date of the 19th—and I hope this date will be correct—that originates from Lieutenant General Viktor Shilov, commander of the Southern Army Group, as it was he who said that on the 19th he personally will leave Hungary's territory as the last Soviet soldier. We know today that Lt. Gen. Shilov will return to Hungary a few

days later, as it is also known that no successful conclusion was reached at the talks between experts and government commissioners that was scheduled for this week. Thus, after his transfer to Munkachevo, the general will presumably put on civilian clothes and come back to Hungary to conduct the discussions connected with the financial talks.

Economic Issues Discussed

*LD1506054291 Budapest MTI in English 2139 GMT
14 Jun 91*

[Text] Budapest, June 14 (MTI)—Konstantin Katushev, Soviet minister for foreign economic relations, arrived in Hungary on Friday to hold talks with his Hungarian counterpart Bela Kadar on the financial, economic as well as property issues involved in the Soviet military pull-out, and on bilateral economic cooperation.

The Soviet minister met Prime Minister Jozsef Antall together with Bela Kadar. The sides surveyed the difficulties in the two countries economic cooperation and the chances of their settlement. Katushev conveyed the greetings of Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, and expounded the worries and the position of the Soviet leadership. He emphasized the Soviet leaders, vested interest in the soonest possible solution of the open financial issues related to the military pull-out. The sides agreed that the ministers for foreign economic relations should speed up their related talks in the coming weeks.

Ivan Aboimov, Soviet ambassador to Hungary, was also in attendance.

Payment Issue Unresolved

*LD1606092191 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 2200 GMT 15 Jun 91*

[Text] The commissioner of the Soviet Government will remain in Hungary for at least another 10 days in order to try to clear accounts in connection with the troop withdrawal. Lieutenant General Antal Annus could not estimate exactly how much the Soviet Union will pay, but in his view, the sum would hardly be more than 48 billion forints. The Soviets will definitely pay more than 10 billion forints for neglect of maintenance work, but damage to the environment is also great. The Hungarian commissioner emphasized that only the Hungarian claims acknowledged by the Soviet Union can be endorsed.

Further on Financial Disputes on Soviet Troop Presence

Disagreements Over Damages

*LD1806222391 Budapest MTI in English 0734 GMT
18 Jun 91*

[Text] Budapest, June 18 (MTI)—Hungarian-Soviet expert talks on financial issues concerning the Soviet troops withdrawal from Hungary continued in Budapest on Monday.

Colonel Gyorgy Keleti, spokesman of the Hungarian Ministry of Defence told the daily MAGYAR HIRLAP, that the Monday talks had indicated a deadlock in the progress of negotiations. There are considerable differences of opinion between the sides on three basic issues.

The Soviets familiarized themselves with the nearly 10,000 pages of documents on the environmental damages caused by Soviet troops but their delegation in charge of environmental protection affairs consisted of one expert only as opposed to the Hungarian side's 15-member delegation. Several environmental protection experts are expected to arrive from the Soviet Union on Tuesday but they will probably start the talks on damages all over again, which will cause a considerable loss of time.

Another difference stems from the fact that the Hungarian side refuses to pay for 2,500 establishments of the several thousand ones built by the Soviets as these do not conform to Hungarian construction standards and the Soviets have not even asked for permission to build them, Colonel Keleti said.

The third issue on which the positions of the sides diverge is that the Soviets firmly refuse to pay for damages caused in historic buildings, saying they have taken over these buildings in the same way as other "ordinary" establishments.

Differences of opinion in themselves do not mean there is no chance of the sides coming to agreement. A lot depends on results of talks to be conducted in the next few days, Colonel Keleti stressed.

On the Soviets' behalf, the negotiating delegation is headed by Lieutenant General Viktor Shilov, who, according to information received by MAGYAR HIRLAP, will leave Hungary on June 19 as the last Soviet soldier, but after a two or three-day stay in Munkachevo (Munkacs), he is to return to Hungary as commissioner of the Soviet government.

Defense Official Comments

*LD1906224791 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 2000 GMT 19 Jun 91*

[Text] The Hungarian negotiating team wants to divert the discussion on the financial implications of the Soviet troop withdrawal to political-diplomatic levels instead of the military-professional approach it has adopted so far. Miklos Vasarhelyi said this at the National Assembly's foreign affairs committee meeting after he had announced that a foreign affairs ad hoc committee will join in the work of the government delegates.

Vasarhelyi, as chairman of the committee, said that we have to prepare for hard bargaining in a very tense atmosphere because, for example, the Soviets doubled their demands from one day to the next, raising it to 100 billion forints. The deputy did not specify the exact final

sum of Hungary's demand and doubted that the final documents on the accounts will be ready as planned for next Tuesday [25 June].

General Antal Annus said that if no agreement about the financial accounting has been reached by the originally-set deadline, then neutral international experts will be asked to settle the disputed questions.

'Last' Departure Reported

*LD1906141491 Budapest MTI in English 1312 GMT
19 Jun 91*

[Text] Budapest, June 19 (MTI)—On Wednesday at 15.01 hrs (Central European Time), the last Soviet soldier left the territory of Hungary.

IRAN

U.S. Claims on Area Missiles, Disarmament Viewed

NC1606133591 Tehran SALAM in Persian
1 Jun 91 p 12

[Unattributed commentary: "Iran in the Radius of the U.S. Plan for Middle East Disarmament"]

[Text] Now that the oil war has ended, the United States is revealing its plans for the future of the Middle East, plans which are designed to ensure its hegemony. One such plan is its proposal for disarmament in the Middle East, which it put forward on the pretext of promoting security and which includes the Zionist regime within its scope. At the same time, the WASHINGTON TIMES, citing intelligence officials, alleges that Iran has tested a medium-range ballistic missile for the first time in four years. In an attempt to lend credibility to its allegations, the newspaper identified the location from which the missile was supposedly fired and the target it supposedly struck. It also claimed that the United States has traced the route taken by the missiles Iran purchased from North Korea and has concrete data about the number of such missiles.

Citing the former CIA director, the newspaper goes on to say: U.S. intelligence services have been following this issue from every angle and will give top priority to the nonproliferation of biological, chemical, and nuclear

weapons and of missile transport systems in the decade of the nineties. Webster said that by the year 2000, 24 countries will possess biological and chemical weapons and another 15 countries will be able to manufacture ballistic missiles.

Continuing its propagandistic blackmail, THE WASHINGTON POST claimed that Iran is planning to deploy medium-range missiles along its borders in the near future.

It is interesting how these CIA discoveries are splashed across the American press at the same time a U.S. warship fired on Iranian boats sailing along our country's coastline, martyring three of our dear combatants. This criminal act by the United States shows the dimensions of its plans for the Middle East, the main obstacle to which is Islamic Iran.

Contrary to the claims of those intimidated by the presence of foreigners in the region, the Islamic Republic is quite capable of upsetting the U.S. plans. If each and every U.S. movement is not confronted forcefully, however, the enemy will become ever more arrogant and take further steps. Why have these provocations failed to arouse the necessary reaction? The threats and propaganda of the United States send the clear message that the meaning of the new world order in the Middle East is the complete disarmament of the forces of revolution before the forces of arrogance. This is what is meant by international understanding and U.S. security in the region.

GENERAL

Petrovskiy on Disarmament Process Evolution

PM1106090191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 4 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister: "To Seek the Answers to the Challenges of the Times"]

[Text] A new phase has started in the history of international relations. The world community, for many years frozen in the ice of the "cold war," is emerging into the expanses of cooperation. The contours of the future world order can be seen increasingly clearly. The bipolar system of harsh confrontation is giving way to the multipolar structure of cooperation that is being formed. Mutual dependence with a "minus" sign (the threat of mutual destruction) is being replaced by mutual dependence with a "plus" sign (common aims of development).

But it would be wrong to believe that all the icebergs of the "cold war" have thawed once and for all. Only the first steps have been taken, though they are big steps. The transition from confrontation to partnership is not an instant leap but a process that is protracted in terms of time and space. We have not only to resolve problems that remain as a legacy of the past, but also seek answers to the new, no less complex challenges of the times.

Going beyond the framework of peace seen as a temporary state of lack of war and transferring to genuine peace is a very important feature of the present. Reliable guarantees for eliminating the threat of the use of force, and political-legal mechanisms blocking the escalation of incipient confrontation to armed conflict are being included in its structure.

The concept of deterrence—the cornerstone of the present model of security—will be subject to significant modification. The development of the disarmament process and the further improvement of mechanisms of coordinating the policy of states in maintaining security are moving the world community toward a fundamentally different type of deterrence which will be based not on mutual intimidation but on the certainty of the lack of a threat, and a high level of openness and trust in the military sphere.

The actual nature of security is changing too—both national and international security. Today it cannot boil down to just security against war, but is equally determined by economic, environmental, scientific-technological, and socio-humanitarian criteria.

Another feature of the world order that is forming is the undoubted primacy of multifaceted collective efforts. Overcoming confrontational opposition does not lead to the leveling and elimination of differences of opinion in states' national interests. Differences in approach

remain, as do contradictions, rather acute ones, moreover. It is important not to dramatize them, however, and to avoid the temptation of a return to unilateral bloc prescriptions for solving things. The most reliable coalition of interests today is the United Nations. Any difficulties and friction may be eliminated on the basis of jointly elaborated decisions within its framework.

The Persian Gulf crisis was a serious test of the reliability of the system of international relations that has been forming. And it must be said that it stood this test and demonstrated the preferability of collective coordinated actions of states over unilateral actions.

The peculiarities of the present transitional period are acutely affecting the sphere of disarmament, which has initiated the dismantling of the structures of the "cold war."

In the context of multilateral disarmament, qualitative progress means putting the task of transforming national military doctrines and lending them a defensive character into the forefront. The Soviet Union advocates starting broad international dialogue on all questions that arise in this connection. Through such dialogue, it might be possible to achieve coordination of attitudes to military defense doctrines and armed forces defense structures, and jointly work out criteria and parameters of defense sufficiency.

Naturally, the complex of questions of nuclear disarmament should remain the subject of constant attention. The Soviet Union believes that genuine universal security may be achieved only by way of the full elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, we realize that moving toward a nonnuclear and secure world is a stage-by-stage balanced process, which presupposes a number of consistent and objectively stipulated stages. In the face of this, it seems, we must bring about a situation whereby the role of the temporarily remaining nuclear weapons among methods of ensuring international security are steadfastly reduced. The reduction of quantitative and qualitative characteristics of nuclear potentials to a minimum deterrence level is seen as an optimum option here. The key element in such a reduction is maintaining stable strategic equilibrium at all phases in the reduction of nuclear arsenals.

In this connection, we might consider a series of consultations between the five nuclear powers to discuss the whole spectrum of questions of the essence of a minimum nuclear deterrent, and its basic principles and its role as a stabilizing factor.

A top-priority aim in the sphere of nuclear disarmament is to put an end to nuclear testing. The Soviet Union consistently advocates a universal and complete ban on them. It is our belief that this would best be promoted by an optimum combination of bilateral and multilateral efforts. The Soviet Union is prepared to end all test explosions at any time on condition that the United States also decides to close down its nuclear testing

programs. At the same time we proceed on the basis of the consideration that the movement toward a ban on nuclear testing may be of a phase-by-phase nature, and may proceed through successive stages of restricting their number and yield.

We also see the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, of the technologies involved in manufacturing them, and of their delivery vehicles as an all-embracing and multidimensional task. The main aims here are the strengthening and full implementation of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Turning it into an open-ended agreement with the appropriate enshrinement of its new status is seen as the main aim of the Conference for Examining the Operation of the Treaty for 1995. It is also obvious that establishing strict international supervision of the proliferation of missile weapons and their production technologies is one of the most important actions in the globalization of efforts in the sphere of disarmament.

The creation of a network of systems for the nonproliferation of individual types of weapons is also a future action in multilateral diplomacy. The formation of such systems may be done both on a global and a regional scale. It presupposes various forms of combining partial and complete bans as well as other restrictions, taking into account the specific nature of certain regions.

The activation of international efforts to restrict the supply of conventional weapons is becoming increasingly urgent. The Persian Gulf crisis was a warning bell indicating the need for a very speedy transition to actions. We believe that in order to resolve the tasks that are arising in this connection, it is necessary to apply fully the potential of UN disarmament mechanisms. We could start with the creation, within a UN framework, of an international register for sales and supplies of conventional weapons.

The task of the globalization of the disarmament process has placed questions of restricting the activity of the naval forces on the agenda. The Soviet Union consistently advocates the immediate holding of talks on the whole spectrum of naval problems. We are proceeding on the basis of the expediency of stage-by-stage progress toward ensuring security and strengthening stability at sea. At the same time we could start with the elaboration and realization of the simplest measures of trust, openness, and predictability of naval activity.

Regional measures are an integral constituent component of the disarmament process. Europe's example testifies to their high efficiency. It was here in fact that the defusing of the seat of potential conflict began and the structure of regional security is being created—the prototype of a worldwide system of collective security stipulated in the UN Charter. Next is the Persian Gulf and the Near East. Recent dramatic events led the world community to understand the need to form a reliable system of post-crisis security in this region.

The new conditions of the development of international relations are also promoting evolution in a positive direction in the Asian-Pacific region and overcoming the legacy of the "cold war" there. In the first place this concerns reducing the level of military confrontation, the creation of preconditions for the formation of a reliable infrastructure of security and constructive intergovernmental cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region. USSR President M.S. Gorbachev made proposals on this during his visit to Japan. This involves both triple Soviet-Japanese-American consultations and the calling of a conference involving five sides, with the participation of the superpowers of the region (the USSR, the United States, the PRC, India, and Japan) and the holding in 1993 of a meeting of Asia-Pacific countries' foreign ministers.

Regional disarmament in conjunction with measures of trust and openness makes the search for ways to achieve political settlements to crises—which is an integral element in ensuring international security—significantly easier. At the same time, the modern world is not so much a world of crises as a world of preventive diplomacy. That is why we must use more actively the means of "early detection" of possible conflicts which the world community already has at its disposal, and prevent them by means of joint efforts.

Events of recent times confirm that essentially a new agenda for multilateral disarmament is being formed today. The question of the influence of scientific and technological progress on maintaining international security and stability is being put into the foreground. After all, scientific and technological progress does not just involve the potential danger of the upsurge of a qualitative arms race, but also a huge positive potential. Coordinated efforts on the part of these states in this sphere would make it possible essentially to restrain the proliferation of military technologies and at the same time activate the international exchange of scientific and technical information. The question of forming a mechanism under the auspices of the United Nations, which would ensure fair access to technical information and state-of-the-art technologies for everyone, and at the same time restrict the use of scientific and technical achievements to military ends, could be examined on a multilateral level in the future.

Against the background of the real progress that has recently been made in disarmament, the world community's attention is focused on problems connected with arms destruction and primarily, of course, the broad spectrum of environmental questions. It must be admitted that the influence of the arms destruction process on the environment has not been properly studied yet. The United Nations and other international organizations and scientific research centers may make a perceptible contribution to resolving this problem and in particular, to the elaboration of environmentally safe technology for destroying the weapons being reduced.

It must be stressed that the prospects of world development depend to a great extent on the success of the disarmament process. Disarmament means it will be possible to redirect the enormous material and human resources that are employed in military production into solving global problems that are becoming increasingly acute, into extending social programs, and finally, raising people's living standard. It might be possible to organize research into problems of transferring the military economy into civilian channels at UN level, and summarize and circulate the experience of conversion in various countries and regions. In particular, it would be useful to employ the economic expertise of conversion programs in order to calculate their results in every specific case by the "yardstick of dividends."

The wide range of appeals for multilateral disarmament requires urgent work on the part of its mechanisms. Today their rationalization is an urgent task. It seems that the time has come to include the disarmament theme in the sphere of Security Council activity. The work of the UN General Assembly First (political) Committee should be organized in a more topical way, in our view. The time has come to gear this organ to the concrete needs of the disarmament process, reducing the overall number of resolutions it adopts and placing an emphasis on the ones that are really efficient. I think that the priority of tasks that are resolved, and their practical significance and the extent of their feasibility can serve as the main criteria here.

The future work of the Committee on Disarmament is seen in a new light. It could concentrate on in-depth work on individual questions with the aim of preparing them for a subsequent decision, which might be adopted at the Conference on Disarmament.

The improvement of regional disarmament mechanisms is worthy of special attention, incidentally. The experience of creating a Center for the Prevention of Conflicts in Europe is seen as useful. The idea of forming a multilateral UN center for reducing the risk of war, which would exchange information with the permanent members of the Security Council and with security structures in various areas of the world, is also promising.

We assess highly the significance of regional UN conferences on disarmament, including the International Conference on Questions of Disarmament in Kyoto (Japan) organized at UN level. They open up an additional channel for the realization of the extensive scientific and intellectual potential in the sphere of disarmament of the states which are members of the organization, and create a political environment that favors efforts to implement measures in this sphere, that is, solving a problem that is vitally important for the whole of humanity.

It stands to reason that all this should not have a negative influence on the USSR's security. The USSR Foreign Ministry, together with other statewide departments, wants the strategic equilibrium on the international

arena to be preserved and maintained so that the lives of Soviet people are reliably protected. All the problems that arise should be resolved by strictly taking into consideration the sides' interests and unconditionally observing reciprocity during the disarmament process. We intend to continue going steadfastly along the outlined path, never forgetting that ensuring the country's reliable security is still a top-priority aim in Soviet foreign policy.

Bush Middle East Proposals 'Under Consideration'

*OW1006091191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1530 GMT 7 Jun 91*

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] Moscow's procrastination in reacting to the Bush plan on the Middle East is accounted for by the fact that it is "under consideration". Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has in the past put forward similar proposals it is taking its time about voicing support for the American President's initiative that provides for slashing military expenditure in the region. A Soviet Foreign Ministry official told DP [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent it is worthwhile to consider the ambiguous reaction to this proposal in the Arab world. Some of the Arab nations see cuts in arms sales to the region playing into the hands of Israel. Diplomatic sources emphasised that does not mean the Soviet Union is backing the Arab view of the situation. Yet further study of the issue is necessary on the part of both the USSR and other permanent members of the UN Security Council.

Spokesman Views Mitterrand Disarmament Plan

*LD1006174191 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT
10 Jun 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Alexander Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, June 10 (TASS)—The Soviet Union considers French President Francois Mitterrand's arms reduction and disarmament plan as an important initiative, which corresponds on the whole to proposals, including Soviet initiatives, concerning ways to achieve international stability, as well as regional and world security after the "cold war", Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

He said the Soviet side will thoroughly study and analyse specific aspects of this initiative, adding that France's decision to join the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons arouses a "feeling of satisfaction" in the Soviet Union.

He said the Soviet Union considers the decision as "a new opportunity for a comprehensive promotion and universalisation of this most authoritative international arms reduction agreement".

"The Soviet side expresses hope that France's example will be followed by other states that have so far refrained from joining the treaty," Churkin said.

He said the Soviet Union "fully shares" France's ideas as regards the need to intensify talks on a draft international convention banning chemical weapons and holding for this purpose a special meeting of the foreign ministers of countries participating in the talks within the disarmament conference framework.

France's proposals on conventional arms trade restrictions, as well as on the development of a reliable and effective regime of non-proliferation of combat missiles and missile technologies are noteworthy, Churkin said.

He said Mitterrand's acknowledgement of the importance of the coordinating and stimulating role of the United Nations and the Security Council in disarmament issues corresponds to the Soviet Union's views.

"The Soviet side is ready to maintain working contacts with France to coordinate efforts in finding optimal ways to implement the French president's proposals," Churkin said.

Citizens Polled on Nuclear Disarmament

*OW1706054691 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1800 GMT 14 Jun 91*

[From "Viewpoint"; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] An opinion poll taken by the National Public Opinion Studies Center (VCIOM) last March among 1,953 people making up a representative cross-section of the USSR's urban population contained the question "Do you think the Soviet Union should go ahead with nuclear disarmament?"

The news agency DATA reports nearly one half (48 percent) of the respondents said YES to the question, one third (32 percent) suggested the nation should preserve its nuclear potential, and the rest failed to express a definite opinion.

Asked what they thought about cuts in conventional armed forces and armaments, 45 percent of those polled said such cuts should continue, 33 percent warned against that policy, and 22 percent said they did not know.

The statistical error margin was set at 3 percent.

Reaction to Bush Mideast Arms Race Remarks

*PM1906100391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5*

[Sergey Filatov "Viewpoint": "Near East: Farewell to Arms?"]

[Text] To cap the Gulf war, the victors have begun to ponder whether it is time to clear the Near East of the

countless weapons systems that have piled up there in the years of Arab-Israeli confrontation. Sooner or later this conflict may flare up with fresh force and who knows what harm it may do the people of the planet. Atmospheric discharges from Kuwait's blazing oil wells are already beginning to change the climate in vast regions around the Persian Gulf.

That is why U.S. President G. Bush's recent proposals for an end to the arms race in the Near East and the Maghreb aroused a fairly animated reaction in the world and, primarily, in the region itself. Speaking in Colorado Springs, he called for the major suppliers of arms to these countries to display "restraint"; production of nuclear materials to be banned in the states of the region; for them to freeze the acquisition, production, and testing of "surface-to-surface" missiles; and subscribe to the Convention on the Prohibition and Elimination of Chemical Weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention. G. Bush also suggested beginning discussion of the problems raised at the meeting of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, which are also effectively the main suppliers of arms to the Near East.

The initial response to the U.S. initiative among the Arabs has proved largely positive, but cautious. Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the PLO, and Syria have expressed their interest in various ways. Israel has, for its part, said that the proposals are "very important," but it has "certain questions" as regards this plan.

Be that as it may, no one has uttered a definite "no." And that is a direct indication that the countries of the region are prepared in principle to discuss the problem of arms reduction. I think that each country approaches this problem from the viewpoint of its own security. And the U.S. plan does contain some elements that require clarification. For instance, the intention is to cease nuclear weapons production, but according to various data, Israel already possesses these weapons, while its Arab neighbors do not, and the latter cannot help but be concerned over this imbalance.

Nevertheless who would deny that there is of course a grain of sense in the U.S. proposals. It is for that reason that the permanent members of the UN Security Council will most likely be gathering in Paris for the proposed meeting. France, Britain, China, and the United States have agreed. Informed USSR Foreign Ministry sources say that Soviet diplomatic circles have reacted with interest to G. Bush's initiatives and are currently studying the question of a Soviet delegation taking part in this conference. It is after all high time to relieve the Near East of the arsenals that have piled up there.

START TALKS

U.S. Finalizes New Stance on Strategic Arms

*PM1006131791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 8 Jun 91 First Edition p 5*

[Unattributed report: "The United States Clarifies Its Stance on Strategic Offensive Armaments"]

[Text] U.S. President George Bush held a conference on Thursday with his leading national security advisers, at which there was a discussion of the new U.S. stance at the talks on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments. So says THE WASHINGTON POST, citing senior U.S. officials.

The paper stresses that the conference was held on the eve of the meeting planned for Friday between Secretary of State J. Baker and USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh in Geneva. "Baker and Bessmertnykh have to try to solve the questions that are impeding the completion of a new American-Soviet treaty on the reduction of long-range nuclear armaments," THE WASHINGTON POST noted. "Both sides expressed the hope that the treaty could be signed by Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev at a Moscow summit at the end of June or beginning of July."

At the same time, as THE NEW YORK TIMES noted yesterday, the conference was an "uncommonly hasty attempt to regulate U.S. policy on the questions that were impeding the Moscow summit and revealed a split in the administration," in particular, a difference of opinion between Baker and B. Scowcroft, assistant to the President for national security affairs, over talks tactics. According to official administration spokesmen, THE NEW YORK TIMES notes, during the conference at the White House on Thursday these internal differences were settled and most of the details of the U.S. position at the talks, which Baker will present to Bessmertnykh, were finalized.

Bessmertnykh on Prospects for START Completion

*AU1006133191 Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG
in German 9 Jun 91 p 6*

[Report on "exclusive" interview with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh by Heinz Vielain: "Soviet Foreign Minister in WELT AM SONNTAG on His Strategy in Europe"]

[Excerpt] Bonn—[passage omitted] Asked to what extent he and his U.S. counterpart James Baker were able to make progress during the deliberations in Geneva in solving the unresolved problems concerning strategic offensive weapons (START Treaty) and thus come closer to the summit between U.S. President George Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow, Bessmertnykh said: "In Geneva we concentrated on solutions that will make it possible to conclude the formulation of this treaty. Once again, we looked at all unsolved substantive issues and defined three main problems on which the conclusion of the treaty now in practice depends. For us it is very important to reestablish the agreements achieved with Baker in Houston last December. The questions that are still open are primarily technical ones. They are so technically difficult that many politicians and military people do not understand what they are all about. Nevertheless, these questions

occupy an important place in the current stage of working out the treaty. I do think that the Gorbachev-Bush summit has come closer as a result of the talks with Baker. Secretary of State Baker gave me a letter from President Bush addressed to President Gorbachev, which deals with START issues."

Bessmertnykh announced that it has been agreed to have additional expert groups come to Geneva to "help" the negotiating delegations in examining the "questions that we defined." He is in agreement with Baker on "keeping in daily contact and closely following the work of the negotiators. We will meet to discuss START preparations soon, no later than at the European foreign ministers' conference in Berlin on 19 and 20 June."

Asked whether the planned Moscow summit between President Gorbachev and U.S. President Bush might take place before the international economic summit in mid-July, the Soviet foreign minister said: "This is difficult to tell. It is not decisive, either. For us it is important to prepare a good and solid treaty that corresponds to the state and defense interests of the Soviet Union."

Concerning the treaty on conventional disarmament in Europe, Bessmertnykh said that the experts have now finished the text of the treaty: "Now it only has to be discussed and briefly coordinated with the other parties to the treaty. Then the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe can be ratified."

Bessmertnykh on START, Soviet-U.S. Summit

*AU1706135491 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG
in German 12 Jun 91 p 2*

[Interview with Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh by NOVOSTI reporter Vladimir Markov; place and date not given: "On the Way to the Summit Meeting"]

[Text] [Markov] What progress did you make in your meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Geneva at the end of last week when discussing issues that are still unresolved in connection with the START talks? Has the Moscow summit meeting become more likely?

[Bessmertnykh] At the meeting in Geneva, we focused our efforts on the completion of the START treaty. After discussing the open problems, three major issues turned out to be decisive for the conclusion of the treaty. I would like to mention one of these issues: access to telemetric information during the missile takeoff.

It was very important for us to restore the whole package of agreements that was concluded in talks with James Baker in Houston last year. The unresolved questions are mainly of a—sometimes very complicated—technical nature. They assume a very important role in the current phase of the drafting of the START treaty. We assigned

corresponding tasks to the two delegations, which are making intense efforts to arrive at a solution.

I believe that we really succeeded in making the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow more likely.

[Markov] How can the START talks in Geneva be accelerated?

[Bessmertnykh] Both sides will send additional groups of experts to Geneva who will help the delegations find a solution to the technical aspects of the problems. We agreed with Baker that we will maintain constant daily contact and follow the work of our delegations in Geneva. We will discuss the situation again with Baker not later than on 19 and 20 June when the council of CSCE foreign ministers will hold its first session in Berlin.

[Markov] How do you assess the talks that were held by Soviet and U.S. experts in Moscow after your meeting with the U.S. secretary of state in Lisbon, during which differences of opinion concerning the treaty on conventional armaments in Europe were removed?

[Bessmertnykh] I assess them in a very positive way. They complete the work and make it possible finally to draft the agreement, including all technical aspects. Thus, only a few more aspects have to be discussed with other partners in the talks. Then the treaty will be ready for ratification.

[Markov] When do you think the Moscow meeting between Gorbachev and Bush can take place?

[Bessmertnykh] We have not yet set a specific date for the summit meeting because it will depend on progress in the START talks. Once the outlines of a complete document become discernible, the date of a summit meeting can be set quickly and without problems.

[Markov] Can one proceed from the assumption that the summit meeting in Moscow will take place before the G-7 meeting in London?

[Bessmertnykh] You know, it is difficult to answer this question. I do not think that this is so important at this point. It is much more important to draft a good document that corresponds to the state and defense interests of the Soviet Union. In any case, both the Soviet and the U.S. side believe that the summit meeting should be substantive. This means that the START treaty must be ready for signing before it can take place.

U.S. Observers Cited on Summit, START Prospects

*PM1706141491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jun 91 Second Edition p 7*

[Article by correspondent Viktor Linnik under the "View From New York" rubric: "Complex Patterns: Toward the Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting"]

[Excerpts] June—Today, while there is still hope that the postponed summit meeting will be held in the not too distant future, it is apposite to ask: How have the sides used the involuntary delay caused by the impossibility, for G. Bush, of coming to the rendezvous planned for February? This year Washington's main foreign policy burden has been the "hot" war in the Persian Gulf. Throughout this time, Soviet-U.S. dialogue has not been interrupted.

Now the U.S. component in Soviet foreign policy seems to me to be gradually taking the place that properly belongs to it: central but not solitary; a priority, but not exclusive. The same is true of the U.S. attitude to us. Here is what I was told on this point by leading U.S. sovietologist R. Legvold, director of the Harriman Institute of Long-Term Study of the Soviet Union at Columbia University:

"I think the war in the Persian Gulf pushed Soviet-U.S. relations into the background in U.S. foreign policy. And apparently that is where they will stay, unless something happens in the Soviet Union to make them again become the number one subject of concern for the present administration..."

There are various reasons for this. I think the Persian Gulf war played a part, by showing that along with the spheres of intersecting Soviet and U.S. interests, each of these countries also has its own, special interests that by no means always coincide. For instance, the creation of permanent U.S. military bases in the Persian Gulf can hardly be seen as a phenomenon that accords with our interests or with the establishment of panhuman values.

Dialogue Demands Continuation

The central aspect of Soviet-U.S. relations—which is obviously what disarmament is—is not in doubt, for one simple reason: the enormous military potential that the two countries still have. If we are still a superpower, unfortunately it is only in one limited sense: Today the USSR is the only country in the world that retains the potential physically to annihilate the other superpower—the United States. The reverse is also true. This parity is not psychologically the same for each country. We spent many years drawing back from the situation of a country that could be destroyed by dozens of different states in the world, arriving at a situation where the only mortal threat to us came from the United States. For the United States, which had no such threats or rivals virtually throughout its history, we were the first such country. I am deliberately disregarding the other threats to our national existence that exist today in connection with domestic factors. And so the disarmament aspect of our relations dictates the need to continue the Moscow-Washington dialogue.

"Who, in your view, is to blame for the delay in resolving arms reduction questions," I asked Legvold, "the Soviet military, as the American press reports, or the U.S. Administration?"

"As you know, the administration has linked progress at strategic arms reduction talks to the reduction of conventional arms," the scientist replied. "The Soviet military people object on this last point. I do not wish to say that their arguments are absolutely groundless, in the context of the abolition of the Warsaw Pact Organization. But a conventional arms agreement has already been signed, and it must be respected. Maybe the United States could also be more magnanimous, in view of the new situation that has arisen. But that is not how countries usually behave. As for strategic arms reduction, in my view the problem here has its roots in the U.S. approach. For 12 months now Baker has been saying that the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty is 95-percent ready. It is time really to make progress." [passage omitted]

Emotion and Hard Work

Today the level of expectations on the eve of the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has declined, compared to what usually preceded such meetings formerly. This is not least because the administration constantly maintains a state of uncertainty about the actual date of the meeting. Its latest postponement—this time, perhaps, to the end of August—is, as THE NEW YORK TIMES put it, "a not very elegant attempt by the Bush administration to squeeze out of the Soviets speedy agreement to the new American proposals on strategic arms reduction." It is also only natural that the emotion prompted by radical breakthroughs in relations always flares higher than that prompted by the routine hard work of consolidating and developing what has been achieved. Moreover it is hard now to come up with any events or decisions that would be comparable in drama to the fall of the Berlin Wall or the restoration of capitalism in Eastern Europe. Especially since, judging by the administration's present mood, it does not intend to discuss an economic aid program in concrete terms in Moscow.

And another thing—the domestic factor: Henceforth progress in Soviet-U.S. relations and in U.S. foreign policy will in the near future be dictated by the pace and limits set by the 1992 presidential campaign, which is now getting under way. Any shifts or, conversely, immobility in the U.S. position will now have to be seen from the standpoint of the election battles. However popular the President may be now and however much his victory next year may, according to all the predictions, be beyond dispute, nothing will be done in Soviet-U.S. relations that could jeopardize G. Bush's chances of reelection. And conversely, any benefits, any progress will henceforth be timed to fit in with the calendar of primaries. This means that if the arms reduction treaties are not completed in time for the Moscow summit meeting (and that possibility exists), they will most likely be postponed to the period after the end of the 1992 presidential campaign.

But here in the United States, on the basis of the results of the preceding Soviet-U.S. meetings, M.S. Gorbachev

has gained a firm reputation as a master of political surprises. These cannot, of course, be ruled out this time...

Bessmertnykh Cited on START, Summit Timing

PM1806144391 Moscow IAN PRESS RELEASE
in English (Undated)

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh by IAN correspondent Vladimir Markov; date, place not given: "Gorbachev-Bush Summit: 'Filled With Substance'"]

[Text] Markov: When you met with James Baker in Geneva, how much progress did you make on the issues which remain unresolved at the talks on the START treaty, and did you succeed in bringing the planned Moscow summit any closer?

Bessmertnykh: We did give much thought to the problems surrounding the START treaty. We looked into the outstanding issues and identified three top priorities crucial for the completion of the treaty. One concerns access to telemetry data during test-launching of missiles.

We thought it of great importance to bring back the package of accords which were reached during the talks with James Baker in Houston in December last year. The issues which still defy solutions are predominantly of a complex technical character. Yet they are no less important at this point of work on the START treaty.

We have mapped out approaches to these issues and instructed both delegations to put maximum effort in the work to find appropriate solutions. James Baker gave me President Bush's message for Mikhail Gorbachev on strategic arms issues, we also came forward with some fresh ideas on a number of issues.

I think that, as a result, we did succeed in bringing closer the planned Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Markov: How can strategic arms talks be sped up in Geneva?

Bessmertnykh: Both sides are sending additional groups of experts to Geneva to help the delegations with an in-depth technical consideration of the issues we singled out. Further, Baker and I agreed to keep constantly, daily, in touch, and monitor the work being done by our delegations in Geneva. Somewhat later, but before June 19 or 20, when in Berlin the CSCE foreign ministers' council will meet in session for the first time, Baker and I will again meet to discuss the way the work on the START treaty is going.

Markov: What do you think of the talks held by Soviet and U.S. experts in Moscow following your meeting in Lisbon with the U.S. Secretary of State, where you ironed out differences over the treaty on conventional arms in Europe?

Bessmertnykh: I think they were a success. We did all the work that had to be done and formalised previous accords including all technical aspects. The remaining task ahead is to hold a short discussion with the other parties to the treaty, which thereupon will be ready for ratification.

Markov: All things considered, when do you think the Gorbachev-Bush Moscow meeting can take place?

Bessmertnykh: We did not try to fix the date of the summit, as the timing will depend on progress at the START talks. Once the treaty begins to take a definite shape, it won't take us long to agree on the date. So the exact time of the summit is not really at issue.

Markov: Can we expect the summit in Moscow to take place before the G-7 meeting in London?

Bessmertnykh: It's hard to say, you know. Again, I think this is not very important. What really matters is to produce a good, fine-tuned document that would be in the national and defence interest of the Soviet Union. The question of when to meet will not take long to decide. I think. There is the same feeling among the Americans and Soviet parties: they want the planned summit to be filled with substance, and the treaty to be signed by Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush must be at the heart of this substance.

Commentator Expects Further START Progress

LD1906121891 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The announcement by President Bush that he has received what he termed as a positive letter from Mikhail Gorbachev concerning the strategic arms reduction problem has given rise to quite a few speculations about further progress of the Strategic Arms Reduction [START] talks. And Yuriy Solton has this comment:

President Bush was very reserved in his assessments. According to him it was no breakthrough yet, but unquestionable progress. The difference gap has narrowed and the START treaty, which leaves 1,600 strategic arms delivery vehicles and 6,000 warheads for either of the sides, is now ready, not by 95 but by 96 percent, as President Bush has put it. The treaty defines a balance in the strategic field. Any error committed in it may turn into a factor bound to undermine stability.

The questions remaining unresolved, though referred to as technical, are actually very serious. It's the control of the production of strategic arms, it's the exchange of information about their testing and the definition of characteristics for new kinds of strategic missiles. I see no point in guessing how quickly the talks over the remaining problems will develop. Twelve years ago on 18 June an agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons was signed by the Soviet Union and the United

States in Vienna. Ever since, the work has been going on, with some interruptions, over a new agreement. And this new agreement is almost ready. Against this background it's not so important, I think, if the negotiations over it last one more month or end a month earlier. The most important thing is that both the Soviet and the American sides are determined at the highest level to make this agreement a reality. In fact, President Gorbachev and President Bush are considered to be the unofficial participants in the talks. They have to interfere whenever the talks are deadlocked.

One more statement by President Bush is worthy of attention. He said he had left blank spots in his schedule at the end of June or at the beginning of July, looking forward to this meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev. He gave to understand that he was ready to have such a meeting with President Gorbachev even if not all the i's would be dotted and all the t's crossed in the agreement. This statement reaffirms the intention of the American Administration to go ahead with its policy aimed at promoting relations of understanding with the Soviet Union. Moscow approaches its relations with the United States from a similar stand.

On 20 June, the Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, is expected to meet the American secretary of state, James Baker, in Berlin. The two officials will examine disarmament and other problems dealing with the preparation of a Soviet-American summit. And I think we have every reason to count on further progress, Yuriy Solton writes in conclusion.

SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

Krasnoyarsk Radar Destruction Criticized on Economic Grounds

91WC0119A

[Editorial report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian publishes in its 11 June 1991 issue on page 2 a 400-word article by its own correspondent V. Nelyubin entitled "While the Radars Are On, Children Sleep More Peacefully." Nelyubin discusses the dismantling of the Krasnoyarsk radar station—to comply with the U.S.-Soviet ABM Treaty—and notes the cost of both constructing and then dismantling it. He criticizes the military authorities, first for launching such an expensive construction project while keeping it secret from the Soviet public, and then for being wasteful in the process of dismantling it. Nelyubin cites a figure, from the Soviet press, of 120 million rubles to construct the station, which he says is probably understated; as to "how many millions" will be spent on the dismantling, he says it is too early to tell. He goes on to assert that "housing, production buildings, communications installations and a large part of [the radar station's] equipment, judging by everything, is simply being thrown away." He asserts that local inhabitants are stealing such items from the site as "construction materials, spare parts for vehicles and tractors, and pieces of sheet metal." However, he says

that since the materials in question are at least being put to use, the thefts may be preferable to the military's preferred procedure of "burying, burning, or dumping [dismantled materials] in the forest."

Nelyubin concludes by accusing the military of habitually being "a dog in the manger" in regard to deactivated military facilities, preferring to see such facilities fall into disrepair rather than be put to use in the civilian economy. However, whereas in other instances the military's attitude has cost the national economy "thousands," in the case of the Krasnoyarsk radar, "the losses are in millions."

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Reports, Comments on Completion of Pullout From Hungary

SGF Commander Interviewed

PM0606114991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 5 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Lieutenant General V. Shilov, temporary acting commander of the Southern Group of Forces, by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Borovikov; date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction: "We Shall Always Be Neighbors"]

[Text] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic is reaching completion. Our correspondent talks about some of the results of the action carried out to restation units and subunits with Lieutenant General V. Shilov, temporary acting commander of the Southern Group of Forces [SGF], the USSR Government's fully empowered representative for the affairs of the Soviet troops' presence in the Hungarian Republic.

[Borovikov] Viktor Yegorovich, describe the problems you encountered at the end of last year when you came to head the process of the troops withdrawal.

[Shilov] Ensuring the uninterrupted schedule for the withdrawal and at the same time maintaining combat readiness and martial discipline at the proper level in the group's units and subunits—that is perhaps the main thing. The reports from the new stationing posts attest to how far this has been successfully done. In their majority our servicemen are embarking without hesitation on the fulfillment of the combat training programs and are showing quite good results. And that is frequently under conditions when daily life has not yet been completely sorted out, when the provision of facilities leaves room for improvement. Of course, for our part we have done everything to provide the departing units with the necessary material means and construction materials. But you cannot take everything with you. On the other hand the cohesiveness of the military collectives, their mutual aid, their ability to allocate their forces and potential correctly, remained up to standard. That is noted by

many of the military chiefs who have received our units under their subordination in the internal districts.

But to this day there are problems of a different nature. The Hungarian side is doing everything to drag out the question of the mutual settling of accounts for establishments constructed by the USSR Defense Ministry on Hungarian territory, thus ignoring one of the points of the intergovernment agreement. Constant consultations and dialogues at the highest levels are so far producing small advances. We ourselves have had to resolve the question of the withdrawal of material assets, although the Hungarian side had undertaken to help in selling 125,000 tonnes of material stocks. We succeeded in seeking reserves and additional opportunities in order not to disrupt the withdrawal schedule and by 1 May the withdrawal of that part of the material assets was basically completed and the tension here abated. We also had to resolve ecological questions. The Hungarian side frequently makes unjustified financial claims for ecological damage allegedly caused by our troops during their stay in Hungary. The statements by representatives of the Hungarian leadership and in the Hungarian mass media persistently defend the idea of the zero option in settling mutual accounts.

[Borovikov] Will there be a final settling of accounts for the establishments which we are leaving for the Hungarians? When and in what form will that occur?

[Shilov] On 8 April 1991 the fully empowered representatives of the USSR and Hungarian governments approved the method for the reception and transfer and determining of the residual cost of establishments and also for determining the difference in maintaining establishments temporarily used (leased) by Soviet troops and the extent of the damage caused to the environment by the Soviet troops. Some 90 percent of military townships were investigated for ecological pollution. The assessment has been completed of the cost of the buildings and installations constructed at the Soviet side's expense which have now been handed over. As a result of this work documents are being drawn up to submit the sides' financial claims. But so far nothing has been received for the 110 townships handed over to the Hungarian side.

[Borovikov] As the Soviet Government's fully empowered representative you have sufficient information about the Hungarians' attitude toward the return of our troops to the Union. Please share this information.

[Shilov] As a whole the withdrawal of the units of the Southern Group of Forces is being implemented in an atmosphere of good will toward our troops. Suffice it to say that in the process of their withdrawal there has not been a single instance of acts of provocation against us. The overwhelming majority of the Hungarian population is seeing off the Soviet servicemen as friends. I personally have seen many cases of the display of sincere friendly feelings toward our soldiers during the echelons' departure.

Many people are voicing understanding of the daily living problems which our officers and ensigns and members of their families are encountering upon their return to the Motherland.

We can feel support from the Defense Ministry and the country's leaders in resolving many questions. Primarily those which concern the fulfillment of the troop withdrawal schedule. Some of the country's state and political leaders have come out with the initiative to hold celebratory demonstrations 30 June to mark the completion of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungarian territory. I hope that these projects will not contain plans of an anti-Soviet bent. Otherwise it would be greatly in contrast to the overall atmosphere of mutual understanding which characterizes our two peoples and their armies.

[Borovikov] According to the intergovernment agreement between our countries, by the end of June this year not a single Soviet soldier will be left on the territory of the Hungarian Republic. But soldiers' graves and monuments and obelisks to the Soviet servicemen who gave their lives in the struggle against fascism will remain. Tending them and maintaining them in proper order was in the overwhelming majority of cases the concern of the Southern Group of Forces servicemen and members of their families. What is the fate of the symbols of our military and human fate in the future?

[Shilov] You have touched on a very sensitive problem. About 1,000 graves of Soviet servicemen who died in the fighting for Hungary's liberation from fascism are scattered over the country's entire territory. The majority of these graves are fraternal, over 140,000 of our compatriots died on Hungarian soil. Many local self-management organs have assured us that the Soviet servicemen's graves will be maintained in a good stage, and that has also been stated by the Hungarian Republic president, to whom the Southern Group of Forces addressed a relevant letter.

But in my view this problem must be decided at intergovernment level, with the signing of a special agreement within the framework of the new documents which are now being elaborated between the Soviet Union and the Hungarian Republic.

Hungarian President Welcomes Pullout

LD1706101591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0630 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Excerpts] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary has been completed. Celebrations are planned throughout the country on 30 June to mark the event. Our Budapest correspondent Sergey Shavygin, asked the president of the Hungarian Republic, Arpad Goncz, to tell us about this in an interview for Soviet radio. [passage omitted]

[begin recording] [Goncz in Hungarian with simultaneous Russian translation] First, let me make one thing

clear, we are celebrating not because the Soviet Union and its troops are leaving. Our joy is that for the first time in the centuries-old history of Hungary, we are able to feel ourselves fully sovereign. I think it necessary to note that your country is pulling its military units out on its own initiative, on the basis of a bilateral agreement. Our joy that we are obtaining full sovereignty, part of which, indeed, Hungary is willing to forego in the interests of developing international cooperation, is in no way directed against the Soviet Union or against the Soviet Army. I am convinced that the departure of the Soviet soldiers will not distance our countries from each other, but on the contrary, will bring them closer together. This is not so much the completion of a process, but rather the beginning of a new one. Now nothing remains that could hinder the development of really friendly and sincere relations between Hungary and the Soviet Union.

Withdrawal Completed

LD1906190391 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Zhirnikhin]

[Text] Budapest, June 19 (TASS)—The last Soviet soldier left Hungary today. The Soviet Army's withdrawal from Hungary has been completed two weeks ahead of schedule under the intergovernmental agreement between the two countries reached in the spring of 1990.

Local newspaper reported that a total of 100,000 Soviet Southern Army troops and their families have been evacuated, as well as 27,000 pieces of military equipment and several hundreds of tonnes of various goods.

Hungarians wish Soviet troops well on the whole. The tone was set by the country's leaders—President Arpad Goncz and Prime Minister Jozsef Antall. The Soviet Army's withdrawal restores full independence to Hungary and the Hungarian people must take leave of Soviet soldiers with a friendly handshake, they said. The Hungarian president promised on behalf of his people that the tombs of Soviet soldiers who fell on Hungarian soil during the war against Nazis will be taken care of.

The mass media and the leaders of different political parties have been unanimous in their calls to preserve and strengthen good- neighbourly relations with the Soviet Union. The MAGYAR HIRLAP newspaper summed up the common approach in stressing that owing to the Soviet Army's withdrawal the Soviet Union begins its rightful incorporation into a common European home.

Along with this, the Hungarian press notes that economic problems related to the Soviet Army's withdrawal remain. Moreover, according to Hungarian experts, the positions of the two countries on this score have never been so far apart as they are today. One stumbling block is the sum of compensation for the Soviet Southern Army's installations suitable for civil use. Hungarians

say that the ecological damage caused by Soviet troops practically equals the cost of the property left behind by the Soviet Army.

Talks on economic problems between experts from the two countries continue.

Preserving Military Stockpiles Proves 'Useless'

LD1106081191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 10 Jun 91

[Text] What is to become of the Treaty for Conventional Armed Forces in Europe now that all interpretation differences have been ironed out? We took the question to Radio Moscow's Navy Captain Aleksandr Yakovlev:

I am sure the signatories will send the treaty for ratification shortly, and there'll be an unprecedented reduction in offensive weapons, dangerous weapons, even though they are called conventional. NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries together will reduce tens of thousands of military equipment and arms, the surplus potential that the two sides got during the cold war. It has proved useless to preserve this potential when nations are moving towards an order based on a guaranteed absence of military threat. The correlation of forces will change in Europe when the treaty gets into action. NATO will have a slight edge in tanks, artillery systems, combat aircraft, and attack helicopter gunships, but the Soviet military believe an imbalance of this kind does not clash with the minimum defense sufficiency criterion. The Soviet Union, instead, will no longer be, in Western eyes, a supermilitarist country jeopardizing Europe, and we, ourselves, will stop regarding this country as some kind of besieged fortress. Still more important is this: Conventional arms in Europe will be scaled down to a level that rules out a surprise attack and large-scale offensive actions in Europe. When the treaty is ratified, it will stimulate disarmament; it should, because disarmament has somewhat slowed down over the past few months. When it is ratified, there will be more Vienna talks for conventional weapons and for gradually ridding Europe of all nuclear weapons.

'Outstanding Differences' Removed in CFE Talks

LD1406224991 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 14 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna, June 14 (TASS)—An extraordinary conference of the 22-nation Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe [CFE] took place here today. The sides exchanged statements which completely remove the outstanding differences over various attitudes to the limitation of armaments in the Marines, Coast Guard and guards of Strategic Rocket Forces of the USSR.

The road to this agreement was thorny. But as a result of intensive political dialogue at the highest level, primarily an exchange of messages by Soviet and U.S. presidents,

a general formula, taking account of the positions of the sides while observing the balance of forces established by the treaty, was found.

What is the essence of the found solution? The essence of the compromise is that 933 tanks, 1,080 artillery systems and 1,725 armoured vehicles in service with the Marines and Coast Guard forces of the USSR shall not be limited under the treaty. The Soviet Union undertakes an obligation not to increase these armaments above the existing level. For the purpose of retaining the integrity of treaty parameters, the USSR will compensate for armaments in the Marines and Coast Guard by reducing a similar number of armaments 40 months after its entry into force.

Half of the military hardware to be reduced will be deployed outside the region covered by the treaty with the subsequent elimination or conversion in the eastern part of the country of the amount that is equal to the weapons withdrawn.

The compromise package provides for excluding 1,701 armoured vehicles in service with Strategic Rocket Forces from counting into the levels to be limited under the treaty. However, it is understood that the above number will not be increased.

Finally, the Vienna talks marked an important step towards strengthening European security. As all participants in the talks admitted, these decisions will provide a satisfactory basis for moving towards ratification and implementation of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, signed at the Paris summit on November 19, 1990.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Foresees CFE Ratification

LD1706153991 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, June 17 (TASS)—“It can be said with confidence that the way towards ratifying the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) treaty is now open,” Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

He was commenting on the results of the weekend's extraordinary conference in Vienna between 22 member-states of the treaty, signed in Paris last November.

A Soviet Government statement submitted to the conference, the spokesman said, sets out pledges assumed by the Soviet Union outside the framework of the CFE treaty in order to remove differences stemming from different approaches to arms limitation in the naval forces, coast guards and Strategic Missile Forces guards.

Churkin stressed that the statements made by other member-states at the conference admitted that the Soviet Government statement provided a satisfactory basis for progress towards ratifying and implementing the CFE treaty.

A principled formula for solving problems arising in connection with the treaty was found, taking into account the positions of the sides while preserving the established balance of forces, the spokesman said. It was the result of intense political dialogue and above all the exchange of messages between the Soviet and U.S. presidents, as well as talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and chief of staffs Mikhail Moiseyev and their U.S. counterparts.

Reports on Completion of Withdrawal From Czechoslovakia

Last Troop Train Due 'Today'

LD1906013691 Prague CTK in English 1719 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] Prague, June 18 (CTK)—The last Soviet troop train, carrying military equipment as well as 917 Soviet soldiers and 83 family members, is due to leave Milovice, central Bohemia, formerly the largest Soviet Army base in Czechoslovakia, on Wednesday, a member of the Czechoslovak parliamentary commission in charge of the Soviet troop withdrawal told CTK today. Petr Brodsky said there were 73,500 military servicemen, 18,500 officers and 44,340 civilian workers and dependants in Czechoslovakia at the end of February 1990 when Soviet troops began withdrawing. Brodsky described the conduct of representatives of the Soviet command as very constructive, thanks to which the withdrawal took place without any great problems. He said the last Soviet military representative, General Eduard Vorobyev, is expected to leave for the Soviet Union on June 26, one day after a protocol on the definitive departure of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia is scheduled to be signed. The whole 23-year chapter of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia is expected to be closed by a session of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly (parliament) on June 30, 1991, which will declare null and void the 1968 agreement on the "temporary" stay of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia. Brodsky suggested that the Federal Assembly declare June 30 as Czechoslovakia's commemorative day.

Further on Withdrawal

LD1906221191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent S. Andreyev in Prague]

[Excerpt] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from two Eastern European countries, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, is nearing completion. We have received a report from Prague.

[Andreyev] The last units which guarded the property of the Central Group of Forces and transferred it to the Czechoslovak Army's care are leaving today. Combat equipment was sent home long ago, that is 1,260 tanks,

2,505 infantry vehicles, 1,218 artillery guns, 77 aircraft and 146 helicopters. The Central Group of Forces stationed in Czechoslovakia numbered 73,500 people. A most complex operation which has proceeded strictly in accordance with schedule, in a well-organized and worthy manner, is drawing to a close. Individual incidents do not count. Judging by press-publications, our Czechoslovak colleagues, journalists, have understood this, too. Today they surrounded Colonel-General Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Forces. They spoke about constructing new relations between our countries and about how to use the structures left after the withdrawal. A Soviet-Czechoslovak intergovernment agreement on settling property and financial issues related to the withdrawal of troops will be signed soon. [passage omitted] [video shows trucks on open railway cars; journalists talking to Vorobyev]

NUCLEAR TESTING

Test Sites To Close if U.S. Takes Similar Step

OW1906083591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 18 Jun 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama;" following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Union is prepared to close down immediately both its nuclear sites in Semipalatinsk and Novaya Zemlya if the United States agrees to similar course of action concerning its site in Nevada. That's the upshot of the commentary received by our DP [Diplomatic Panorama] from the Soviet Foreign Ministry's department on arms limitation and disarmament. To create favourable conditions for such a decision the Soviet Union has taken major unilateral steps including a substantial curb of its own test programme. Since October 1989 it has held only one nuclear test.

The Soviet test programme including its "territorial aspect" is under consideration by the Supreme Soviet, goes on the commentary prepared for some publications on the so-called "geo-physical" and "tectonic" weapons allegedly used by the Soviet Union. The nature of such weapons is to cause an earthquake with the help of a nuclear explosion at a distance of hundreds or even thousands kilometres. In that context the authors link the actions of the central government and the natural disasters in various regions of the USSR.

In this light the Foreign Ministry points out that the Soviet Union was one of the first participants of the convention on banning influence on the natural environment and climate for military or other purposes which came into force in 1978. No blame has since been pinned on the Soviet Union for any violations of that convention by any of its approximately 60 members including the United States and Britain. The Soviet Union has repeatedly voiced its readiness to consider any measures aimed at still better effectiveness of the convention and its control mechanism.

CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Chemical Troops Officer Questions CW Convention

91WC0115A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA
in Russian 23 Mar 91 p 2

[Article by Maj Gen Igor Yevstafyev, professor and chief of a directorate in the USSR Ministry of Defense Chemical Forces: "The Roses and Thorns of Chemical Disarmament: The USSR's Position at the Geneva Talks"]

[Text] Let us try to look through the prism of the economy at several problems that will face our country after the signing of the convention banning the development, production, accumulation and destruction of stores of chemical arms, negotiations on which have been conducted in Geneva for decades now.

From the very outset I want to make it perfectly clear that I am presenting only my personal viewpoint and the results of my personal analysis and personal assessment of the state of the problem and its prospects.

The draft future convention provides three basic, fundamental provisions:

- a ban on the development of chemical weapons;
- a ban on their production and stockpiling;
- the destruction of existing stocks.

Let us start with the question of banning development. First of all, the draft convention contains no definition at all of the very concept of "the development of chemical weapons." Second, while paying great attention to verification procedures and inspections, the existing rolling text of the convention contains nothing about verification of precisely this matter, the nondevelopment of chemical weapons. A question arises as to whether such verification is even theoretically possible. It is impossible to halt the development of world chemistry, research on the boundary between chemistry and biology, and the study of more and more new classes of biologically active substances and their influence on targets in the human organism. But this very research, in principle, can also serve the development of new toxic substances—such is the nature of present-day knowledge.

And it is evidently no accident that the draft convention contains permission to synthesize limited quantities of toxic substances in any laboratories. Does it not follow from all this that the participants in the Geneva talks have tacitly agreed that effective verification of the nondevelopment of chemical weapons is hardly possible?

Let us look at a second pillar of the future convention—the ban on the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Let us note that both of the leading powers in the area of chemical weapons—the USSR and the

United States—have experience stopping such production. The USSR announced that it was stopping the production of chemical weapons in 1987. The United States, too, produced no chemical weapons from 1969 through 1987. Stopping production means conserving special equipment, and a real possibility of using our chemical-weapons plants and their highly skilled production personnel for the production of other, peacetime products. For us this is an extremely timely problem.

But just how does the convention being drawn up in Geneva treat the conversion issue?

"...All specialized and standard equipment is subject to physical destruction....All specialized and standard buildings are subject to physical destruction....Standard buildings mean buildings that have been built in accordance with standards common in industry for facilities that do not produce highly toxic, lethal chemicals." In general, no conversion whatsoever; the complete destruction, under the bulldozer, not only of specialized equipment (that would be understandable), but also of ordinary industrial buildings and installations and general industrial equipment. So, in the event the convention is signed, no peacetime products will come from those plants. To the contrary, our state will have to undertake serious economic outlays for the destruction of chemical-weapons plants. The destruction of those plants will take more effort that was once expended to destroy the Church of Christ the Savior. The result, to be sure, will be the same—level ground and, in the future, efforts to identify the specific people responsible for those decisions.

The United States can permit itself to raze its former chemical-weapons plants—its enterprises have not really operated since 1969, are not incorporated into the structure of the peacetime chemical industry, and no longer represent any material value to speak of. Furthermore, the American chemical industry, unlike ours, faces no conversion problem. Incidentally, according to the draft convention, the plants that produce the components of American binary systems will not be subject to destruction at all. The other Western countries do not have any modern chemical-weapons plants, either. In general, it is only us, Russia, on whom these lines of the future convention will impose an economic burden. Rather strange economic "benefits" await us once the accord being drawn up in Geneva takes effect.

And finally, the third pillar of the future convention—the destruction of existing stockpiles of chemical weapons—imposes (and this is proper even without any convention) extremely strict requirements for environmental protection during the destruction of chemical-weapon stocks. It provides for continuous international verification and fixed deadlines for the destruction of stockpiles and, consequently, specifies required capacities (and rather high ones, at that) for special plants.

The Americans, for all intents and purposes, have already accomplished the task of building such plants.

US outlays for the destruction program amounted to nearly \$2 billion by 1990, and nearly another billion dollars is to be allocated for 1991-1995. Facilities have been built for the destruction of chemical weapons in Tooele (Utah) and on Johnston Atoll. On the whole, the United States is practically ready for the destruction of its obsolete chemical-weapon stocks, the fulfillment of bilateral commitments, and its possible commitments under the future convention. We have practically no real facilities for the destruction of chemical weapons. We need money—billions of rubles—for the construction and operation of plants.

But the expense of destroying chemical-weapon stocks and their former production base is only part of the state's outlays for the fulfillment of its commitments in the event that the convention banning chemical weapons takes effect. Expenditures will be required for supporting authorized activities, preparing an institution of inspectors, and conducting inspections themselves on other countries' territory. That means billions of rubles more. In this case, disarmament is proving to be extremely costly.

And so now the question arises: Can our country presently allocate these billions of rubles? Must we, once again, toss out the well-known, old slogan about "catching up with and overtaking America"? Can any decision on sites for the construction of facilities for destroying chemical weapons be made in the present sociopolitical atmosphere? Which republic will agree to have them sited in it? The Baltics? Moldavia? Or possibly Georgia? Or Kazakhstan, on the territory of the Sary-Ozek that has been cleared by explosions? There is no need for illusions—the only place to be considered will once again be Russia. And in a situation in which the republics are economically independent, the outlays will be borne first and foremost precisely by Russia—instead of roads for the Nechernozemye, instead of housing, instead of kindergartens and schools.

The West evidently knows that in the area of disarmament, in our striving for foreign-policy effects, we often put the horse before the cart. Now we are being invited to undertake serious material outlays in a devastating chemical-disarmament race. Won't this multibillion-ruble race be just one more serious blow to the country's economic foundation?

And what is to be done about our country's defense capability? Here, too, everything is not so simple. At the present time there already exists the 17 July 1925 Geneva Protocol, which banned "the use in war of asphyxiating, toxic or other similar gases, and likewise of any liquids, substances and processes." The USSR ratified the Geneva Protocol back in 1925. The United States also ratified the Geneva Protocol—granted, not until 1975, after the Vietnam war was over.

The Geneva Protocol does not ban the development and stockpiling by any country of chemical weapons, but it

does exclude such weapons from the arsenal of means of armed struggle and bans their combat use.

At the present time, the parties to the Geneva Protocol number about 120 states—practically the whole civilized world—and its effectiveness and unshakeability were confirmed anew by the 1989 Paris International Conference, in which delegations from 146 countries took part.

The significance and authority of the Geneva Protocol was demonstrated anew in the course of the Persian Gulf Conflict. Despite provocative strikes by the coalition forces against facilities for the storage and production of chemical weapons, Iraq, which had joined the Geneva Protocol in 1931, did not bring itself to break it.

Just why do we think that the future convention that is presently being drawn up in talks at the disarmament conference accomplish the objective of freeing the world from the threat of chemical war more effectively than the universally recognized 1925 Geneva Protocol?

If we want to sacredly believe in the peaceful aspirations and unselfishness of our partners in the present Geneva talks, why not believe in the sacredness and unshakeability of the treaties and accords that already exist, are already working, and have been tested by life?

It is hardly our job to drag the Americans' chestnuts out of the fire, conform to their deadlines for the planned destruction of obsolete models, and spend billions for carrying out, on an emergency basis, measures that we can and should carry out calmly according to our own plans, adjusting them to our economic capabilities.

Of course, it must be understood that ultimately, regardless of the prospects for the convention banning chemical weapons to take effect, we will have to destroy our existing chemical-weapon stocks. Chemical weapons, like any other weapons or material devices, cannot be kept for ever.

The United States estimates the annual cost of storing its existing chemical weapons at \$60-\$70 million. One can assume with confidence that our storage costs do not exceed the Americans'. In this connection, one must consider that a substantial part of our chemical-weapon stockpiles have been in storage 20 years less than those of the United States. With far less expense than the cost of destroying them, the bulk of our stocks could be stored for another 50 years with complete guarantee of safety.

In time, we will be forced to address the problem of destroying our stocks. We will be forced to allocate the financial, material, intellectual and human resources for solving that problem. But those expenses will be several times less and, most importantly, can be spread out over time. Another circumstances of no small importance is that in five to ten years the questions of the technology of destruction and the problems of ensuring environmental safety will have been treated much more thoroughly than they are now.

In general, no matter from what side we look at it, the multilateral convention banning chemical weapons that is being drafted in Geneva gives our country nothing—either in the economic area, or in the area of enhancing our country's security. Do we need such a convention today?

Perhaps it would be more advisable for us today, taking our actual economic and social situation into account, to propose that the world community strengthen the 1925 Geneva Protocol and draw up, if necessary, an appropriate and effective international verification mechanism for it.

Perhaps the time has come, in general, to calculate more carefully not just the political but the economic consequences of different options for the anticipated chemical disarmament.

Environmental Concerns in CW Destruction

91WC0115B Moscow ROSSIYA in Russian No 17, 3 May 91 p 4

[Interview with Sergey Yufit, doctor of chemical sciences and expert with the Union of Social Ecology, conducted by Yevgeniy Vlasov: "Arsenals That Are Unneeded"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] At a recent Moscow conference on chemical disarmament that was organized by the Soviet Peace Committee, reports were given by highly prominent specialists in chemical weapons from several countries, and parliamentarians, scientists and military personnel exchanged views. Several original ideas were expressed by Sergey Yufit, doctor of chemical sciences and expert with the Union of Social Ecology.

[Yufit] We need a fundamentally new approach to the very problem of chemical disarmament. Since international law forbids the use of chemical weapons, one might provisionally assume that it is not the weapons but very dangerous, highly toxic substances that are subject to destruction. Thus, the problem takes on an environmental character. It is necessary, once an appropriate international agreement is concluded, that all chemical-weapon arsenals be turned over to civilian authorities. The military will lose control over chemical weapons. The aura of secrecy will be removed from the problem, which will make it possible to hold an international competition for the technology of destroying and recycling chemical weapons, as well as to make a general inventory of stockpiles and to modernize storage facilities. But the main thing is there will not be any problems with mutual verification.

[Vlasov] Will the military agree to give up control over such an important part of its arsenal?

[Yufit] On the whole, it too has an interest in the destruction of chemical weapons. But the military always does everything slowly, especially when it comes to weapons reductions. But the problem, after all, is not

just the military. How are chemical weapons to be transported, and where will plants for the destruction of chemical substances be built?

[Vlasov] What, in your view, could Russia's approach to the solution of this problem be?

[Yufit] Chemical-weapon arsenals are located on the territory of Russia, among other places, and thus they should be destroyed here. As far as I know, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's Committee on the Environment looks with understanding on the solution of this problem. But this question, unfortunately, has not been discussed at all in the parliament itself. Our immense secrecy results in a situation in which we ourselves do not know what is stored where. Therefore, Russia must first of all demand that the military lift the secrecy on its arsenals. That is difficult, because all the stores are located in populated regions, but nonetheless, the problem must be solved.

[Vlasov] And one last thing: How your idea of turning chemical arsenals over to civilian authorities found support?

[Yufit] No, it hasn't.

All there same, there was some response. At the conference in the Soviet Peace Committee, Maj Gen G. Yevstafyev, director of the USSR Defense Ministry's 27th Center, asked that the question of who should be responsible for the destruction of chemical weapons in the USSR not be discussed, since the president had already assigned that task to the Ministry of Defense and other interested departments.

Spokesman Lauds U.S. Chemical Arms Proposal

LD1006155991 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 10 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, June 10 (TASS)—The United States planned steps to intensify negotiations on an international convention to ban chemical weapons, announced by U.S. President George Bush on May 13, 1991, are regarded by the Soviet Union as having a serious potential for advance towards reaching agreement on a number of still unresolved questions, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

He said that first of all this refers to the United States consent to include in the future convention the provision on unconditional and total ban on the use of chemical weapons, as well as the United States readiness to refuse the opportunity of preserving two per cent of its chemical weapon reserves and fully to destroy these reserves within ten years since the convention's coming into effect.

Assessing the new U.S. proposals as a step forward in the quest of consensus at the talks, the Soviet Foreign

Ministry spokesman noted at the same time that they insufficiently set out a number of important matters awaiting solution, first of all, those related to the problems of verifying the future convention.

The Soviet Union supports the Soviet president's idea of intensifying negotiations to resolve the main outstanding problems and assessing real opportunities for concluding the convention within a definite timeframe. The Soviet Union proposed a package solution of these problems comprising the entire range of security interests of the states.

The spokesman said that a special meeting of foreign ministers in the framework of the conference on disarmament could give a strong added impetus towards final arrangement. "A considerable majority of the participants in the talks admit the usefulness of such a meeting," Churkin said. "Apparently the time has come for important measures so that the meeting results be adequate to what is planned. Unambiguous official support for such a meeting by the United States would be one of decisive factors for its success.

"The Soviet Union, on its part, is ready for constructive cooperation with all parties to the talks to achieve a convention which will ensure a world free from chemical weapons," Churkin said.

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES & PEACE ZONES

Kim Il-song Cited on Nuclear Arms, NFZ

*PM1106144991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "No Objection to Inspection"]

[Text] Tokyo—The question of international inspection of nuclear facilities on the territory of North Korea, which is "suspected" of possessing nuclear devices of nonpeaceful designation, should be resolved by talks between the DPRK and the United States. This standpoint was expressed by DPRK President Kim Il-song in an interview given to Japan's KYODO.

"We are not against inspection of our nuclear facilities," Kim Il-song observed. "The country does not produce or possess any nuclear arms whatsoever. We have invariably advocated the transformation of the Korean Peninsula into a nonnuclear zone" [NFZ]. The problem, however, according to the North Korean leader, is that U.S. nuclear arms are deployed in South Korea, and international inspection of nuclear facilities on DPRK territory should be carried out simultaneously with the withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from the territory of the South. "And once the problems between our country and the United States have been resolved, the problems existing between the DPRK and Japan will be easily overcome," Kim Il-song stated, effectively answering Tokyo's demand for IAEA inspection in North Korea.

This issue is the biggest political obstacle in relations between Pyongyang and Tokyo, which have been conducting talks on restoring diplomatic relations since January this year.

AAPSO Official Interviewed on Nuclear Inspection

*SK1306103491 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0959 GMT 13 Jun 91*

[Interview with Vladimir Tolstikov, first vice-chairman of Soviet Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Committee, by KCNA correspondent in Moscow on 11 June]

[Text] Moscow, June 11 (KCNA)—As for the question of the nuclear inspection, simultaneous inspection of the North of Korea and the nuclear weapons of the United States in South Korea should be made.

Vladimir Tolstikov, first vice-chairman of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee [AAPSO], said this in an interview with a KCNA correspondent in Moscow on June 11 supporting the joint statement of the 20 political parties and public organisations of the DPRK released on June 10 in connection with the daily-increasing nuclear threat of the United States.

Pointing out that U.S. bourgeois propagandists and the stooges of the imperialists are alleging that the nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea pose no threat to the Soviet Union, the DPRK and other Asian countries, he said that such allegation is a scheme to smooth down the legitimate struggle of the Soviet, Korean and Asian peoples for peace and security and mislead the world public.

The enemies of the Korean people and occupationists cried that the DPRK declared it would not allow the inspection, he said, adding: This is a sheer lie and deception.

The U.S. troops and nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction, are deployed in South Korea, he noted. He demanded that they be withdrawn at an early date.

He continued:

The announcement of the joint statement is another important measure which increases the international prestige of the DPRK.

I am convinced that the progressive peoples of the world and governments, political parties and social organisations of Asian countries will fully support this joint statement.

ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES

Discussions on Sino-Soviet Border Arms Cuts

Delegation Leader Interviewed

OW1106093891 *Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin*
0900 GMT 10 Jun 91

[Text] Dear Chinese listeners, the fourth round of Sino-Soviet talks on mutual arms reduction and enhancing trust in the military aspect began in Beijing this week. A special reporter of our station, Glebov, had an interview with Kireyev, the leader of the Soviet delegation and ambassador extraordinary of the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union. Following is the content of the interview:

Our station reporter said: Before raising any questions to Soviet diplomat Kireyev, it is obviously necessary to provide some background for our listeners. The agreement reached in May 1989 in Beijing on reducing armed forces on Sino-Soviet borders to a minimum level helped bring about the beginning of the talks. This level conforms to normal and good-neighbor relations. Today we can say that these talks achieved initial results. What would you like to say about this issue?

[Kireyev is briefly heard, speaking in Russian, fading into Chinese translation] First of all, an intergovernmental agreement on the basic principle of mutual armed force reduction on the Sino-Soviet borders and enhancing trust in the military aspect was signed on 24 April 1990 when Chinese Premier Li Peng visited the Soviet Union. This document, prepared by diplomats and military experts of the two countries, determines the scope and direction of the talks.

As we all know, the talks began last September. Kireyev said that three rounds of talks have been conducted. Both Chinese and Soviet delegations expressed their belief that the beginning of the formulation for the general agreement on a whole set of issues concerning armed forces reduction in the border areas is truly a tremendous result of these talks. The Soviet diplomat pointed out that it is not an agreement, but a letter of intention. However, it is a very important letter of intention, which determines the direction of our work in the future. Kireyev said in the interview that we began to discuss and formulate this general agreement in concrete terms in the fourth rounds of talks in Beijing.

Let's talk in detail about the significance of the intergovernmental agreement on the basic principle of mutual armed force reduction on Sino-Soviet borders and enhancing trust in military aspects. A Sino-Soviet communique, announced right after the Moscow summit meeting held not long ago, points out that this agreement is very important for maintaining peace and stability in our common borders and for enhancing mutual trust between the two countries. What can you say about this issue?

In answering the question raised by our station's special reporter, Kireyev, the ambassador extraordinary of the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union, said: [Kireyev is again briefly heard, speaking in Russian, fading into Chinese translation] Without doubt, the talks themselves and the spirit of this inter-governmental agreement, made great contributions to maintaining peace and stability in the border areas. I wish to mention a very important thing in particular here—article seven of the agreement particularly stipulates that, before resolving overall border issues of the two countries, both parties will strictly preserve present border conditions and take all necessary measures to maintain normal order in the border areas and forbid any violation of present conditions. This is a fact which enables both parties to have reasons to say that these talks and this agreement are one of the special factors conducive to enhancing the peace and stability on Sino-Soviet borders. I would also like to point out another fact, that is, that this agreement created a fine atmosphere for Sino-Soviet border talks.

Soviet diplomat Kireyev said: As we all know, major progress has been made in these talks, leading to the conclusion of an agreement on the eastern section of Sino-Soviet border. This is a very important document for resolving border issues in the history of Sino-Soviet relations. There is another important situation, that is, the joint communique announced after the Sino-Soviet Moscow summit meeting reaffirms that we are ready to speed up the border talks and prepared to activate the talks on armed force reduction so as to achieve practical results.

Soviet diplomat Kireyev added: Judging from all the facts, I am sure that both parties are ready to realize all of the goals in their actual work in the fourth round of talks on mutual armed force reduction and enhancing trust in the military aspect.

This article on the interview with Kireyev, ambassador extraordinary of the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union, is provided by Glebov, special reporter of the Moscow Radio Broadcasting Station.

Commentary on Issues

91UF0829A *Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian*
No 19, May 91 pp 26-27

[Article by Aleksey Voskresenskiy: "Are Clouds Still Hanging Over the Border?"]

[Excerpts] **Unsolved border problems with the PRC have been placed on the back burner in our times. However, they have not by any means disappeared.** [passage omitted]

Proceeding from abstract ideological differences, both parties created their own scientific concepts in the years of the confrontation which justified the sovereign rights of each of the states to the "disputed territories" in question. In the process—this is paradoxical!—these concepts are as convincing to the minds of our neighbors

as our own concepts are to ours. To be sure, we should acknowledge that from the point of view of methodology, the Chinese concepts regarding the former resolutions of the border issue which were unfair to China have an absolute right to exist because they proceed from certain experiences (in the philosophical sense), that is, factual data of some sort. To this day, we are having great difficulty grasping this.

Attempts to resolve the emerging problems by proceeding from the positions of one of the parties are fruitless, all the more so are attempts based on force. Incidentally, this conclusion was suggested by bloody clashes in the area of Damanskiy Island and the locality of Zhalanashkol (Semipalatinsk Oblast). Nonetheless, it took time for both the USSR and the PRC to recognize that the existence of differences should not mean that it is impossible to begin negotiations, because only through negotiations may we attempt to come to an agreement.

The Soviet-Chinese border negotiations resumed as late as 1987. They reflected new tendencies in interstate relations. As early as the first round of talks the sides reached an agreement on considering the alignment of the Soviet-Chinese border along its entire length. They expressed common opinions regarding the rationality of using, based on the pertinent treaties on the current border between the USSR and the PRC, the principle of delimitation along the main navigating channel on navigable rivers, and for nonnavigable rivers, along the middle of the river or its main branch. An agreement was reached to the effect that, along with continuing negotiations at the level of delegations, the sides would create a working group of experts which would take up the consideration of specific issues concerning the alignment of the eastern section of the Soviet-Chinese border. Subsequently, the common opinion was expressed that the settlement of border issues and the transformation of the Soviet-Chinese border into a zone of friendship and good neighbor relations would be very significant, not only for the two countries but also for maintaining peace and stability in Asia and around the world.

Changes in the policy of the two countries and in their approaches to each other created the conditions for a summit meeting which was held in Beijing in mid-May 1989. A joint communique on the results of the meeting

laid the political foundation for Soviet-Chinese relations which are now structured on the basis of a clearly perceived correlation of national-state interests and are based on universal principles of interstate communication.

As far as border relations are concerned, the sides agreed to proceed toward reducing armed forces in the border areas to a minimum, and came out in favor of the border disputes between the Soviet Union and China, which were historically inherited, being resolved fairly and rationally on the basis of treaties on the current Soviet-Chinese border, in keeping with the generally accepted norms of international law, in the spirit of consultations on an equal footing, with mutual understanding and mutual concessions.

A joint group of military and diplomatic experts was set up, and embarked on work with a view to serious and substantive discussions.

Real results have been achieved at the border talks in the last two years. By all signs, by the end of 1990 almost nine-tenths of the entire length of the Soviet-Chinese border, which comes to about 7,500 kilometers, were reviewed and coordinated.

Confidence-building measures in the military sphere were also reinforced. In late 1989, negotiations with the PRC on a mutual reduction of the armed forces along the border began. A special intergovernmental agreement on key guidelines for the mutual reduction of the armed forces and confidence building in the military sphere in the area of the Soviet-Chinese border was signed by the USSR and PRC ministers of foreign affairs during a visit by Premier of the PRC State Council Li Peng to the USSR in April 1990.

The Soviet side has also taken a number of important unilateral steps. It was announced in January 1990 that the group of Soviet troops in the Far East would be reduced by 120,000 men, 16 combat vessels would be withdrawn from the composition of the Pacific Fleet, and the number of aircraft based there would be reduced. Also, a restructuring of the armed forces deployed along the Soviet-Chinese border began with a view to making them entirely defensive in nature. In the long term, a complete demilitarization of the border is envisaged. [passage omitted]

FRANCE

Military Announce Nuclear Test at Mururoa

AU1406201191 Paris AFP in English 1948 GMT
14 Jun 91

[Text] Paris, June 14 (AFP)—The French military exploded a nuclear test device at its Mururoa atoll in the South Pacific at 1800 GMT Friday, it was announced here.

An armed forces statement said the yield was below 30 kilotonnes.

GERMANY

Kohl, Mulroney Discuss Arms Export Controls

LD1306135691 Hamburg DPA in German 1220 GMT
13 Jun 91

[Excerpt] Bonn (DPA)—The German and Canadian Governments want to submit a joint initiative for export controls on arms goods at the Western economic summit in mid-July in London. This was announced by Chancellor Helmut Kohl in his talks with Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney in Bonn today.

"We want the economic summit in London to set clear signals. The export of conventional weapons must finally be checked and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction must be prevented," Kohl said in his luncheon speech. He also underlined Germany's interest in closely involving Canada in the future shaping of Europe: "Canada has permanent residency rights in the European house," Kohl said. He also urged that the Canadian Armed Forces stationed in Germany should remain in the country.

Mulroney emphasized Kohl's special achievement in the completion of German unity, in the process of European unity, and in the expansion of transatlantic relations. No country has done more to open up Europe to the Soviet Union in the east and to Canada and the United States in the West. "You have recognized that the opening of borders between nations is irreconcilable with the establishment of borders between regions," Mulroney said, addressing Kohl.

He strongly supported Kohl's aim of helping the Soviet Union and the reformed countries of Eastern Europe within the framework of the CSCE and the leading Western industrialized nations. Kohl appealed to Canadian industry and the economy to invest in the new laender. The economic development of eastern Germany would still "require much patience, effort, and sacrifice." In a few years the new laender will, however, be among the most modern places in Europe. [passage omitted]

Defense Minister: 'No Evidence' of Chemical Arms in East

LD1906164291 Berlin ADN in German 1351 GMT
19 Jun 91

[Text] Bonn (ADN)—There is "absolutely no evidence" that chemical weapons are stored on the former territory of the GDR. Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg emphasized this talking to the press in Bonn today (Wednesday) after suspicions were aroused by comments made by the USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on the existence of Soviet nuclear weapons in Germany. The minister did not wish to go into the type and location of the Soviet nuclear weapons in eastern Germany as he is not in possession of any confirmed information.

Stoltenberg went on to say that in the process of disarming the Bundeswehr until the year 2000, there will be a 23 percent reduction of the existing 84,500 civilians employed by the armed services in the old laender. By September it should also be clear how many of the 95,000 civilian employees in the Armed Forces' administration and armament departments are still necessary. The staff reductions should be concluded, however, in a manner which is socially tolerable, according to the defense minister. There will be no dismissals in the old laender which are against the wishes of those concerned. It will not be possible, however, to avoid transfers. The intention is to allow older employees to apply for early retirement from the age of 55 with 75 percent of their last salary.

From today's standpoint, it is assumed that the future requirements in the new laender will be approximately 13,000 civilians in the Armed Forces. The current deployment concept, which will be finally decided upon by the end of August, was described by the Christian Democratic Union politician as a further intermediary step in the reform of the Bundeswehr.

Swift Talks on Short-Range Missiles Desired

LD1906194991 Berlin ADN in German 1336 GMT
19 Jun 91

[Text] Bonn (ADN)—The Federal Government has spoken in favor of the swift start of negotiations between the United States and the USSR on the reduction of nuclear short-range missiles. In reply to a question by Social Democratic Party deputy Hermann Scheer, Helmut Schaefer, the minister of state in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated in the Bundestag today that the Federal Government is in favor of a joint position for negotiations being drawn up before the NATO summit in the autumn and negotiations being started at the earliest possible opportunity. The minister of state said that a more exact date depends on the results of the preliminary discussions.

NTIS
ATTN: PROCESS 103

2

5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

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

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, 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.