

JPRS-TAC-91-024
18 OCTOBER 1991



JPRS Report

Arms Control

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

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

19990114 112

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-91-024

CONTENTS

18 October 1991

CHINA

Significance of START Treaty Discussed	
<i>[Chen Wenqing, Mu Changlin; SHIJIE ZHISHI No 17, 1 Sep]</i>	1
Foreign Minister Addresses UN General Assembly <i>[RENMIN RIBAO 26 Sep]</i>	3
Reportage on Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Proposals	4
XINHUA Report <i>[28 Sep]</i>	4
Congressmen Endorse Move <i>[XINHUA 28 Sep]</i>	4
Cheney Orders Implementation <i>[XINHUA 28 Sep]</i>	5
Further on Response to Bush Initiative	5
Foreign Ministry 'Welcomes' Plan <i>[XINHUA 29 Sep]</i>	5
Reasons for Proposal Studied <i>[Hong Kong TA KUNG PAO 29 Sep]</i>	5
Move Affects Election Plans <i>[Hong Kong TA KUNG PAO 29 Sep]</i>	6
Editorial Views Reactions <i>[Hong Kong WEN WEI PO 30 Sep]</i>	7
Column Views Initiative <i>[Hong Kong TA KUNG PAO 30 Sep]</i>	8
XINHUA Notes World Reaction to Bush Proposal	8
Gorbachev Assessment 'Positive' <i>[29 Sep]</i>	8
UK To Retain 'Deterrent' <i>[28 Sep]</i>	9
UK Responds With Arms Cuts <i>[28 Sep]</i>	9
Germany Hails 'Historic' Move <i>[28 Sep]</i>	10
NATO Urges Soviet Response <i>[29 Sep]</i>	10
France, Japan, NATO Members React <i>[29 Sep]</i>	10
Tokyo Paper on U.S. Supremacy <i>[29 Sep]</i>	11
Australia Welcomes 'Decisive Step' <i>[28 Sep]</i>	11
Further Reportage, Comment on Bush Proposal	11
XINHUA 'News Analysis' <i>[Yang Guokiang; XINHUA 1 Oct]</i>	11
Gorbachev Response Reported <i>[XINHUA 1 Oct]</i>	12
Moscow Urges Dialogue <i>[XINHUA 1 Oct]</i>	12
UN Chief Welcomes Move <i>[XINHUA 30 Sep]</i>	12

EAST ASIA

JAPAN

Reaction to President Bush's 27 Sep Address	14
Prime Minister Backs Proposal <i>[KYODO 28 Sep]</i>	14
No Defense Changes Foreseen <i>[KYODO 30 Sep]</i>	14
Administrators, Dietman React Positively <i>[Tokyo TV 28 Sep]</i>	14
Parties Welcome Arms Cuts <i>[KYODO 28 Sep]</i>	15

EAST ASIA

INDONESIA

Foreign Minister Lauds Bush Initiative, Seeks Test Ban <i>[ANTARA 1 Oct]</i>	16
--	----

NORTH KOREA

Foreign Ministry Welcomes Bush Nuclear Arms Proposal <i>[Pyongyang Radio 28 Sep]</i>	16
'International Solidarity March' Demands Korean NFZ	16
Letter to President Bush Adopted <i>[KCNA 29 Sep]</i>	16
Letter to UN President Adopted <i>[KCNA 29 Sep]</i>	17
Letter to South Leaders Adopted <i>[KCNA 29 Sep]</i>	17
Appeal to Governments Adopted <i>[KCNA 29 Sep]</i>	18
Kim Yong-sun Welcomes President Bush's Proposal <i>[KCNA 29 Sep]</i>	18

SOUTH KOREA

President No Responds to Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative	19
Welcomes, Supports Proposal [YONHAP 28 Sep]	19
Says Cuts Unlikely Soon [YONHAP 30 Sep]	20
Government Ponders Implications of Bush Initiative	20
'Urgent Meeting' Held [Seoul Radio 28 Sep]	20
Seoul To Aid U.S. Initiative [YONHAP 28 Sep]	20
Cabinet To Further Discuss Proposals [YONHAP 30 Sep]	21
Removal of Tactical Nuclear Weapons Planned [YONHAP 28 Sep]	21
Foreign Ministry Views New U.S. Nuclear Policy [YONHAP 28 Sep]	21
Defense Minister Says U.S. Umbrella To Remain [YONHAP 28 Sep]	22
Parties Hail President Bush's Nuclear Proposal [YONHAP 28 Sep]	22
Editorials View U.S. Arms Reduction Proposals	22
Called 'Dramatic Initiative' [THE KOREA TIMES 29 Sep]	22
'Comprehensive Changes' Viewed [THE KOREA HERALD 29 Sep]	23
'Warning' Against DPRK [THE KOREA HERALD 29 Sep]	24
U.S., Seoul To Discuss Defense Policy Changes [YONHAP 30 Sep]	25
USSR's Shevardnadze on North's Nuclear Stance [Seoul TV 1 Oct]	25
Ministry Reaffirms Opposition to Denuclearization [YONHAP 1 Oct]	25
Agreement With U.S. on Tactical Nuclear Arms Withdrawal [CHUNGANG ILBO 2 Oct]	26

LAOS

Bush's Move on Nuclear Cuts Hailed Worldwide [Vientiane Radio 1 Oct]	26
--	----

MALAYSIA

Prime Minister Hails Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative [NEW STRAITS TIMES 30 Sep]	27
--	----

PHILIPPINES

President Aquino Praises Bush Nuclear Initiative [AFP 30 Sep]	27
---	----

SINGAPORE

Editorial Salutes Bush's Nuclear Initiative [THE STRAITS TIMES 1 Oct]	27
---	----

THAILAND

Column on 'Confidence' of Bush's Arms Proposal [Sunthon Wathi; THAI RAT 30 Sep]	28
Editorial Lauds Reaction to Bush's Arms Proposal [BANGKOK POST 1 Oct]	28

VIETNAM

President Bush's Arms Reduction Address Reported [Hanoi Radio 28 Sep]	29
Bush Must Prove Arms Reduction by 'Deeds' [Hanoi Radio 1 Oct]	29

EAST EUROPE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Minister on Transportation, Soviet Troop Transits [J. Nezval; SVOBODNE SLOVO 19 Sep]	30
Havel: Bush Arms Initiative 'Very Important' [Prague Radio 30 Sep]	30

HUNGARY

Defense Conference: Bush Initiative 'Correct Step' [Budapest Radio 28 Sep]	30
--	----

POLAND

Hungarian Defense Minister Discusses 'Open Skies' [MTI 30 Sep]	30
Paper Reports Number of Soviet Troops Remaining [PAP 1 Oct]	31

LATIN AMERICA

CUBA

Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative Reported [Havana Radio 28 Sep]	32
---	----

PANAMA

Column Hails Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative [LA PRENSA 29 Sep]	32
--	----

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

U.S. Arms Cuts Seen as Part of Changing World [London AL-HAYAH 29 Sep]	33
--	----

BAHRAIN

Amir Hails Bush Nuclear Arms Reduction Initiative [WAKH 1 Oct]	33
--	----

BANGLADESH

Commentary Welcomes President Bush's Nuclear Cut [Dhaka Radio 29 Sep]	33
---	----

EGYPT

Officials Laud Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative	34
Foreign Minister Welcomes Decision [MENA 28 Sep]	34
Deputy Premier Views Plan [Cairo Radio 29 Sep]	34

IRAN

President Bush's Nuclear Arms Initiative Viewed [Tehran Radio 29 Sep]	34
---	----

IRAQ

Reaction to Bush's Arms Reduction Initiative	35
World 'Clamor' Criticized [Baghdad AL-QADISIYAH 30 Sep]	35
Further Reaction [Baghdad Radio 1 Oct]	35

KUWAIT

U.S. Arms Cuts Seen as Part of World Trend [London SAWT AL-KUWAYT AL-DUWALI 29 Sep]	36
--	----

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister Welcomes Bush Move on Nuclear Weapons [Islamabad Radio 29 Sep]	36
---	----

SAUDI ARABIA

Council of Ministers Praises Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative [SPA 30 Sep]	37
--	----

SYRIA

Bush Initiative Hailed; Mideast Peace Stressed [Damascus Radio 28 Sep]	37
--	----

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Bush's Arms Plan 'Historic,' 'Courageous' [AL-BAYAN 29 Sep]	37
---	----

SOVIET UNION

GENERAL

'Global Security System' Called For [S. Machulin; NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 Sep]	38
Worries Over Control of Nuclear Arms Continue [E. Alekseyev; TRUD 18 Sep]	39
Problem of Near East Arms Exports Viewed [N. Revenko; IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]	41
Leaders, Media React to Bush Disarmament Proposal	42
Gorbachev: Move 'Completely Positive' [Moscow TV 28 Sep]	42
Gorbachev, Yeltsin Welcome Initiative [INTERFAX 29 Sep]	43
Yeltsin, Bush Discuss Proposal [Radio Rossii 27 Sep]	43
Pankin Sees 'Full Support' From USSR [TASS 28 Sep]	43
Pankin: 'New Impetus' to Disarmament [TASS 28 Sep]	43
Shaposhnikov Welcomes Initiative [TASS 30 Sep]	44
Karpov: USSR Supports Nuclear Abolition [Hamburg DPA 28 Sep]	45
Spokesman Sees 'Adequate' Response [TASS 28 Sep]	45
Spokesman on Reciprocal Arms Cuts [TASS 28 Sep]	45
Spokesman on U.S. Stance on Test Ban [Moscow Radio 28 Sep]	45
PRAVDA Calls Bush 'Bold,' 'Farsighted' [V. Gan; 30 Sep]	46
Observer Hails 'Unprecedented' Plan [G. Petrov; TASS 28 Sep]	47
Washington Correspondent on Speech [B. Kalyagin; Moscow TV 28 Sep]	47
'World This Week' on Bush Initiative, Vienna Talks [Moscow Radio 29 Sep]	47
Further Reaction to Bush Disarmament Initiative	49
Gorbachev's Caution Noted [S. Ryabikin; TASS 30 Sep]	49
Gorbachev Reply Likely by Midweek [INTERFAX 30 Sep]	49
Gorbachev 'Surprise' Highlighted [S. Dardynkin; IZVESTIYA 1 Sep]	50
Pankin Sees 'Radical' Change in Ties [TASS 1 Oct]	51
Petrovskiy: USSR To Act Comparably [TASS 30 Sep]	51
Karpov Urges U.S. Test Ban Support [Vienna DIE PRESSE 30 Sep]	51
General Staff's Omelichev Comments [TASS 30 Sep]	52
Post-Putsch Timing Contemplated [Ye. Shashkov; PRAVDA 1 Oct]	52
U.S. Fears Nuclear Arms in Ethnic Strife	
[A. Vasilyev; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Oct]	54
USSR To Meet Arms Initiative Halfway [V. Solovyev; Moscow Radio 30 Sep]	55
Levin: New Approach to Disarmament [Moscow Radio 29 Sep]	55
New Soviet-U.S. Confidence Cited [A. Golts; ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Oct]	56
RSFSR Legislator Calls Bush Arms Initiative 'Compromise' [V. Lukin; Radio Rossii 1 Oct]	56

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Special Verification Commission 11th Session Opens [TASS 23 Sep]	57
--	----

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Easing E-W Military Tension Poses New Issues [V. Markushin; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Sep] ...	57
Soviet Officers Complete CSBM Inspection in France [TASS 20 Sep]	58
Soviet Officers Make CSBM Inspection at UK Unit in Germany [TASS 21 Sep]	58
Lithuania Seeks Prompt Withdrawal of Soviet Forces	58
Landsbergis Calls Withdrawal 'Main Political Task' [Vilnius Radio 23 Sep]	58
Calls 1994 Start for Withdrawal 'Unrealistic' [BALTFAX 25 Sep]	58
Insure on Nuclear Weapon Deployment [Radio Vilnius 29 Sep]	59
Insists on Troops Leaving by New Year [BALTFAX 30 Sep]	59
Plans for Air Defense Forces Withdrawal Under Way [BALTFAX 30 Sep]	59
Defense Minister on Withdrawal From Baltics, Moldova	
[Ye. Shaposhnikov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Sep]	59
Soviet Commander in Germany on Troop Pullout	59
Commander Interviewed [M. Burlakov; Hamburg DIE WELT 27 Sep]	59

Denies Presence of Nuclear Weapons [TASS 30 Sep]	61
Moldovan Premier, Soviet Commanders Discuss Troop Withdrawal [N. Mulyar; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Sep]	62

SHORT-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Artillery Chief on Control of Tactical Nuclear Weapons [V. Mikhalkin; IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]	62
---	----

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS Reports Nuclear Test in Nevada [TASS 20 Sep]	63
Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Range To Open for Reporters [Radio Moscow]	63

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES & PEACE ZONES

Belarusan Foreign Minister on Desire for NFZ [TASS 27 Sep]	63
--	----

WEST EUROPE

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

NATO Unanimously Supports Bush Arms Initiative [Paris AFP 28 Sep]	64
---	----

AUSTRIA

Bush Weapons Proposal Called 'Courageous Step' [H. Portisch; Vienna TV 28 Sep]	64
Commentary: Bush Initiative 'Bold Gesture' [E. Trost; NEUE KRONEN-ZEITUNG 29 Sep]	65
Bush Seen Exchanging Deterrence for Confidence [G. Possanner; DER STANDARD 30 Sep]	65
Bush Seeking Security Cooperation With USSR [P. Krotky; DIE PRESSE 30 Sep]	65

CANADA

Prime Minister Backs Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative [Montreal Radio 28 Sep]	66
---	----

CYPRUS

Government Calls Bush Initiative 'Significant Step' [Nicosia Radio 30 Sep]	66
--	----

FRANCE

President Mitterand Greets Bush Arms Cut Initiative	66
Notes Call for Four-Power Nuclear Talks [Paris TV 28 Sep]	66
Says 'France Rejoices' [AFP 28 Sep]	66
Nation To Join Effort [Paris Radio 28 Sep]	66
Radio: Plan 'Not Disappointing' [Paris Radio 28 Sep]	67
Further on Response to Bush Disarmament Proposals	67
Elysee Communique [LE MONDE 29-30 Sep]	67
Editorial Commends Initiative [LE MONDE 29-30 Sep]	67
President, Defense Minister on Bush Initiative	68
Mitterand: 'On Right Path' [LE MONDE 1 Oct]	68
Defense Minister Comments [LE MONDE 1 Oct]	68

GERMANY

Local Impact of Troop Withdrawals, Reductions [FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 5 Sep]	68
Soviet Forces Completely Vacate 5 Former Bases [DPA 23 Sep]	71
Soviet, German Foreign Ministers Urge Total SNF Ban [DPA 24 Sep]	72
NATO Nuclear Weapon Bunker Construction Denied [FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 25 Sep]	72
Reaction to Bush's Disarmament Announcements	72
Kohl: 'Of Historic Proportions' [DPA 28 Sep]	72

Genscher: Fulfilled Our Hopes [DPA 28 Sep]	72
Further Genscher Remarks [ADN 28 Sep]	72
Finance Minister: Bush on Offensive [DPA 28 Sep]	73
NATO Chief, Finance Minister Comment [ADN 28 Sep]	73
SPD Spokesman Comments [ADN 28 Sep]	73
SPD, FDP Leaders [DPA 28 Sep]	73
FDP Praises Initiative [ADN 30 Sep]	74
Survey of Press Reaction [SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 30 Sep, etc.]	74
USSR Said To Still Have Short-Range Nuclear Arms in East	75
Allegation by SPD Official [SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 28-29 Sep]	75
Soviet Commander 'Dispels' Concern [ADN 30 Sep]	75

GREECE

Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative Hailed	75
Government Statement [Athens Radio 29 Sep]	75
Prime Minister Calls Plan 'Historic' [Athens Radio 29 Sep]	76

SPAIN

Government in 'Total Agreement' With Bush Initiative [Madrid Radio 28 Sep]	76
Political Parties React 'Favorably' to Proposal [Madrid Radio 28 Sep]	76

TURKEY

Government 'Welcomes, Supports' Bush Initiative [ANATOLIA 29 Sep]	76
---	----

UNITED KINGDOM

Official Response to Bush on Nuclear Arms Cut	76
Prime Minister Hails Initiative [PRESS ASSOCIATION 28 Sep]	76
UK To Scrap Own Short-Range Arms [PRESS ASSOCIATION 28 Sep]	77
Bush Plan Moves Emphasis to Submarine Systems [THE DAILY TELEGRAPH 30 Sep]	78

Significance of START Treaty Discussed
HK2609153291 Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI
in Chinese No 17, 1 Sep 91 pp 16-17

[Article by Chen Wenqing (7115 2429 3237) and Mu Changlin (3663 7022 2651): "Difficult Yet Major Breakthrough: United States, Soviet Union Conclude Treaty on Strategic Arms Reduction"]

[Text] The U.S.-Soviet talks on strategic arms reduction, which had lasted for nine years, finally reached agreement on 31 July at the U.S.-Soviet summit in Moscow; a treaty was officially signed. There were 15 rounds of difficult talks since 1982, and these talks have now been concluded against the background of the end of the Cold War. The signing of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty is another breakthrough made by the United States and the Soviet Union in nuclear arms cuts after the signing of the treaty on medium-range guided missiles. It will play a role in reducing the level of nuclear confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, and in reducing the danger of a nuclear war; therefore, it is welcomed by world public opinion. However, after the cuts, both sides still have the nuclear arms to destroy the other side several times over, and they still have a long way to go in the area of nuclear arms cuts.

The Main Content of the Treaty

Both sides restrict the number of strategic launchers. The treaty stipulates that both sides have less than 1,600 strategic launchers (intercontinental ballistic missiles [ICBM], submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and strategic bombers), among which there are no more than 154 heavy ICBM's (that is, Soviet SS-18 missiles).

Both sides restrict the total number of various kinds of strategic nuclear warheads. Both sides may keep 6,000 strategic nuclear warheads, among which no more than 4,900 nuclear warheads are to be carried by ICBM and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and no more than 1,100 nuclear warheads are to be carried by strategic bombers. Of the 4,900 nuclear warheads to be carried by ICBM's and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, no more than 1,100 are to be carried by mobile ICBM's, and no more than 1,540 are to be carried by heavy ICBM's.

Special restrictions on the number of nuclear warheads to be carried by strategic bombers. On both sides, one strategic bomber for carrying out the task of nuclear attack is counted as one strategic launcher, and all the nuclear bombs and short-range attack nuclear missiles are counted as one nuclear warhead. Each U.S. strategic bomber can carry 20 air-launched long-range (more than 600 km) cruise nuclear missiles, but the treaty treats them as 10 warheads; each Soviet strategic bomber can carry 16 air-launched long-range cruise nuclear missiles, and the treaty treats them as eight warheads.

More stringent measures specified for inspection and auditing. The contents for inspection and auditing stipulated by the treaty include: Exchange of relevant data, carrying out on-the-spot inspection and auditing of refitting and destruction of weapons systems, carrying out

continuous monitoring of the production facilities for ICBM's, and challenging and inspecting "suspicious spots." In addition, both sides will establish a "joint control commission" to supervise implementation of the treaty.

Adoption of the principle of stage-by-stage reduction. Both sides will accomplish the task of arms reduction in three stages within seven years after the treaty becomes effective, and at each stage work will proceed according to the agreed upon ratio, so as to always maintain a balanced strategic nuclear strength between both sides.

The outcome of START is a product of long-term bargaining between the United States and the Soviet Union; in particular, the Soviet side has made comparatively big concessions and compromises. During the early period of the talks, the Soviet Union always insisted that the problem of strategic arms reduction be linked to the halting of U.S. efforts to develop, test, and deploy offensive weapons in space, and it was opposed to the U.S. demand that the sea-launched cruise nuclear missiles be excluded from the talks. The disputes concerning the above-mentioned problems between both sides had brought an impasse to the talks. Under U.S. pressure, the Soviet Union finally made concessions and agreed to "exclude" the problem of "Star Wars" and sea-launched cruise nuclear missiles from the question of strategic arms reduction. According to the agreement reached by the United States and the Soviet Union, the sea-launched cruise nuclear missiles with a range of more than 600 km are excluded from the restricted number stipulated by the treaty, and each side is allowed to have 880 such missiles, made available by the statement which contains "political restraint." At the same time, the United States also made concessions and agreed to let the Soviet Union maintain a certain number of mobile ballistic missiles and, in the form of a "political statement," allowed the Soviet Union to maintain not more than 500 backfire bombers.

Political Significance Is Greater Than Military Significance

START sees a relatively big cut in the strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union for the first time. However, out of their own strategic needs, the treaty leaves much room for maneuver. The cuts required by the treaty do not affect the status of the United States and the Soviet Union as nuclear superpowers; in this sense, the treaty's significance is a political significance.

The quantitative strategic nuclear weapons race between the United States and the Soviet Union is checked to some extent. Under the conditions of the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union never stopped competing for quantity of strategic nuclear weapons. In 1960, the United States and the Soviet Union had a total of 3,481 strategic nuclear warheads (the United States had 3,127; the Soviet Union had 354); by 1990, they had a total of 22,922 nuclear warheads (the United States had 12,081; the Soviet Union had 10,841). Since the treaty has been signed, the United States and the Soviet Union will reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals to the numbers prescribed by the

treaty, and for the first time both sides shifted from the past pattern of "seeking balance from building up" to "seeking balance from cutting down," trying out a balance at the level after the reduction.

The level of U.S.-Soviet nuclear confrontation will decrease. The long-term nuclear arms race has put the U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear arsenals in a "super-saturation" situation. At present, the number of nuclear weapons possessed by the United States and the Soviet Union accounts for more than 95 percent of the total number possessed in the world, and the explosive strength equals 1 million atomic bombs of the type unleashed in Hiroshima. Although the quantity to be cut by the treaty is less than the originally proposed 50 percent, 30 percent will be cut, and those to be cut are mainly the land-based ICBM's which are designed for first-strike attack. But the treaty has comparatively loose restrictions on air- and sea-based strategic nuclear weapons; therefore, it does not affect the survival and retaliatory capabilities of the strategic nuclear weapons on both sides. On the contrary, they are being strengthened. The stability of strategic relations between both sides is thus maintained.

The Soviet Union's strength in the area of land-based ballistic missiles is weakened. For a long time in the balance of strategic nuclear strength between the United States and the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union was superior in the area of land-based ballistic missiles, and the United States was superior in the area of air- and sea-based missiles. The treaty cuts the Soviet Union's 6,500 warheads to be carried by land-based ballistic missiles to 3,200, among which half of the Soviet SS-18 heavy land-based ICBM's are cut; this basically lets the United States achieve its purpose of cutting and restricting the nuclear strength of the Soviet Union's land-based ballistic missiles, as well as reducing the U.S. concern about the Soviet Union launching a first-strike nuclear attack. In addition, the treaty permits strategic bombers to carry nuclear warheads far exceeding the number allowed to exist by the treaty, and this will enable the strength of the U.S. strategic bombers to be basically free from the treaty's restriction.

The status of the United States and the Soviet Union as big nuclear powers will not be affected. Although the United States and the Soviet Union will greatly reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals according to the treaty, both sides' strategic nuclear attack strengths will not be substantially affected by the reduction. First, the quantity allowed to exist by the treaty is very large, while the quantity of strategic nuclear warheads to be cut by the United States and the Soviet Union is very limited; second, because the treaty adopts a passive calculation method of discounting the nuclear warheads to be carried by strategic bombers, while sea-based nuclear cruise missiles are excluded from the calculation, both sides actually will have a number of warheads far exceeding the number prescribed by the treaty; and third, those to be cut by both sides are mainly outdated weapons about to be demobilized, and not only are a large number of new weapons preserved, but there is much room for their development. The treaty still permits the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the

upgrading of their deterrent power; therefore, the strategic nuclear strength to be cut by the United States and the Soviet Union according to the treaty can be made up by making the strategic nuclear weapons more precise and lethal. In addition, the treaty does not require the removed nuclear warheads to be destroyed; therefore, when a crisis takes place, both sides can rapidly expand their strategic nuclear strengths and break through the restrictions laid down by the treaty. An expert commented that even if the treaty is implemented, the number of nuclear weapons possessed by the United States and the Soviet Union will still be roughly the same as in 1982 when the talks began. Therefore, the status of the United States and the Soviet Union as big nuclear powers will not be shaken by the signing of START.

Still a Long Way To Go

In the area of arms reduction, the United States and the Soviet Union still have a long way to go; both sides said they would carry out second-stage talks on reducing strategic weapons.

1. The United States and the Soviet Union still have potential to further greatly reduce strategic nuclear weapons. After the signing of the treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union will need to have a period of time to digest the content of the treaty and to inspect the situation of implementation; therefore, the next round of talks can hardly be started soon. However, due to the fact that the number to be cut by the treaty cannot meet the actual needs of the United States and the Soviet Union, there is therefore still a possibility for both sides to have further reductions. Many international arms control experts and politicians think that even if the United States and the Soviet Union reduce their strategic nuclear warheads to 3,000 respectively, they will not lose their nuclear deterrent power.

2. Conflicts and differences will increase during U.S.-Soviet talks. During talks at the next stage, the United States must tackle the problem of the Soviet mobile ballistic missiles and multiple-warhead ballistic missiles; the Soviet Union must tackle the problem of the U.S. submarine-launched ballistic missiles, sea-based cruise nuclear missiles, and space weapons. This will directly touch upon the crucial parts of the U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear strengths; therefore, neither side will make concessions easily. In particular, the Soviet Union will find less room to maneuver, and the talks will be more difficult and much longer.

3. The United States and the Soviet Union will still continue their strategic nuclear weapons modernization programs. Apart from forbidding the development of new and heavy ICBM's, START does not prohibit the current strategic nuclear weapons modernization programs on both sides. The defense budget prepared by the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1992 indicates that the United States will continue to buy seven strategic weapons systems, including B-2 strategic bombers, Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and advanced cruise nuclear missiles, and it is estimated that \$64 billion will be spent in the next

few years. As disclosed by the Western press, the Soviet Union will also continue to deploy new strategic missile-launching submarines and mobile land-based missiles, and it is also stepping up efforts to manufacture five or six new strategic missiles. Therefore, although the race for larger quantities of nuclear weapons between the United States and the Soviet Union has been checked to some extent by the breakthrough in the talks, the race for better quality will continue, and this will bring about new unfavorable factors to the prospects for arms reduction.

Foreign Minister Addresses UN General Assembly
HK2709134591 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese
26 Sep 91 p 7

[By reporter Zhang Liang (1728 0081): "Foreign Minister Qian Qichen's Speech at 46th Session of UN General Assembly"]

[Excerpts] United Nations, 26 September (RENMIN RIBAO)—Qian Qichen—Chinese state councillor, foreign minister, and head of the Chinese delegation—made a speech at the 46th session of the UN General Assembly today. In his speech, Qian explained the Chinese Government's principles and stand on major international affairs and its proposition of establishing a peaceful, stable, just, and equitable new international order. The full text of his speech follows: [passage omitted]

In this solemn UN forum, in order to discuss with you and to probe matters concerning the establishment of a just and equitable new international order, I would like to expound the stand and propositions of the Chinese Government on questions of peace, security, and economic and social development.

1. In this century mankind has tasted to the full the bitterness of the two world wars, and deeply understands the precious value of peace. The development of all countries and the progress of mankind require a peaceful international environment. We believe that the following points are essential to the maintenance of world peace: All countries should respect each other's sovereignty, treat each other as equals, try to seek common ground while putting aside differences, carry out friendly cooperation, and live in harmony. No country should seek hegemony, try to manipulate international affairs, or pursue power politics according to the law of the jungle. All states—large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor—should participate in the discussion and settlement of international affairs as equal members of the international community. Every state has the right to choose independently its own social, political, and economic systems and its own path of development in light of its own national conditions; no country, and in particular no large country, should be allowed to impose its own ideology, value concepts, or development patterns on other countries. All countries should observe the principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and inviolability of national borders, and no country should be allowed to invade or annex the territories of other countries under whatever pretext. Disputes between states should be settled in a

reasonable manner by peaceful means, and the use or threat of force is impermissible in international relations.

2. An important link for ensuring the security of all countries is to stop the arms race and carry out effective disarmament. This is an important means for easing international tension. China has always maintained all-round prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and prohibition of research into and development of any new weapons of mass destruction. It is also in favor of adopting necessary, appropriate, just, and equitable measures in accordance with the principles of comprehensiveness and balance so as to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. China pursues a policy of not supporting, encouraging, or helping other countries develop nuclear weapons. To achieve the purpose of overall prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and to maintain international peace, security, and stability, China has declared its accession, in principle, to the "Treaty on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons." China has always stood for the early conclusion of a treaty prohibiting chemical weapons and for strengthening the effectiveness of the treaty on prohibiting biological weapons.

Recently, the United States and the Soviet Union reached an agreement on the reduction of their strategic nuclear weapons. We welcome this agreement, but the signing of this treaty is just an initial step in the reduction of the huge strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union. This treaty does not cover all kinds of nuclear weapons and does not prohibit the two sides continuing to improve the quality of their nuclear weapons or developing new weapons. After reducing their nuclear weapons according to this treaty, both sides will still possess more than 90 percent of the world's nuclear weapons and will have the ability to destroy mankind several times over. In particular, recent changes in the Soviet Union have aroused the serious concern of the international community, which doubts whether the nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union can be strictly controlled. Therefore, the United States and the Soviet Union still have a long way to go in fulfilling their special responsibilities and obligations in nuclear disarmament.

In principle, China is in favor of placing the arms trade—including the trade in various sophisticated weapons—under fair, reasonable, and effective control. This should be decided by the international community, however, after making sufficient preparations and through extensive and equal consultations.

We maintain that the military forces of all countries should be used for self defense only. No country should seek an armament level higher than that necessitated by reasonable national defense. We support the proposal for establishing in the Middle East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction and are in favor of implementing arms control in this region under the principles of comprehensiveness and balance and through equal consultations and negotiations among various countries. We must fully respect and listen to the opinions and views of the countries in this region and prevent a small number of countries

from imposing their views on others. Arms control is only a means, the purpose of which is to achieve just and everlasting peace in the Middle East. Therefore, arms control should be linked to the peace process in the Middle East. The United Nations must give full play to its due roles, and when necessary, should call a Middle East arms control conference attended by all countries concerned.

Outer space belongs to mankind and should be exploited for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind. No country should develop space weapons. First, the United States and the Soviet Union should stop developing, experimenting in, and deploying space weapons and should destroy all existing space weapons. The international community should have talks on an all-out ban on space weapons and should conclude an international treaty on this subject in order to prevent the arms race spreading to outer space. [passage omitted]

Reportage on Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Proposals

XINHUA Report

OW2809055791 Beijing XINHUA in English
0420 GMT 28 Sep 91

["Bush Proposes Sweeping Nuclear Disarmament Initiative"—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Washington, September 27 (XINHUA)—U.S. President George Bush today put forward a sweeping nuclear disarmament initiative, including the elimination of all U.S. and Soviet land-based tactical nuclear weapons.

In his address televised live from the Oval Office, Bush said that with the end of the Cold War, "we can now take steps to make the world a less dangerous place than ever before in the nuclear age."

But a senior administration official, briefing reporters shortly before the speech, said that the initiative mainly came out the concerns for the prospect that the Soviet Union might lose its control on the short-range missiles.

And U.S. press pointed out that the initiative will cut deeper in the Soviet advantage in the land-based, multi-warhead strategic nuclear arms than the U.S. strength in the sea and air-borne strategic systems.

Bush said that the United States will:

- Withdraw all of its nuclear artillery shells and all nuclear warheads for its short range ballistic missiles to the United States. These weapons, most of which are based in Europe, and similar warheads currently stored in the United States will be dismantled and destroyed.
- Remove all tactical nuclear weapons, including nuclear cruise missiles, from its surface ships and attack submarines. It will also remove nuclear weapons associated with land-based naval aircraft. Many of these weapons will be dismantled and destroyed with the remainder placed in secure storage areas.
- Remove all U.S. strategic bombers from day-to-day alert status and return their weapons to storage areas.

—Immediately stand down from alert all U.S. long-range strategic missiles to be dismantled under the START treaty. The process will be accelerated if the treaty is ratified by the Senate.

—Terminate the development of railroad mobile version of the MX long-range missiles and limit the modernization of long-based strategic missiles to a single-warhead missile program.

For all the above steps to be taken by the United States, the President called on the Soviet Union to take similar actions. The U.S. moves will be reversed if no response comes from the Soviet Union, the administration official said.

Bush also proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union seek early agreement to eliminate all multi-warhead strategic ballistic missiles from their arsenals.

He called on the Soviet Union to permit the deployment of defense systems against limited ballistic missile strikes and said that the United States will propose initiatives in the area of early warning system. These proposals will have to renegotiate the anti-ballistic missile treaty reached by the two countries.

While calling for drastic cuts in nuclear weapons, Bush said the big-ticket non-nuclear programs such as the B-2 bomber and strategic arms initiative will be fully funded.

Congressmen Endorse Move

OW2809040191 Beijing XINHUA in English
0335 GMT 28 Sep 91

["Bush's Nuclear Proposal Meets With Mixed Reactions in Congress"—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Washington, September 27 (XINHUA)—Members of the U.S. Congress noted tonight that Bush should turn more attention to domestic problems, while endorsing the President's proposals for deep cuts in U.S. nuclear arsenal.

"We are pleased that the President has accepted the view we have been urging for years," Senate Democratic leader George Mitchell said after Bush's remarks.

Mitchell also said he hoped Bush would "turn some of his attention homeward, to cooperate with us in acting on our proposals to create jobs, to reduce poverty, ignorance and poor health."

Senate Republican leader Robert Dole predicted Bush would get strong support in the Congress. He also said the pressure would now be on the Soviets to agree to cooperate in joint arms reductions. Bush "has put the ball squarely in their court," he said.

Bush, in a nationally televised speech from the White House Oval Office, announced his plans to eliminate all U.S. land-based tactical nuclear weapons and remove all short-range nuclear arms from submarines and ships worldwide.

Bush also called for the Soviet Union to match his unilateral actions, and for the two sides to launch arms control talks to cover multiple-warhead weapons.

While praising Bush's plan, Les Aspin, House Armed Services Committee chairman, said that to reduce defense spending, Bush's proposals would need to be enhanced with additional U.S. arms cuts.

Aspin noted that Bush's plans would save only about 500 million U.S. dollars this year out of a 291 billion dollar defense budget.

Aspin also noted that Bush would not cut some of his favorite weapons programs, which include the anti-missile Strategic Defense Initiative and the expensive B-2 bomber.

Claiborne Pell, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called Bush's proposal to eliminate the multiple warheads "both wise and welcome." But he noted that the Senate voted for such a ban two decades ago, only to be ignored by the Nixon administration.

"Both sides have spent those two decades and tens of billions of dollars and rubles and have needlessly slowed and complicated arms control," Pell said. "Now...we have come to our senses."

Rep. John Conyers noted that the Bush administration should further cut defense spending to free up money to address domestic problems.

"Without a doubt, the country has many pressing needs without enough resources to meet those needs," Conyers said.

Cheney Orders Implementation

*OW2809224691 Beijing XINHUA in English
2200 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Text] Washington, September 28 (XINHUA)—U.S. Defense Secretary Dick Cheney today ordered hundreds of U.S. nuclear weapons to stand down as the first step of a sweeping nuclear disarmament initiative.

Cheney said at a press briefing that he has ordered an executive order removing 40 long-range bombers and 450 single-warhead Minuteman missiles from their full-time alert.

Cheney said that the United States will also destroy 2,100 nuclear artillery shells and short-range Lance missiles, remove some 100 nuclear-tipped Tomahawk missiles and another 500 tactical weapons from warships. About half of the sea-borne weapons will be destroyed.

Under the plan unveiled yesterday by President George Bush, the United States will also cancel the development of a railroad mobile version of the MX missiles and seek an early agreement with the Soviet Union to eliminate all land-based multi-warhead strategic ballistic missiles.

Cheney made it clear that submarine-borne multi-headed ballistic missiles, an area the United States enjoys a significant large advantage over the Soviet Union, will not be affected by Bush's initiative.

Cheney said that despite the removing of some U.S. weapons, the U.S. military readiness will not be weakened, and "under this plan we believe we will have enough."

Remaining on alert will be 500 three-warhead Minuteman III missiles, 50 10-warhead MX missiles and two thirds of the U.S. nuclear submarine forces, Cheney said.

The U.S. defense secretary conceded that the immediate savings of the Bush initiative would not be large because of the program termination costs and weapon destruction costs, but over a long run, it could save taxpayers roughly 20 billion U.S. dollars.

Further on Response to Bush Initiative

Foreign Ministry 'Welcomes' Plan

*OW2909100391 Beijing XINHUA in English
0950 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Beijing, September 29 (XINHUA)—A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman stated here today that China welcomes the plan for nuclear disarmament announced by U.S. President Bush on September 27.

The spokesman made this statement when asked by correspondents to comment on Bush's initiative for nuclear disarmament.

The spokesman said that the Chinese Government has always stood for nuclear disarmament, advocating complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

China hopes that this plan "will help realize the above-mentioned objectives," he said.

He continued, "We maintain that the United States and the Soviet Union which possess the largest nuclear arsenals have a special responsibility for nuclear disarmament and thus have the obligation to take the lead in halting the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and substantially cutting the nuclear weapons of all types in their possession."

Reasons for Proposal Studied

*HK2909072091 Hong Kong TA KUNG PAO
in Chinese 29 Sep 91 p 3*

["American Hot Line" by Wang Jen-yun (3769 0088 5366), TA KUNG PAO correspondent in United States: "Why Is Bush Willing To Reduce Short-Range Nuclear Arms?"]

[Text] New York, 28 September (TA KUNG PAO)—To most people, U.S. President Bush's announcement in his speech on the evening of 27 September of his intention to reduce short-range nuclear arms across the board is after all a surprise, although the gradual reduction of nuclear arms has been seen as an inevitable trend of historical development.

According to Bush's proposal, the United States is willing to withdraw all its sea- and land-based tactical nuclear arms deployed in Europe and Asia, most of which will be

destroyed in the United States. In addition, the United States also will cancel both the plan to install MX missiles with 10 warheads each on rail trucks and the project to develop mechanical launchers for single-warhead Midgeman missiles. In other words, if the Soviet Union is ready to take similar actions in return, short-range nuclear weapons deployed by the United States and the Soviet Union very soon will disappear from Eastern and Western Europe, as well as from the Asian part of the Soviet Union, and projects to develop this kind of weapon undertaken by the United States and the Soviet Union will be suspended.

Taking Preemptive Measures To Gain the Initiative

It is the Soviet Union rather than the United States that over the years has been calling for the opening of talks to seek ways to reduce tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe. The United States' very purpose in massively deploying short-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe during those years was to counterbalance the Soviet Union's superiority in Eastern Europe in terms of conventional military forces. During the previous rounds of U.S.-Soviet talks on reduction of nuclear arms, the United States had always placed the negotiations on long-range nuclear weapons before those on short-range nuclear weapons. What are the reasons that have impelled Bush to suddenly make this 180-degree turn?

Interpreting from a completely positive viewpoint, one may say that the targets at which the deployment of U.S. short-range nuclear arms in Western Europe usually aimed now have disappeared, since Eastern European countries are casting off Soviet influence and all the Soviet troops stationed in these countries eventually will withdraw. If the United States keeps its short-range nuclear arms in Western Europe, quarrels over this issue certainly will break out between it and European countries in the future. Originally it was the changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe that paved the way for the withdrawal of short-range nuclear weapons deployed in Europe, but now Bush has taken the initiative and brought the focus of people's attention back onto himself as the "diplomatic president."

Preventing Nuclear Proliferation Within the Soviet Union

Some people believe that Bush's unexpected offer of an across-the-board reduction of short-range nuclear arms at this moment is linked to U.S. worries about the proliferation of nuclear arms within the Soviet Union after the split of the country. Referring to the Soviet Union's tactical nuclear arms, a high-ranking official of the Bush administration pointed out: "They are facing a situation in which there are so many nuclear arms there, even their own safety is under threat." Bush's proposal is based on this calculation: He would prefer trying to reach an agreement on the destruction of short-range nuclear arms with the Soviet Union as soon as possible, while the Soviet central government still maintains nuclear arms under its control, rather than to take the risk that may arise from the sharing of short-range nuclear arms among the member republics of the Soviet Union.

Funds Will Be Devoted to Key Projects

It is also based on a consideration of internal affairs that Bush suggested an overall reduction of short-range nuclear arms. As the United States has not yet taken any action to significantly cut its military spending despite the end of the Cold War between the East and West, the U.S. electorate is wondering when they will receive the "peace dividend." According to the five-year military expense budget submitted by U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney last year, U.S. military spending will be as high as \$1,200 billion for the next five years. The reduction of short-range nuclear arms may give people the impression that the United States is likely to cut its military spending.

One must also be aware, however, that Bush reiterated in his speech that "it is necessary to ensure the reliability of this country's deterrent force," and "the provision of all funds needed to run the B2 Stealth fighter plane project and the Star Wars program." So, according to Bush's calculation, suspending short-range nuclear arms development projects is probably a strategy to divert funds to the B2 Stealth fighter plane project and the Star Wars program. With the suspension of short-range nuclear arms development projects as a camouflage, Bush will have a greater chance to prevent the Stealth fighter plane project from being "brought down" by the Congress.

Move Affects Election Plans

*HK2909072791 Hong Kong TA KUNG PAO
in Chinese 29 Sep 91 p 3*

[Article by Wen Ta (5113 6671): "Bush Is Helping Himself and Others as Well"]

[Text] In the wake of the great dramatic changes in the Soviet Union, the possibility of revising U.S. military strategy and speeding up nuclear disarmament has become a topic of debate in the United States. In this regard, opinions vary within the Bush administration. Now Bush's sudden announcement of a new proposal on nuclear disarmament signifies the end of a stage of the debate.

The appeal for stepping up disarmament has been mainly voiced by the Democratic Party. Now, by taking the initiative in announcing his proposal, Bush has received much praise both at home and abroad. While announcing his plan on destruction of land-based tactical nuclear arms, Bush has silenced one of the big guns that the Democratic Party is going to use to fire at its rival in the general election.

In the UK, the Conservative government has made a prompt, positive, and concrete response, taking this opportunity to win more support for the general election which is due in the next 10 months. The opposition Labor Party has long been advocating a substantial reduction of nuclear arms and using this as slogan to win the electorate's support. This time the Conservative Party has a rare chance to frustrate its rival.

Bush has done something for himself and for his friends as well. He has indeed killed two birds with one stone.

Editorial Views Reactions

*HK3009064191 Hong Kong WEN WEI PO
in Chinese 30 Sep 91 p 2*

[Editorial: "U.S. Reduction of Nuclear Arms Should Be Affirmed"]

[Text] Commenting on television about the nuclear disarmament plan presented by U.S. President George Bush on 27 September, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said: "This proposal is very positive," but he also indicated that "it is still premature to assess the whole scope of these proposals." Hence, Gorbachev did not offer any reciprocal moves.

Meanwhile, a spokesman of the Chinese Foreign Ministry issued a statement actively supporting nuclear disarmament. China maintains: "The Chinese Government has always advocated nuclear disarmament and the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. We welcome the initiative announced by President Bush on 27 September and hope that it will help realize these objectives. We maintain that the United States and the Soviet Union, which possess the largest nuclear arsenal, have a special responsibility for nuclear disarmament and thus have the obligation to take the lead in halting the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and substantially cutting the nuclear weapons of all types in their possession."

China's attitude is very clear in that it advocates "a prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons." While the nuclear disarmament announced by the United States this time still has some way to go toward fulfilling the word "total," China will extend its affirmation and support as long as both the United States and the Soviet Union make a stride on the question of comprehensive nuclear disarmament. The U.S. announcement and the Soviet reaction at least showed the two countries' admission that there was no longer any need to threaten each other with nuclear weapons and put the entire human race under the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. The people of the world are all opposed to nuclear weapons. It is best that the U.S. intention for partial nuclear disarmament be realized as soon as possible. Once partial nuclear disarmament is carried out, it will contribute to world detente and whip up a progressive trend toward a popular demand for comprehensive nuclear disarmament.

Naturally, Bush's announcement of the plan to withdraw all ground-launched theater nuclear weapons from Europe and South Korea, remove all tactical nuclear weapons from surface ships and attack submarines, and drop alert status on strategic nuclear weapons is based on several considerations, but one point that cannot be ignored is the dramatic changes that have taken place in the international situation: As the superpower rival of the United States, the Soviet Union has disintegrated rapidly and no longer can confront and threaten the United States as it did in the 1980s. Well aware of the Soviet Union's lack of financial and manpower resources to engage the United States in a nuclear arms race, Gorbachev took advantage of its remaining influence to begin a peace offensive on the

United States in the late 1980s and asked for nuclear disarmament, which won cheers and acclaims. Times have changed and it is now Bush's turn to launch a nuclear disarmament offensive against the Soviet Union and put it on the defensive. It is like a rich knight urging a poor knight to join him in throwing their swords into the ocean as a gesture of peace. Once the poor knight throws away his sword, however, he no longer has the money to make new ones, but the rich knight has ample wealth, and if he wants to, can make better weapons to overwhelm everyone.

Bush announced: "Without any doubt, we will retain the necessary force and will react whenever necessary." "The United States will continue to seek the development of the B2 bomber plane and the Star Wars project." Does the so-called "necessary force" refer to defense and security needs, or does it have more implications? Only time will tell.

The Gulf war already has shown that it is the accuracy and first strike capability of weapons and not their quantity which matters in the battlefields. Following its dramatic transformation, the Soviet Union plunged into an economic crisis and was forced to ask for sizable aid from the United States. However, the United States has taken a "lukewarm" policy, opting to release aid according to its own whims. It is practically impossible for the Soviet Union to spend huge sums of money on the development of high technology weapons anymore.

The United States wants to take advantage of the Soviet Union's current "lack of financial capability" to push it into "retiring its weapons to the arsenal." After all, the Soviets and the Europeans are concerned that the crisis of ethnic division could cause the short-range nuclear weapons deployed in various republics to fall into the hands of extremists and result in a human disaster in case of a slight accident. Bush's proposal on the reduction of short-range nuclear weapons is also a carrot-and-stick measure that could allow Gorbachev to follow it through and take the opportunity to recover and destroy short-range nuclear weapons.

While the Soviet Union has not made any reciprocal move in response to the U.S. announcement, it appears that Gorbachev does not have much room for turning it down. He will have to make some move out of either political or economic considerations.

The proposal on the reduction of short-range nuclear weapons was welcomed by the people of the world. The question is: After the United States and the Soviet Union have destroyed their short-range tactical nuclear weapons, what will be the future U.S. nuclear policy? If it dominates the arms race and continues to manufacture a new generation of sophisticated nuclear weapons and Star Wars weapons, it will be violating the aspirations of the great majority of the world's people and of the American people. Meanwhile, China's view in favor of "complete nuclear disarmament" and emphasis of its support for the "United States and the Soviet Union to take the lead in halting the

testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons"—these statements are of tremendous realistic significance.

Column Views Initiative

*HK3009071091 Hong Kong TA KUNG PAO
in Chinese 30 Sep 91 p 2*

["Political Talk" column by Shih Chun-yu (2457 0689 3768): "Opportunity for United States To Raise Proposal on Nuclear Arms Limitation"]

[Text] U.S. President Bush has suddenly announced a series of nuclear arms reduction proposals. This was well received by the world. This is the boldest nuclear arms reduction program proposed by the United States since the emergence of atomic bombs 40 years ago. The Soviet response will determine whether this program comes true.

It Awaits Soviet Response

Bush's proposals are composed of two parts. The first is adjusting the balance of nuclear forces, destroying tactical nuclear weapons (some will continue to be stored), and lifting the alert status of strategic bombers and long-range strategic missiles; the second proposes talks with the Soviet Union on the elimination of all multiple warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The realization of all these depends on the Soviet response. The elimination of tactical nuclear weapons requires bilateral efforts, and this is even more so with the elimination of ICBMs.

Since the end of the so-called "Cold War" and the disintegration of the East European bloc, people in Europe have kept proposing that the United States and the Soviet Union should hold talks on the elimination of short-range nuclear weapons from the hypothetical European battlefield subsequent to their agreement on destroying intermediate nuclear weapons. At last year's START talks Bush also raised a proposal for reducing ICBMs, but the two sides could not go on with their talks because the deadline for reaching agreement was close and the United States insisted on reducing land-based missiles, in which the Soviet Union maintains superiority.

Now Bush has raised the two proposals together, apparently thinking that the opportunity has come.

Seizing a Favorable Opportunity

The situation has become comparatively stable since the military coup, but the prospects are still unclear and nobody knows how the situation will develop. Soviet nuclear weapons still worry the West. According to the strategic arms limitation treaty signed in June, Soviet strategic nuclear weapons can be deployed in the Russian, Kazakh, Belorussian, and Ukrainian Republics. Soviet tactical nuclear weapons are deployed in federated republics. Their deployment is even wider and even more difficult to control. If no limitation measures are worked out when the Soviet central government still has definite power, there could be no end of trouble in the future if the Soviet Union splits.

Moreover, the Soviet Union is asking the West for huge emergency assistance to tide it over its difficulties during the coming winter. Yeltsin's power is pressing Gorbachev and the Soviet's traditional military power is weakening. This is a favorable situation for the United States to set new requirements. After informing Gorbachev Bush notified Yeltsin, who made a more positive response than the former. For the United States, this is unquestionably a hard-earned opportunity.

Apparently, a problem Gorbachev must consider is multiple warhead ICBMs. Bush may make some concessions on sea-launched missiles to demand the destruction of all ground-based missiles. The United States will gain the upper hand in this respect in the future.

Stress Is Laid on Domestic Influences

Bush announced his proposals to the whole nation on television after coming back to Washington from speaking at the UN General Assembly. By announcing his world peace-related proposals on television instead of raising them at the United Nations, Bush wished to stress the importance of domestic influences. This "diplomatic President," criticized for lacking ideas in internal affairs, still hopes to gain popular support from its foreign policy at a time when the presidential election is becoming the main theme of public opinion.

However, this arms reduction will not necessarily bring much benefit to the U.S. economy, which falls short of funds from time to time. Aspin, chairman of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, pointed out that Bush's program will only save \$500 million out of this year's \$291-billion military budget. Bush will not reduce funds allocated for the "Star Wars" program or the B-2 Stealth bomber program.

The United States and the Soviet Union still store the larger part of nuclear weapons in the world. Any move by these two countries to reduce nuclear weapons is welcomed by the people of the world. People hope that this process will continue until all nuclear weapons are eliminated from the world.

XINHUA Notes World Reaction to Bush Proposal

Gorbachev Assessment 'Positive'

*OW2909142891 Beijing XINHUA in English
1417 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Moscow, September 29 (XINHUA)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Saturday made a "highly positive assessment" on U.S. President George Bush's Friday initiative on nuclear disarmament.

"Our assessment of these proposals is highly positive," Gorbachev said this over the Soviet Central Television on Saturday.

The Soviet president, however, believed it is still too early to make comprehensive and specific assessments of the proposals as many problems remain to be further cleared up.

Bush proposed on Friday a unilateral decision on eliminating U.S. ground-based nuclear weapons deployed in other countries, as well as all American nuclear shells and warheads of short-range ballistic missiles. He also urged the Soviet Union to take the reciprocal steps.

Gorbachev also hoped that the Soviet Union and the United States could "make an unprecedented step" on the issue of stopping the nuclear test.

Gorbachev said that he and Bush have agreed to make the Soviet and U.S. experts start talks on Bush's proposals immediately.

UK To Retain 'Deterrent'

OW2809030791 Beijing XINHUA in English
0130 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] London, September 27 (XINHUA)—British Prime Minister John Major tonight gave his backing for U.S. President George Bush's latest disarmament initiative but stressed that Britain would retain its nuclear deterrent, including the Trident Nuclear Missile Program.

British officials said that Major and Bush today had a 15-minute talk by telephone on the U.S. President's proposals.

In a nationally televised address tonight, Bush will reportedly call for further deep cuts in U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals.

He will drop plans to mount up to 50 intercontinental missiles on rail cars if the Soviet Union takes its own multi-warhead SS-24 missiles off the rails.

Bush is also expected to announce U.S. willingness to remove or limit nuclear cruise missiles on warships in return for more cuts in Moscow's stockpile.

British officials stressed that there was no immediate threat to Britain's new Trident submarine, which is to replace the aging Polaris force by the mid-1990s. Each submarine will carry 16 missiles, each with eight warheads supplied by the United States. government ministers said that plans to order a fourth Trident submarine would go ahead.

The officials said that while fully supporting what are regarded as imaginative and bold steps to reduce the numbers of nuclear weapons, Major believes that Britain must retain its nuclear deterrent for the foreseeable future.

Major is understood to have told Bush that he regards adequate conventional and nuclear weapons as the bed-rock of British and European security, and intends to ensure that both are retained by Britain.

Hundreds of U.S. nuclear weapons are likely to be withdrawn from Britain under Bush's new proposals.

About 1,700 U.S. nuclear weapons are currently based in Britain.

So far, Britain's nuclear weapons have not been involved in superpower arms cuts.

Major is expected to come under severe pressure to reduce Britain's nuclear arsenal after Bush outlines his plans.

Britain's opposition politicians said that the government would almost certainly face demands to cancel the Trident Nuclear Missile Program.

UK Responds With Arms Cuts

OW2809134891 Beijing XINHUA in English
1315 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] London, September 28 (XINHUA)—Britain said today that it would join the United States in scrapping short-range and battlefield nuclear weapons and that its Navy ships would stop carrying nuclear depth bombs.

Defense Secretary Tom King, making the announcement after U.S. President George Bush promised on Friday to scrap all ground-launched short-range nuclear weapons, also said Britain would go ahead with plans to update its nuclear submarine fleet.

Speaking on BBC Radio, King said Britain planned to unilaterally destroy its short-range and battlefield nuclear weapons and would cease to carry nuclear depth bombs aboard warships.

Under the plan, Britain's 12 elderly Lance short-range nuclear missile launchers would be destroyed along with about 70 missiles. The Navy's nuclear depth bombs are designed to be dropped by military aircraft and helicopters to attack enemy submarines.

But King said Britain would maintain adequate conventional and nuclear forces. There would be no let-up in plans for a new missile system for the air force and the more modern Trident system will replace Polaris nuclear submarines.

The plans envisage the replacement of the Polaris fleet with four new Trident vessels carrying more than 500 U.S. Trident warheads, according to defense experts. Britain is due in January to launch the first of the new submarine fleet, which costs an estimated nine billion pounds (15.6 billion U.S. dollars).

Britain was committed to maintaining at least one nuclear armed submarine at sea at any time as a minimum nuclear deterrent, he said, adding that the country needs "to have a credible deterrent and ... to therefore have a deterrent which carries some punch."

The main threat has been the Soviet nuclear arsenal which has remained in place, he explained.

King said that despite changes in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union was a "very dangerous and unstable place and it still has huge stocks of weapons and huge stocks of nuclear weapons as well."

"We now worry about who has control over that nuclear arsenal in the Soviet Union and republics," he said.

British Prime Minister John Major has welcomed the U.S. disarmament initiative and urged the Soviet Union to respond "with equal imagination."

The United States and its allies had agreed to "take further imaginative steps in arms control, while preserving the essentials of our defense in a world which is still unstable," Major said in a statement following Bush's announcement.

Anti-nuclear campaigners and opposition parties, however, said the British Government's response to the Bush initiative did not go far enough.

Marjorie Thompson, chairwoman of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said Britain "does not need to go ahead with the Trident system."

Menzies Campbell, defense spokesman for the Liberal Democrats, said the Trident plan could result in the deployment of more nuclear warheads than with Polaris. He also called for more far-reaching cuts in nuclear missiles.

The main opposition Labor Party's defense spokesman, Martin O'Neill, said Britain had to think carefully whether it now needed Trident on the scale previously proposed.

Germany Hails 'Historic' Move

*OW2809111391 Beijing XINHUA in English
1048 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Text] Bonn, September 28 (XINHUA)—The German Government today welcomed U.S. President George Bush's proposal to reduce the United States' nuclear arsenal.

German Chancellor Helmut Kohl described it as a "decision of historic proportions".

In a statement released here today, Kohl said "with these drastic cuts in nuclear armaments we stand on the threshold of an historic change in security policy. Peace will become more secure".

Kohl also called on the Soviet Union to take similar steps to reduce its own nuclear arsenal.

Part of Bush's plan provides for the withdrawal from Germany of all U.S. nuclear short-range missile warheads and nuclear artillery shells. "For that I warmly thank the President in the name of all Germans", Kohl said.

Upon returning home from Canada this morning, German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said Bush had "fulfilled all our hopes".

NATO Urges Soviet Response

*OW2909022091 Beijing XINHUA in English
0203 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Brussels, September 28 (XINHUA)—Member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) said on Saturday that they unanimously back the nuclear disarmament initiative put forward by U.S. President George Bush.

The NATO Council of Ministers, the organization's governing body, said in a statement following a special session that the Bush proposal is consistent with the reform NATO is undergoing and with the drastic changes in Europe.

Terming Bush's initiative as "a historical step" toward security and stability in Europe, the statement asked the Soviet Union to give a positive response.

NATO leaders declared at their London summit last year that owing to the changes in East-West relations, they would use nuclear weapons only as a "last resort."

France, Japan, NATO Members React

*OW2909154191 Beijing XINHUA in English
1519 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Beijing, September 29 (XINHUA)—Western nations have expressed their welcome to U.S. President George Bush's sweeping nuclear arms reduction initiative made public late Friday.

In his response on Saturday, French President Francois Mitterrand said the leaders of the four countries with nuclear arms in Europe would meet shortly to discuss the issue.

The four countries are Britain, France, the Soviet Union and the United States.

According to the French President in Evry, south of Paris, Bush and his Soviet counterpart Mikhail Gorbachev had agreed to his proposal that the four powers should hold the meeting.

Mitterrand reiterated that his country would be ready to take part in reducing arms of mass destruction.

However, he said, the reduction would only take place once the United States and the Soviet Union had made considerable cuts in their nuclear arsenals, and once an imbalance in conventional forces in Europe had been removed.

Under the Bush initiative, the United States would destroy all its battlefield nuclear weapons, including 700 short-range nuclear missiles and 1,500 nuclear shells deployed in Europe.

In London, British Defense Secretary Tom King on Saturday promised to scrap short-range nuclear missiles as Britain's contribution to the U.S. nuclear arms reduction initiative.

King said the British Government planned to destroy its short-range and battlefield nuclear weapons and to cease to carry nuclear depth bombs aboard naval vessels.

He told British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) radio that Britain's 12 elderly Lance short-range nuclear missile launchers would be destroyed along with some 70 missiles.

But Britain would remain committed to a planned replacement of its Polaris nuclear submarine fleet with the more modern Trident system to maintain a "minimum deterrent," he said.

In Tokyo, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu expressed welcome to Bush's initiative and called on Soviet leaders to "respond immediately in a positive manner."

In Brussels, ambassadors of the 16 member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) gave unanimous support to the new U.S. initiative and called on the Soviet Union to match it.

Before issuing a statement to this effect, the ambassadors heard a briefing on the initiative by U.S. Ambassador William Taft.

Tokyo Paper on U.S. Supremacy

*OW2909170691 Beijing XINHUA in English
1616 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Tokyo, September 29 (XINHUA)—U.S. President George Bush's Friday moves to reduce nuclear arsenals are aimed at capitalizing on recent changes in the Soviet Union in order to maintain an upper-hand in the nuclear strategy game, a Japanese newspaper said Saturday.

MAINICHI SHIMBUN revealed that the United States, according to U.S. Government sources, believes it would be the most advantageous for it to advance the proposals at a time when the Soviet military leadership and the so-called "conservatives" are suffering setbacks.

The United States also believes that its move will help avoid confusing debate in the Soviet Union and put the nuclear weapons under the direct control of the Soviet central government.

There is no doubt Bush's proposal is designed to seek an absolute superiority in strategic nuclear weapons, the newspaper said.

Because the Soviet Union has more intercontinental ballistic missiles than the United States, it will greatly reduce the threat to the United States to remove these Soviet warheads.

On the other hand, the United States will maintain its lead in nuclear cruise missiles launched from surface ships and attack submarines and protect its strategic nuclear superiority, the newspaper concluded.

Australia Welcomes 'Decisive Step'

*OW2809135391 Beijing XINHUA in English
1333 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Text] Canberra, September 28 (XINHUA)—Australia's Prime Minister Bob Hawke has welcomed the decision announced today by U.S. President George Bush to cut large numbers of nuclear weapons.

Hawke said here in a statement that "it is the single most decisive step for world peace since the nuclear age began nearly 50 years ago."

He said the decisions on the structure of U.S. nuclear forces constituted "the most sweeping act of unilateral disarmament in modern history," and the proposals Bush has made for further arms reductions "promise to reshape fundamentally the nature of global relationships."

Hawke noted that he had sent a message to President Bush congratulating him on his achievement.

He has also sent messages to Soviet President Gorbachev and Russian President Boris Yeltsin urging them to respond in the same spirit, "a spirit worthy of George Bush's proposals, and of their own achievements."

"I hope other nuclear powers will also, in turn, respond in similar spirit," Hawke said.

Meanwhile, the federal opposition today also welcomed Bush's proposal to cut the tactical nuclear weapons, but warned that this did not mean Australia could afford to lower its defense guard.

Further Reportage, Comment on Bush Proposal

XINHUA 'News Analysis'

*OW0110093691 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service
in Chinese 0646 GMT 1 Oct 91*

["News Analysis: Behind the U.S. Unilateral Reduction of Tactical Nuclear Weapons"—XINHUA headline; by reporter Yang Guoqiang (2799 0948 1730)]

[Text] Washington, 29 September (XINHUA)—U.S. President Bush suddenly announced last Friday evening a plan for the large-scale reduction of nuclear weapons, deciding to remove from Europe and Asia and to destroy 1,300 land-based nuclear artillery shells and 850 warheads for short-range ballistic missiles, as well as to remove about 500 tactical nuclear weapons from submarines and military vessels.

This unilateral nuclear disarmament, the first on a large-scale by the United States, naturally has aroused the attention of various sectors.

While the international strategic situation is undergoing tremendous changes, the disarmament plan is undoubtedly a major component of the U.S. efforts to readjust its nuclear strategy. Since the end of World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union, in contending for world hegemony, have launched a fierce arms race, constantly increasing and upgrading their respective nuclear forces. The U.S. tactical nuclear weaponry system, which was set up in the 1950's, constitutes a small section of the U.S. nuclear arsenal and is deployed totally abroad. During Cold War era, tactical nuclear weapons played a certain "deterrent" role in U.S.-Soviet confrontation, but with the changing situations in East Europe and the Soviet Union, these weapons have lost their target, and to preserve these weapons and maintain them in good condition requires huge financial resources and manpower. Some West European countries—especially Germany—which used to support the U.S. deployment of tactical nuclear weapons on their territories from a political viewpoint, now are worried that the existence of these weapons will place their own countries in danger, and so no longer welcome them. As pointed out in U.S. newspapers, the nuclear weapons to be removed by the United States are "outdated" and "most useless" weapons.

From an economic point of view, the nuclear disarmament plan announced by Bush will cut U.S. military spending by approximately \$2 billion, or roughly 1 percent of total U.S.

military expenditures. Nevertheless, this move not only will ease the pressure of domestic demands for reducing the defense budget, but also will enable the United States to concentrate efforts on developing more advanced nuclear weapons systems and conventional arms. Announcing the plan, Bush pointed out flatly: "The peace dividend I am seeking cannot be calculated in terms of dollars. Some measures to be taken in the near future may cost even more money." He said that in doing so, the purpose of the United States is to "ensure that we have necessary funds to readjust our (strategic) forces," or, to go all out to develop B-2 Stealth bombers and the "Star Wars" program.

The U.S. nuclear disarmament plan was drafted in the wake of political changes in the Soviet Union. This is an indication of U.S. concern over the future of that country. According to newspapers in the United States, Washington is concerned about the Soviet Union losing control over its massive nuclear weapons as a result of further divisions in the country, thus aggravating the danger of "nuclear proliferation" and "nuclear war." Therefore, the United States is anxious to totally destroy the tactical nuclear weapons within the range of 150 km, which have the "strongest mobility" and are the "most difficult to control," in hopes that the U.S. initiative will bring about corresponding measures from the Soviet Union and avert a situation of the Soviet central authorities losing control over nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it is obvious that the ultimate objective of the U.S. nuclear disarmament plan is to take the advantage of political turbulence in the Soviet Union and its diminishing power in all fields in order to further weaken Soviet strength, while taking this "historic opportunity" to comprehensively readjust the strategy of U.S. nuclear weaponry, consolidate its superiority, and further modernize U.S. nuclear forces, thereby providing a "substantial foundation" militarily for establishing a U.S. style-"new world order."

Gorbachev Response Reported

*OW0110055991 Beijing XINHUA in English
0343 GMT 1 Oct 91*

[Text] Moscow, September 30 (XINHUA)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said today that the Soviet Union should avoid rashness in responding to the U.S. proposal for nuclear reduction.

Any prompt response to such a major move, either by the country or its president, would be short of careful consideration, Gorbachev told reporters after his meeting with Austrian Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky.

"In order to figure out the essence of the U.S. initiative, we have to raise quite a few questions. Now there exist some slight differences," Gorbachev said.

Since the U.S. proposal is unilateral, he stressed, the Soviet study of the issue should not impede the United States from taking action unilaterally.

The Soviet president also proposed that nuclear tests should be ceased. He hoped the United States could expand its initiative to reducing nuclear tests while trying to cut nuclear weapons.

It was also reported that the Soviet Foreign Ministry announced on Monday that Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksey Obukhov will visit Washington early October to hold talks with the U.S. side on the nuclear reduction proposal raised by U.S. President George Bush recently.

Bush on Friday put forward a nuclear weapons reduction plan, including a unilateral cut of all U.S. short-range nuclear missiles now stationed in Europe, and a scrap of its rail-based mobile missiles.

Moscow Urges Dialogue

*OW0110060091 Beijing XINHUA in English
0346 GMT 1 Oct 91*

[Text] Moscow, September 30 (XINHUA)—The Soviet Union today called for immediate and detailed dialogue on United States President George Bush's proposals on nuclear disarmament.

Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, speaking at a news briefing, said that the Soviet Government's proposals would exert a "major impact" on the reduction of chemical and conventional weapons.

On Friday, President Bush put forward a nuclear weapons reduction plan, including a unilateral cut of all U.S. short-range nuclear missiles now stationed in Europe, and the scrapping of its rail-based mobile missiles.

Bush also called for a reduction and the final dismantling of all land-based, multiple-head missiles by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Bush's initiative would be enriched if it included a proposal on banning nuclear testing, Petrovskiy said.

He said it was necessary to bring all other nuclear nations into the process of nuclear disarmament at a certain stage. There was "a realistic chance" of making a "break-through" towards establishing a nuclear-free world, he added.

He said the Soviet central government would coordinate its efforts with the republics during the negotiations with the United States.

UN Chief Welcomes Move

*OW0110003891 Beijing XINHUA in English
1921 GMT 30 Sep 91*

[Text] United Nations, September 30 (XINHUA)—U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar today welcomed the measures announced by the United States to cut its nuclear arsenals.

In a statement issued here today, the U.N. chief said that the announcement by President George Bush on September 27, which outlines the measures that U.S. would unilaterally take to cut its nuclear weapons and forces is "timely and far-reaching."

He said the announcement "comprises a most substantial set of measures that would further the process of nuclear disarmament and further de-escalate the threat of nuclear war."

Under the announcement, the United States would eliminate all of its tactical nuclear weapons on land and at sea in Europe and Asia, stop the 24-hour alert of long-range bombers, and offer to negotiate with the Soviet Union on the sharp reduction of their strategic missiles.

These steps proposed by the United States, the secretary-general said, "could go a long way towards strengthening international peace and security."

He also hoped "earnestly" that discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union relating to the U.S. proposal for the elimination of certain multiple nuclear warheads will commence as soon as possible. "The success of those negotiations would be of utmost importance to the world as a whole," he added.

JAPAN

Reaction to President Bush's 27 Sep Address

Prime Minister Backs Proposal

OW2809031891 Tokyo KYODO in English 0308 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Tokyo, September 28 (KYODO)—Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu welcomed Saturday a proposal on nuclear arms cuts by U.S. President George Bush, saying it will help enhance peace in the world.

"Japan praises a bold and courageous initiative by President Bush and strongly supports the proposal as a step toward the total elimination of nuclear arms," Kaifu said in a statement.

Bush proposed the elimination of land- and sea-based short-range nuclear arms and deep cuts in strategic nuclear arsenals by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Kaifu called on the Soviet leadership to quickly and clearly accept the Bush proposal.

He said he hoped the balanced curtailment of nuclear arms by Washington and Moscow will be achieved while maintaining effective deterrence.

He also expressed hope U.S.-Soviet relations will become even more stable through the Bush initiative and bring more peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region and the world.

Government sources said the proposal will contribute to forming a new order in the world. But they are concerned about the future of Japan's security treaty with the U.S. if the Bush proposal is completely achieved.

If this happened, the sources said they thought a new arrangement with Washington would be required.

The United States notified Japan in advance of Bush's proposal on nuclear arms cuts, Foreign Ministry sources said Saturday.

The sources said a letter handed to Kaifu by U.S. Ambassador to Japan Michael Armacost on Friday evening included the arms-reduction proposal made by Bush on Friday night.

Japan was also informed in advance of the proposal by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in New York, they said.

Meanwhile, Hiroshima Mayor Takashi Hiraoka welcomed the arms reduction proposal and said he hopes Washington and Moscow will continue efforts toward total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Nagasaki Mayor Hiroshi Motoshima also told reporters he strongly supports the Bush initiative and hopes the reduction will be realized as early as possible.

Motoshima said he hopes nuclear weapons will be totally eliminated this century and he would like to ask the U.S.

and the Soviet Union to take the initiative in leading other countries besides Britain, France, and China toward complete eradication.

No Defense Changes Foreseen

OW3009100591 Tokyo KYODO in English 0947 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Text] Tokyo, September 30 (KYODO)—U.S. President George Bush's announced nuclear arms cuts will not prompt "fundamental changes" in Japan's defense policy or Japan-U.S. security arrangements, a top Foreign Ministry official said Monday.

Vice Foreign Minister Hisashi Owada told a press conference that the announced cuts are not of a nature which would necessitate such changes.

As for the Japan-U.S. security relationship, Owada denied that the cuts would undermine the so-called U.S. nuclear umbrella over Japan, noting that Washington intends to maintain an effective level of nuclear deterrence.

As for Japan's policy of striving to reach a minimum level of defensive capability, Owada noted that the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) are geared toward warding off an act of aggression against Japan where conventional, not nuclear weapons, are employed.

Last Friday, Bush announced plans to eliminate the entire U.S. stock of land-based, short-range nuclear weapons and called for deep cuts in the strategic nuclear arsenals of the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

He also announced that the U.S. will withdraw all tactical nuclear weapons and all nuclear Tomahawk cruise missiles from its surface ships and attack submarines.

A top Foreign Ministry source said that the implications of the cuts will be analyzed in regular defense consultations with the U.S., adding that there is no need to call an urgent session of talks.

Administrators, Dietmen React Positively

OW2809135191 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1000 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] With respect to the arms-reduction proposal announced today [27 September] by U.S. President George Bush, interested persons in the nation commented on a question of U.S. nuclear arms brought into Japan as follows:

[Begin recording] [Hisashi Owada, administrative vice foreign minister] As you know, the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty stipulates that, if nuclear arms are brought into Japan, Japan must be informed of this in advance, and Japan has a right to say no. This policy has been in effect heretofore, and it will not change in the future. Generally speaking, removal of strategic nuclear arms, including those on vessels, will lessen public suspicion against nuclear weapons on U.S. vessels coming to Japan.

[Kosuke Uehara, chairman of the Security Policy Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Japan] The

United States has decided to withdraw short-range nuclear missiles and land-based tactical missiles, which are currently deployed all over the world. Taking into account that there are so many U.S. bases in Japan and the fact that many U.S. warships and submarines call at ports in Japan, I cannot help thinking that some nuclear arms must have been brought into the country.

Since both the United States and the Soviet Union still claim the need for nuclear deterrent power, we should carefully determine our future course of action. However, the Social Democratic Party of Japan maintains its principle to call for a complete abolition of nuclear arms, and we will make steady efforts to achieve the goal by working on policymaking process of the country and by appealing to world opinion.

[Masahide Ota, governor of Okinawa Prefecture] It is officially said that nuclear arms were removed from Okinawa when the prefecture was returned to Japan. However, a later survey indicated that more than 50 percent of Okinawan people still feel that some form of nuclear weapons might remain on the island. In connection with the anxiety of the people, President Bush's announcement is heartily welcomed.

[Takashi Hiraoka, mayor of Hiroshima] The United States must have eventually come to understand the terror of nuclear arms. I believe that voices of Hiroshima citizens and all other pacifists around the world have contributed to the latest move by the United States. Taking this opportunity, we strongly wish the world to start moving toward a complete abolition of nuclear arms. [end recording]

Parties Welcome Arms Cuts

OW2809114891 Tokyo KYODO in English 1106 GMT
28 Sep 91

[Text] Tokyo, September 28 (KYODO)—Japan's ruling and opposition parties welcomed Saturday U.S. President George Bush's disarmament proposal to unilaterally eliminate its land-based tactical nuclear weapons and remove short-range atomic arms from ships.

Keizo Obuchi, secretary general of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, termed the proposal a "courageous decision" which will contribute to world peace and stability.

Obuchi expressed hope that the Soviet Union will respond to Bush's proposal and take corresponding steps.

Japan hopes that not only the superpowers, but all other nations possessing or planning to produce nuclear weapons will follow the American lead.

The No. 1 opposition Social Democratic Party said Bush's proposal could lead to superpower negotiations for mutual reduction of nuclear arms.

Noting that Bush's proposal involves withdrawal of tactical nuclear missiles deployed in South Korea, the party urged North Korea to accept on-site inspection of nuclear facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency, paving the way for denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

Komeito, the No. 2 opposition party, called Bush's overture a bold, epoch-making step, marking a turnabout of Washington's global nuclear strategy which could spur moves toward disarmament worldwide.

The party expressed hope that the United States will take comprehensive measures toward reduction of strategic nuclear arms.

The Democratic Socialist Party, welcoming the proposal, urged the Soviet Union to coordinate with the United States towards the abolishment of nuclear arms worldwide.

The party expressed hope that the two superpowers will implement nuclear disarmament in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Japanese Communist Party called the proposal encouraging to world peace.

The party demanded that the two superpowers and other developed nations start negotiations on concrete terms for the abolishment of nuclear arms.

It said Bush's proposal proved an end to the East-West Cold War era.

INDONESIA

Foreign Minister Lauds Bush Initiative, Seeks Test Ban
BK0110090991 Jakarta ANTARA in English 0848 GMT 1 Oct 91

[Text] New York, October 1 (OANA-ANTARA)—Commenting on the U.S. announcement to unilaterally abolish all its short-range nuclear arms and to follow it up with other steps, Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas expressed the hope that the Soviet Union and other nuclear powers would follow the American example.

The step as announced by U.S. President George Bush had long been waited for by the non-nuclear countries, particularly Indonesia.

Because essentially it is the abolishment of one category of nuclear arms, he told ANTARA here on Monday.

Apart from that, he added, more important still was the unilateral abolishment without waiting for verification particulars, a step which never had happened before.

Therefore, our hope is now directed towards the Soviet Union and the other nuclear powers to take reciprocal steps, he remarked.

The step taken by President Bush should be welcomed enthusiastically by the world community, because it showed that the disarmament process had at present reached a momentum, he remarked.

Asked about his efforts as chairman of the conference to amend the Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT), Foreign Minister Alatas stated that it would be continued.

According to the non-nuclear and non-aligned countries, in order to achieve an effective nuclear disarmament, followed by a nuclear arms ban, Alatas said, nuclear tests as the source should first of all be tackled.

If nuclear arms tests were banned in all kinds of environments, including underground tests, the nuclear arms race would automatically diminish, he stressed.

At the PTBT amendment conference at the UN headquarters in New York last January, delegations had expressed anxiety about the increasing terrifying destructive power of nuclear arms in the future, because underground tests were aimed at increasing the nuclear arms destructive power.

According to the non-nuclear and non-aligned countries, underground tests which were not included in the PTBT, should also be banned so that a total ban would be achieved on land, in the air, as well as underground.

However, Alatas said, the superpowers had so far not shown any inclination to stop underground tests.

He hoped however that due to the increasing favourable climate at present, efforts towards achieving a total ban on nuclear arms tests would achieve progress.

Pursuant to a decision of the conference to amend the Partial Test Ban Treaty, Foreign Minister Ali Alatas would during the current session of the UN General Assembly, conduct consultations with PTBT signatories.

NORTH KOREA

Foreign Ministry Welcomes Bush Nuclear Arms Proposal

SK2809093791 Pyongyang Korean Central Broadcasting Network in Korean 0900 GMT 28 Sep 91

[DPRK Foreign Ministry spokesman statement—read by announcer]

[Text] According to news reports from Washington, U.S. President Bush announced on 27 September that the United States will unilaterally eliminate short-range nuclear weapons from U.S. ground and naval bases.

We welcome the U.S. announcement on unilateral withdrawal of nuclear weapons and hope that practical measures will be taken toward this end at an early date.

It is the human race's unanimous desire and aspiration to remove the danger of nuclear war and guarantee durable peace on the face of the earth.

The Korean people who are directly under the nuclear threat find the issue of removing the nuclear weapons from the Korean peninsula the most urgent matter. South Korea is now filled with U.S. nuclear weapons, and our people are constantly under the nuclear threat.

Given President Bush's speech, we hope for a measure to be taken to withdraw the U.S. nuclear weapons, as a matter of course.

If the United States really withdraws its nuclear weapons from South Korea, a road will also be opened for signing the nuclear safeguards accord.

Our Republic's government has long put forward a proposal for turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone and has constantly been making efforts to realize it. What counts most in realizing the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula is to have U.S. nuclear weapons withdrawn from South Korea.

If and when the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula is realized, it will contribute to peace in Asia and the world at large.

28 September 1991

Pyongyang

'International Solidarity March' Demands Korean NFZ

Letter to President Bush Adopted

SK2909114891 Pyongyang KCNA in English 0945 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Text] Pyongyang, September 29 (KCNA)—The joint meeting of the participants in the international solidarity

march for supporting Korea's reunification held in Pyongyang today adopted a letter demanding that the U.S. chief executive respond to the proposal for converting the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone [NFZ].

The letter addressed to the U.S. chief executive says:

The present situation on the Korean peninsula shows that any unexpected accident may spark off another war there any moment.

It is as clear as daylight that if a war breaks out on the Korean peninsula, the United States itself will suffer colossal material and human damages and irretrievable moral wounds and peace and security in Asia and the rest of the world will be in great jeopardy.

We believe that it is high time the United States gave a deep consideration to the Korean issue and rectified its Korea policy which had been formulated in the era of cold war.

We consider, therefore, that the United States should respond to the call for replacement of the Korean Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement, withdrawal of its troops and nuclear arms from South Korea and conversion of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

And we strongly demand that the United States should stop encouraging the South Korean authorities to North-South confrontation and permanent division and discontinue supporting their suppression and violation of human rights against patriotic and democratic forces who call for reunification.

It is natural that the United States should take hands off Korea so that the Koreans may solve the Korean question by themselves.

We are looking forward to hearing from you soon that you have decided to revise the policy of occupation and rule over Korea which had been authored by your predecessors, thus meeting the demand of a new era.

Letter to UN President Adopted

*SK2909120491 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0956 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, September 29 (KCNA)—The joint meeting of the participants in the international solidarity march for supporting Korea's reunification held here today adopted a letter to the president of the 46th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Noting that the United Nations should pay attention to the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, the letter says:

It is truly unusual that the status quo of ceasefire has been protracted on the Korean peninsula for over 38 years since the Korean war in which the name of the U.N. was abused and this mars the dignity of the United Nations.

We insist that the United Nations should not allow the United States to assume the name of the U.N. any longer in Korea and take concrete measures to replace the Korean

Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement and withdraw the U.S. troops and their nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Today, the U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea constitute a source of jeopardizing peace and security of Asia and the rest of the world.

The only way to completely remove the danger of a nuclear war on the Korean peninsula is to make the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone.

Paying heed to the fact that the United Nations has precedentedly made a positive contribution to denuclearizing some other countries, we hope that on the Korean peninsula, too, the United Nations will make an equal contribution to her denuclearization.

Considering that a unilateral nuclear inspection of the DPRK forced by the United States is a brigandish high-handed act of the nuclear power, we hold that the United Nations should respect the stand of the DPRK demanding simultaneous nuclear inspection.

We hope that you will exercise your competence during your term of office as the president of the 46th session of the U.N. General Assembly to take positive measures to remove the nuclear threat and preserve peace on the Korean peninsula.

Letter to South Leaders Adopted

*SK2909115391 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0950 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, September 29 (KCNA)—The joint meeting of the participants in the international solidarity march for supporting Korea's reunification held in Pyongyang today adopted a letter to the South Korean authorities, urging that they give up their stand of confrontation and division and follow the trend of the time towards peace and reunification.

Denouncing the South Korean authorities for obstinately following the treacherous way in conspiracy with the foreign forces and countering the aspirations and desire of the Korean nation, the letter continues:

We consider that denuclearization of the Korean peninsula is the only way for removing the rootcause of nuclear war danger from the Korean peninsula and that to carry into practice the proposal for reunification through confederacy is the only realistic way for independent and peaceful Korean reunification.

Considering that the more than 40,000 U.S. troops and more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear weapons in South Korea are main stumbling blocks lying in the way of Korea's reunification, we hold that the South Korean authorities should urge the U.S. administration to withdraw them from South Korea, discontinue the "Team Spirit" joint military exercises and respond to the peace proposal of the DPRK to adopt a North-South nonaggression declaration and turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free, peace zone.

We strongly urge you, the South Korean authorities, to remove the concrete wall and all the material and legal obstacles lying in the way of Korea's reunification including all anti-democratic fascist laws as early as possible.

We strongly demand that you, the South Korean authorities, stop your plot for the perpetuation of national division supported by outside forces, lend an ear to the daily growing reunification desire of the Korean people and the desire of the world's peaceloving people and take a correct stand and attitude for a peaceful reunification of the country and for peace in the Korean peninsula and Asia.

We hope that you will make a positive response to our principled and peaceloving call and take appropriate measures.

Appeal to Governments Adopted

*SK2909121391 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1002 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, September 29 (KCNA)—The joint meeting of the participants in the international solidarity march for supporting Korea's reunification held in Pyongyang today adopted an appeal to all governments, parliaments, political parties and peace and solidarity organizations, and international organizations.

Noting that tension is relaxed and regional disputes are settled in other regions of the world but it is only on the Korean peninsula that tension and confrontation still goes on while the danger of war is constantly hanging over, the appeal goes on:

Recently the United States mapped out "120 day war scenario" and initialled the Wartime Host Nation Support Agreement with the South Korean ruling group which can be seen only on the eve of war.

Furthermore, the United States disregards the preconditions for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and tries to force the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a non-nuclear member state of the Treaty, to sign the nuclear safeguards accord blackmailing her with nuclear weapons.

Should a nuclear state be allowed to threaten and attack a non-nuclear state with the nuclear weapons at random, it is only too clear that no country would join such an unjust treaty.

Instigated by the U.S., the South Korean authorities arrest at random youth and students and other patriotic people in South Korea who are struggling for independence, democracy and national reunification. They are trying to curb the growing desire of the nation for concord and reunification.

Peace can not be maintained if such a situation lasts on the Korean peninsula. If another war breaks out on the Korean peninsula, it will bring grave consequences upon peace in Asia and the rest of the world.

In order to ensure peace on the Korean peninsula, first of all, non-aggression declaration should be adopted between the North and the South of Korea and a peace agreement

be concluded between the DPRK and the U.S. so as to improve the relations between North and South and between the DPRK and the U.S., that are now in a state of confrontation.

The denuclearization of the Korean peninsula is an international issue of primary importance in eliminating the most dangerous hotbed of a nuclear war.

Let all the peace-loving governments, parliaments, political parties, and social organizations in various countries and international organizations that love peace render active support to the peace initiatives put forth on many occasions by the government of the DPRK including the proposal for adopting a nonaggression declaration between the North and the South, concluding a peace agreement between the DPRK and the U.S. and the proposal of making the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone!

Let us all force the U.S. and South Korean authorities to respond to them!

It is a prerequisite not only for Korea's reunification but for peace on the Korean peninsula to achieve the unity of the entire Korean nation in North, South and abroad.

Let all governments, parliaments, political parties and social organizations and international organizations assist in reconciliation and unity of the Korean people instead of doing harm to their great national unity and put strong pressure on the South Korean authorities to abolish the "National Security Law" which labels the fellow countrymen as enemy and the reunification movement as illegal, stop the suppression against the democratic figures calling for reunification and release those arrested and detained at once!

We, the participants in this joint rally, earnestly appeal to all the governments, parliaments, political parties, social organizations of various countries and international organizations to keep step with each other and continue to render strong support to and firm solidarity with the Korean people in their righteous struggle for peace and independent and peaceful reunification of the Korean peninsula.

Kim Yong-sun Welcomes President Bush's Proposal

*SK2909093791 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0900 GMT 29 Sep 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, September 29 (KCNA)—Kim Yong-sun, secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea who is chairman of the Korean Committee for Solidarity With the World People and chairman of the Korean Anti-Nuke Peace Committee, made a report at a joint meeting of participants in the international solidarity march for supporting Korea's reunification which was held here today with a large attendance.

Noting that although the atmosphere of confrontation has been eased in the international arena in general, the dark clouds of nuclear war are still hovering over the Korean peninsula and this is gravely threatening peace in Korea with every passing day and casting dark shadows over

peace and security in Asia and the rest of the world, he said this situation has been created entirely because the United States has deployed more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear weapons in South Korea and is resorting to its policy of nuclear blackmail against the peoples of the DPRK and other Asian countries.

Notably, the United States is rendering the situation in our country all the more strained, raising a hue and cry over the fictitious "development of nuclear weapons" by us, he said, and continued:

The U.S. claim for a "nuclear inspection" of us is aimed at misleading the ever louder voices of justice of our people and the world's peaceloving people demanding the withdrawal of the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea and at justifying its policy of nuclear blackmail on the Korean peninsula.

As long as the nuclear threat to our country exists the question of our signing the nuclear safeguards accord cannot be solved smoothly.

The United States should hold talks with us over the questions of withdrawing its nuclear weapons from South Korea and of guaranteeing the non-use of nuclear weapons against our country so that we may sign the nuclear safeguards accord, instead of only forcing a unilateral inspection of our country.

We welcome the announcement of the U.S. chief executive on September 27 that they would withdraw short-range nuclear weapons in its ground and naval bases and so on, and hope practical steps will be taken to this end at an early date.

In view of this speech of the U.S. chief executive we expect that a step should be taken promptly to withdraw the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea, too.

In order to remove the danger of nuclear war from the Korean peninsula, it is imperative to get the U.S. nuclear weapons, its very source, withdrawn from South Korea and turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

If the United States and the South Korean authorities respond to our denuclearization proposal, the "nuclear inspection" problem raised by them will be solved naturally.

Referring to the country's reunification, he said:

Of prime importance in achieving national reunification is to ensure peace on the Korean peninsula and create peaceful preconditions for national reunification and, to this end, to remove the political and military confrontation between the North and the South.

We consider it necessary to solve the humanitarian questions of travels and exchange, but the solution of more urgent peace and military problems cannot be delayed.

We hold that the South Korean authorities must not avoid adopting a nonaggression declaration any longer but stop the aggressive "Team Spirit" joint military exercises that aggravate the military confrontation.

The United States should sign a peace agreement with us and withdraw its troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea at an early date since there is neither reason nor pretext for it to keep them in South Korea.

The proposal for reunification through a confederacy based on one nation, one state, two systems and two governments is the great principle of defining the most reasonable way of solving the question of national reunification independently and peacefully.

Although the North and the South separately entered the United Nations, there is no change in our stand that Korea is one and it must be reunified into one, and we will make all efforts to reunify the country in the U.N. arena, too.

Noting that the South Korean authorities have suppressed the patriotic struggle of students and other people for independence, democracy and reunification at the point of the bayonet, arrested visitors to the North including the Rev. Mun Ik-hwan and woman student Yim Su-kyong who had visited Pyongyang for the sake of reunification, and those related to the pan-national alliance for the country's reunification and a large number of pro-reunification patriotic figures by invoking the notorious "National Security Law," and are harshly penalizing them, Secretary Kim Yong-sun stressed that the South Korean authorities must not pursue the line of confrontation, war and division persistently but join in the historical trend toward independence, peace and reunification.

He expressed the belief that all the progressive people of the world will as ever render invariable support and encouragement to the Korean people's cause of justice for peace and reunification of the country.

SOUTH KOREA

President No Responds to Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative

Welcomes, Supports Proposal

SK2809032991 Seoul YONHAP in English 0300 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Honolulu, September 27 (OANA-YONHAP)—South Korean President No Tae-u welcomed U.S. President George Bush's worldwide nuclear initiative Friday and urged the removal of all nuclear weapons from Northeast Asia.

"President No welcomed and gave his full support to President Bush's worldwide nuclear initiatives announced today as an epoch-making step toward world peace," Presidential spokesman Yi Su-chong said in a statement.

"President No hoped the Soviet Union and other nuclear powers would respond to the U.S. initiatives with corresponding measures. He also urged strongly that the countries concerned must take measures to remove all nuclear weapons from Northeast Asian region," he said.

"President No will continue to cooperate actively with the relevant countries and take necessary measures so that the

new U.S. nuclear initiatives can be translated into tension reduction, military confidence-building and arms reduction for building a peace structure in Northeast Asia, including the Korean peninsula," the statement said.

It recalled No's Sept. 24 keynote speech at the U.N. General Assembly, in which he stressed limiting the use of nuclear energy to peaceful purposes.

The South Korean leader, now here on his way home from a trip to the United Nations and Mexico, repeated his demands that North Korea immediately renounce its nuclear weapons development program and unconditionally accept outside inspection of its nuclear materials and facilities.

"The U.S. Government has had close consultation with the Republic of Korea on its new nuclear initiatives," Yi said. "President Bush, in his letter of advance notice to President No, specifically reaffirmed that the United States commitment to the security of Korea remained rock-solid."

Says Cuts Unlikely Soon

SK3009041991 Seoul YONHAP in English 0042 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Text] Honolulu, September 29 (YONHAP)—South Korean President No Tae-u indicated Saturday that it would take some time for the United States to dismantle its arsenal of short-range, ground-launched nuclear missiles because U.S. President George Bush had called on the Soviet Union and other nuclear states to make similar cuts.

No, resting on his way home from a trip to the United Nations and Mexico, told Korean reporters accompanying him that Korea would remain under the U.S. nuclear umbrella even if tactical weapons were removed from overseas U.S. bases.

"President George Bush's initiative would contribute to easing tensions on the Korean peninsula and forming an atmosphere for South and North Korea to reduce arms," he said.

He stressed, however, that the nuclear development of North Korea and the U.S. nuclear initiative were separate issues and should never be linked.

"By Bush's new nuclear plan, Pyongyang was left with no excuse to develop nuclear weapons," he said.

Unless the North abandoned its nuclear development project, it was possible for its nuclear facilities to be forcefully inspected with approval of the U.N. Security Council, he said.

Nuclear issues would be discussed in the fourth round of the inter-Korean prime ministers' talks, scheduled for late October, No said.

"The government will prepare specific plans to expedite arms control on the Korean peninsula as the time has come to do so," he said when asked about a response to the U.S. announcement.

Government Ponders Implications of Bush Initiative

'Urgent Meeting' Held

SK2809034491 Seoul KBS-1 Radio Network in Korean 0300 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] In connection with President Bush's epoch-making announcement on cutting nuclear weapons, the government held an urgent meeting and discussed measures about the issue concerning nuclear weapons on the Korean peninsula, about relations with North Korea, and about its influence on the Korean peninsula.

In connection with the new U.S. nuclear policy, the government held an urgent meeting, chaired by Prime Minister Chong Won-sik, in a conference room in Samchong-tong this morning.

At today's meeting, because the U.S. decision to withdraw its strategic nuclear weapons is related to the Korean peninsula, the government views that North Korea is no longer in a position to claim that the strategic nuclear weapons of the U.S. forces in Korea be removed. The government also views that North Korea is no longer in a position to claim that the Korean peninsula be turned into a nuclear-free zone.

The government decided to take a measure to lead North Korea to accept nuclear inspection at once.

Along with this, the government discussed the issue of security on the Korean peninsula in the wake of the U.S. decision to withdraw its strategic nuclear weapons, and decided to continue to closely cooperate with the United States for stability on the Korean peninsula and for peace in East Asia.

Seoul To Aid U.S. Initiative

SK2809061891 Seoul YONHAP in English 0556 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Seoul, September 28 (YONHAP)—The government decided Saturday, after hearing U.S. President George Bush announce the unilateral reduction of U.S. nuclear weapons, that it ought to figure out some new proposals for arms reduction on the Korean peninsula.

In a high-level meeting right after Bush's announcement, it was agreed to begin by asking North Korea to stop developing nuclear weapons.

The meeting concluded that the reduction included all of the tactical nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea.

"There was no mention in Bush's announcement that the Korean peninsula was excluded," an official close to the meeting said.

The meeting, chaired by Prime Minister Chong Won-sik, also decided to do something to help the U.S. initiative bring peace on the Korean peninsula and in Northeast Asia by easing tension and reducing arms.

Deputy Prime Minister Choe Ho-chung, Defense Minister Yi Chong-ku, National Security Planning Director So Tong-kwon and Vice Foreign Minister Yu Chong-ha attended the meeting.

The participants agreed the U.S. reduction provided a complete environment to deter North Korean nuclear development and that South Korea should cooperate with other countries to get North Korea to sign a nuclear safeguards accord with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

North Korea has refused to sign an agreement until U.S. nuclear weapons are removed from South Korea.

They also said South Korea should urge China and the Soviet Union to take measures corresponding to the U.S. measures.

North Korea demands that the Korean peninsula be designated a nuclear-free zone and that U.S. Nuclear weapons be pulled out.

The U.S. measure will have a significant impact on relations between South and North Korea, so the government should find ways to expand dialogue with the north, including a summit, the official said.

South Korea should strongly urge China and the Soviet Union to remove nuclear weapons that are within range of the Korean peninsula, he said.

Cabinet To Further Discuss Proposals

SK3009031291 Seoul YONHAP in English 0258 GMT
30 Sep 91

[Text] Seoul, September 30 (YONHAP)—South Korean President No Tae-u will chair a special cabinet meeting Tuesday to discuss urgent matters following U.S. President George Bush's nuclear initiative, and inter-Korean relations following joint admission of South and North into the United Nations.

No, due home Monday from the United Nations and Mexico, will brief the cabinet on the outcome of his trip and his discussion with Bush, government officials said.

The president is expected to reveal the government's basic positions on designating the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone, arms reduction, inter-Korean prime ministers' and summit talks, and North Korea's signing of a nuclear safeguards agreement and nuclear inspection in the cabinet meeting to be held in the presidential office.

The cabinet is expected to urge North Korea to immediately stop nuclear development and sign a nuclear safeguards agreement now that Bush has decided to scrap tactical nuclear weapons, ending the dispute over their existence in the South.

The cabinet is also expected to agree to put the nuclear issue on top of the agenda of the South-North Korean prime ministers' talks in Pyongyang Oct. 22.

The cabinet is expected to agree to work out new ways of arms reduction based on the assumption that nuclear weapons do not exist on the peninsula.

It will also discuss ways to realize a meeting between No and North Korean President Kim Il-song at an early date to extract agreements on arms reduction and easing of tension between South and North Korea.

Removal of Tactical Nuclear Weapons Planned

SK2809052591 Seoul YONHAP in English 0514 GMT
28 Sep 91

[Text] Seoul, September 28 (OANA-YONHAP)—Tactical nuclear weapons will be removed from South Korea in the near future, a high ranking Korean official said Saturday.

The United States had decided to scrap all of the tactical nuclear arms it keeps in its overseas bases, including short-range ballistic, Pershing and cruise missiles.

He said that although reductions announced by U.S. President George Bush on Friday are limited to tactical nuclear arms, long-range strategic nuclear weapons would be cut when the strategic arms reduction talks between the United States and the Soviet Union are concluded.

Troop withdrawals from South Korea would be decided in consideration of the regional political situation, he added.

Foreign Ministry Views New U.S. Nuclear Policy

SK2809053691 Seoul YONHAP in English 0517 GMT
28 Sep 91

[Text] Seoul, September 28 (OANA-YONHAP)—Sweeping reductions in the worldwide U.S. nuclear arsenal will affect South Korea, but the U.S. nuclear umbrella will remain through long-range ballistic missiles, a high ranking Foreign Ministry official said Saturday.

The United States, in the "not-too-far-away future," will be able to announce its elimination of tactical weapons, including those in South Korea, the official said.

"After the announcement, North Korea's long-held condition that U.S. nuclear weapons be withdrawn from the South before it signs a Nuclear Safeguards Accord will no longer be valid," he said.

North Korea, insisting that U.S. nuclear weapons be withdrawn from the South, is delaying its signing of a safeguards accord that would open its nuclear facilities to international inspection.

U.S. President George Bush had sent a letter to President No Tae-u explaining his nuclear initiative, the official said.

Korea was also briefed at the United Nations when Secretary of State James Baker notified NATO foreign ministers of Bush's plan. South Korean Ambassador to United Nations No Chang-hui attended the meeting, the official said.

Under Bush's proposal, any tactical weapons in South Korea would be taken back to the United States and destroyed.

Neither Seoul nor Washington will confirm or deny the presence of nuclear weapons in Korea.

"The part about tactical weapons will affect the nuclear policy on the Korean peninsula, but the United States maintains its inter-continental ballistic missiles, which will keep South Korea under its nuclear umbrella," he said.

"The new U.S. initiative is globally oriented and will not affect the planned scaleback of U.S. troops stationed in South Korea," he said, denying the cutback may be expedited.

There are 43,000 U.S. troops based in South Korea, and 7,000 non-combatants are to be sent back by the end of next year under the U.S. East Asia strategic initiative.

"South Korea urges that the United States set the precedent in nuclear withdrawal and that other nations take reciprocal steps to match the U.S. action," the official said.

Defense Minister Says U.S. Umbrella To Remain

SK2809101091 Seoul YONHAP in English 0953 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Seoul, September 28 (OANA-YONHAP)—South Korean Defense Minister Yi Chong-ku said Saturday U.S. President George Bush's sweeping nuclear initiative would not necessarily leave a vacuum in U.S. deterrent to war in the region.

Answering questions during a second-day parliamentary inspection of his ministry, Yi stressed it should be noted that air-launched nuclear arms would not be affected by the new U.S. nuclear policy.

Citing the allied victory in the Gulf war as an instance, Yi said advanced military technology would be instrumental in resisting nuclear threats.

The top military official said South Korea would remain protected by the U.S. nuclear umbrella and U.S. commitment to South Korea's security would remain firm.

"I believe Bush's nuclear initiative would contribute substantially to ensuring stability in northeast Asia and to forming an atmosphere for North Korea to abandon its nuclear development program," Yi said.

Asked whether he expected any change in the U.S. "neither-confirm-nor-deny" [NCND] policy as for the alleged presence of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in South Korea, Yi said, "Bush's initiative does not mean a change in the basic principle of the NCND policy. But the initiative evidently makes it a useless thing to do to argue about presence of nuclear weapons in South Korea any further."

"If U.S. nuclear weapons are deployed on the soil of the Korean peninsula, they will be removed in accordance

with Bush's initiative. Our government will make clear its position on how to cope with the initiative after studying it more closely," he said.

Asked whether the U.S. NCND policy is still effective with regard to air-launched nuclear arms since U.S. Air Force elements are stationed in South Korea, he said, "maybe or maybe not. On the positive side, I can say South Korea is still under the U.S. nuclear umbrella," Yi said.

He said the Korean Government had been notified of Bush's nuclear initiative in advance.

Seoul and Washington had close consultations on nuclear problems involving the Korean peninsula in a bilateral working-level policy meeting in Washington in June and a White House summit in July between President No Tae-u and George Bush, he said.

Parties Hail President Bush's Nuclear Proposal

SK2809112791 Seoul YONHAP in English 1114 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Seoul, September 28 (YONHAP)—South Korea's ruling and opposition parties have welcomed U.S. President George Bush's sweeping nuclear initiative that will destroy its ground-based short-range nuclear weapons around the world.

Pak Hui-tae, spokesman for the ruling Democratic Liberal Party, called Bush's announcement "a green light" for ending the cold war around the world and ensuring peace on the Korean peninsula.

He called on North Korea to give up its nuclear development program immediately and accept outside inspection of its nuclear installations.

The opposition Democratic Party said in a statement that the party hailed Bush's nuclear initiative in that it would contribute to world peace and stability and hoped it would lead to the destruction of all nuclear weapons in the long run.

Party spokesman No Mu-hyon urged Pyongyang to sign the nuclear safeguards accord and abandon its nuclear development project since U.S. nuclear arsenals deployed in South Korea would be removed.

Editorials View U.S. Arms Reduction Proposals

Called 'Dramatic Initiative'

SK2909012991 Seoul THE KOREA TIMES in English 29 Sep 91 p 6

[Editorial: "Bush's Arms Cut Initiatives"]

[Text] Hard on the heels of the collapse of hard-line Communists in the Soviet Union, U.S. President George Bush has now taken the most dramatic initiative in the reduction of U.S. nuclear weapons since the start of the nuclear arms race in the early 1950s. Bush's disarmament proposal is rated as a most comprehensive change in U.S. military strategy.

The Bush proposal is focused on the elimination of the U.S.'s land-based tactical nuclear weapons and removal of all its short-range atomic arms from its submarines and ships. The new proposal follows the U.S.-Soviet agreement on the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) that was signed in Moscow in July, last year but the new overture is far-ranging, marking a turning point in nuclear disarmament.

President Bush announced the sweeping measures as ones that the U.S. would take unilaterally, calling upon the Soviet Union to take similar steps to match them. He confidently asserted that now the Soviet people and their leaders can seize the opportunity to shed the heavy burden of a dangerous and costly nuclear arsenal which has threatened world peace for the past five decades.

What catapulted the U.S. leader to take such a bold and decisive step is certainly the diminishing danger of war in the course of the democratic reformists' triumphs in the Soviet Union, the crumbling of the Warsaw Pact, the disintegration of the totalitarian Soviet Union with the independence of the runaway Soviet republics and the weakening of the overall military strength of the Soviet federation.

At the same time, the U.S. President has to accommodate growing domestic opinion which is questioning the need for maintaining the huge arsenal in the present post-Cold War era. As Bush himself stated, "We can now take steps to make the world a less dangerous place than ever before in the nuclear age."

Bush disclosed that he had called Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Russian President Boris Yeltsin, saying that their responses were positive and hopeful. Yeltsin was quick to announce that Russia would participate in working out specific steps in the military sphere to build upon the Bush initiative.

It is expected that Moscow will soon give a formal response to the U.S. proposal for the destruction of their entire inventory of ground-launched nuclear weapons and that the two countries will start negotiations for an agreement on the elimination of all long-range ballistic missiles with multiple warheads. As if to spark such reciprocal action, Bush said that he would order U.S. strategic bombers to immediately stand down from their alert posture.

Gorbachev has come under realistic and moral pressure to follow the lead of the Bush call and make use of an unparalleled opportunity to change the nuclear posture of both the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is considered a major U.S. concession to the Soviets, that Bush pledged to destroy or mothball an estimated 400 nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missiles from U.S. Navy warships, despite their superiority over Soviet Union armament.

However, it is to be noted that Bush, deliberately or not, has kept intact some controversial weapons systems—the B-2 bomber and elements of the Strategic Defense Initiative or Star Wars. The United States and Western allies

will maintain nuclear missiles and bombs aboard aircraft in Europe, but the Bush disarmament step will bring about a fundamental change in U.S.-Soviet nuclear arrangements.

The new series of arms cut measures are more than welcome to the U.S.'s NATO allies. As a matter of fact, Bush reportedly consulted on the initiatives with British Prime Minister John Major, French President Francois Mitterrand and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and therefore, the proposal has not elicited reactions of surprise.

As for Korea, it is noted that the ground-launched, short-range nuclear weapons that are to be eliminated are mostly based in Europe but there are some here. The peace initiative is welcome, but it should not affect the regional security system as set up under the global arms reduction program.

The Korean government, it is disclosed, received prior notice from Washington of the disarmament proposal with the U.S. assurance of protection under its nuclear umbrella. This is necessary, of course, especially as Pyongyang is secretly developing nuclear weapons, refusing to allow international inspections of its nuclear facilities and materials.

'Comprehensive Changes' Viewed

SK2909015391 Seoul THE KOREA HERALD
in English 29 Sep 91 p 8

[Editorial: "Bush's N-Arms Initiative"]

[Text] The stirring announcement by U.S. President George Bush yesterday that the United States will eliminate all its land-based tactical nuclear weapons and remove all short-range atomic arms from U.S. submarines and ships certainly signals, both materially and symbolically, the very beginning of a new era in which the superpowers can be geared towards closer cooperation for world peace. Epitomizing the historic announcement, President Bush declared that the superpowers can now take steps to make the world "a less dangerous place than ever before in the nuclear age."

In unequivocal terms, not without persuasiveness, Bush asked the Soviet Union to reciprocate by destroying its entire inventory of ground-launched theater nuclear weapons. He expressed his confidence that the Kremlin leadership's response would be positive.

To say the least, Bush's sweeping new initiatives mark one of the broadest and most comprehensive changes in U.S. nuclear strategy since the start of the nuclear arms race in the early 1950s. They appear to be aimed not so much at merely lowering world-wide military tension as in evolving a new U.S.-Soviet relation that surely fits into a new world order.

Since the leaders in the Kremlin and the republics in the Soviets have been openly questioning their need to maintain a huge nuclear arsenal at the expense of a deteriorating economy, Bush's proposal would be an unparalleled

opportunity for the Soviet Union to undertake a sweeping change in its nuclear posture. Once Moscow shows responsiveness to the new initiative and a quick agreement is reached, the two superpowers can then sit down and hammer out better terms on which to work for closer economic cooperation that the Soviets desperately need to get ahead with its perestroika policies.

But nuclear arms control cannot be limited to the superpowers. It should be expanded so as to embrace the Third World, given the threats posed by potential nuclear and missile proliferation elsewhere. This naturally brings attention to the nuclear potential of North Korea whose real intention, despite its professed decision to abide by the terms laid down by the International Atomic Energy Agency, is yet to be known. Pyongyang has used all plausible pretexts to avoid an international inspection of its nuclear facilities. But, Bush's bid will leave no excuse whatsoever for Pyongyang to retain such recalcitrance.

Superpowers must work together to eliminate the suspicion standing in the way of removing all legacies of the Cold War from this part of the world. The influence of the United States and the Soviet Union should be so steered as to induce stability and reconciliation in Korea and in the Northeast Asian region. Bush's initiative is looked upon to produce a gigantic, tangible boon to humanity as an outgrowth of the collapse of the Cold War.

'Warning' Against DPRK

*SK2909014791 Seoul THE KOREA HERALD
in English 29 Sep 91 pp 2-3*

[News analysis by correspondent Kang Song-chol]

[Text] Honolulu, Hawaii—The new U.S. nuclear policy announced by President Bush Friday will put the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula in quite a different light from the past.

The dramatic policy change will serve as a warning against North Korea regarding its development of nuclear arms, security analysts say.

Applied to the Korean Peninsula, the U.S. initiative will mean the withdrawal of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons if they ever existed.

Washington neither confirms nor denies [NCND] the existence of nuclear arms. Seoul has conformed with the so-called NCND policy.

The removal of U.S. nuclear arms from South Korea will deprive the North of the key reason it has long cited in refusing to accept international inspection of its nuclear facilities.

The North became a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1985, but it has yet to sign a mandatory safeguards accord with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

"The latest U.S. nuclear policy will have both direct and indirect influence on such countries as Iraq and North

Korea suspected of developing nuclear weapons," said Kim Chong-hwi, South Korean President No Tae-u's national security adviser.

The North is believed to be capable of producing nuclear arms within a few years. One North Korean defector to the South recently said there exists an underground test site for nuclear explosions.

Seoul and Washington in recent months have stepped up diplomatic efforts to push IAEA's inspection of nuclear facilities in North Korea.

Seoul and Washington are expected to marshal all diplomatic efforts to enforce the inspection, regardless of the North's intention.

One of Seoul's security policy-makers predicted that the United States will not rule out the possibility of taking military action against the North if it continues to decline to accept international inspections.

"The withdrawal of its tactical nuclear weapons from around the world will give the United States a kind of justification in using some forcible means," he said.

Seoul's Defense Minister Yi Chong-ku earlier this year said commando raids might be considered against North Korean nuclear facilities, though he later dismissed the remark as a slip of the tongue.

Yi Friday made similar remarks in response to questions by lawmakers.

South Korean government officials appear to believe that the North will have no other choice but to change its restive attitude.

They say North Korean Prime Minister Yon Hyong-muk may mention the subject in his address to the U.N. General Assembly Oct. 2.

They say they have been in close contact with the United States over the nuclear issue, but Seoul may have gotten a clear picture on the new U.S. nuclear policy just quite recently.

In his U.S. speech last Tuesday, President No said he is ready to discuss with the North the nuclear issues on the Korean Peninsula, if the North abandons its nuclear weapons development program.

The expression would have been different had No been aware of the change in the U.S. nuclear policy, they assert.

No's security adviser Kim said he was informed of the U.S. policy shift by U.S. Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz last Sunday in New York.

There may be no denying that Seoul has tried hard to resolve the Korean nuclear question which has been a major stumbling block to progress in inter-Korean talks.

Consultations between Seoul and Washington about nuclear issues on the Korean Peninsula are believed to have started at the summit talks between No and Bush held in Washington July 2.

The talks were followed the next month by a high-level policy consultation meeting in Hawaii between Kim and Wolfowitz.

"There have been discussions over policy options of both countries," Kim said.

The resolution of the nuclear question would help improve inter-Korean relations, analysts say. With the absence of the knotty nuclear question, the two Koreas would find it easier to engage in arms reduction talks and to make progress in promoting economic and various other forms of exchanges.

No, in his U.N. speech, proposed to North Korea the signing of a peace treaty, the promotion of arms reduction as well as economic and personnel exchanges.

On No's proposals and his call for inspection of North Korean nuclear facilities, one of the North's U.N. delegates responded negatively. He argued that it is contradictory for the South Korean President to urge the North to discard its nuclear program while the South is maintaining U.S. nuclear weapons.

The North's attitude will be different once the South is free of any nuclear arms, the analysts say.

The new U.S. nuclear policy is expected to speed up the process of reducing tension and promoting peace throughout the world.

Such a development will definitely have a positive effect on inter-Korean relations, the analysts say.

Some South Korean people may be worried about the security situation on the peninsula following the removal of U.S. nuclear weapons.

To allay such concerns, Bush wrote a letter to No Friday, stating that the U.S. commitment to the defense of South Korea will remain "rock solid."

Officials say that even without the U.S. nuclear weapons, South Korean and U.S. forces in the South are fully capable of deterring any North Korean armed attack against the South.

U.S., Seoul To Discuss Defense Policy Changes

SK3009072491 Seoul YONHAP in English 0639 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Text] Seoul, September 30 (YONHAP)—South Korea and the United States are expected to hold a working-level contact early next month to re-examine the overall picture of their bilateral defense policies in light of President George Bush's sweeping reduction of tactical nuclear weapons, Foreign Ministry officials said Monday.

The talks would precede the 23rd annual security consultative meeting (SCM) in Seoul Nov. 20-22 and involve working-level military officers and diplomats from both sides, they said.

In the preliminary talks to be held in Hawaii, the two allies are likely to discuss in depth ways to reduce arms on the

Korean peninsula. Other topics might be ways to modernize conventional weapons in the south and the scheduled phaseout of U.S. troops stationed in Korea, they said.

The United States will soon notify Korea of the date of the meeting, they said.

"Bush's announcement to substantially reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal around the world is absolutely in line with U.S. nuclear policy," an official said.

He predicted the "neither-confirm-nor-deny" policy of the United States regarding presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea would not be affected by the move and that nuclear issues concerning the Korean peninsula would be decided after consultations between Seoul and Washington.

The government is preparing measures in case the North says it will halt development of nuclear weapons on condition that it is assured of the removal of U.S. nuclear arms from the South and that nuclear facilities in both Koreas are simultaneously laid open to international inspection, they said.

USSR's Shevardnadze on North's Nuclear Stance

SK0210041091 Seoul KBS-1 Television Network in Korean 1200 GMT 1 Oct 91

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, former Soviet foreign minister, by reporter Choe Pyong-chan in Moscow on 1 October—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Choe Pyong-chan] North Korea refuses to sign the nuclear safeguards accord or agree to nuclear inspection. What do you think of this?

[Shevardnadze] It is very unreasonable for North Korea to refuse to sign the nuclear safeguards accord. I have expressed my regret at this many times in the past. North Korea should stop refusing to sign the nuclear safeguards accord and stop running fully counter to the interests of the world and the Korean people as a whole.

[Choe] As you know, President Bush announced an epoch-making plan for reducing nuclear weapons on 28 September. What is your assessment of this?

[Shevardnadze] Many agreements on the reduction of nuclear weapons, including the intermediate- and short-range nuclear missiles, have been signed so far, and in the process of this Bush has put forward the latest proposal.

I believe that Bush's proposal is an immense plan for denuclearization. We must start negotiations after carefully scrutinizing Bush's proposal. But on the whole it seems to be a very important measure. [passage omitted]

Ministry Reaffirms Opposition to Denuclearization

SK0110101291 Seoul YONHAP in English 0941 GMT 1 Oct 91

[Text] Seoul, October 1 (OANA-YONHAP)—Pullout of U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea is not linked to

North Korea's signing of the Nuclear Safeguards Accord, a Foreign Ministry official said Tuesday.

Both South Korea and the United States oppose making the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone since it would mean a halt to protection of South Korea under the U.S. nuclear umbrella, the official said.

The latest U.S. nuclear initiative is a unilateral issue and cannot be a subject of Seoul-Washington negotiations, the official said. Because the policy is unilateral, South Korea will not need to separately declare that it does not have U.S. nuclear arsenal on its territory, he said.

"The initiative will not be delayed or reconsidered even if North Korea delays signing and implementation of the nuclear safeguards accords," he said.

The official denied reports that the two Koreas, the United States, Japan, China and the Soviet Union will hold multilateral negotiations to discuss declaring the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone, saying the Seoul government does not want to bring up Korean issues to international discussion.

"If the peninsula is declared nuclear-free zone, South Korea would no longer be covered under the U.S. nuclear umbrella. Both Seoul and Washington are opposed to the idea," he said.

The United States is keeping its air-launched weapons which would still protect South Korea, said the official, and Washington will not have to discard its neither-confirm-nor-deny policy on its nuclear deployment.

South Korea's position is that it will seek denuclearization of the Korean peninsula within protection from American nuclear umbrella, according to the official.

Preparatory talks for the annual Korea-U.S. Security Consultative Meeting (SCM) will open in Hawaii Oct. 7-9, and officials from the two sides are expected to review overall security policies on the Korean peninsula.

The official added that Washington made clear it would not improve its ties with North Korea unless the latter completely abandons its nuclear development.

Richard Solomon, assistant U.S. secretary of state for East Asia and Pacific affairs, met with South Korean Foreign Minister Yi Sang-ok at the United Nations and made clear Washington's position toward Pyongyang, the official said.

Agreement With U.S. on Tactical Nuclear Arms Withdrawal

*SK0210150691 Seoul CHUNGANG ILBO in Korean
2 Oct 91 p 1*

[Text] It has been learned that the ROK and the United States have reached an agreement on the principle concerning withdrawal of tactical nuclear weapons which the U.S. forces in the ROK possess and that they have already begun to discuss concrete methods for this.

On 2 October, a high-ranking government official said that since the ROK and the United States have held sufficient

discussions and reviews on nuclear operations on the Korean peninsula, implementation of withdrawal will not require much time when detailed plans including the timetable of withdrawal are provided during the annual ROK-U.S. Security Consultative Meeting slated for sometime in November in Seoul.

LAOS

Bush's Move on Nuclear Cuts Hailed Worldwide

*BK0110034291 Vientiane Vitthayou Hengsat Radio
Network in Lao 0000 GMT 1 Oct 91*

[Text] On the evening of 27 September in Washington, D.C., U.S. President George Bush made an announcement saying that the United States would destroy all strategic nuclear weapons installed on land and in the seas within Asia and Europe, would end the around-the-clock alert posture for all U.S. long-range strategic bombers, and has proposed to the Soviet Union negotiations on the drastic reduction of all short- and long-range nuclear missiles.

On 28 September, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, responding to the U.S. move, gave a positive response to the U.S. President's proposal on the reduction of nuclear weapons. He noted that the Soviet Union and the United States should seize this important opportunity as a step toward achieving a halt in nuclear arms tests.

According to foreign reports, French President Francois Mitterrand called the U.S. president's announcement on a wide-range reduction of nuclear arms a real turning point. He said France is ready to take part in the reduction of the mass-killing arsenals.

In London, Britain's Prime Minister John Major praised the move as being a far-reaching, historic, and imaginative initiative. He said if the Soviet leaders respond with an equal imagination, it would be a turning point in our history, bringing enormous benefits to mankind.

The U.S. press on 28 September gave extensive coverage and comments on the development, hailing President Bush's move as a great change in world politics.

Reports from Washington said that U.S. Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney noted that President Bush's plan was the single greatest change in the alignment of nuclear weapons since the 1950's. He went on to say that the move would make the world a safer place to live.

Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke hailed Bush's announcement as a unilateral move which is the single most decisive step for world peace since the nuclear age began nearly 50 years ago.

Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu called the initiative epoch-making and courageous.

New Zealand's prime minister called Bush's announcement significantly historic and far-reaching in progress for the people all over the world.

MALAYSIA

Prime Minister Hails Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative
BK0110100491 Kuala Lumpur NEW STRAITS TIMES in English 30 Sep 91 p 7

[Excerpt] Subang, Sun.—Datuk Sri Dr. Mahathir Mohamed today welcomed the decision by the United States to dramatically cut back its nuclear weapons arsenal and stressed that all nuclear weapons possessed by all countries should be destroyed.

The prime minister said he was happy with President George Bush's announcement on Friday that the United States would destroy all battlefield nuclear weapons, the so-called tactical weapons that have been ready to repulse a Soviet invasion of Western Europe for decades.

Dr. Mahathir said: "We believe all such weapons should be destroyed because we should no longer live in fear of the weapons being used by any country." [passage omitted]

PHILIPPINES

President Aquino Praises Bush Nuclear Initiative
HK3009094191 Hong Kong AFP in English 0927 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Text] Manila, September 30 (AFP)—Philippine President Corazon Aquino praised U.S. President George Bush's pledge for cuts in the U.S. nuclear arsenal, saying his actions should be followed by other countries.

"The United States' lead on the destruction of its own nuclear warheads should be followed by other nations," Aquino said in a statement released by her executive secretary.

"Hopefully, with less nuclear arms, we would be closer to a truly peaceful world," Aquino added.

Bush proposed a reduction and eventual elimination of all U.S. and Soviet ground-based ballistic missiles with multiple warheads.

SINGAPORE

Editorial Salutes Bush's Nuclear Initiative
BK0110095591 Singapore THE STRAITS TIMES in English 1 Oct 91 p 28

[Editorial: "Bush Blunts Nuclear Edge"]

[Text] At a time when history is being created almost every other day, it is difficult to use the term "historic" for an event and yet convey an impression of its significance. However, historic is exactly what President George Bush's proposal to cut the US nuclear arsenal is. Its scope is gigantic. The US will withdraw all ground-based, short-range nuclear weapons from Europe and elsewhere, including the Korean peninsula; remove all nuclear-tipped cruise missiles and bombs from ships and submarines; and take US strategic bombers off alert status. President Bush

also wants to hasten the destruction of thousands of strategic nuclear weapons and desires an early agreement with Moscow on eliminating intercontinental ballistic missiles with multiple warheads. In one unilateral decision, wisely timed and boldly taken, Mr Bush has done more for world peace than was achieved through years of tentative, tortuous and even cynical disarmament talks.

The benefits are obvious. If Moscow responds in kind to the US initiative, as it is expected to do, there will be fewer nuclear weapons to fall into unpredictable hands and threaten the world should the Soviet Union fragment. Moreover, the withdrawal of US ground-based, short-range nuclear arms and seaborne weapons—spurring the Soviet Union to do the same—is a boon for allied nations, particularly Germany and Japan, whose citizens were most vulnerable to the Soviet use of these weapons. Politically, Mr Bush's proposal lets Japan and other American allies off the hook of having to pretend that US warships calling at their ports do not carry nuclear weapons; nuclear warheads will now be carried almost exclusively by strategic submarines. Domestically, the US proposal, if reciprocated by the Soviet Union, will allow both countries to reduce their defence burden in financially demanding times, though an immediate peace dividend for the US might be a premature hope. And all this will be done without any loss of credible deterrence for the US.

However, even more important than the details is probably the psychological effect, globally, of this change in US strategic direction. The character of the entire international balance of terror, poised precariously on relations between two military superpowers which held the rest of the world to unwilling ransom, is set to change. The balance will still be there—Washington and Moscow will remain, in the conceivable future, the nuclear capitals par excellence of international politics—but President Bush's message is that these two poles will not be viscerally opposed, as they have been. True, that change in superpower relations has been felt in world politics over the years since Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev came to power. But only now is the nuclear edge of the new world—the edge that really, finally counts—being blunted. In making his proposal, Mr Bush has transformed into a nuclear revolution what was a political tour de force by Mr Gorbachev.

Tremendous as is this de-escalation of superpower nuclear rivalry, it is important to remember that the world is not about to turn swords into ploughshares. Apart from the abilities of existing nuclear states, aspiring regional powers—North Korea is a case in point—quietly benefit from the proliferation of nuclear technology and greater ease in the manufacture of delivery systems. Add to these the presence of other weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical, and it is imperative that efforts be redoubled to contain the arms race in all its dimensions, not just in the nuclear field and not just at the superpower level. Indeed, in the absence of a general improvement in international security, two weaker military superpowers may create a few new issues even as they solve many old problems. The nasty truth is that the superpowers' nuclear

arsenal, not in spite of but because of its terrible power, kept international peace overall in the past four decades: The balance of terror was also the balance of peace. It is now necessary, and possible, to keep that peace at lower nuclear levels, but it must be kept.

THAILAND

Column on 'Confidence' of Bush's Arms Proposal

*BK3009103191 Bangkok THAI RAT in Thai
30 Sep 91 p 2*

[Column under the rubric "World Window" by Sunthon Wathi: "Bush's Nuclear Disarmament"]

[Excerpts] President George Bush recently made the most important announcement on nuclear disarmament since the beginning of the cold war confrontation between the two camps of the world superpowers five decades ago. [passage omitted]

The announcement made by Bush marks an important compromise toward the Soviet Union following several similar announcements by Mikhail Gorbachev on unilateral disarmament.

This time, the White House leader has assumed the offensive after having played the defensive role most of the time. The next step for him is to wait and see how Moscow will respond to the proposal and what kind of action it will take.

Arms experts believe that there are still a lot of problems regarding disarmament between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both sides still possess large quantities of highly destructive weapons that can destroy the whole world.

But Bush is bravely moving ahead on this issue because he has confidence that the competition in arms production begun during the cold war era has come to an end, and the failed coup attempt in Moscow has led to the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union, thus posing no more threats.

The world today is entering an era of peace and disarmament in which various resources can be used for the well-being of the world population. Whoever stubbornly insists on further competition in arms production will only become an "out-of-date" person.

Editorial Lauds Reaction to Bush's Arms Proposal

*BK0110005591 Bangkok BANGKOK POST in English
1 Oct 91 p 4*

[Editorial: "From Washington With Vision"]

[Text] Rhetoric has become such a feature of world politics that when an international figure says anything described as "historic" or "imaginative" people tend to switch channels. For almost half a century we have lived knowing that a handful of people have possessed the means, if not to blow us all into nuclear dust, at least to destroy enough of the world to make the rest of it probably not worth living

in. So when US President George Bush went on television on Friday to say "We can now take steps to make the world a less dangerous place than ever before in the nuclear age," hardened cynics might be excused for reacting as if an aspiring politician had promised to outlaw poverty.

But within hours of President Bush ordering the removal of nuclear Cruise missiles from submarines and warships and the destruction of all US ground-launched tactical nuclear weapons, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev described the decision as "historic". Moscow's detailed response is now expected later in the week. The American cuts, the most dramatic since the superpowers began their Cold War nuclear rivalry in the 1940s, could help the Soviets reduce their crippling military spending and also assist President Gorbachev to meet Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin's demands for arms reductions.

Any lingering doubt about the substance of President Bush's speech came when US Secretary of Defence Dick Cheney said he had ordered some 40 bombers off alert and their missiles deactivated. Nevertheless US officials have since emphasised the cuts could be reversed if the Soviet Union fails to reciprocate.

World leaders gushed superlatives of praise. Germany Chancellor Helmut Kohl, noting the initiative meant the US would withdraw short-range nuclear missiles from German soil, said the cuts put President Bush "at the vanguard of international disarmament". Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, who leads the only nation to have been hit by atomic weapons, welcomes "this epoch-making and courageous initiative". Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke described the cuts as "the single most decisive step for world peace since the nuclear age began nearly 50 years ago."

For New Zealand Prime Minister Jim Bolger, there was something tangible. US Navy surface vessels would no longer carry nuclear arms, thus removing the need to ban US warships from New Zealand's self-declared nuclear-free zone. Even North Korea welcomed the initiative. The removal of US tactical nuclear weapons from South Korea has long been a precondition to the North's opening its nuclear facilities to inspection.

There are only two reasons—neither commendable—why nuclear weapons have not been used in warfare since 1945. First, the approximate parity between the two main nuclear adversaries deterred both from pressing the button. Second, those few countries outside superpower hegemony that were trying to develop their own nuclear capability lacked the necessary combination of nuclear weapon and means of delivery.

While the collapse of communism has enabled the superpowers to wind down their Cold War, as President Bush noted, the number of nations with nuclear arms is likely to rise to 20 by the end of the century. Only yesterday UN nuclear weapons inspectors in Iraq said they had "tangible evidence" that Iraq was trying to develop atomic weapons. While some may currently see Iraq as the Satan of the

world community who knows which country will attempt nuclear blackmail in a year or so?

Beyond the lessening of nuclear war by accident, corresponding reduction in world tension and ultimately freeing of cash for constructive rather than destructive purposes, perhaps the most imaginative aspect of the American president's peace proposals was his call for the Soviets to join the US in steps towards non-nuclear defences "to protect against limited ballistic missile strikes, whatever their source." Such a move, if it came to pass, would indeed merit mention in tomorrow's history books.

VIETNAM

President Bush's Arms Reduction Address Reported

*BK2909022091 Hanoi Voice of Vietnam Network
in Vietnamese 2300 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Text] On 27 September, U.S. President Bush, in a televised speech to the nation, announced the U.S. unilateral decision on reduction of U.S. nuclear weapons. He said: The U.S. will destroy all strategic arms on land and remove nuclear cruise missiles from submarines and warships.

President Bush also called on the Soviet Union to make a similar reduction on nuclear weapons.

Bush Must Prove Arms Reduction by 'Deeds'

*BK0110134191 Hanoi Voice of Vietnam Network
in Vietnamese 1000 GMT 1 Oct 91*

[From the daily press review program]

[Text] NHAN DAN today carried an article by Le Ba Thuyen entitled: "Mr. Bush's New Plan in Reducing Nuclear Weapons." The article says: The new plan on reducing nuclear weapons announced by President Bush on 27 September has evoked the world's great interest. Many countries have welcomed this plan, considering this a significant move in reducing the huge world nuclear arms arsenal that can terminate all earthly lives 100 times over. Observers, however, hold that even if Mr. Bush's new plan on reducing nuclear weapons is fully implemented, the U.S. will still retain a huge strategic arms arsenal.

In his speech on the evening of 27 September, Mr. Bush asserted that the U.S. will continue with the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] program. The 1992 budget for this plan is \$4.6 billion while that for the B-2 Stealth aircraft project is \$3.2 billion. Moreover, the Pentagon continues to maintain nuclear cruise missiles in submarines and other modern nuclear arms, including the three categories of nuclear weapons. Taking into account the volume of nuclear weapons permitted by the START treaty, the U.S. has 8,000 nuclear warheads, each with an explosive capacity 100 times the Hiroshima bomb.

The U.S. administration's new nuclear arms reduction plan is positive, which, if it materializes, will further improve international relations. However, the White House must prove this intention by deeds. Even so, the danger of a war of extermination has not been entirely removed. A broad section of the peace-loving people of the world share the view that to make our planet safe and to ward off the danger of a global holocaust, there must be persistent efforts to completely eliminate all kinds of nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction across the globe.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Minister on Transportation, Soviet Troop Transits
AU2409133391 Prague SVOBODNE SLOVO
in Czech 19 Sep 91 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Minister of Transportation Jiri Nezval by Jaroslava Fidlerova; place and date not given: "How To Proceed Further in Transportation?"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Fidlerova] What are the immediate tasks and aims regarding the linking of our transportation network with the European network?

[Nezval] In road transportation, we project construction of approximately 800 kilometers of motorways by the year 2000. Emphasis will be placed on the following routes: Prague-Plzen-Nuremberg (D5), Prague-Dresden-Berlin (D8), Bratislava-Budapest (D2), and on linking Bratislava with Vienna and Kosice.

In modernizing railroad transportation, 1,557 kilometers of railroads have been selected that will be gradually adjusted for speeds of up to 160 kilometers per hour for passenger transportation and 120 kilometers per hour for freight transportation. At the same time, some sections will be adjusted for a subsequent transformation into high-speed routes, that is, for speeds of up to 200 kilometers per hour. The railroad section between Plzen and the FRG border is to be our trial route.

[Fidlerova] All these investments are extremely costly. Who will pay for them, given our lack of resources for transportation? What is the general financial situation of your department?

[Nezval] The situation is bad, especially in railroad transportation. The department has received for the CSD [Czechoslovak National Railroads] a bridging loan of 4.7 billion korunas that is to be repaid by the end of the year. The prerequisite of repayment is that by the end of the year the CSD will receive 3.3 billion korunas in long-term recovery credit plus 2.5 billion korunas in subsidies. At the same time, the economic returns from the railroads keep deteriorating as a result of the falling volume of freight transportation. The decline is more than 60 percent more than originally expected. At the same time, to be able to at least minimally adjust the railroad workers' wages for inflation, we would need an additional 245 million korunas. [passage omitted]

As far as investments are concerned, the roads are now within the jurisdiction of the republics. [passage omitted] As for railroad modernization, foreign firms have shown an interest, with some of them guaranteeing government credits at 4 percent interest.

[Fidlerova] One last question: What is the present state of negotiations on the transit of Soviet troops [from the former GDR] through Czechoslovak territory?

[Nezval] The Soviet Army is interested in the transit of one or two trains daily at most, through both Czechoslovak and Polish territory. It is interesting that the Polish side offered

the Soviet Union transit of up to 30 (!) trains a day, plus a 10 percent discount on international rates. The USSR Ministry of Transportation now demands a similar or even higher discount from us as well. The draft of the agreement, which contains a clause about the possibility of interrupting the transit at any time, is now in the stage of interdepartmental appraisal.

Havel: Bush Arms Initiative 'Very Important'
LD3009151491 Prague Ceskoslovensky Rozhlas
Radio Network in Czech 1300 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Excerpt] Republic President Vaclav Havel, at today's meeting with journalists at Prague Castle, described as very important George Bush's disarmament initiative. According to Vaclav Havel, the initiative to reduce significantly U.S. Armed Forces is a great appeal to the USSR to carry out similar steps. [passage omitted]

HUNGARY

Defense Conference: Bush Initiative 'Correct Step'
LD2809111691 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 1000 28 Sep 91

[Report by correspondent Janos Molnar at the Hungarian Defense Ministry's international conference in Budapest on 28 September]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] At the conference, participants considered President Bush's decision, announced overnight, of a reduction in U.S. nuclear forces, to be a correct step. The Soviet expert said that the gesture could open a new phase in the disarmament process, for instead of agreements created through lengthy negotiations, mutual trust can take over the leading role in the reduction of military force. [passage omitted]

POLAND

Hungarian Defense Minister Discusses 'Open Skies'
LD0110082891 Budapest MTI in English 1736 GMT
30 Sep 91

[Text] Warsaw, September 30 (MTI)—Another "open skies" agreement, similar to the one between Hungary and Romania, is now being discussed by Hungary and Poland, Hungarian Minister of Defence Lajos Fur said after talks today with his Polish counterpart Piotr Kolodziejczyk.

The open skies agreement allows the countries to fly aircraft over and monitor each other's territories.

"If there are enough states to join in," Fur said, "we could create open skies above Europe."

A joint Hungarian-Polish test is to be conducted within the framework of the open skies, which will serve as a basis for further cooperation, Kolodziejczyk said.

According to Fur, the military agreement signed in March 1991 between the two countries is an important contribution to European stability. The sides agreed significant

results have been achieved in a number of spheres already, and discussed possible ways of expanding cooperation.

Regarding Hungary's possible membership in NATO, Fur said the time was not yet right.

Paper Reports Number of Soviet Troops Remaining
*LD0210042391 Warsaw PAP in English 1146 GMT
1 Oct 91*

[Text] Warsaw, October 1—About forty-five thousand Soviet soldiers still remain in Poland, Tuesday's GAZETA WYBORCZA daily reported.

The daily, summing up the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland since April 8, said that the 4,387 soldiers who left Poland came from Soviet auxiliary units, while the number of combat units in Poland remained unchanged.

The Soviets withdrew from Poland 85 tanks, 33 missile launchers, 97 combat vehicles and over 54 thousand tonnes of other military equipment. During the past months, the Polish state railways hired to the Soviet side 374 freight cars. Some of the soldiers as well as part of the military equipment was withdrawn in 2,190 Soviet vehicles which remained in the Soviet Union.

Soviet troops are also leaving Poland by air, using Soviet TU-134 transport planes, some of them making a one-way flight.

The timetable of the withdrawal of Soviet units from Poland has not been yet agreed upon, thus the number of soldiers to leave this country by the end of this year is unknown to the Polish side.

Up to now, the Soviet side has handed over to respective governors 958 empty military buildings and 1,821 hectares of land, the paper stated.

CUBA

Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative Reported

*FL2809120091 Havana Radio Rebelde Network
in Spanish 1100 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Text] Reports from Washington indicate that President George Bush has announced the elimination of all tactical land nuclear weapons and the withdrawal of short-range nuclear missiles launched in submarines and ships but said will maintain conventional military capabilities.

In a televised address to the nation from the White House Oval Office, last night Bush urged the Soviet Union to implement similar cuts and begin joint negotiations on reduction of other types of weapons. Following this line, he proposed Moscow to eliminate all ballistic missiles equipped with multiple nuclear warheads. The USSR has more of these missiles than Washington. However, he did not mention the numerous nuclear warheads at sea. The United States surpasses Moscow on this.

The proposal contemplates the reduction and eventual elimination of all land ballistic missiles with multiple warheads but does not include the ballistic weapons launched at sea in which Washington also has superiority.

The five-point package also includes the pullback of the MX missiles on rails system. The financing of this \$225 million project was rejected by the U.S. Senate yesterday.

While Bush favored the unilateral elimination of tactical nuclear weapons from Europe and South Korea and the withdrawal of all nuclear weapons launched in ships and submarines, he asserted that the air nuclear weapons may remain in the Old Continent.

Bush said last night that he had previously talked with his French, British, and Soviet counterparts and with Russian President Boris Yeltsin and informed them of his proposal.

In the meantime, government sources gave their assurances that the U.S. President continues with the idea of developing the Star Wars project worth millions of dollars and the B2 superbomber.

After the President's announcement, George Mitchell, leader of the Democrat majority in Congress, welcomed the fact that nuclear weapons will no longer pose a threat to humankind but regretted the fact that military spending was not reduced so that the funds could be used to solve domestic social problems.

PANAMA

Column Hails Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative

*PA2909142991 Panama City LA PRENSA in Spanish
29 Sep 91 p 1A*

[From the "As of Today" column]

[Text] Since 6 August 1945, day one of the atomic era, the world has lived under the threat of an Armageddon for which mankind has had to pay. As predicted, the USSR detonated its own bomb a few years later, thus beginning what is known as the nuclear race. The fission bombs were followed by the fusion bombs in a sort of self-destructive frenzy that could have unchained the apocalypse at any moment or at the slightest mistake (as almost happened in October 1962). Then came a time called the period of balance of terror, which had a very high economic, political, and psychological cost. The two superpowers, involved in senseless competition, neglected the modernization of their respective economies and allowed tremendous social problems to accumulate. When Gorbachev rose to power, the black cloud hovering over the world since 1945 was lifted. For the first time in history since World War II, it was possible to agree on reducing the arsenals. The pretext of accumulating them was the danger each rival represented to the other. Now that the Soviet Union has disintegrated, the United States is left without that excuse. President Bush has just decided unilaterally to substantially reduce its nuclear weapons. This is an audacious, fruitful, and encouraging initiative that the Soviets have received in the same spirit in which it was made, and mankind at long last has reason to feel optimistic.

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

U.S. Arms Cuts Seen as Part of Changing World

PM0110113091 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic
29 Sep 91 p13

[Kamran Qurrah Daghi article: "It Is a Different World"]

[Excerpts] Had U.S. President George Bush's new initiative on tactical nuclear weapons cuts come before the aborted coup in Moscow, it would have immediately become a factor in the Soviet Union's internal polarizations and would have played an extremely important part in strengthening Mikhail Gorbachev's shaky position.

At the time, Gorbachev sorely needed such an initiative, which he could have used as an effective weapon to prove the success of his own policy of Soviet nuclear arms cuts and to refute rightwing charges that the United States did not reciprocate when he made his own concessions in that field. [passage omitted]

Apart from that, everyone must welcome the new U.S. initiative because it means that the end of the cold war is not something that we merely talk about, but something real and tangible. In addition to the actual destruction of complete types of tactical nuclear weapons, the initiative includes measures that will replace fear and suspicion with trust between the two nuclear superpowers.

For the first time since the beginning of the cold war and the East-West confrontation after World War II, Washington has decided to cancel the daily state of alert for all U.S. strategic bombers and to return their weapons to the stores. Furthermore, the United States will end the state of alert for all the intercontinental missiles that will eventually be eliminated under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty negotiated recently. As soon as the treaty is ratified, the United States will do away with all these missiles once and for all.

Is this convincing evidence that the world is now really living under a new world order? Be that as it may, it is a different world, a changing world, whether we like it or not.

BAHRAIN

Amir Hails Bush Nuclear Arms Reduction Initiative

JN0110114491 Manama WAKH in Arabic 1030 GMT
1 Oct 91

[Text] Manama, 1 October (WAKH)—His Highness Shaykh 'Isa Bin-Salman Al Khalifah, amir of the State of Bahrain, has sent a cable to U.S. President George Bush in which he hailed his initiative to reduce nuclear weapons.

His highness stressed that this positive step contributes to a considerable extent in alleviating the world's fears and increasing hopes toward achieving an international community that directs its capabilities in service of humanity's objectives and realization of peace in a world that enjoys

stability and satisfaction, and where efforts are made to secure the welfare of all world peoples.

BANGLADESH

Commentary Welcomes President Bush's Nuclear Cut

BK2909170091 Dhaka Radio Bangladesh Network
in English 1540 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The announcement of U.S. President George Bush about a drastic cut in nuclear arms has been welcomed by the international community as a historic move. This is indeed a very rational (?approach). This is a bold step toward ending cold war in nuclear arms race. It is a step of global significance.

The U.S. President announced on Friday the most dramatic reduction of U.S. nuclear weapons since the cold war spawned a spiralling arms race. Washington is to destroy all ground-launched tactical nuclear weapons, bring home all nuclear cruise missiles, and end the alert status on which U.S. strategic bombers have operated for 34 years. The reductions would involve (?several) thousand nuclear artillery shells, warheads, and ground-launched missile in Europe and South Korea and more than 400 highly accurate Tomahawk nuclear cruise missiles aboard U.S. submarine ships worldwide as well as nuclear bombs and aircraft carriers.

While announcing the dramatic nuclear arms cut, the U.S. President has called upon the Soviet Union to match this move. The United States will begin the reduction now unilaterally. All long-range land-based U.S. missiles scheduled for destruction over the next seven years under the recently signed U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty—START—would immediately be deactivated. President Bush also canceled the planned replacement of short-range nuclear attack missiles for strategic bombers.

Friday's announcement by the U.S. President has thus brightened the prospects of (?total) and complete nuclear disarmament for which peace-loving peoples of the world have for long been pressing. This move will certainly lead to more initiative by other nuclear powers to work together for a complete ban on and destruction of nuclear weapons of all sorts.

The U.S. President has said his move has followed the new international climate marked with the fast-moving developments in Europe and the Soviet Union. It is indeed the most befitting time to take advantage of the unparalleled opportunity offered by the recent developments in the world at large.

The U.S. move will help create conditions for all the nuclear powers to shed the heavy burden of the dangerous and costly nuclear arsenal which has threatened world peace for the past five decades. The announcement of reduction by Washington would indeed be the most significant since the United States and the Soviet Union began a costly nuclear arms race following detonation of U.S.

atomic bomb on Japan in the Second World War. As such, there has been a worldwide welcome to President Bush's announcement. Apart from the the Soviet Union, support for the U.S. President's plans has come from Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Italy, Australia, and many other countries.

Bangladesh has also welcomed the U.S. President Bush's unilateral announcement to destroy and reduce different types of nuclear weapons. Prime Minister Begum Khaleda Zia, in a message to the U.S. President, has termed the announcement as epoch-making and historic. She has rightly noted that the unilateral announcement of the U.S. President would contribute immensely, significantly, and positively toward all-round peace and development in the world. Prime Minister Khaleda Zia has quite befittingly expressed the hope that the immense wealth to be (?released) following the disarmament of the nuclear weapons would be spent for the welfare of mankind. This would indeed go a long way in [words indistinct] poverty, hunger, and diseases.

EGYPT

Officials Laud Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative

Foreign Minister Welcomes Decision

NC2809172991 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1650 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] New York, 28 September (MENA)—Egyptian Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa has welcomed U.S. President George Bush's unilateral decision to eliminate [takhalli] short-range nuclear weapons. He described this decision as a historic step, not only because of its great importance in the field of arms reduction and disarmament, but also because it was made unilaterally and without bargaining in order to give political momentum to the international efforts to establish a new world order removed from showdowns and conflicts.

Musa said this decision truly expresses the new spirit in international relations based on positive gestures and actions.

Musa, currently in New York, was commenting on the U.S. President's decision which was announced today.

Musa stressed that Egypt looks forward to positive international reaction to this step, especially from the other nuclear states, so that the world will take further important steps toward eliminating nuclear weapons.

Musa also expressed hope that this step will prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and will help eliminate the nuclear arsenal, especially in areas of conflict such as the Middle East.

Deputy Premier Views Plan

NC2909065291 Cairo Arab Republic of Egypt
Radio Network in Arabic 0400 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Text] Dr. Butrus Ghali, deputy prime minister for foreign relations, has described U.S. President George Bush's statements on reducing world nuclear weapons as another step toward world peace.

In a statement yesterday, Ghali said Egypt has always advocated the reduction of all weapons of mass destruction and supported the establishment of areas free of these weapons. He noted that this step contributes to peace and is in line with Egypt's foreign policy and diplomacy, aiming to perpetuate world peace.

IRAN

President Bush's Nuclear Arms Initiative Viewed

LD2909135691 Tehran Voice of the Islamic
Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian
1052 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] In the name of God. Greetings dear listeners. U.S. President George Bush has ordered the unilateral elimination of all U.S. short-range nuclear tactical arms on land and at sea. [passage omitted]

The U.S. Government's order for the complete elimination of its short-range nuclear weapons is, in fact, the result of a multiple considerations. On the international dimension, the U.S. Government has observed current changes and developments in international relations; it has also become confident that Soviet developments are long-lasting, and that the possibility for a return to the previous era no longer exists. It has therefore decided to reduce its short-range nuclear arms. Regarding that decision, it also consulted its allies beforehand, receiving their agreement.

Moreover, regarding Europe, the order can extensively reduce probable tension and help establish further tranquility and leave the security of Europe to Europeans—something that Europeans have favored for many long years. Also particularly considering a possible European political unification in the near future, it can have an important influence on the creation of regional security arrangements by the countries of the region. The domestic effects of that order cannot be ignored by the United States, considering that there will be a reduction in the pressure exerted on the budget by the heavy cost of maintaining those arms.

Although some experts believe the order will have positive effects on America, Europe, and even the Soviet Union—particularly in connection with reducing that country's military expenditure and helping its shattered economy—others believe that the U.S. Government's insistence on continuing the B-2 and Star Wars projects is indicative of the Bush administration's militaristic policies, which are reminiscent of the Reagan era.

According to U.S. Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, even though the U.S. nuclear system has undergone extensive changes, the American defense weapons, particularly the nuclear ballistic missiles, are still quite capable of countering any kind of attack. This issue, in fact, is indicative of the point that the U.S. Government continues to seek to maintain its global power and supremacy, and its tactics can only be seen in light of its continuing pursuit of power and absolute global hegemony.

But how far can it influence other countries' viewpoints through resorting to such maneuvers? That is a question that must be answered by waiting and watching current world developments and the actions of world leaders.

IRAQ

Reaction to Bush's Arms Reduction Initiative

World 'Clamor' Criticized

JN0110160291 Baghdad AL-QADISIYAH in Arabic
30 Sep 91 p 2

[Article by Muhammad al-Sab'awi: "What Is Behind Bush's Initiative and the International 'Clamor'?"]

[Text] The media organs have been preoccupied over the past three days with U.S. President George Bush's initiative to get rid of "short-range nuclear weapons." And the reason for this is either to give the initiative "dramatic" importance or to follow up on the official reaction by other nuclear and non-nuclear states. The media organs were also concerned with showing the initiative as if it is "the greatest victory" in an attempt to polish the image of its owner and to put "the mask" of a human on his face.

The other "major" three in Moscow, Paris, and London are participating in the beating of drums and playing of clarinets that has been going on over the past three days to surround Bush's initiative with a ceremonial atmosphere. The three repeated words of admiration and entertainment like the ones used in an "Egyptian orchestra." The objective is clear; namely, to hide the reasons that made Bush "launch his initiative," and hide the real objectives of this initiative. Is this possible?

The human experiment shows that not all people dance to the same tune, and not every tune entertains the experienced and calm ears and mind.

Therefore, "apart" from entertainment and enjoyment, the experienced and calm mind can show the purpose or purposes of all this "clamor" on this "initiative" and can put it in its proper perspective.

The initiative does not mean the removal of all nuclear weapons. And Bush might not call for this, because he clearly confined his call to "short-range" weapons. He has his reasons and goals for this. The following are the most prominent reasons and goals:

A. America's weapons of this type reach targets only in East European countries—no longer adversaries after having fallen in the American basket.

B. The similar weapons possessed by the Soviet Union—once an adversary—are scattered in three or four republics, and there is no guarantee that these republics will be ruled by U.S.-tailored leaderships. Removing these weapons, therefore, ensures that these republics will be without claws, regardless of the type of their leaders. To the United States, this is an additional precautionary measure.

C. The plan also takes off the nuclear claws of the European allies, especially France, within a process of collective removal. There is fear from the fluctuating, uncertain French position, but with Mitterrand in power, there is a chance now to tame France. There is also a chance to block the road in front of the German giant, if he thinks of moving in this direction.

In effect, this will maintain Washington's monopoly over long-range strategic nuclear weapons, with the existence of (optimal) conditions for negotiations with Moscow—Bush has asked for speedy negotiations. Moscow will not be in a position to reject the U.S. "conditions" so as to eliminate the burden of competition and remove the strategic weapons it possesses in return for (a loaf of bread) given not by Washington, but by Europe!

Moreover, the plan, in the final analysis, eases the burden on the U.S. economy, which has been moaning under inflation and recession.

Does the plan, then, merit this festive reaction? As far as the United States is concerned, the answer is yes. But what about the others, especially Gorbachev, Mitterrand, and Major, and the rest of the chorus (they are up on their feet, ready to dance to this American tune)? It is said that if you know the motive, you will not be surprised; and it appears that the motive of each one of these is not difficult to comprehend.

Further Reaction

JN0110192991 Baghdad Republic of Iraq Radio First
Program Network in Arabic 1735 GMT 1 Oct 91

[From the "Spotlight on the News" program]

[Text] From the outside, the U.S. President's decision to cut nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal looks like a U.S. initiative to guarantee world peace and security. Many political observers view this decision with skepticism, however, as it again reveals the contradiction in U.S. politics. Observers ask: Why is the U.S. Administration deploying its weapons in the Arab Gulf region or close to its shores? And why did the Bush administration not take a serious move to freeze the Zionist nuclear activity, which poses the gravest danger to the Arab region? Those observers affirm that the effects of the U.S. decision to reduce nuclear weapons remain limited unless it is coupled with a significant step represented by a U.S. withdrawal of all nonconventional and sophisticated weapons that were stockpiled in the Zionist entity's arsenal during and after the 30-state aggression against Iraq.

The political observers believe that clearing the Arab region of the nonconventional weapons stockpiled in the

Zionist entity's arsenal will help facilitate the peace process in the region, and that such a move is considered one of the most basic requirements of the peace process.

Dear listeners, Murshid al-Zubaydi, the political writer in the newspaper AL-JUMHURIYAH, speaks on our program, Spotlight on the News, concerning the U.S. President's decision to cut nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal and the objectives behind this decision. He says:

[Begin al-Zubaydi recording] We notice that before the Gulf events, before the Atlantic-U.S.-Zionist aggression against Iraq, there were many balanced calls in the world. It seems to me that one of the most prominent among these was Iraq's call for a comprehensive and balanced reduction of weapons of mass destruction, especially in the Middle East, provided that such a move coincides with many measures to achieve a regional balance besides an international balance. Iraq declared that it did not object to destroying all of its weapons of mass destruction, provided that the weapons of the other side, the Zionist entity, also be destroyed. We noticed then that the U.S. President and his allies did not respond to that call, however. This is because they wanted to destroy Iraqi power and maintain Israeli power.

It is known that the Israeli nuclear, biological, and chemical program began earlier this century. It seems that some information indicates that Israel began to acquire nuclear weapons in the fifties, and developed them well in the sixties. There are some Israelis who have begun to talk about this. The United States, as a superpower and a state with advanced intelligence services and technical apparatuses that know many things in the world, certainly knows that the Zionist entity possesses such weapons. Why, for example, did the U.S. President call for the destruction of Iraq's power but not call for the destruction of Israel's power? This leads us to another question: Does the U.S. President's current call mean a reduction in the West's weapons in return for a reduction in the East's weapons? My assumption is that even if the U.S. President says such a thing, he practically does not seek to implement it. This is because after the recent events in the Soviet Union, last year's events in Eastern Europe, and after the Gulf war—or which we call the U.S.-Atlantic-Zionist aggression against Iraq—we noticed that the United States was seeking to be the only major pole in the world through [word indistinct] the policy of hegemony over the Soviet Union, Europe, the Middle East, and the Arab Gulf region. For this purpose, it achieved maritime control in the Arabian Gulf region and (?neutralized) anti-U.S. forces in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Now, Bush personally seeks to be the indisputable leader of the world. The United States is seeking to be the only dominating pole in the world. All this prompts us to doubt the U.S. President's calls, which are attempts to throw dust in the eyes to achieve hegemony and control over the world. [end recording]

KUWAIT

U.S. Arms Cuts Seen as Part of World Trend
PM0110111691 London SAWT AL-KUWAYT
AL-DUWALI in Arabic 29 Sep 91 p 1

[Muhammad al-Rumayhi article: "From Making Weapons To Making Peace"]

[Excerpts] What is happening in the United States today is part of the change sweeping the entire world. And U.S. President George Bush's announcement yesterday about reducing defense industry programs, including strategic nuclear weapons, outlines some of the features of this change.

The change is characterized by a move away from war establishments toward peace establishments. The move presents not only a new economy, but new values, new ideas, and a new order based on making peace, instead of making weapons. [passage omitted]

We live in a world that is changing rapidly, President Bush said yesterday. Researchers at the influential Brookings Institute have produced a study that says that the Pentagon's budget can be reduced in the five-year plan by at least \$300 billion. The reduction could reach \$600 billion. In Washington you can see the happiness in people's faces when they hear these figures.

This is not a discourse about the United States, which our country's amir, Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad, is visiting, or about Bush, with whom the amir will meet in the next few days. It is about a changing world, of which we are part. It is about new values to which we are trying as hard as possible to contribute. It is clear that in the Arab-Israeli conflict and in the other local and regional conflicts numerous parties still live under their old delusions: They resort, or threaten to resort, to force, and use the language of aggression and war, when the wind of change is sweeping the entire world under the banner of peace. If Saddam and Shamir are the most famous of the self-deluders, generals such as [Sudanese President] Al-Bashir, who is resorting to the army to subjugate the people in the South, and presidents such as Yemen's 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih, who resort to the physical liquidation of their adversaries to resolve their problems, are no less deluded than Saddam and Shamir.

Just as war requires establishments, peace too requires establishments. As far as we in Kuwait, the peninsula, and the Gulf are concerned, this matter concerns us in particular, because we are still on the borderline of peace and have not yet moved out of the war, nor will we do so as long as Saddam Husayn remains in power. But because peace establishments are not built overnight, we must start right away to lay their foundations and outline their features in order to contribute to a future that will not be built by others alone.

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister Welcomes Bush Move on Nuclear Weapons

BK2909045491 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network
in Urdu 0200 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Text] Prime Minister Mohammad Nawaz Sharif has welcomed President Bush's announcement to make a cut in American nuclear weapons. In a message to the American President, he expressed hope that this step will begin a new era of world peace. The prime minister appealed to other

nuclear powers to follow America in order to make the world free from destructive weapons. Mohammad Nawaz Sharif called on Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao to cooperate with Pakistan in order to promote peace in the region. He said we should work together to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to solve problems peacefully. The prime minister also emphasized that President Bush should play a role in making South Asia free of nuclear weapons.

SAUDI ARABIA

Council of Ministers Praises Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative

LD3009185191 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1630 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Excerpts] Jeddah, 30 September (SPA)—King Fahd Bin 'Abd-al-Aziz Al Sa'ud, custodian of the two holy mosques, presided over a Council of Ministers meeting today at Al-Salam Palace in Jeddah. Information Minister 'Ali Hasan al-Sha'ir made the following statement to SPA after the meeting: [passage omitted]

Minister Al-Sha'ir went on to say: On another subject—the effort to eliminate weapons of mass destruction—the Council expressed its satisfaction and appreciation over the announcement made by U.S. President George Bush two days ago on his historic decision to reduce and limit U.S. land- and sea-based nuclear weapons. This represents a brave humanitarian initiative and an auspicious start on the road to eliminating all kinds of nuclear weapons for the good of all humanity and the protection of humanity from destructive weapons. [passage omitted]

SYRIA

Bush Initiative Hailed; Mideast Peace Stressed

JN2809123191 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1130 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Station commentary]

[Excerpt] With President George Bush's decision to unilaterally destroy all the short-range nuclear weapons, and

to ask the Soviet Union to reach a comprehensive agreement on destroying the long-range weapons, the world has taken an additional important step toward consecrating the climate of detente, peace, and stability. Had Israel responded to international endeavors and renounced its expansionists schemes, the Middle East would now be heading quickly toward genuine peace, devoting its resources for the sake of prosperity, progress, and economic and social improvement. [passage omitted]

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Bush's Arms Plan 'Historic,' 'Courageous'

JN3009200591 Dubayy AL-BAYAN in Arabic 29 Sep 91 p 1

[Editorial: "A Historic Initiative"]

[Text] Because it is a courageous step placing the world at the threshold of a new, positive stage, the entire world was deeply satisfied with President Bush's plan to reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

This step prompts the world to defuse an explosive mine, which threatens humanity and its civilized achievements with annihilation.

Bush's initiative is an important historic turning point, closing the curtain on a frantic 40-year race to stockpile weapons and ammunition. This race has depleted resources of rich and poor countries alike.

At the same time, and from material and human points of view, the plan embodies an extremely important dimension for the concept of the post cold war era. But above all, Bush's initiative constitutes the cornerstone of the talk about a new world order. The decision labels the United States as a responsible leader, and removes suspicion that it is a strong, dominant power.

Sooner or later, Bush's initiative will certainly force other countries to follow suit and reduce their military arsenals. Consequently, arms will be kept out when international conflicts are addressed.

Curbing the arms race means rich and poor countries will save a substantial amount of money, using it for economic and social development. This is one of the most salient features of Bush's initiative.

GENERAL

'Global Security System' Called For

92WC0002A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA
in Russian 18 Sep 91 p 4

[Article by Sergey Machulin: "Potential Resistance. Strategic Arms and Defense Under Conditions of the USSR Crisis: Is It Possible To Escape From the Impasse?"]

[Text] Disarmament

The events of the end of August aggravated to the extreme those economic and political problems whose solutions have been dragged out over recent years. One of the most important of these problems has to do with strategic arms and the military-industrial complex which is involved in their development, production, and operation. It was the critical nature of this problem that served as one of the most important causes of the unsuccessful coup.

In addition to the purely economic issues related to the need to reduce expenditures on arms, the conversion of the military industry, and labor placement of millions of people, this problem affects radical geopolitical issues related to international stability and security and integration of the world community. The treaty on reducing strategic nuclear arms signed by the presidents of the USSR and United States only slightly eased the economic conditions of the strategic arms race, but it by no means opens up the paths to solving the most crucial problems. In particular, it is not so simple to put anything up against the strategy of nuclear containment which lay at the basis of the military doctrine and foreign policy of the nuclear powers and provided for curtailing aggressive plans over the past for decades. Incidentally, according to the treaty for reducing strategic nuclear arms, the relatively inexpensive stationary missile complexes are to be destroyed, but the mobile ones whose production costs many times more, on the contrary, will be developed.

Thus in spite of a certain amount of progress in the area of arms limitation, a new round has been started, and our country, torn apart by internal shocks and unable to feed and clothe its citizens, continues to spend billions to support the military-industrial complex.

Where is the solution? The most painless variant of conversion of the military-industrial complex and a breakthrough in providing for a new level of international security and cooperation are possible if work is begun for a global system of strategic control and defense (GSSKO) under the aegis of the UN. The idea of unifying the efforts of recently opposing parties, which is unexpected at first glance, has obvious political and economic advantages.

Let us discuss briefly how this system might possibly look. It would be expedient for the GSSKO to be able to perform the following basic functions:

- monitoring of the condition of strategic offensive weapons;
- antinuclear and antispace defense;

- monitoring of the condition of the armed forces of states and analysis of their military-political situation;

- ecological monitoring and reporting of emergency situations.

The administration of the system should be provided from several centers that duplicate functions and are located in various countries, with international teams under the direct jurisdiction of the UN Security Council. The core of the system should be comprised of a global network of communications and computer centers, which in principle could be used for solving any problems of the UN and UNESCO and international economic, law enforcement, and humanitarian structures.

The first two groups of functions should be performed on the basis of means developed within the framework of the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] program but with considerably less cost. The reduction of costs by a factor of 10-15 as compared to the American program would be brought about by the following factors:

- the means of defense may be calculated to destroy a 15-20 times smaller quantity of carriers and warheads (assuming that they are reduced in the USSR and United States to the level of other nuclear powers);

- with cooperation between the USSR and United States there will no longer be a need to complicate the system involved in improving delivery devices (reducing the active section of the trajectory, protective coverings, false targets, and so forth);

- integration of the efforts of the USSR and United States will make it possible to avoid duplicating developments, for example: The USSR could take responsibility for the basic costs in the area of systems for delivery into orbit (including with the use of missiles scheduled to be destroyed) and the United States—in the area of control and communications systems.

It should also be taken into account that a significant share of the expenditures could be taken on by countries not included in military blocs which need to provide for their security (for example, the Arab countries).

Questions might arise regarding the parties' basic readiness for cooperation in the military-industrial complex but this readiness has already been proved by numerous examples. Moreover, there is a fundamental possibility of a kind of conversion of both our military-industrial complex and those in the West, which will not only not encroach upon their interests but, almost without affecting the nature of their activity, will shift its goals to supporting long-term programs in the interests of the entire world community.

What will the development of the proposed program do for the economy of our country, which is on the verge of a catastrophe? In the first place, in the near future there is the possibility of sharply (by 70-80 percent) reducing costs of financing scientific research and experimental design work and arms production while still providing for the

operation of almost all enterprises of the military-industrial complex (the GSSKO program could be financed mainly through foreign sources, and the USSR's share in the initial stages could be covered, for example, through providing missile carriers, communications and tracking satellites, and so forth). This financing plus the inevitable introduction of modern technologies with a relatively small reorientation of activity will create ideal conditions for conversion of the military-industrial complex. Those who think that it is possible to reorient cumbersome small-series productions of the military-industrial complex to the output of civilian products in short periods of time without many billions in capital investments are deluding themselves. In the second place, the development of work under the GSSKO program will bring about a change in the restrictions on importing advanced technologies and the influx of investments and will increase the intensiveness of the interaction among specialists, which will contribute to improving their qualifications. Moreover, the participation of the military-industrial complex in international programs will raise the curtain of secrecy, which was needed mainly to cover up the many billions in ineffective costs and bad decisions on the part of the leaders, it will increase the effectiveness of the work of the collectives as a result of breaking through the information blockade, and it will make it possible for the organs of power and the public to monitor the activity of the military-industrial complex at all levels.

We shall discuss only the main political advantages of the introduction of the GSSKO.

1. There will be radical changes in the policy of nuclear containment, which for four decades was the basis of relations between the East and West. The restraint of aggressive aspirations and security for each state will no longer be provided through our own offensive, essentially armed means and not by fear of retribution but by a system that is truly defensive, is the same for all, and guarantees equal security for all.
2. There will no longer be any point in any of the parties' developing new kinds of strategic nuclear arms since in principle it will be impossible for any state to gain any long-term advantage in science and technology over the united forces of the world community.
3. The UN will acquire real power and sharply increase its influence, which will be a significant factor in restraining political adventurers.
4. The process of nuclear disarmament will be essentially simplified because it will take place under continuous technical monitoring, and temporary imbalances in the potentials of the parties will be of no significance against the background of the defense system. Moreover, in the future the GSSKO will make it possible to completely eliminate nuclear arms and delivery systems for them.
5. The new level of cooperation in science, technology, economics, and the military sphere will significantly push back the curtain of secrecy and will make it impossible to secretly create new kinds of arms, it will have a favorable

effect on the economies of the civilian branches of industry and international economic integration, and it will give a new impetus to development in all branches.

Worries Over Control of Nuclear Arms Continue

*91WC0170A Moscow TRUD in Russian
18 Sep 91 p 3*

[Article by E. Alekseyev, TRUD international observer: "Nuclear Worries: Will They End?"]

[Text] **By 1998, the United States and the USSR will still have 1,600 units of strategic nuclear delivery systems each and 6,000 units of nuclear weapons each.**

Two powerful waves of nuclear worries have shaken our planet like tsunamis in a short period of time. Remember that when the intensity of the situation in the Persian Gulf region reached the "war" mark mankind shuddered. Does Iraq have nuclear weapons and will it use them? It turned out that up to that point Iraq did not have these weapons. That was a relief.

Now we have been flooded with questions from worried people. Did we lose control of the nuclear weapons during the days of the putsch? Here it is very important that while many people panicked, NATO officials, as we later learned, remained calm. The unnamed NATO representative who was mentioned, in particular, by the French LIBERATION, testified that "throughout the crisis in the USSR we quite attentively observed all forms of military activity on the territory of the USSR. There was not a single moment of danger or even the slightest threat involving nuclear weapons." Well, if that is true, as they say, thank God.

But anxiety in the world has not been allayed. And what will be the fate of Soviet nuclear weapons after these largely unpredictable changes? Uneasiness has been expressed and is still being expressed not only, as it were, by emotional people, but also by respected specialists. The former leader of the U.S. delegation in the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, Max Kampelman, said right out that the proclamation of state independence by the USSR republics on whose territories nuclear weapons are located could threaten the security of the United States and the entire world.

As we know, explanations and assurances followed from the Soviets. In a recent Soviet-U.S. satellite television broadcast USSR President M.S. Gorbachev emphasized that control over nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union was stronger than it is in the United States and "nobody should be alarmed about that." But RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President B.N. Yeltsin explained that the nuclear weapons now on the territory of Russia, the Ukraine, and Kazakhstan will be moved in the future from the Ukraine and Kazakhstan to Russia. And this gives the RSFSR the major responsibility for controlling them. (There are nuclear weapons in Belorussia as well.)

When journalists asked official White House (U.S.) representative Judy Smith if the U.S. Administration was not disturbed by "Yeltsin's intention to transfer all Soviet nuclear weapons to the territory of Russia and, possibly, to take control of them into his own hands," she answered briefly and not very clearly: "We will wait and see." Then, true, she added: "As far as I know, the nuclear weapons are under the control of the center. I assume that this situation will continue until the crisis in Moscow is fully surmounted and all the details are worked out."

In any case President of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev, for his part, thinks that on the territory of the USSR all defense should be unified and nuclear weapons should be under the unified control of those republics in which they are located. "I am against having any one republic have nuclear weapons, regardless of how large it may be," he stated.

It turns out that not all doubts and misgivings have been removed yet. As Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulrooney said, the West is now satisfied that nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union are under the proper control. "But we cannot allow ourselves to take a risk," he warned.

Let us be objective and recognize that it is not only the events in the Soviet Union that prolong the nuclear risk. It will remain as long as there are nuclear weapons and as long as other states in addition to the present "nuclear" ones are trying to get their hands on them. As long as they persistently promote the idea that in all the postwar years nuclear weapons have been a "restraining factor" and a "deterrent" which made it possible to avoid a worldwide military explosion. But I think that all this is still purely speculation. Has this nuclear "restraining factor" prevented the hundreds of armed conflicts that have taken hundreds of thousands of human lives? Did it stop the Iraqi aggressors or would it have kept them from using this terrible weapon if it had been ready?

Recent events, in my opinion, dictate with special insistence the need to work more actively on solving problems of nuclear disarmament. There are already calls for a sharp—even by 90 percent—reduction of nuclear arsenals. Many are already speaking about the urgent need to solve the problem of tactical nuclear weapons. All this is true and this work must be stepped up. But in general to continue to preserve and improve nuclear weapons as a "universal deterrent" is immoral and inhuman, and it costs a lot of money. And there is, I am convinced, the underlying problem whose solution would contribute most effectively to a rapid advancement toward a nonnuclear world. This problem is halting nuclear testing.

And here a great deal of attention, mainly from the U.S. public and political circles, was attracted by the interview with President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin on the American CNN Television Network which was shown a couple of days before the television satellite broadcast. At that time he confirmed that the republic would continue to speak out in favor of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the halting of testing, and, ultimately, destruction of these arms.

U.S. journalists immediately established that the key problem is testing and asked the official Pentagon representative P. Williams to clarify the position of the U.S. Administration. He said, in particular:

"The question of nuclear testing is nothing new in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. On the whole we consider the question of which tests the USSR intends to undertake to be its own internal affair. At the same time the United States has always held the position that if we have nuclear weapons we should retain the possibility of testing them. Our position is that we must retain the possibility of continuing to test new kinds of nuclear weapons."

It is all fairly clear. So far there have been no positive changes in the U.S. position. If we stretch a point, of course, it is possible to place on the positive side the fact that last year there were only 18 nuclear tests, the smallest number in the past 30 years. The United States had eight of them, France six, China two, and the USSR and Great Britain had one each. Last year France conducted six tests, the United States three, and the USSR, China, and Great Britain did not conduct any. And on 14 September, as if confirming its position, the United States conducted its fourth nuclear explosion this year.

Even now people frequently say: Should our country not declare a moratorium on testing again? But we have already declared one. For a year and more than eight months now we have had only one explosion. But the United States apparently does not intend to follow our example. But what prospects do we have? When the new USSR Defense Minister Ye.I. Shaposhnikov at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet asked about the fate of the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing ground, he stated that there would be no more explosions there. But, the minister noted, the country cannot yet completely refrain from testing nuclear weapons, but where to conduct them—this is the question that must now be answered.

Of course, the main problem remains: How to achieve universal and complete termination of all nuclear testing. I want to draw your attention to an important suggestion which the Swedish Government made just last month. The idea is that with the end of the cold war the time has finally come to conclude an agreement for a complete ban on all testing of nuclear weapons. Emphasizing the significance of such an agreement, the Swedish representative on the Committee for Disarmament in Geneva, Ambassador May-Britt Teorin, noted that without test explosions it is impossible to produce reliable systems of destruction and the development of nuclear weapons would be pointless. A ban on testing, in her words, is the "key to nuclear disarmament."

To turn this "key" is undoubtedly not so simple. But recently there have been not only many alarming and even tragic events but also gratifying changes in world affairs, and decisions have been made which quite recently it would have been difficult even to dream of. We can and must solve the problem of nuclear testing as well, if not in words but in deeds we join the forces of the public and

those states which are really striving for a nonnuclear world. Today the most crucial human aspiration and right is to be freed from nuclear terror.

Problem of Near East Arms Exports Viewed

*PM2409121591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Sep 91 Union Edition p 5*

[Article by N. Revenko: "How To Clear the Powder Keg of Explosives. Near East Is Still Arming Feverishly"]

[Text] Of late our newspapers have commented mostly on our domestic affairs. That is understandable since they affect the interests of every one of us. But we are living in an interdependent world where plenty of acute problems have accumulated and to ignore them is to become isolated. One of these problems is the problem of curbing the arms race in the Near East—a problem that is arising increasingly insistently as the regional peace conference draws near.

According to figures from London's International Institute of Strategic Studies, in 1989 roughly 23,000 medium tanks and more than 3,800 combat aircraft—a vast quantity for a comparatively small area of land—were concentrated in this region. Many specialists include the states of northern Africa in addition to western Asia and the northeast segment of the African continent in this estimate. It is paradoxical that some Near East countries have more conventional arms than even European NATO members.

No one is in any doubt that this problem must be resolved. But there is no unanimous opinion on how this is to be done. There are many plans but, in my view, none of them can bring about real disarmament.

Take the "Bush plan," for instance, which the U.S. president made public at the end of May. One of the measures proposed by the head of the U.S. administration is for arms suppliers to show restraint, meaning restrictions on sales of "destabilizing" arms and the mutual provision of information regarding forthcoming shipments.

It seems a good suggestion but, to be honest, it is extremely doubtful that Britain, France, China, and the USSR would be prepared to agree to substantially cut shipments of military equipment. However, let us nonetheless imagine for a moment that the great powers reached the appropriate agreement. How would the clients react to this? As long as there is tension in relations with their neighbors and a threat to their security, they will hardly sit idly by and refuse to seek new sources of supply; and the potential of the national military industry in the region's countries is constantly increasing.

In recent times the circle of states producing arms and military hardware has expanded considerably. Such countries as Brazil, Argentina, the Republic of South Africa, the DPRK, the ROK, Israel, and Egypt, which the United Nations classes as Third World countries, have appeared among the exporters. They do not want to cut their military shipments, which bring the treasury hard currency revenue.

Another stumbling block is: What kinds of weapons should be considered "destabilizing"?

Take such an aspect of the problem as missile technology. The level of development now achieved by the Iraqi and Iranian military industries is sufficient to copy and modify foreign models, and Israel is capable of producing ballistic missiles of its own design. For instance, by lengthening fuel tanks, reducing the weight of the warhead, and increasing the engines' cut-off time, along with other technical changes, Iraq has been able to increase the range of the Soviet Scud to 600-900km. Obviously, you cannot expect an end to missile production and testing in the current situation. But in this case freezing shipments of ballistic surface-to-surface missiles, as the U.S. President is now suggesting, will only put other states in the region in an unequal position. And what about a country's right to self-defense then?

The problem of eliminating mass-destruction weapons is equally complex. It is quite clear that Israel will not under any circumstances allow its nuclear potential to be destroyed (experts estimate that it has roughly 100 nuclear weapons [boyezaryad]) as long as the Arabs have the edge in conventional and chemical weapons and there is the threat of Israel's becoming the target of aggression. On the other hand, as long as the atomic bomb remains an Israeli monopoly the Arab states will oppose the destruction of toxic agents—the "poor man's nuclear weapons."

What is the way out of the current—to be blunt—deadlock situation? It would be simply absurd for me to claim that I know how to do this. At the same time it is now obvious what steps must be taken for the disarmament process to begin. First, it is essential to clearly see that the real end of the arms race in the Near East is indissolubly linked with a conclusive Arab-Israeli settlement. Without that any programs—even those proposed by prestigious politicians—will fail to produce the desired effect.

Another indispensable condition is the formulation of confidence-building measures, since every state must have guarantees that no one and nothing threatens its security. Moreover, debates on confidence-building measures must be held in parallel with a discussion of the political aspects with the idea that they are mutually complementary.

The negotiating process may drag on for many years, so therefore there is no point in harboring illusions that we can expect speedy results in curbing the arms race in the Near East. However, it can still be given some kind of restrictive framework. For instance, developed states, above all the permanent members of the UN Security Council who are the main suppliers of military hardware to the region, could agree to stop shipments of the kinds of weapons that they have a production monopoly on. I refer above all to high-technology weapons, since they are the most destabilizing and disruptive to the strategic balance.

Another avenue is to work out a UN register of arms shipments and sales. In practice this means that exporters will be forced to inform the United Nations about transactions to supply military equipment or provide other military aid.

What is more, it is extremely important to formulate principles governing arms shipments—for instance, to acknowledge as illegal the sale of weapons to countries that commit acts of aggression, build up their armed forces over and above their defense needs, and threaten the territorial integrity of other countries. After these principles are approved by the United Nations any state that sells military hardware to Iraq or Libya will bear the responsibility for so doing.

All this can be done now without waiting for progress at a Near East peace conference.

Leaders, Media React to Bush Disarmament Proposal

Gorbachev: Move 'Completely Positive'

LD2809165191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1515 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Video interview with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev by correspondent Andrey Grachev on 28 September; place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Grachev] Mikhail Sergeyevich, as has become known, last night President Bush adopted a major initiative on questions of nuclear disarmament. Was this unexpected for the Soviet side?

[Gorbachev] I must say that yesterday I had a conversation with President Bush, and the previous morning he sent me a letter on this question, evidently counting on the fact that I would acquaint myself with the President's proposals on this matter. We held a conversation yesterday evening. I must say, therefore, that really there were no surprises for me. But the main thing, I think, is that there were no surprises for the following reasons:

This is a development of the process that was laid down in Geneva, then in Reykjavik, and that was further developed on Malta, in Washington, and in Moscow. So this is a very important process of nuclear disarmament in which both our countries, possessing the greatest nuclear potential, are taking part, and actively taking part. This process is moving to a new level and a new dynamic. I would say that it is acquiring large-scale significance.

[Grachev] How would you evaluate the significance of these initiatives, at least in their provisional form?

[Gorbachev] I think that without exaggerating at all, our stance, our evaluation of these proposals is positive, completely positive. It demonstrates the adherence of the U.S. Administration and George Bush personally to the process of nuclear disarmament, and, as a result of these proposals, this process I would say is now moving on to the sort of scale which promises a serious advance toward a non-nuclear world.

[Grachev] Have we all understood correctly that it is a matter of unilateral initiatives and that it is, perhaps, the first time that the U.S. side has done this? That is to say, the kind of initiatives that do not require an immediate reaction on the part of the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] I understand you, I understand you. This was my first question to the President. I said: Mr. President, please be specific in that you are acting unilaterally as far as your major initiative is concerned. Yes, he confirmed that this was the case. At the same time, both in the letter and in the conversation, the President stressed that naturally they count—and, more than that—they call on us to do, to meet them halfway, to do the same thing, or take similar and commensurate steps.

[Grachev] But our reply is not a condition for the adoption of these U.S. measures?

[Gorbachev] No, no. I immediately told the President that having familiarized myself with the written materials, and having listened to his clarifications, I said immediately that we indeed see it as a major step and a major initiative. I would say that this initiative ranks with the achievements attained during and after Reykjavik.

[Grachev] Do we not have any doubts or questions, in the initial reaction at least? In short, is there no trick here?

[Gorbachev] I must say that at the moment of course it is still too early to assess all these proposals as a whole, especially in specific terms, and this would be too hasty on our part, and I think unconvincing for everyone. Nevertheless, what we know allows us to say, no, this is a serious proposal, but many questions have arisen for me.

The first question: Does this concern the other nuclear powers, primarily, the European ones? For both in the letter and the conversation, all appeals were directed at the Soviet Union. The President said that initially, he has in mind our two superpowers which have the greatest potential. That is one question. The next question I put to him—I read the letter and made notes—I asked a question which in my view I should naturally ask: These large-scale proposals are essentially aimed at effecting very significant cuts, at cutting programs, since the President states that all programs for the creation and perfecting of nuclear weapons are to be halted in the future, apart from one type of missiles. There are other questions which bear witness to the fact that all these programs, linked with nuclear arms, are being curtailed.

Naturally I raised the question of what will happen with regard to nuclear tests. This issue was not touched on in the President's letter. In our conversation President Bush said, yes, this issue is not raised in these proposals, but he and the members of his government have in mind that we must naturally, in the new context, look at this problem as well. I personally take the stance that the possibility is opening up to take an unprecedented step and to come to a mutual halt in testing nuclear weapons. Then the whole world community would be convinced that, yes, this is a new very promising breakthrough.

[Grachev] Yes, these are critical points. But do you think this opens the way or makes it easier in turn for our progress along the road of nuclear and other disarmament, along the road of conversion?

[Gorbachev] I think all this is wholly and naturally connected. But I and the President have agreed, since the subject matter is very complex—and we have a great many questions—I have mentioned this, but I also asked: Does this apply to aircraft carriers, to strategic submarines, and so on. This just illustrates how many questions can still be asked. That is why I and the President agreed that we will find a way that is convenient for both sides in order to bring about complete clarity, and to clarify all the points of this very important proposal by the U.S. President.

We also agreed to act without delay. Consequently there will presumably be some contact, we shall find a method, a form, for cooperating by acting together.

[Grachev] So is it possible to say—one would like to take it thus—that at last not only we, but the West as well, have taken, or have proposed to take, a major step along the path toward that very nuclear-free world that the Soviet side has talked about in its time?

[Gorbachev] Well yes, if one takes the last few years, we have resumed this talk once again, this idea in general of a nuclear-free world, although that topic was always present in movements linked with the struggle for, with the arms race, especially as far as nuclear weapons are concerned; but it is indeed so. In recent years we have raised this, specifically in 1986. But then there followed years during which we worked together, and in the present case I think we will equalize the tally. In Reykjavik we put forward large-scale proposals. Without Reykjavik and everything that was done after it, this would not have been possible. On an even wider plane, we will say directly: Such an initiative would not have taken place and would not have made its appearance, either from our side or the U.S. side, if we, within the framework of the new thinking had not moved away from and bid farewell to the cold war and started to move in the direction of a lengthy peaceful period, toward the building of new international relations. So all of this is interlinked. I hope we are witnessing a major event which promises the world hope, great hope, for a nuclear-free world.

Gorbachev, Yeltsin Welcome Initiative

OW3009000791 Moscow INTERFAX in English
2155 GMT 29 Sep 91

[From "Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Gorbachev speaking on national television on Saturday indicated his country's positive response to Mr. Bush's latest initiative on nuclear disarmament including ground and sea-launched short range weapons, strategic bombers, and long-range missiles.

For his part, the Russian President Boris Yeltsin who also welcomed the U.S. new move had called for appropriate large measures by the Soviet Union, his press officials informed. Russia, said Yeltsin, intends to take part in working out concrete measures to reciprocate Mr. Bush's move.

Yeltsin, Bush Discuss Proposal

LD2709204691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1900 GMT 27 Sep 91

[Text] A telephone conversation took place this evening between RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President Boris Yeltsin and U.S. President George Bush. The new major initiative of the U.S. side on issues of nuclear disarmament in relation to sea- and land-based nuclear tactical weapons, strategic bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and other measures in reducing the nuclear arsenals and strengthening stability were discussed in the conversation.

Boris Yeltsin highly assessed these proposals and spoke in favor of substantial measures to be undertaken by the Soviet Union. He stressed that the U.S. proposals are timely and in accordance with the new level of trust and the changes that have taken place in Russia and in the USSR as a whole. Russia will take part in working out concrete steps in the military sphere in relation to this initiative, stated the RSFSR president.

Pankin Sees 'Full Support' From USSR

LD2809163591 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1516 GMT 28 Sep 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] UN, 28 September (TASS)—Boris Pankin, USSR foreign minister, has welcomed the U.S. initiatives in the field of disarmament. In this connection, the Soviet minister made a statement for representatives of the mass media in New York today.

"Proposals connected with the radical reduction and elimination of whole types of nuclear weapons and, in the first place, of all tactical weapons, represent an opportunity to change in a fundamental way the whole character of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in such a key field as nuclear disarmament," Boris Pankin said.

"The unilateral measure as well as measures demanding our mutual actions will certainly find full support on our side, and they give evidence to the fact that our relations are irrevocably coming out of a period of confrontation and that they are based on close interaction and friendship," the minister stressed.

Pankin: 'New Impetus' to Disarmament

LD2809185891 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1703 GMT 28 Sep 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] United Nations, 28 September (TASS)—"The Soviet Union will take commensurate measures in response to the measures undertaken by the U.S. in the disarmament sphere," USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin said in New York today.

He welcomed the U.S. initiatives, presented by U.S. President George Bush on Friday, in the disarmament sphere.

In this connection the Soviet minister made a statement for representatives of the mass media.

"Proposals connected with radical reduction and elimination of whole types of nuclear weapons, and primarily all tactical weapons, represent an opportunity to change in a radical way the whole character of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in such a key field as nuclear disarmament.

"Measures of unilateral character as well as measures demanding our mutual actions will certainly find full support on our side, and they give evidence to the fact that our relations are irrevocably coming out from a period of confrontation and that they are based on close interaction and friendship.

"A world without weapons is our ideal. And today we are saying together with the U.S., in essence: Farewell to the theory of nuclear deterrents. There can be no doubts that the Soviet Union will respond in a commensurate way while bearing in mind the lack of symmetry in our military mechanisms, to the measures that have been announced by the United States. We state with satisfaction that the nuclear dialogue, thanks to the proposals put forward by French President Francois Mitterrand, which were mentioned by President Bush, is becoming a kind of quartet. This also meets the needs of our time.

"These days here, in New York, during a conversation with President Bush and during talks, which lasted for many hours, with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, we came to an agreement on a fairly tight and concrete schedule for negotiations on the whole complex of disarmament issues.

"Undoubtedly, the statement made by President Bush yesterday will give a powerful new impetus to speeding up these negotiations and decisions which are to be taken.

"As a human being I was touched by the fact that President Bush linked his proposals directly with those radical democratic changes which have been taking place in our country since our people rejected the putschists and smashed this attempt to turn the development of events in our country to the past. The world justly says now that the proposals by President Bush are a dramatic peaceful challenge. I would add that they are also a reply to a challenge which was made by the Soviet people and the Soviet Union who embarked on the road of democratic development and of turning into a civil society and law-governed state".

Due to a tight schedule of talks with his colleagues from different countries the minister could only reply to one question, that is, whether he was surprised by this U.S. initiative:

"I was not surprised when I was listening to President Bush because the U.S. side informed us in advance about the proposals it would make. President Bush informed President Gorbachev and President Yeltsin about this and I had a detailed conversation concerning the U.S. initiatives with my opposite number Baker well in advance. On the

whole, it proceeded from all our contacts here, in New York, and earlier in Moscow that something important was to happen and something important expected. Let us hope that in the near future we will be able to sit down at the negotiations table also regarding the elimination of nuclear tests. In light of the proposals by President Bush this becomes already, in my view, an absolutely natural step".

Boris Pankin noted that Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow will comprehensively set out the Soviet position on President Bush's speech.

Shaposhnikov Welcomes Initiative

*LD3009055991 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0415 GMT 30 Sep 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo, 30 September (TASS)—USSR Defense Minister Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov has welcomed the proposals by U.S. President George Bush aimed at major reductions in the nuclear arsenals, describing them as a very strong initiative. It is especially gladdening that the United States no longer regards the Soviet Union as its "main enemy," the minister noted in an exclusive interview published today in YOMIURI SHIMBUN, the first interview with the Japanese mass media since he replaced Marshal Dmitriy Yazov, head of the Soviet defense department, who was a member of the "gang of eight" putschists.

If things keep moving in the direction of eliminating tactical nuclear weapons, Shaposhnikov noted, then that may have an effect on a reduction in strategic nuclear armaments as well. The arsenals of such weapons, the minister thinks, ought to be lowered to a maximum low level, paying priority attention not to strength but to rationality. He expressed the opinion that it is necessary to set up a group of experts in the interests of implementing Bush's proposals, which would specifically study the qualitative differences in the Soviet and U.S. arsenals of strategic weapons. We should also take into account the problem of nuclear tests, as well as the nuclear weapons possessed by other nuclear powers, primarily England and France. The USSR defense minister stressed the need to preserve the principle of unity in the Soviet Armed Forces. Touching upon the question of their number, which is 3.7 million men at present, he said that 3 million men is the realistic figure that presents itself for the foreseeable future. Further reductions will depend on the course of the reforms in the USSR Armed Forces and on the talks on the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe.

Replying to a question about "the Northern Territories"—the group of islands in the southern part of the Kuril ridge for which Japan is contending with the Soviet Union, Shaposhnikov said that he agrees with the position of Russian President Boris Yeltsin, who put forward a staged plan to solve the territorial problem in January last year. He supports the intention recently expressed by the Russian leader for speeding up the settlement process. He spoke out against the formula envisaging handing over the

islands to Japan in exchange for economic aid. The minister pointed out the need for a circumspect approach to this problem and warned against a one-sided solution to it, since this may trigger a chain reaction of territorial claims being made against the USSR on the part of other states.

Karpov: USSR Supports Nuclear Abolition

LD2809095491 Hamburg DPA in German 0912 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—The Soviet Union supports the complete abolition of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000, says Soviet defense expert and Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov in a BILD AM SONNTAG interview. Karpov, long-standing chief negotiator in the U.S.-USSR disarmament talks, says: "Such prospects are now very realistic because of the political changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union." The transition to cooperation in U.S.-USSR relations is making nuclear weapons redundant.

One of the most reliable ways for promoting abolition is to stop all nuclear tests, Karpov said. Moscow is prepared to do this and calls on all other nuclear powers to follow its example. Other nuclear powers could join the U.S.-USSR talks on the reduction and abolition of nuclear weapons. Nuclear and conventional naval force reduction should also become a subject of the negotiations. The Soviet politician further calls for a convention on the banning and destruction of all chemical weapons as well as a ban of any arms in space. Disarmament is also necessary in Latin America, Asia, the Far East, and the Pacific regions.

Spokesman Sees 'Adequate' Response

LD2809201191 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 28 Sep 91

[by TASS correspondent Sergei Kuznetsov]

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev considers U.S. President George Bush's initiative to radically reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal "as crucial not only for relations between the superpowers but for international relations as a whole," Gorbachev's spokesman Andrey Grachev told the U.S. Cable News Network on Saturday.

He expressed confidence the Soviet leadership will soon come up with a detailed reply to the U.S. initiative.

"I'm sure the Soviet Union will take adequate steps in this sphere," Grachev said. He added the Soviet Union will be guided by the principle "warhead for warhead," stressing "we will try not to yield to the United States in terms of courage, boldness and initiative".

Grachev said Gorbachev was "greatly inspired by the fact that new thinking has at last crossed the ocean". "The president, of course, was encouraged by the fact that the idea of strengthening international security along with democratic reforms in Soviet society has eventually been understood. He has been developing this idea of a nuclear-free world over the last five years," Grachev said.

Spokesman on Reciprocal Arms Cuts

LD2809150791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1424 GMT 28 Sep 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Staroselskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 28 September (TASS)—The USSR president has assessed as "extremely positive" the initiative of U.S. President George Bush in the sphere of nuclear disarmament, which he put forward on Friday. This was reported today to journalists at an unofficial briefing by a representative of the press service of the USSR president. Here he cited yesterday's telephone conversation between the heads of the two states.

The briefing was called unofficial because the representative of the president's press service requested that quotations not be ascribed to him. Despite this, the meeting with the journalists was fruitful. Specific and exhaustive replies were given to all questions which touched on the subjects of the briefing.

It was noted, in particular, that Mikhail Gorbachev was able to acquaint himself beforehand with the initiative of the U.S. President after a conversation with J. Collins, the temporary United States charge d'affaires in Moscow—and prior to a telephone conversation with George Bush he was able to consult with representatives of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense. They also gave it a positive evaluation, having noted that this problem demands to be studied in depth. First and foremost, in their view, is the differences in the structure of the nuclear forces of the USSR and the United States.

A representative of the president's press service rejected the term "nuclear republics" which was put forward by one of the journalists in his question. He emphasized that at present it is possible to speak about a "nuclear power" which is the Soviet Union, and about the republics upon whose territory nuclear arms are sited. In his words only the positive reaction of Boris Yeltsin, the president of Russia, is known at present.

At the briefing it was stated that this evening the USSR president is to speak on Central Television, to give an account of his position regarding the initiative of the head of the U.S. Administration.

If one tries to expound this idea in a few words, it comes to a unilateral (and this was underlined and fixed in a telephone conversation between Gorbachev and Bush) decision to eliminate U.S. nuclear land-based weapons located in other countries, and also all U.S. nuclear shells and warheads of ballistic short-range missiles. The U.S. President pointed out that he calls on the USSR to follow this example. According to a press spokesman, this step will be reciprocated.

Spokesman on U.S. Stance on Test Ban

LD2809142491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Excerpts] A spokesman for President Gorbachev has told newsmen in Moscow the Soviet Union will reciprocate President Bush's decision to slash the national nuclear potential.

The spokesman said President Gorbachev has been informed about the coming U.S. move in advance and had discussed it with top Foreign and Defense Ministry officials.

The foreign and defense ministries had favored the move. [passage omitted]

The Soviet spokesman described the U.S. move as another step toward a nuclear-free world, and a result of joint Soviet-U.S. efforts. He wished other nuclear powers followed suit too. And he appreciated attention other nations have paid to the unilateral Soviet steps for disarmament.

He informed newsmen that in a telephone conversation with President Gorbachev, Mr. Bush had indicated his country was ready to negotiate a nuclear test ban.

PRAVDA Calls Bush 'Bold,' 'Farsighted'

*PM2909195591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Sep 91 Single Edition p 4*

[V. Gan report: "George Bush's September Surprise. What Prompted Amendments to White House's Global Strategy? Major Cuts in U.S. Nuclear Forces Promised. Washington's Opinion: Now Moscow Has To Respond"]

[Text] Washington, 29 September—When U.S. President G. Bush stated on national TV Friday evening that the world is changing at a fantastic pace and that each day is writing a new page before the ink on the previous page has dried, those words could have been equally applied to the United States itself. After all, as recently as late July, before his trip to Moscow, Bush told us Soviet journalists that he would not be taking any bold initiatives in the arms control sphere. It was thought that, following the START Treaty, there would need to be a kind of time-out before we moved ahead. Only a few days ago the President's concept of a "new world order" had comprised mainly abstract arguments and was clearly short on specifics.

Now, it seems, a lot has changed. The initiatives just announced by Bush allow us to talk without any exaggeration about a revision of U.S. strategic doctrine and its postulates, which have remained untouched for four decades. The White House incumbent has essentially proposed a new agenda for international perestroika.

The general outlines of the program proposed by the President are as follows: The United States will withdraw from Europe and other parts of the world all its tactical (short-range) nuclear weapons and nuclear artillery shells, the entire arsenal of which will be destroyed. All tactical nuclear missiles—including cruise missiles—will be removed from ships and submarines and from land-based naval aircraft.

ICBM's due to be destroyed under the Soviet-U.S. START Treaty will be stood down from alert status even before that treaty is ratified or comes into force. For the first time in many years U.S. strategic bombers' round-the-clock alert status is being revoked—this was done Saturday—and their nuclear weapons are being placed in storage. Programs to develop [sozdaniye] new tactical missiles and

mobile ICBM's are being abolished. Talks are planned with Moscow on destroying all missiles with multiple nuclear warheads.

Having said that the United States can now take unilateral steps to "make the world less dangerous than ever in the nuclear era," G. Bush appealed to Moscow to make "equally bold" decisions. In conversation with journalists a senior official administration spokesman, who wished to remain anonymous, said that a lot of the President's program could be canceled if our country refused to respond in a reciprocal manner. However, in an interview with ABC TV, Defense Secretary R. Cheney spoke quite confidently, expressing hope for a "very good reception" for the U.S. initiatives from the Soviet leadership.

It has to be said that the first statements by spokesmen for M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin seemingly reaffirmed the justification for such expectations. But, despite its positive assessment, the Soviet president's comment Saturday that it would take time to carefully study the U.S. proposals made many people here moderate their euphoria. Although the comment was fair enough, it is hardly appropriate to speak off the cuff on such complex and involved issues.

So how should we nonetheless view the political watershed which the Bush decisions mark? What lies behind the U.S. leadership's "September surprise?" To begin with, of course, everything rests on the obvious fact that the Soviet Union has changed beyond recognition during the years of democratic transformations and even since the three famous days in August.

In other words, Washington has recognized that we have really changed so much that it is an irrational anachronism to keep pointing the nuclear pistol at us. The bankruptcy of the totalitarian system has raised the question of elaborating new political approaches and seeking a fundamentally new level of Soviet-U.S. and international cooperation.

Judging by official statements, the administration is now worried—and this, it is believed, was one of its motives—about the reliability of controls over the Soviet tactical nuclear weapons arsenal. During the putsch in Moscow local officials were playing down in every possible way their concern that these arms could fall into the "wrong hands." The Soviet undertakings on this score were reassuring, but not entirely so.

"The new leaders in the Kremlin and the republic are now questioning the need for their huge nuclear arsenal," G. Bush said. "The Soviet nuclear stockpiles are now more of a burden than an instrument of national security." One of his advisers somewhat amplified the President's statements, adding that Washington had recognized the readiness of Soviet reformers—specifically new Soviet Defense Minister Ye. Shaposhnikov—for far-reaching agreements with the West.

...On the whole, the White House initiatives have been greeted very positively in the United States. From the standpoint of purely domestic political considerations—

and the election campaign which will choose both the U.S. President and the makeup of the Senate and House of Representatives in November next year is essentially under way—Bush has clearly outmaneuvered the Democrats. The White House has undoubtedly put a stop to any accusations from the Democratic opposition of “slowness” or a “lack of imagination” in the face of the crisis in the Soviet Union.

Understandably, the Republicans are praising the President's statement, calling it, in the words of their Senate leader R. Dole, “yet another step to turn the promise of a new world order into concrete reality.” Well, U.S. public opinion also favors such assessments. Realistically speaking, it is giving Bush a free hand—according to the latest figures from a joint WALL STREET JOURNAL and NBC poll, around 50 percent of Americans believe that the United States could halve its military spending by the year 2000 without detriment to its security.

There is no doubt that in putting forward his program G. Bush has shown himself to be a bold and farsighted politician who has laid to rest the widespread stories about his being a timid and irresolute figure. His initiatives tightly combine objective reality, an understanding of our huge and severe problems, and concern for his own political survival. This tight bundle has made it possible for us to have in hand the first and highly important Western response to our own acute and sometimes unpredictable changes. As people say here, “the ball is in our court”—and a lot will depend on Moscow's response.

Observer Hails ‘Unprecedented’ Plan

*LD2809112791 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1042 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[By TASS international observer Gennadiy Petrov]

[Text] Moscow, 28 September (TASS)—Every cloud has a silver lining. The August events in the Soviet Union, having scarcely checked the processes of perestroika, then resulted in the USSR's disintegration into sovereign republics. This aroused well-founded concern in this country and abroad, but along with this it has sped up progress along the path toward a safer non-nuclear world. In the first place it is the consequences of these very events which have obviously prompted George Bush, the U.S. President, to put forward an unprecedented initiative in the sphere of the reduction of nuclear weapons.

This concerns a television address made by the head of the U.S. Administration, in which he stated his intention to eliminate U.S. tactical land-based nuclear weapons sited in all countries of the world. The Pentagon is also dismantling all tactical nuclear weapons on surface vessels and strike submarines, as well as on naval aircraft.

In Bush's speech there is the clearly discernible hope that the Soviet leaders will adopt similar measures. There can be no doubt that there will be measures in response, and not only because Soviet officials have already reacted positively to his proposals. It is no secret that leaders both at the center and in the republics are seriously concerned

over the presence of the vast nuclear arsenal, and so the unilateral initiative taken by the chief of the White House is most timely. In short, a further element, which was lacking after the recent signing of the strategic arms reduction treaty in Moscow by Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, will form part of the foundation for the building of a safe world through the efforts of the two powers.

Washington's fundamental review of military strategy must have a positive effect on the situation throughout Europe. It is not fortuitous that the leaders of Great Britain, France, the FRG, and other NATO countries have backed Bush's new initiatives. It is now important that the United States' European allies also review their plans in the arms field more radically.

Washington Correspondent on Speech

*LD2809210191 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Video report by correspondent B. Kalyagin in Washington; from the “TV Inform” newscast]

[Text] We have just received a report from Washington with details of the Bush initiative.

[Kalyagin] With the aim of lowering tension, the head of the U.S. Administration has ordered that the state of heightened combat readiness be revoked for all U.S. strategic bombers and a part of their ballistic missiles. The U.S. President has declared the intention of the U.S. side to accelerate the fulfillment of the treaty signed in Moscow on strategic offensive weapons, and to eliminate those nuclear systems subject to cuts earlier than the fixed deadline.

George Bush has proposed that the Soviet Union begin negotiations on the total elimination of intercontinental ballistic multiple warhead missiles. At the same time, the head of the White House has come out in favor of the limited development of systems of nonnuclear anti-missile defense.

Now Washington is awaiting the reply of the Soviet leadership. If the Soviet Union undertakes adequate [adekvatnyye] actions, then, as President Bush said, further cooperation is inevitable. [Video shows front page of today's NEW YORK TIMES, Stealth bomber in flight, Bush and Gorbachev signing treaty, intercontinental ballistic missile launch, Kalyagin in front of White House]

‘World This Week’ on Bush Initiative, Vienna Talks

*LD2909213191 Moscow All-Union Radio First
Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1330 GMT
29 Sep 91*

[“The World This Week: International Review” program with Moscow Radio Observer Viktor Levin; Ambassador Oleg Alekseyevich Grinevskiy, chief USSR negotiator to Vienna arms talks; and presenter Yevgeniy Osipovskiy]

[Excerpts] [Osipovskiy] I will begin this program with the problems of nuclear disarmament. Today there is no lack

of material on world reaction to the initiative by U.S. President George Bush on the unilateral reduction of tactical nuclear weapons. In practically all the countries of the world this announcement has been meeting with the most positive response possible. This was also evaluation by our country. I will ask Viktor Levin, our observer, to report in more detail.

[Levin] The first assessment that Soviet President Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union, gave to the new U.S. initiative demonstrates that the Soviet Union has reacted to this very positively and extremely seriously. It is true, now, that the questions, of where, how, and under what conditions the leaders of the two great powers will meet or exchange opinions to resolve the questions proceeding from the U.S. President's proposal remains open. But these are, as it were, technical questions, since the main thing has already been said. The main thing, I repeat, consists of the fact that the United States is assuming the boldness to unilaterally eliminate, in essence, tactical nuclear weapons.

We are being called upon to follow this example, and I think that people will not have to wait long for us. Thus, a truly unique situation is being created, when the United States of America and the Soviet Union, without very long and thorough negotiations... I don't want to say in the least that negotiations are not necessary, but nonetheless they are adopting a decision which diminishes, and very noticeably diminishes, the threat of a nuclear war breaking out. And it brings peace closer, taking one more very important step on the way to universal nuclear disarmament.

After all, until now the concept of the first use of nuclear weapons has existed in NATO. NATO strategists explained this concept by claiming that the Soviet Union possesses an enormous quantity, together with the other states of the Warsaw Pact—the strategy still applies to the time when this organization fully existed. So, anyway, it has on its side an enormous quantity of tanks and other land forces and to counterbalance them in the event of a possible attack by the Warsaw Pact on the NATO sphere it will supposedly be necessary to use tactical nuclear weapons first.

And this question, although it manifestly switched a long time ago to a theoretical plane, has concerned many people, since the concept remained and although there had been talk before in NATO on the possible elimination of tactical nuclear weapons, the concept, the strategic setup, so to speak, was preserved.

Now it is being deprived of a material basis, although, actually speaking, the material basis on the part of the other military-political grouping was eliminated much earlier. This is if, so to speak, one looks at the military aspect. Here there is still a number of questions that do indeed require explanation and clarification, and without doubt the military specialists will still have their say.

Today, I would primarily like to draw attention to this decision by the U.S. President. I recall that back in the times of Reagan, the U.S. approached all negotiations on

arms control, as they put it, from a position first of trust and then of disarmament. In our country this concept was subject to criticism, but practice demonstrates that, indeed, trust creates a very reliable, very solid basis for arms control and ensures security, I would risk saying even, better than an unrestrained arms race, better than armament.

Just look, while we occupied confrontational stances we and the United States amassed enormous quantities of arms, and so much built up that even now we are capable of annihilating all living things on the earth several times over, and the earth as well. Gigantic resources went on this, gigantic resources which undermined our economy, which are making themselves felt particularly painful in our country, although the United States has not gone through this without a scratch.

And so, it transpires that on the basis of trust it is possible to reinforce security without an arms race, on the contrary, by means reducing arms. This yields an enormous saving in resources while security, I repeat, is becoming more reliable, firmer.

Sununu, White House chief of staff, has said that this initiative is the U.S. President's initiative and is, to a certain extent, also a reaction to the suppression of the August coup in the Soviet Union. Indeed, there is here a direct reason, if you like, a link of cause and effect.

If the members of the State Committee for the State of Emergency [SCSE] had emerged on top, having set themselves the task of again throwing our state back into a communist, totalitarian regime, throwing it back to previous times, then of course there could not only have been no question of a U.S. initiative, but we would have found ourselves confronted by a new escalation in an arms race and not disarmament.

This is quite clear, and it is no accident that at the head of this coup were representatives of the military industrial complex, those institutions which, to the detriment of the country, to the detriment of the people, for the sake of their own egotistic, indeed, egotistic parochial interests, were ready to drive us into a new spiral of militarization. And it is even difficult to imagine where this would have ended.

And the rout of the members of the SCSE not only erased out these plans, it confirmed the potential for the development of democracy in the Soviet Union. Confronting us are enormous difficulties. No one is closing their eyes to this. But it is quite clear that the country has changed. And the initiative by President Bush demonstrates that the United States intends to behave completely differently with regard to this country, completely differently.

It is no longer a question here of confrontation. It is a question of support for our country, of an aspiration to provide it with assistance in its resolution of economic problems and political ones as well. And of course, this initiative by the U.S. President has a most direct bearing on the fact that the nature of Soviet-U.S. relations is changing and that the nature of relations throughout the world is changing.

After all, the British, for example, have already adopted decisions corresponding to the U.S. initiative and have announced that they also intend to eliminate their tactical nuclear weapons and eliminate their submarine-based nuclear bombs intended to destroy enemy submarines.

That is, a very broad movement toward the elimination of nuclear weapons has started and, honestly, I don't have any doubts that we also will follow this noble example and also reject tactical nuclear weapons.

I now recall that once Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, who was then the USSR foreign minister, when preparations for the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons had reached the final stage, expressed the opinion in a conversation with journalists that that would probably be the last such treaty, and now I think one can say that he was a seer.

Now, the most complex problems are being resolved on a different basis. I would say, on a simpler but no less reliable basis. After all, 10 years' work went into the preparation of the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. The experts puzzled over the resolution of the most complex technical problems. Much time was spent on adjusting the balance of interests of the parties, literally to the last milligram. And now, with one decision, President Bush is changing the correlation of nuclear weapons not to the advantage of the United States of America, but creating conditions for nuclear disarmament in one more sphere.

And, of course, that time spent on the preparation of the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons was not for nothing. But this was a time of confrontational politics. Each party sought to prevent the other obtaining any kind of advantage as a result of the reduction of strategic offensive weapons.

Now we are moving to a new plane. To a plane of relations of a different nature. And here the basis... I want to return to the thesis of trust. This trust creates a basis for further progress to liberate mankind from the burden of nuclear weapons.

[Osipovskiy] Thank you. I will add that Marlin Fitzwater, White House press secretary, stated that George Bush considers the interview with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to be a positive reply to his initiative on the reduction of nuclear weapons. [passage omitted]

In Vienna the latest round of negotiations on cutting armed forces in Europe, as well as individual negotiations on confidence-building and security measures, is at its height. The leader of the Soviet delegation is Ambassador Oleg Alekseyevich Grinevskiy. He has given a circumstantial interview to Soviet Radio on the course of the Vienna negotiations, and, among other things said:

[Grinevskiy] I would highlight three basic areas. First, we are evolving a broad concept of future negotiations both on disarmament and on the reinforcement of European institutions.

Second, we are now evolving an agreement on cutting the numbers of conventional armed forces in Europe. If in the last agreement concluded in Paris we agreed on cutting tanks, artillery, and armored vehicles, then now we are attempting to work out an agreement that would limit the number of personnel of the armed forces of the 22 participants in the negotiations.

Well, and finally we are continuing to develop measures of confidence and security for Europe. [passage omitted]

Until now we have been involved, I would have said, in the limitation of the numbers aspect of the arms race. That is, limiting the number of cannons, tanks, artillery, armored vehicles, and so forth. Well, perhaps the time has come to look at the quality aspect of the arms race. [passage omitted]

Further Reaction to Bush Disarmament Initiative

Gorbachev's Caution Noted

LD3009185291 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1822 GMT 30 Sep 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow, 30 September (TASS)—“The USSR should not respond urgently to the United States' initiative. Haste in these matters by the USSR and its president will be too ill-considered a step toward the important and major initiative which we regard the United States proposal to be.” This is what USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev told journalists after his meeting in the Kremlin today with Austrian Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitsky. The United States President and I have agreed, he reported, that both countries will maintain contacts though foreign political and other departments involved in this very complex problem and “we will ask many questions in order to clarify the essence of this initiative. Certain grey areas [nyuansy] exist.”

Since the initiative is unilateral, Mikhail Gorbachev noted, our studying of this problem does not impede the United States from acting unilaterally, and this is a good example for all. The USSR backs the United States initiative and, furthermore, stressed the president, we will propose broadening the initiative, making the proposed concept more complete—by adding to the nuclear arms cuts a reduction in nuclear tests as well. This, in the view of Mikhail Gorbachev, will be very opportune since, “if we are moving away from nuclear weapons, then why carry out nuclear tests.” “We need to remove anxiety from the world community, and the USSR is willing to do so,” the USSR president stated.

Gorbachev Reply Likely by Midweek

OW3009131891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1010 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR president is preparing his reply to the latest initiatives of the U.S. President concerning drastic cuts in nuclear weapons, said a prominent member of M.

Gorbachev's press service. The Soviet reply, the spokesman told IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent, is likely to be ready by the middle of this week, after which M. Gorbachev will make it public.

The USSR president positively assessed George Bush's proposals. He said however that he will need time to study them carefully.

Gorbachev 'Surprise' Highlighted

PM3009205991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Sep 91 Union Edition p 1

[S. Dardykin article: "Gorbachev's Reaction to U.S. Initiatives Leaves Main Question Unanswered So Far"]

[Text] It seems that the nuclear arms reduction initiatives announced Friday evening by U.S. President George Bush have caught Moscow by surprise. Just as, incidentally, they came as a complete surprise to Washington's closest allies and even to the U.S. Congress. Until the very last minute only a handful of officials from the President's immediate entourage knew that such an initiative was in the offing and that it would contain what it did. Incidentally, all this is very reminiscent of the 1989 situation—the first year of the Bush presidency—when the idea of his meeting with Gorbachev on Malta was hatched in similar secrecy. In just the same way no more than a dozen of the U.S. President's aides were in on the plan. The idea was formulated in the same way, and then made public at a time of growing criticism of Bush—who people were saying was unable to keep ahead of events and could only react to them. And exactly the same surprise effect was created.

USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's Saturday interview on Central TV started in this area, by answering a question on how unexpected Washington's proposals were. No, one learned from what our president said, the Bush initiatives did not come as a complete surprise. "Yesterday," Gorbachev said, "we talked with President Bush, and the previous morning he had sent me a letter on the matter, clearly counting on my familiarizing myself with the President's proposal on this score, and yesterday evening we had a conversation."

Gorbachev went on to say that the U.S. proposals are a "development of the process begun in Geneva and later in Reykjavik, and developed in Malta, Washington, and Moscow. So this very important nuclear disarmament process, in which both our countries—which have the largest nuclear potential—are participating, and actively participating, is reaching a new level and attaining a new dynamic. I would say that it is acquiring large-scale importance," Gorbachev concluded.

Had the president been interviewed by a journalist rather than his own press secretary, that journalist would probably not have missed the opportunity if not to sharpen the discussion, at least to flesh it out by asking just how unexpected were the proposals, their content, and the fact that the Americans have started implementing these measures without waiting for our reaction. However, the

presidential aide who was asking the questions switched to another subject—our assessment of the Bush initiative.

"Our assessment of the proposals is positive, very positive," Gorbachev replied. "I would say," he went on to note, "that this initiative can be classed alongside the achievements during and after Reykjavik."

There could hardly have been any particularly doubt in Washington or anywhere else that our reaction would be positive. And how could one side's reaction be anything else, when the other side unilaterally and without preconditions takes a resolute step in the direction of disarmament? Although, as transpired from subsequent statements by U.S. Secretary of Defense R. Cheney and other officials, there are conditions. Washington, it transpires from these statements, could go back to the initial position if similar or equivalent steps do not follow from the Soviet Union. That is why anyone who heard the Gorbachev interview would be interested in knowing, above all, whether we will respond. And if so, when? And, most importantly of all, what sort of response will it be?

The text of the Gorbachev interview leaves these questions open. "It is too soon to completely assess all these proposals now—especially regarding specifics. It would be too hasty for our part and, I think, unconvincing for everyone. Nonetheless, on the basis of what we do know we can say that, no, these are serious proposals," he noted in response to a question about whether there was any trickery in the U.S. initiative. It transpired from Gorbachev's answer that the U.S. proposals had made him ask a whole number of questions. The first being: Does all this affect the other nuclear powers? At present we know that two of the other nuclear powers—Britain and France—have already reacted to Washington's measures by announcing reductions in their own tactical nuclear weapons.

The other question which arose for Gorbachev applies to nuclear tests. "I personally insist," he said, "that an opportunity is opening up to take an unprecedented step and move to the mutual ending of nuclear weapons tests. Then the entire world community would be convinced that, yes, this is a very promising new breakthrough."

Having closely familiarized myself with the text of the interview, I would assume that people in Washington—and in our country too, incidentally—would have nonetheless expected a somewhat different reaction from our president. They would have expected, if not a list of steps to be taken in response, at least promises that such steps would be taken. Naturally, one can and should accept the explanation that any measures in a sphere such as nuclear disarmament require preliminary consideration. One can also appreciate that the times really have changed (incidentally, Washington appreciates this perfectly) and that decisions even in the disarmament sphere are now made not so much in the Kremlin—they have at the very least to be coordinated with the republics. Perhaps the USSR president's power is no longer what it was even a few weeks ago. But his prestige is still sufficient for the interview not to have left unanswered the main question: Just what kind of step are we going to take in response to the Americans?

Pankin Sees 'Radical' Change in Ties

*LD0110081891 Moscow TASS in English 0659 GMT
1 Oct 91*

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeny Menkes]

[Text] United Nations, October 1 (TASS)—The Soviet Union will respond adequately to President George Bush's arms control initiative, Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin said on Monday at the Council for International Relations in New York.

"The victory of the democratic revolution in the Soviet Union helped remove domestic barriers on the road to demilitarising all spheres of public life and eliminating the excess military potential," Pankin said. "Military conversion is considered a priority. Sufficiency becomes a guiding principle for building armed forces."

"President Bush's peaceful initiative put forward last week, was a response to the Soviet Union's democratic challenge. The president's proposal is a logical continuation of the nuclear disarmament programme outlined by President Mikhail Gorbachev in January 1986 and a dialogue between the Soviet and U.S. Presidents in Reykjavik," Pankin said.

"The initiative provides for radical change in the character of U.S.-Soviet relations in the military-political sphere," Pankin said.

"The announced unilateral moves and measures demanding mutual actions will undoubtedly have an adequate response from our side," Pankin said. "A quick and positive reaction to the U.S. initiative by Presidents Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin proves this. Ukrainian parliament head Leonid Kravchuk also spoke about it from the U.N. rostrum."

Petrovskiy: USSR To Act Comparably

*LD3009231491 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1705 GMT 30 Sep 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Nikishov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 30 September (TASS)—"The Soviet Union is ready to take actions of comparable significance", stated Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR first deputy foreign minister, at a briefing today. He was commenting on the initiative of U.S. President George Bush with regard to the reduction of nuclear weapons arsenals.

In the view of Vladimir Petrovskiy, the initiative proposals of the U.S. President "could give a new dynamic to the process of movement toward complete rejection, in the final analysis, of nuclear arsenals".

The USSR first deputy foreign minister assessed the fact that President George Bush acquainted not only the closest allies of the United States with his proposals in advance, but also the Soviet Union as "a new way of conducting international affairs". "This is graphic evidence of the assertion and development in Soviet-U.S. relations of partnership, trust and close—and in effect—constant

interaction in settling the acute problems of world politics", he stressed. While paying due tribute to the positive content of the U.S. initiatives, Vladimir Petrovskiy noted that their "range could have been even richer if it had also embraced the issue of stopping nuclear tests". He also expressed the opinion that "it would also be important at a certain stage to involve all other states which possess this deadly weaponry in the nuclear disarmament process as well".

"We favor the immediate development of a dialogue on the content" of the George Bush's initiative, noted Vladimir Petrovskiy. "There is a real chance today to break through toward a nuclear-free world, and it is our deep conviction that this chance must not be squandered", he stressed. In his opinion this initiative will have great influence on other directions for disarmament as well, including chemical and conventional weapons.

Answering a question about the possibility of a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, Vladimir Petrovskiy recalled that de facto the Soviet Union is not carrying out any tests. "Why couldn't the other side interpret that as a policy which shows a good example?", he said.

In conclusion, Vladimir Petrovskiy stated that during talks with the United States, the position of the USSR will be coordinated with the republics, something which has, in effect, become the actual practice of the All-Union Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Karpov Urges U.S. Test Ban Support

*AU3009105991 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German
30 Sep 91 pp 1-2*

[Vladimir Markov report from Moscow: "Moscow, Too, Is Ready for Disarmament"]

[Text] Moscow— U.S. President George Bush's latest disarmament initiative fell on fertile soil in Moscow. Viktor Karpov, Soviet deputy foreign minister and former USSR chief negotiator at the Geneva disarmament talks, said in an interview with DIE PRESSE that the USSR is willing to start consultations and negotiations with the United States.

In addition, he announced that the Soviet strategic bombers' state of alert would be reduced—as had already been ordered by President Bush for U.S. bombers. The security and disarmament expert assessed Bush's initiative as an important step toward creating a qualitatively new and lasting basis for relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This initiative and Mikhail Gorbachev's positive reaction to it deals with the transition from the policy of confrontation and containment to normal cooperation between the two superpowers.

Karpov welcomes Bush's decision to eliminate all U.S. nuclear short-range missiles all over the world. This is particularly urgent in view of topical developments in the Soviet Union, where these weapons systems are widely

distributed in the Armed Forces. Moscow has long advocated the elimination of all tactical nuclear weapons.

According to Karpov, it is desirable to reduce not only Soviet and U.S. stocks, but also the arsenals of other nuclear powers. "Consultations and negotiations between the USSR and the United States are necessary to coordinate the implementation of the disarmament and arms control measures that have been announced and of other measures and to avoid misunderstandings," Karpov said.

As a result, the Soviet diplomat and disarmament expert added, the standpoints of Moscow and Washington now concur concerning the issue of eliminating sea-based tactical nuclear weapons.

The reduction of the state of alert of strategic bombers of the United States and the Soviet Union introduces a new element in the relations of both states and will have a very positive effect as regards further detente, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Karpov told *DIE PRESSE*.

The question of strategic missiles, which was also broached in Bush's initiative, is a bit more complicated. This involves partly the fulfillment of the treaty regulations of the START agreement, which was concluded last July, and partly more far-reaching structural changes in the strategic forces. The latter requires additional negotiations.

Therefore, according to Karpov, Moscow proposes the start of bilateral talks on this subject before the ratification of the START agreement. A new round of consultations, which should serve, among other things, the consolidation of strategic stability, could start as early as at the beginning of October.

According to Karpov, the Soviet Union also wants to take up Bush's offer for negotiations on technical cooperation in storing, transportation, disassembly, and destruction of nuclear warheads.

Like Mikhail Gorbachev in his first comment on Bush's initiative, Karpov pointed to the need to put the question of a comprehensive stop to nuclear testing on the agenda. Unfortunately, this problem was not mentioned in the U.S. initiative, he remarked.

All Soviet nuclear testes were ceased more than a year ago. "U.S. readiness to stop nuclear tests together with us would decisively reduce their importance for modern arsenals," Karpov stated.

In this connection, the Soviet deputy foreign minister spoke about the concurrence achieved now between Russia, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, and Belorussia that all nuclear weapons stationed on their territories must remain under the strict control of the central power. A splitting of the Soviet nuclear forces would be disastrous, Karpov said.

At the same time, however, these republics must have the right to have their say as regards nuclear weapons. However, this does not mean in any case that the republics are to get the right to use nuclear weapons independently.

General Staff's Omelichev Comments

*LD3009195691 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT
30 Sep 91*

[By TASS correspondent Andrei Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow, September 30 (TASS)—"The General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces has positively received the initiative for nuclear arms reduction, which was launched by U.S. President George Bush last Friday," Colonel-General Bronislav Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR General Staff, told TASS.

At the same time, he recalled that "a similar initiative was put forward by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev back in January 1986. It contained, in part, the well-known programme to work towards a nuclear-free world by the year 2000. One should evidently speak today about how the existing proposals can be combined to begin a real movement in this direction." Omelichev said the General Staff is already looking for suitable measures to complement the U.S. initiative.

Omelichev said tactical nuclear weapons were and remain to be deployed on the territory of several Union republics. Speaking about the possibility of their unsanctioned use, he emphasised "the existing nuclear control system rules this out." As for the union republics that declared state sovereignty, "troop withdrawals from their territories, to be regulated by respective treaties, will be carried out in parallel with the withdrawal of battlefield nuclear weapons," Omelichev said.

He clarified that weapons located on the territory of some or other republic are not that republic's property. "This is the property of the Armed Forces and them alone. Only the Defence Ministry has the right to control tactical or any other nuclear weapons. Naturally, by the decision of the supreme state leadership," Omelichev said.

Commenting on reports about U.S. planned steps to lower the level of its strategic nuclear weapons' operational standby, Omelichev said the Soviet side is considering appropriate reciprocal actions. He said a positive answer could be given to some aspects of the proposals even now. "Say, if the U.S. removes strategic bombers from operational standby, we are ready to decommission our heavy bombers, which represents an adequate step."

As for intercontinental ballistic missiles, Omelichev believes it would be more appropriate to consider this issue within the framework of the talks on strategic stability. True, this purely technical issue "will require a thorough study", Omelichev stressed.

Post-Putsch Timing Contemplated

*PM0110104891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Oct 91 Single Edition p 5*

[Yevgeniy Shashkov article under the "My Opinion" rubric: "Magic Wand for Whom?"]

[Text] Strike while Gorbachev is hot! That, paraphrasing the well-known saying, is how I would characterize G.

Bush's latest disarmament initiative. In a television address to the nation, the U.S. President announced his decision to eliminate in all countries of the world U.S. land-based tactical nuclear weapons based there.

The United States will also remove all tactical nuclear arms from surface ships, attack submarines, and land-based naval aircraft. The U.S. President called on the USSR to act in the same way. G. Bush also proposed to begin cooperation with the USSR in three spheres: technical cooperation on the safe and economically [as published] responsible storage, transportation, dismantling, and destruction of nuclear warheads; cooperation in ensuring the security of nuclear arms; and, last, the formulation of measures to ensure additional protection against unsanctioned or accidental use of nuclear weapons.

As is usual among real allies, G. Bush held preliminary consultations on these problems with the leaders of leading Western countries, and in particular he took account of the valuable advice of Prime Minister Major, President Mitterrand, and Chancellor Kohl. No such preliminary consultations were held with our president, unless you count a letter and telephone call from Bush a few hours before the announcement of the peace initiative. Nonetheless M. Gorbachev immediately described it as positive, and as promising substantial progress toward a nuclear-free world. Although those who saw his television interview on Saturday could not fail to observe that our president was "hedging" on the concrete details of the Bush plan. But you can understand the leader of the center: Disarmament topics are for him a kind of "magic wand"—an opportunity to tackle a concrete task in conditions where the center's other functions are increasingly evaporating. What is surprising is something else: There was also instant approval from other politicians, including republic figures.

Undeniably, the destruction of nuclear weapons, the desire for a nuclear-free world—all this deserves support. But why, today, when the country lacks elementary civil peace, when people are dying every day in the hot spots and society is on the brink of economic disaster, has no state figure stated outright that what we expect today from the United States, and from the West in general, is not so much disarmament initiatives as proposals of a very different kind. On the eve of a cold and hungry winter, how can the most important thing for us be technical assistance from the Americans in dismantling and destroying nuclear warheads, or an agreement on the joint creation and deployment of a nonnuclear antimissile defense system?

Maybe the Americans have agreed to finance, for free, the disarmament process in our country? Nothing of the kind. At the moment, every new disarmament agreement means more and more black holes in our budget.

In my view the United States, Britain, and France (these last two countries have also put forward proposals analogous to the Americans') and other leading Western states have come to the conclusion that tactical nuclear weapons have fulfilled the functions assigned to them during the period of the "cold war" and East-West confrontation. What need, for instance, does France have today for Hades

land-based missiles? At best they could only reach Wuerzburg or Prague. The same applies, in general, to U.S. nuclear shells and land-based tactical missiles.

But was that the only reason why the West put forward its disarmament initiative? I think not. After the initial euphoria prompted by the abortive putsch in the USSR, the West suddenly, finally, realized that the Union in its previous form no longer exists, the center is "evaporating," and therefore there will soon be nobody who is fully accountable for the fate of 27,000 Soviet nuclear warheads. Learning from the bitter experience of the bloody disintegration of Yugoslavia, where neither the United States nor the EC states could prevent interethnic carnage, the West became seriously concerned: God forbid that nuclear weapons be brought into play in a similar conflict in the USSR. After all, in the Union, there are such weapons not only on the territory of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Kazakhstan, but also in virtually all the other republics. I am talking about air defense anti-aircraft missiles with nuclear warheads, nuclear artillery shells, and other types of tactical nuclear weapons. It is virtually impossible to monitor [prokontrolirovat] their transportation, and orders concerning their use may be given at the level of divisional commanders.

All this made the French president, even before G. Bush's initiative, call for the convening of a meeting of representatives of Europe's nuclear powers with U.S. participation, in order to "guarantee the continent's security." In short, it is primarily a question of a pragmatic approach on the part of Western countries, with a view to safeguarding themselves against unforeseen consequences of the disintegration of the Union, and only after that is it a question of concern for a nuclear-free world. If that was the point at issue, Bush should also have called for a general ban on nuclear tests, but he did not do this.

Bush's television address did not touch on other topics apart from the disarmament theme. Nonetheless I would not be surprised if, at the conference of nuclear powers of Europe and the United States to be held before the end of this year, the granting of Western economic and technical aid to our country is made conditional on the satisfactory resolution of the nuclear problem. The United States is in a hurry, because G. Bush apparently believes that a full-scale nuclear deal is possible only with the center, with Gorbachev. Any delay could mean that nuclear weapons, including tactical weapons, could become a contentious problem at talks on the independence of sovereign republics. And that could result in nuclear disarmament talks having to be conducted not with the USSR, but with 15 or so independent nuclear states.

Such a prospect horrifies not only disarmament experts, but ordinary people in the Old World. That is why the entire West greeted G. Bush's September appeal euphorically. People there are confident that the U.S. President's plan is extremely attractive to us, since it presupposes the destruction of the nuclear shells and warheads which are scattered around the republics, and that will prevent them from falling into the wrong hands in a period of civil war in our country...

That is what U.S. ABC television said. Well, thanks anyway.

By all appearances, under the same old cloak of talk about a nuclear-free world, the Bush initiative will be wholly accepted by us, without even any substantial preliminary conditions. If that happens, we will be left with a single, but very powerful move in reserve, a move that was proposed by my colleagues on the weekly KOMMERSANT back in the summer, after the signing of the START Treaty. In token of our eternal commitment to panhuman values and the absence of any national interests of our own, and in return for the bronze ensemble of eight ducklings and a duck that was shipped from the United States and installed alongside the Novodevichiy Monastery, representing a generalized image of American fairy tales, we should offer the Americans a statue of Ivan the Fool, the hero of Russian fairy tales. It could be set up near the Arlington Cemetery in Washington.

U.S. Fears Nuclear Arms in Ethnic Strife

PM0110084591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 1 Oct 91 p 5

["Our Commentary" by A. Vasilyev: "Bush Wants To Stay in the White House and Keep Gorbachev in the Kremlin"]

[Text] When the Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction Treaty was signed during the Soviet-U.S. summit at the end of July and beginning of August in Moscow, most experts did not think that the next arms talks would be held soon. They took too long reaching understanding on strategic offensive arms, the subject of tactical weapons was too complex, and there was no need to rush. Regional problems seemed more pressing. What has changed now? Why has G. Bush decided to submit his own initiative?

The failure of the military coup speeded up the disintegration process within the Soviet Union. The great nuclear power is breaking up into individual states and it is impossible to predict what relations will be like between these states and whether they will be able to resolve interstate problems peacefully. The United States is most concerned that nuclear weapons will be used in the event of such conflicts. Moreover, whereas strategic arms are located on the territory of the four most stable republics—Russia, Kazakhstan, Belorussia, and the Ukraine—and are, in all probability, under Moscow's tight control, tactical weapons are scattered throughout the Soviet Union and it is extremely hard to control [kontrolirovat] their movement since it is a question of tactical missiles and nuclear-tipped artillery shells. So the only means of securing the world against further Chernobyls is to destroy the tactical nuclear arms while they are still under the control of the central authorities. The White House obviously hopes that the Kremlin will not be overlyfussy about details in the situation that has taken shape and that the talks will be extremely vigorous. What is more, M.S. Gorbachev can be expected to submit his own proposals shortly which will be even more radical and portentous than G. Bush's initiative. At yesterday's news conference,

for instance, V. Petrovskiy, USSR first deputy foreign minister, already suggested banning nuclear weapons tests.

George Bush very much wants Mikhail Gorbachev to stay in the Kremlin for some time to come. First, it is easier to reach agreement with him on disarmament matters than with the leaders of individual republics who think that it is hardly advisable to disarm ahead of impending interethnic conflicts. Second, it is easier to "wipe out" regional problems with Gorbachev.

One more point: The White House is afraid of being left face-to-face with Boris Yeltsin. Needless to say, Yeltsin has won tremendous prestige throughout the world because of his behavior during the putsch. But it is interesting that a week after the victory over the junta Yankelovich's service conducted a public opinion poll in the United States commissioned by TIME and CNN-TV. The list of questions included the following: What squares more with U.S. national interests—for Gorbachev or Yeltsin to head the Soviet leadership? Some 53 percent of respondents favored Gorbachev, while 22 percent favored Yeltsin. The more predictable "Gorby" is still dearer to the average American than the stormy "Boris," whose statement regarding the possibility of reviewing borders between the republics frightened the West as much as the notorious State Committee for the State of Emergency.

In early September ABC-TV organized a live interview with Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin simultaneously. Americans were conscious of the difference between them: The former spoke of the need for cooperation between the republics and for new relations between them and the center, while the latter pressed for Russian interests. The revival of the idea of "mighty Rus" alarms the West because people there are convinced that democracy is the destiny of satisfied, successful peoples. Russia is "not threatened" with that in the near future, but for that reason the "Russian idea" may easily degenerate into Russian nationalism. It was not for nothing that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker warned Cabinet members a month ago at a White House conference that "nationalism may turn into fascism. If they descend into fascism or go back to Communism, it will be our fault."

Apart from the situation in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations there are also other intra-American reasons why G. Bush decided to submit another initiative. The point is that there will be presidential elections in the United States in a year which G. Bush intends to win. Foreign policy has hitherto been his hobbyhorse and U.S. domestic problems his weak point. In a year G. Bush's role in the victory over Saddam Husayn will have lost its luster and the Democrats will try to pin responsibility on him for the interethnic conflicts in the collapsing Soviet Union. People in the White House are perfectly well aware that mediating in these conflicts is more costly, but they cannot as it were be dodged. G. Bush has now gotten a chance to say that the administration is not renouncing involvement in resolving these problems, while vigorously advocating cuts in tactical nuclear weapons that may be used in interethnic clashes.

USSR To Meet Arms Initiative Halfway

LD3009163891 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1310 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Announcer-read commentary by Colonel Vadim Solovyev]

[Text] The initiative of President Bush of the United States to bring about nuclear disarmament, an initiative which Mr. Gorbachev and other government figures have supported, has evoked a broad response from the Soviet public and the military. Let's listen to our military observer Colonel Vadim Solovyev.

[Solovyev, in Russian with superimposed English translation] The proposals of the American President, as I see it, are fully in keeping with the very logic of years of reduction in American and Soviet strategic arsenals. Obviously, the grown trust for this country's disarmament policy, especially after the August events, has played the key role. Mr. Bush has vast areas of nuclear weapons in mind. The United States is ready to pull out tactical nuclear weapons from Europe and other regions around the world and to scrap them. It suggests getting rid of all tactical nuclear missiles, including cruises, aboard surface vessels and submarines, and ground-based, carrier-borne aviation. Besides, the intercontinental ballistic missiles liable for scrapping under the Soviet-American treaty for cuts in strategic offensive weapons are removed from combat duty. Talks are to take place to eliminate all nuclear MIRV [multiple independently targeted reentry vehicle] missiles.

The United States, however, is making a reservation for some of its military programs. It says it intends to continue getting action on them, including the SDI, giving much worries to the Soviet Union even though America euphemistically refers to it as Star Wars. President Bush's proposals are winning support from his allies. Britain has already volunteered to get rid of nuclear shorter-range missiles and deny its navy nuclear depth charges. All this shows that trust is reaching a principally new level of nuclear disarmament. The previous agreements to limit and reduce strategic offensive weapons took decades to shape, but from now on questions of this kind will be probably solved quickly enough by unilateral initiative.

In fact, what the U.S. President has proposed the Soviet side has repeatedly proposed at a negotiating table. This country is in favor of reducing and eliminating all strategic weapons. It wants to rid the world of all nuclear weapons. As the first step in this direction it believes all weapons of mass annihilation must stop being tested and produced. And I'd like to give you just one example. In 1985 the Soviet Union set a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests and was urging the other nuclear powers to do the same. Then it repeatedly extended the moratorium even though no response followed. Can the Soviet Union ignore the American proposals? An exclusively positive attitude has already been expressed by President Gorbachev and Defense Minister Shaposhnikov. When the proposals are studied in detail the USSR will undoubtedly meet them halfway.

Levin: New Approach to Disarmament

LD3009121891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 0930 GMT 29 Sep 91

[from the "Mayak Panorama" program presented by Lidiya Podolnaya, with "observer" Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Text] [Podolnaya] We will devote the next five minutes to the U.S. disarmament initiative. The essence of this initiative is a radical reduction of nuclear potential. The United States is ready to take these radical measures unilaterally, though it calls on the Soviet Union, in the first place, to follow its example. Viktor Nikolayevich, let us leave the technical side of the matter to military specialists, and let us talk about the political aspect of what has happened.

[Levin] In the first place, it seems to me, it is necessary to say that confidence in the Soviet Union, as the second largest nuclear power, affected this decision by U.S. President Bush. In the past there was a long dispute. The United States would say: First confidence, then disarmament. We, not very eager to step on a road of concrete disarmament, would say: No, first disarmament, then confidence. At last this scholastic argument is over, and now we can see that confidence gives such wonderful fruits. And confidence ensures security. As a matter of fact, the United States has reduced the possibility of an attack on the Soviet Union. Because of this, our security increases. So, confidence ensures security more safely than armaments.

And yet another feature. The elimination of tactical nuclear weapons is also saving huge amounts of money. Consequently, confidence not only ensures security more safely, it is also very important in our current conditions in that it saves money.

[Podolnaya] They might have used our weakness, however, mightn't they, if one judges by past stereotypes.

[Levin] By stereotypes of those who appropriated the name of patriots, the Americans should have conquered us a long time ago. But for some reason they are doing everything possible to ensure that the situation in the Soviet Union stabilizes, and that we solve our internal problems while they make the external situation more favorable.

[Podolnaya] Let us go back to the initiative. The U.S. President stressed the importance of the treaty on strategic offensive weapons, signed in July this year in Moscow, and pointed to the need for its speedy ratification.

[Levin] Of course, this treaty is very important. But in connection with this treaty I would like to remind our listeners that it took more than 10 years to finalize. The text itself and various appendices occupy nearly 1,000 pages. At the very last stage fierce arguments were still going on in the search for a balance of interests. The most complicated technical problems were being resolved and, it seems, one can be bogged down in such technical problems for a long time. The balance was found and the decision made. I remember one day Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, who was the foreign minister at the

time, said: I think this is the last treaty of its kind. From my point of view, he turned out to be a prophet in this particular case. There will be no other such treaty. The START treaty is a wonderful agreement, but of a different era, the confrontation era, when each side carefully adjusted all parameters in order not to lose. And now Bush, by a single decision, changes the situation. By a single decision he liquidates a whole class of nuclear armaments and calls on the Soviet Union to follow his example. He himself has already made this decision. When we were taking unilateral measures we also called on the United States to do so. But what we are approaching now is a new approach in principle toward resolving disarmament problems.

[Podolnaya] What do you think of the assessment by Sununu, chief of staff at the White House, who stated that the initiative by President Bush is nothing else but the result of the putsch that the Soviet Union managed to crush.

[Levin] I think that Sununu is absolutely right. But for the August victory by democracy over those attempting the coup, there would be no talking about such an initiative. Moreover, I think that the START treaty would be under threat now that we know what the plotters wanted. They wanted to bring us back to the previous situation. They wanted to return us to confrontation in our relations with the United States in order to justify politically the exhausting, mad, and senseless arms race. They stood by this. Since the putsch was organized by the military-industrial complex, everything is now clear. I think that today, 40 days since the day the lads defending the Moscow "White House" died, I can rightly say that they gave their lives for our future in the full meaning of this word.

New Soviet-U.S. Confidence Cited

*PM0110113891 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 1 Oct 91 p 1*

[Aleksandr Golts "Commentary" column: "A Miracle Born of Confidence"]

[Text] U.S. President G. Bush has made a sensational statement. In the view of Pentagon chief R. Cheney, it constitutes the most radical change in U.S. nuclear doctrine since 1954. And so the United States intends unilaterally to eliminate the tactical nuclear arms deployed in Europe and the Far East. Tactical munitions on U.S. Navy ships will also be eliminated. Finally, the level of readiness of strategic offensive arms will be lowered. Other constructive initiatives have also been put forward.

I admit I had my doubts as to whether B. Yeltsin was right when he said a few weeks ago that the disarmament process will move more quickly now. I doubted it not because that turn of events would be contrary to common sense. It was simply that past experience had shown that common sense and the logic of military confrontation are incompatible. Take tactical weapons. This means missiles, aviation bombs, and artillery shells with a range of up to 1,000 km. At one time it was these weapons that were

supposed to halt the Soviet tank columns which NATO believed could surge forward from the GDR, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia into Western Europe.

But now the Soviet troops are leaving the East European countries. They will no longer be able to stage a surprise attack on NATO's combat formations. And weapons intended for this kind of "close-range" fighting have lost all meaning. Furthermore, it has become extremely dangerous to keep them.

All these appear to be cogent reasons for eliminating tactical nuclear weapons. But, while recognizing all this, the United States was until recently in no hurry to hold talks on the subject. Today, however, it is not only declaring readiness to eliminate an entire class of nuclear death. It is ready to encroach on naval arms—until recently the Pentagon's most untouchable deity.

Washington has taken this unusual step in the certainty that the Soviet Union will also do its part. And by all appearances it was not mistaken. What has happened? Where did the Americans get this certainty that their unilateral action would not be exploited to their detriment? The answer is simple: Genuine confidence has at long last sprung up between the USSR and the United States. This was stated frankly by White House Chief of Staff J. Sununu: The present initiative would have been impossible without the victory over the putschists.

...General C. Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, has just announced that on the president's orders the alert status of more than 400 ICBMs and 40 strategic bombers has been changed.

In my time I have visited the main U.S. strategic command centers in Washington, Nebraska, and Colorado. I have also been at ICBM launch positions. The Americans meticulously described the control procedures, the multiple duplication of commands using mutually independent computer systems. But even Pentagon computers make mistakes. Instances are known. And good heavens, I was shocked to see the familiar outlines of the Union on the computer screens at U.S. command centers. Henceforth nuclear confrontation, which still persists, is really beginning to lessen.

RSFSR Legislator Calls Bush Arms Initiative 'Compromise'

*LD0110112391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 0800 GMT 1 Oct 91*

[Report by correspondent Georgiy Sovtsov on remarks by Vladimir Lukin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet's international affairs committee, on U.S. President George Bush's disarmament initiatives; from the "Information-Analytical" program]

[Text] Vladimir Lukin called Bush's decision a compromise, since for a very long time the U.S. leadership refused to include cruise missiles and seaborne nuclear weapons in the package of agreements on arms limitation. In the given situation, we must not let slip the opportunity to respond

with our own initiatives, too. However, as the international affairs committee chairman pointed out, there are undoubtedly points that are worth discussing. For example, there are numerous warheads on strategic missiles, and greater reductions of them are envisaged for us, while leaving a considerable potential at sea with the United States. This point needs to be discussed. As for eliminating alert duties [boyevyye dezhurstva], this is what both our countries need. By doing this, we will calm world public opinion.

Lukin says the United States is extending a hand to us for a real alliance in the nuclear sphere and the strategic defense system. If we agree on this, we could be talking about creating a strategic defense system for the whole of mankind—that is, a situation will arise where we, together with the United States, Europe, and all democratic countries, will protect ourselves from people such as Saddam Husayn and others capable of destroying mankind Herotatus-fashion.

This chance must be used and used first in declaring nuclear-free republics within the former Union. While Russia is in favor of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, she is prepared temporarily to take on the obligations of a guarantor. Russia is also in favor of a stable situation over the question of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, since the world needs a guarantee against nuclear terrorism and nuclear madness.

There also arises a serious problem to which, incidentally, the United States has drawn attention: Who will ratify the START Treaty, under which the USSR's strategic missiles will be reduced by approximately 30-40 percent? Answer: The Soviet Union or, in other words, the USSR Supreme Soviet. However, this must include all the republics who have declared their sovereignty and who have nuclear weapons on their territory. Thus, there is a de jure recognition of the fact of the proliferation of nuclear weapons by our country, yet we must not let this happen. As Vladimir Lukin said, here we must be on a level of responsibility; otherwise, we may find ourselves in a serious position in the face of world opinion, a position into which we are so persistently striving to fall.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Special Verification Commission 11th Session Opens
LD2309190691 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT
23 Sep 91

[Text] Geneva, September 23 (TASS)—The Soviet-U.S. Special Verification Commission opened its 11th session here today.

The commission has been instituted in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-range Missiles.

The session will discuss the practical implementation of the treaty.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Easing E-W Military Tension Poses New Issues
PM2509105591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Sep 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by correspondent Colonel V. Markushin: "Central Europe: The Calm After the Storm Warnings"]

[Text] We can still recall the unique storm warnings which used to be published in our press from time to time. It is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish NATO exercises and maneuvers from the deployment of troops for real combat operations. That, essentially, is really how it was. The "Autumn Forge" maneuvers, say, sometimes involved around 800,000 servicemen and a huge amount of combat equipment and armaments. We sought to act commensurately in response, periodically turning the former GDR into a training ground. Now it seems that this mutual undue wariness is a thing of the past. Few people believe in the likelihood of a major military clash in Central Europe.

The opposing groupings stationed on the territory of a united German state have become an anachronism, a relic of the era of confrontation. The "actors and players" themselves have changed. The "East" has stopped referring in every preamble to the aggressive nature of NATO. The "West" has understood that the "Russians are not in the mood for tank dashes to the Channel."

"The USSR Armed Forces have become a thinking army, the likelihood of whose participation in offensive military operations has declined." This conclusion, drawn by Pentagon experts, it is to be supposed, has been noted by the military policymakers in the United States. And although the conclusion is not specially advertised, because of the military leadership's concern to keep a high military budget, cuts in the strength of the U.S. contingent in Germany have now started. It is planned to transfer two combat divisions of the 5th Army Corps to the United States in the next four years. Thus an armored division and a mechanized division, combined in the 7th Army Corps, will remain in the FRG.

The intentions of U.S. NATO allies to "cut back" clearly surplus troops in the FRG and send them home is even more serious. Take the British, for example: In the next four years they intend to return 36,000 servicemen of the Army of the Rhine to the British Isles. By the end of 1992 only 5,000 out of 23,000 Belgian officers and men will remain in the FRG. The Germans themselves are starting to implement their program to cut the Bundeswehr.

But there is another side to this. The desire to make up for lost quantity by higher quality prevails in NATO today. For instance, take the "Certain Shield" exercises. More than 28,000 servicemen will be involved in them this year. Back in 1987 more than 78,000 officers and men took part in a similar kind of exercise, and there were also around 700 tanks. This year there will be no tanks at all involved and the number of other combat vehicles and helicopters too will be sharply reduced. On the other hand, though,

there will be a sharp intensification of the intellectual work of the staff during the exercises. The accent will be on introducing new methods of electronic modeling in a combat situation.

It is also intended to consolidate this line in a special long-term plan for conducting computer exercises with the participation of the supreme organs of command of the North Atlantic alliance's allied forces. In general, as we see it, the style of military activity is starting to change. It is becoming more rational and less aggressive—a natural result of the East-West political rapprochement.

The development of dialogue on security issues and the deepening of contacts between NATO and former Warsaw Pact members are also a result of this rapprochement. And not just at the leadership level. The following example is instructive: In October the NATO command is for the first time inviting officers from the CSCE countries to attend a course in the bloc's higher educational establishments, including its leading college in Rome. Those invited include representatives of our country. The objective of the course is "to get a better knowledge of NATO and of the way the alliance is responding to the changes in the military-political situation in Europe."

The relaxation of military tension in the center of Europe is an indisputable fact. However, this process is not proceeding in a completely painless way. It is also generating the most unexpected problems. For example, a report prepared last month within the FRG Armed Forces Main Staff for the top military leadership gives a negative assessment of the morale and psychological climate in the Bundeswehr. It notes a "drop in the standard of organization of service, combat preparation, commitment, and coordination in military collectives." This, it is concluded, is bound up with a failure by officers and men to see the point of military service in today's conditions. Pacifism, it is to be supposed, will also make its presence felt in other NATO armies.

We clearly won't be immune to such problems either. Is the army capable of strenuous, selfless application without a clearly designated likely adversary? What is to fill the vacuum left in the place of the "burning hatred of imperialism" once fostered? These questions already confront us now and will continue to do so tomorrow. We are in no hurry with the answers as yet, supposing that everything will become clear of its own accord. Meanwhile the abandonment of the policy of confrontation between NATO and the USSR marks merely one milestone in the gradual establishment of a safe world. And it is still a long way from the calm which has set in in Central Europe to the complete victory of civilized values and reason. So we will have to seek answers to the questions facing us while at the same time protecting what has been achieved in the relaxation of military tension.

Soviet Officers Complete CSBM Inspection in France
LD2109042491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 20 Sep 91

[Text] Moscow, 20 September (TASS)—It is being officially reported here that a group of Soviet military inspectors has today completed its inspection of military activities in a specified area of French territory. The inspection

was carried out on the basis of the relevant articles in the Vienna document from the 1990 talks on confidence- and security-building measures [CSBM].

Soviet Officers Make CSBM Inspection at UK Unit in Germany

LD2209020691 Moscow TASS in English 2344 GMT 21 Sep 91

[Text] Moscow, September 22 (TASS)—It was officially announced here on Saturday that on September 16, in accordance with the provisions of the 1990 Vienna document and talks on confidence and security building measures [CSBM] in Europe, the Soviet side approached Britain and Germany with a request to check information on armed forces and plans for the deployment of the main systems of armaments and machinery in the 22nd Armour Brigade of the First Armour Division of Britain located in the town of Hohn, Germany.

The demand was met and on September 21, representatives of the Soviet Defence Ministry visited the indicated unit at the place of its permanent deployment to check on the conformity of the earlier received information with the real state of affairs.

Lithuania Seeks Prompt Withdrawal of Soviet Forces

Landsbergis Calls Withdrawal 'Main Political Task'
LD2509042991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2130 GMT 23 Sep 91

[Excerpt] We have achieved a lot and this is the basis for new immense tasks. What we have achieved is not all yet, said Chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis in yesterday's [22 September] address on Lithuanian TV.

He referred to the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lithuania as the main political task at present. The Soviet troops in Lithuania are believed to be 80,000 strong, a lot more than in Latvia and Estonia.

According to Vytautas Landsbergis, the Baltic countries will receive support from the international community in achieving a rapid withdrawal of Soviet troops. He said that 1994, named by the Kremlin at present as the term for pulling out Soviet troops, was absolutely unacceptable to Lithuania. [passage omitted]

Calls 1994 Start for Withdrawal 'Unrealistic'
OW2509200891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1945 GMT 25 Sep 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Excerpts] In an interview to a BALTFAX correspondent, the Chairman of Lithuanian parliament Vytautas Landsbergis said that Vilnius does not intend to sign the inter-republican economic agreement because it would amount to "Lithuania's continued existence among Soviet republics". Lithuania does not want to be part of a new Soviet Union in which there would still be "constraints emanating from some kind of renewed centre", he said. [passage omitted]

He dismissed as "unrealistic" the time—1994—proposed by Moscow for beginning the withdrawal of troops from Lithuania and stressed that Lithuania would not even discuss the issue since the Soviet military presence in the republic is utterly illegal and unacceptable. "The only questions we are going to discuss during negotiations are the procedure and methods of the troop pullout", he said.

"The time frame for the pullout of troops is a test of the Soviet Union's goodwill", Mr Landsbergis maintained. "When there was ill will, it took the army two days (in 1940.—"BF") to move into Lithuania. So, why can't the army be withdrawn in a matter of two weeks or two months, if there is goodwill?" [passage omitted]

Unsure on Nuclear Weapon Deployment

LD3009130691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International
Service in Lithuanian 0200 GMT 29 Sep 91

[By correspondent Audrius Matonis]

[Excerpts] Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis reported on his visit to Copenhagen, the capital of Denmark, at a Supreme Council news conference yesterday [28 September]. He also spoke about visiting Riga on the way home, which lasted several hours. [passage omitted]

"First of all, however, Lithuania must know how many and what kind of Soviet troops are deployed here. This is necessary both for ensuring people's safety and for carrying out world commitments. It is necessary to know if it is true that nuclear weapons are not deployed in Lithuania. The same can be said about chemical, bacteriological, or any other type of weapons. Besides, it may happen that to carry out an efficient and undelayed control of such weapons, specialists or technical equipment will not be available here in Lithuania. In this case, special help from other countries might be needed." [passage omitted]

Insists on Troops Leaving by New Year

OW3009221391 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1550 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuanian Parliament Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis insists that the bulk of the Soviet armed forces stationed in Lithuania should leave the republic before the New Year. "We demand that the troops be withdrawn and we are not going to discuss the issue with the Soviet side," he stressed speaking on Lithuanian television yesterday. "If we fail to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union on the immediate withdrawal of its troops, we shall have to repeat our demand and even resort to pressure," he said.

He refused to accept the Soviet Government's reason for the delay, namely that the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Lithuania had to be postponed until the Soviet Union withdrew its troops from Eastern Europe and Germany, since this naturally involved serious problems for it, such as the provision of accommodation and employment or the servicemen and their families.

"The Soviet Union is trying to make us solve its problems for it. These problems should be solved by those who have created them, even though they may have done this fifty years ago," concluded Mr Landsbergis.

Plans for Air Defense Forces Withdrawal Under Way

OW0110012491 Moscow BALTFAX in English
2015 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A commission dealing with matters pertaining to the withdrawal of Soviet anti-aircraft units from Lithuania is to start work in the republic this week.

At the end of last week, the commander-in-chief of the Soviet Anti-Aircraft Forces, Anatoliy Ivanov, and other Soviet generals met Lithuanian Vice-Premier Zigmas Vaisvila in Vilnius. They discussed the transfer of buildings and equipment belonging to the anti-aircraft units stationed in Lithuania to the relevant defence structures now being formed in the republic.

Defense Minister on Withdrawal From Baltics, Moldova

PM2409094591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 24 Sep 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by Major A. Yegorov and correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Dokuchayev: "USSR Defense Minister's Press Conference"]

[Excerpts] On 20 September in the USSR Foreign Ministry press center, Aviation Marshal Ye. Shaposhnikov answered questions from Soviet and foreign journalists concerning a very broad spectrum of defense problems: from nuclear weapons tests to the military budget to the democratization of relations in the army.

The defense minister answered your KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent's questions: [passage omitted]

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] The Baltic republics and Moldova are insisting on the speediest and complete withdrawal of units and formations deployed on their territories. Within what deadline can this withdrawal be effected and will it not be like the withdrawal of troops from the East European countries—to places unprepared for service and living?

[Shaposhnikov] The question of the withdrawal of troops from the Baltic is a legitimate one. But I would not like to begin it before 1994 because we shall be engaged in the withdrawal of troops from East Europe. The deadline for withdrawal will be determined by an interstate agreement. As for Moldova, so far it does not have the same status as the Baltic republics.

Soviet Commander in Germany on Troop Pullout

Commander Interviewed

AU2709142991 Hamburg DIE WELT in German
27 Sep 91 p 6

[Interview with Colonel General Matvey Burlakov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Soviet Forces,

WGSF, by Peter Schmalz; place and date not given; "The People Have a Very Good Attitude Toward Us"]

[Text] [Schmalz] General, how is the situation of the Soviet soldiers and civilian employees in Germany? How is the relationship with the German people? Where are the problems?

[Burlakov] First of all, I would like to say something about history. The Western Group was formed in 1945 after the victory of the Soviet people in World War II. The best units and forces that fought at the end of this world war form the basis of the Western Group; most troops are guards troops. After the unification of Germany we were afraid to a certain extent for the fate of our troops. The evil enemy image hovered above us for a long time, and we had been infected by it. However, now I can say that the people have a very good attitude toward us, and I would like to stress especially that this also applies to the people from the western part of Germany. We feel that the local population looks on us with respect. This positive attitude can be felt at all levels, from the leaders of Germany to those of the laender and to the simple German people. This cooperation also extends to supplies with foodstuffs, coal, and heating material.

The second element of our cooperation is the organization of combat training. Of course, the troops always create some noise and that entails problems for the local people. Therefore, we have limited combat training.

[Schmalz] Have plane exercises been reduced?

[Burlakov] We have set a minimum height for flight training of 600 meters. The third element of our cooperation is the withdrawal. Withdrawal of the troops is proceeding successfully, even though the way across the sea is rather complicated. But we are receiving help from the German authorities. Good cooperation has also developed with the Bundeswehr.

[Schmalz] This all sounds very positive. Where are the problems?

[Burlakov] In my view, the biggest problem is the disposition of our real estate. We have 777 military facilities on German territory. A total of 21,000 houses and buildings on these premises were built with Soviet money. Our financial experts estimate this property at 10.5 billion German marks.

[Schmalz] Do you have any hope that you will get the money?

[Burlakov] I hope so! This is a contentious issue, but I think that even if we do not get everything, we will get most of it.

[Schmalz] However, there is also a counter-estimate, namely that the elimination of environmental damage on the returned military premises costs a lot of money.

[Burlakov] I think that this is a political issue. Environmental protection must be calculated from 1941 to today. And then it is difficult to say who has to pay more to

whom. As regards our military facilities, we are putting everything in order. Of course, I cannot say that everything is ideally clean there, but we are trying to eliminate all the effects of our work.

[Schmalz] Do you want to take all ammunition back to the USSR or scrap part of it here?

[Burlakov] We had 780,000 tonnes of ammunition. Almost 400,000 tonnes of that have been removed so far.

[Schmalz] How about your schedule?

[Burlakov] We are now trying, above all, to remove the ammunition more quickly. You know that we have removed all nuclear weapons and now we are trying to remove the simple ammunition as quickly as possible. However, I would like to point to a serious problem: the increasing activities of various extremist forces against the Western Group. There are many such examples, and as the commander in chief I am worried that such excesses by the ultrarightists might lead to counteraction by our people. Recently a captain was killed, two of his comrades were beaten. The officers in this helicopter regiment were so outraged that they wanted to take countermeasures. We control the situation in the troops and restrain counteractions by the people.

[Schmalz] Do you fear spontaneous reactions by your soldiers?

[Burlakov] I am afraid that the patience of some people may be exhausted; therefore I turned to Defense Minister Stoltenberg with the request that the police protect us against such excesses.

[Schmalz] Do you see any problems in the treatment of deserters?

[Burlakov] This is certainly a problem, but not a particular one. Only very few soldiers desert. They do not worry us, they only bring shame for us. We are more worried about the fact that we miss those who have disappeared and we do not know whether they were killed or just disappeared. Our request to the German authorities is to give us some brief information when a deserter turns up in an asylum camp so that we do not have to look for him and do not need to bother the local population.

[Schmalz] How many deserters have you had?

[Burlakov] A bit more than 200.

[Schmalz] Back to the withdrawal: How is the mood of the troops and among the families?

[Burlakov] The mood of the withdrawing soldiers is not all alike. The conscripts return home with great joy. The officers who have an apartment at home are also content. The situation of those who do not have an apartment is complicated. These are 55,000 families in our forces.

[Schmalz] The FRG Government has allocated 7 billion German marks for the construction of apartments.

[Burlakov] This is correct. For part of these funds 3,000 apartments should be built this year. However, not a single one of these apartments has been finished so far. I can understand the worries of the families, in particular of the officers' wives, but I can hardly help them. Therefore, I would like to appeal once again to the German public to have the Soviet real estate in German assessed and then to use these resources for the construction of apartments in the Soviet Union.

[Schmalz] General, what do you feel personally? The Soviet Army once came as the victor. Now you are commander in chief of an army that is withdrawing as a result of international political developments.

[Burlakov] I think that the person who caused the new political thinking is our president. And we understand quite well that we will leave the foreign country, which we are doing now. Now there are also all conditions ready so that in the future we will cultivate good-neighborly relations in the fields of economy, social affairs, and in other areas. I am convinced that a command of the time is now being fulfilled. We have fulfilled our main task in Germany, namely to preserve peace on the European continent.

[Schmalz] What was the role of the Soviet forces in Germany during the explosive days of the attempted putsch?

[Burlakov] Your colleagues from the press would have had me removed from my post already once. Then I invited the television to this room here. The Supreme Command of the Western Group concentrated from the very beginning on fulfilling its constitutional duty. And I think that we did not give any sign of not acting or not being able to act properly.

[Schmalz] As a result of this putsch the republics have intensified their striving for independence. To what extent does this affect the way the Soviet Army understands its role?

[Burlakov] The military reform has been started just now, and the relations between the republics and the Army will then naturally be developed within the shortest possible period. The military reform will lead to setting down a mixed concept in the Army: a professional army on the one hand and, on the other, conscripts.

[Schmalz] You do not think that the proposals to establish a purely professional army will be successful?

[Burlakov] I think that this question is not topical at the moment. We will come to that a little later. Our next task will be to restructure the main Army organizations on the basis of a professional army. In the other technical areas of the Army, which are less important, the soldiers will do their military service.

[Schmalz] General, will the Soviet Army continue to fulfill defense tasks in the republics—in the Ukraine, for instance—or will the Soviet Army turn into a Russian Army at one time?

[Burlakov] I think that the Soviet Army will remain an international army, and as parts of this army the units of the Ukrainian and the Russian Army as well as the armies of the central Asian republics—that is, of all republics of the Union—will be integrated.

[Schmalz] The Soviet Army as a factor of stabilization?

[Burlakov] This is how I understand it.

[Schmalz] Does the Soviet Army have a serving function toward politics today?

[Burlakov] I am of the opinion that the Army cannot be a toy in the hands of the politicians and that the Army must fulfill its role, namely defending the state. The politicians must also understand that they must not force the Army to eliminate conflicts, including nationality conflicts.

[Schmalz] Which task have you assigned to the political officers in the Western Group?

[Burlakov] You know that the party structures in the Army and the military political organs have been abolished. Today the former political officers are subordinate to the respective commanders and have to do their service. Many of the officers who have served for quite some time are preparing for their discharge. The young political officers will undergo retraining as of October.

[Schmalz] General, will you be the last Soviet soldier to leave Germany? What will be your thoughts when you leave Germany?

[Burlakov] I cannot yet say with certainty that I will be the last soldier. I am making every effort so that the great work that is done by our officers will not be in vain and that we will leave many friends here in Germany when we withdraw.

Denies Presence of Nuclear Weapons

*LD3009231191 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT
30 Sep 91*

[By TASS correspondent Igor Osinskiy]

[Text] Berlin, September 30 (TASS)—Colonel-General Matvey Burlakov, the commander-in-chief of the Soviet Western Group of Forces, has refuted last week's report by the SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG newspaper that there are Soviet nuclear weapons on East German territory.

The newspaper referred to the information it allegedly received from Norbert Gansel, the chairman of the German Social Democratic Party parliamentary faction.

"I invite Mr. Gansel or his confidential person to visit any object of the Soviet western group of forces they like, to make sure that there are no Soviet nuclear weapons on territory of the former German Democratic Republic," says statement by General Burlakov, circulated here today.

The command of the Soviet Western Group of Forces expresses the hope that from now on the leadership of the Social Democratic Party of Germany will use verified and objective information, the statement notes.

Moldovan Premier, Soviet Commanders Discuss Troop Withdrawal

*PM3009113191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Sep 91 First Edition p 2*

[Report by Colonel N. Mulyar: "Troop Withdrawal Question Postponed"]

[Text] Kishinev—A meeting has been held between Moldovan Prime Minister V. Muravski and the leadership of the Odessa Military District and commanders of units located on the republic's territory.

The prime minister said that, despite the fact that Moldovan President M. Snegur issued a decree 3 September setting up Moldovan armed forces (paragraph three of the decree states: "Talks shall be initiated with the Soviet leadership in order to settle issues pertaining to the Soviet Army's withdrawal from Moldovan territory and its replacement by Moldovan armed forces formations"), they are not currently raising the question of a troop withdrawal, realizing that it would require considerable material expenditure and a lot of time. But work is underway in this direction.

It was also stated that officers who wish to remain in Moldova after their discharge to the reserve will, like other categories of the population, be granted citizenship and will not have their rights infringed.

The meeting also examined the question of the deteriorating situation in the Dnestr region. A request was made to the military not to interfere in the republic's internal affairs, to strictly observe the USSR defense minister's instructions on this issue, and to strengthen the guard over weapons so as to ensure that they do not fall into the population's hands.

SHORT-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES**Artillery Chief on Control of Tactical Nuclear Weapons**

*PM2509165591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Sep 91 Union Edition p 2*

[Report by V. Litovkin: "Who Holds the Keys to the Nuclear Button"; final two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA postscript]

[Text] It is a month today since USSR President M. Gorbachev came back to perform his duties. The 72 hours during which he was deprived of the "nuclear attache cases" and the chance of influencing the decision to use nuclear weapons have not been forgotten. And although high-ranking military men on both sides of the ocean have said on several occasions that there was no loss of control over the strategic nuclear forces, the alarm of those days has not passed.

What guarantee is there that this will not be repeated? Particularly as regards tactical nuclear weapons that may fall into the hands of extremist forces.

Commenting on French Defense Minister P. Joxe's stay in the USSR, Paris' LE MONDE noted that the West wants

to put an end to Soviet tactical nuclear weapons as rapidly as possible. Scattered across the Union in the hands of unreliable military leaders, they may become the object of political blackmail at such a stormy period, something that is fraught with unpredictable consequences. Nor is it reassuring that nuclear weapons will be moved to RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] territory.

In the opinion of France's LA CROIX, in the eyes of the West and its military specialists, the Soviet military threat is more real today than ever.

"There is no threat of unauthorized use of tactical nuclear weapons in our country," Marshal of Artillery V. Mikhalkin, chief of the Ground Forces Missile and Artillery Troops, said in a conversation with an IZVESTIYA correspondent. "Like strategic weapons they can only be brought into operation with the authorization of the country's top leadership."

What are tactical nuclear weapons? Special warheads for the "Tochka" missile complex in the arsenal of a motorized rifle or tank division's individual missile battalion, special ammunition for heavy long-range artillery, whose units form part of the Supreme High Command reserve.

Marshal of Artillery Mikhalkin claims that nuclear munitions, including warheads, are stored separately from their means of use and delivery systems. That is, some units have weapons and guns while others have arsenals and dumps. They even come under the jurisdiction of different bosses. The safety system for these weapons, formidable in terms of their destructive might, is structured in such a way as to ensure that no one can use them without the knowledge of the country's top leadership.

"In order to replace a missile's conventional warhead with a special warhead," Vladimir Mikhaylovich said, "you have to dial a special figure or code both on the launcher and on the warhead. Even I don't know this code," the marshal said.

He also ruled out the possibility of these warheads being seized by extremists, much less by maintenance personnel.

"First, our people work there in groups," Mikhalkin explained, "groups of several proven, highly reliable people. Second, and I have already said this, the system's technical design does not even allow a specialist who does not have the key to the code to operate it."

There are no reasons to doubt the artillery marshal's sincerity or that of other professionals in this sphere who told me virtually the same thing. At the most diverse levels.

But this idea occurs to me: Words today are not the most convincing argument to reassure public opinion. Other steps are needed. Today we are not only worried by the possibility of unauthorized use of tactical nuclear weapons but also by access to them. Who, what forces, have their hand on the nuclear button?

We still do not know the clear, unequivocal answer. One may assume that previously it was members of the USSR

Defense Council, headed by the president, although a complete list of this council's members was never published. Who is a member of it now? Does the membership of the Defense Council coincide with the membership of the State Council? And if not, who is and is not a member of it? What role do the "nuclear" and "nonnuclear" republics and their leaders play in it?

All these are by no means idle questions and they are not being asked out of idle curiosity. If we are building a civilized rule-of-law state, we should have no secrets that alarm not only the country but also the world.

IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked the questions raised in this article at a press conference given by USSR Defense Minister Ye. Shaposhnikov on the evening of 20 September at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center.

The marshal of aviation said that the USSR Defense Council does not exist now, but he thinks that it should be set up and must include representatives of those republics on whose territory nuclear weapons are stationed.

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS Reports Nuclear Test in Nevada

*LD2009125291 Moscow TASS in English
1148 GMT 20 Sep 91*

[Text] San Francisco, September 20 (TASS)—The United States on Thursday conducted a nuclear test at the Nevada test range. Energy Department spokesman Jim Boyer said the blast measured below 20 kilotons. The test was carried out on the order of an atomic laboratory in Los Alamos to study the impact of radiation on various military equipment.

This has been the sixth announced nuclear test explosion at the Nevada test range this year. An underground nuclear blast with an yield of up to 150 kilotons was staged there six days ago.

Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Range To Open for Reporters

LD0110114891 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English

[Text] The Soviet Union will open up its nuclear testing range in Semipalatinsk for local and foreign reporters for one week as of 14 October. The (?leaders of nuclear powers), scientists, and businessmen were also invited to attend the site closed a month ago. The visitors will, for the first time, be shown around the country's sensitive underground installations and archives. This move is designed to attract attention by businessmen to the problems of the site with its unique capabilities in science and technology accumulated over the years.

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES & PEACE ZONES

Belarusan Foreign Minister on Desire for NFZ

*LD2809040891 Moscow TASS in English
1659 GMT 27 Sep 91*

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Excerpts] United Nations, September 27 (TASS)—Addressing the 46th U.N. General Assembly session here on Thursday [26 September], Belarusan Foreign Minister Petr Kravchenko outlined guidelines in the Belarusan Republic's foreign policy. [passage omitted]

Kravchenko drew attention to the need to turn Belarus into a nuclear-free zone [NFZ] and a neutral state. "The future of the nuclear potential on Belarusan territory—its use, deployment or re-deployment and control over it—can and should be decided only with the direct involvement of Belarus rather than behind its back. This also applies to any other components of the military potential on our territory," he said. [passage omitted]

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

NATO Unanimously Supports Bush Arms Initiative*AU2809162591 Paris AFP in English 1603 GMT
28 Sep 91*

[Text] Brussels, September 28 (AFP) - Ambassadors of NATO countries gave unanimous support here Saturday to the new U.S. nuclear arms reduction initiative announced on Friday, and called on the Soviet Union to match it.

The ambassadors said in a statement that the initiative announced by President George Bush was "a historic step towards enhanced security and stability at lower levels of nuclear weapons."

They issued the statement after a meeting of the North Atlantic Council, the diplomatic wing of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), which was called to hear a briefing on the initiative by U.S. Ambassador William Taft.

The statement said the U.S. move was consistent with the transformation of NATO heralded at a leadership summit last year, in which the alliance announced the end of the Cold War and the start of a wide-ranging strategy review.

The U.S. initiative included the elimination of 700 short-range nuclear missiles and 1,500 nuclear shells deployed by the United States in Europe as part of the NATO force.

The current NATO strategy review includes a lower dependence on nuclear arms. It is scheduled to be revealed at the next NATO leadership summit, in Rome in November.

AUSTRIA

Bush Weapons Proposal Called 'Courageous Step'*AU2809193191 Vienna ORF Television Network
in German 1730 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Commentary by ORF journalist Hugo Portisch in the television studio—live]

[Text] [Announcer] The U.S. disarmament initiative has been welcomed worldwide. FRG Chancellor Kohl spoke of a decision of historic proportions. Great Britain has announced disarmament steps of its own. France, which has always assumed a special role in this sphere, advocates an early meeting of the four European nuclear powers—the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. Despite the planned withdrawal of nuclear weapons, a considerable arsenal will continue to exist. Dr Hugo Portisch assesses the U.S. initiative.

[Portisch] I believe that things must be seen in the proper context. Various views have been expressed. As President Bush stated, his initiative became possible because of the far-reaching changes in Europe, because of the withdrawal of the Soviet Army from central and Eastern Europe to Soviet territory, and because of the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. Thus, surprise attacks on Western Europe are no longer possible. Such attacks can be ruled out from a militarily viewpoint. However, the weapons systems

whose removal President Bush has announced were exclusively designed to ward off surprise attacks. Nuclear artillery was deployed for battles on the spot, short-range missiles were intended to hit supply forces, and intermediate-range missiles were designed to strike marshalling areas behind such offensives.

All of that is no longer necessary. In other words, President Bush plans to scrap weapons system that he no longer needs, that the whole West no longer needs. Still, it is a courageous step because we know that generals and weapons experts are generally opposed to such measures. They want to maintain the theory of a possible threat as long as possible, and they usually stress that the other side must take the first step, and that negotiations—extending over several years in this case—are required. Bush has now announced a step without awaiting the outcome of talks. It is a very important initiative.

There is also another side—the Soviet side. The Soviets, too, no longer need the nuclear weapons. They have withdrawn their Army. In the Soviet Union, too, the use of artillery, short-range missiles, and cruise missiles would be restricted to direct battles with the opponent. However, in August, when a coup was staged in the Soviet Union, it became apparent how dangerous such an arsenal may become. It became frighteningly clear that, if one part of the Soviet Army had fought against another, or if one republic should fight against another in the future, the arsenals—artillery, short-range missiles, and cruise missiles—might be used in a civil war. That is not only a scary scenario for the Soviet Union, but it is naturally also frightening for neighboring Europe. Just think of Chernobyl and the nuclear cloud that moved across Europe. The danger would be all the greater if a nuclear civil war should break out in the Soviet Union.

I believe that President Bush's initiative is particularly valuable in that respect. It makes it possible for Gorbachev, Yeltsin, and the other responsible politicians to tell their military officials and the individual republics, without losing face, that the removal of such weapons from the arsenals and scrapping them has become an international obligation because the other side no longer possesses such weapons. No Soviet general and no weapons expert in the Soviet Union can any longer claim that the Soviet Union still needs the weapons because the other side possesses them as well. For that reason, this initiative is particularly valuable for the Soviet side.

As we know, the big threat continues to exist: The heavy intercontinental missiles still exist. However, in that sphere, too, President Bush linked his initiative with an offer. Let us negotiate those weapons as well, let us advance disarmament talks in the sphere of long-range missiles, of intercontinental missiles, he suggested. Let us reverse the situation. Let us develop a common defense policy out of the mutual threat—not only against each other, but also against the numerous small countries that might have nuclear weapons in the near future, Bush proposed. In Iraq we have seen how fast it can happen. Thus, the U.S. initiative also represents an offer for joint action in a new world order.

Commentary: Bush Initiative 'Bold Gesture'

AU2909155691 Vienna NEUE KRONEN-ZEITUNG
in German 29 Sep 91 p 2

[Ernst Trost commentary: "The Bold Gesture"]

[Text] The cold war was declared over a long time ago, but thousands of U.S. pilots and submarine crews continued to wage that war. Until Saturday [28 September], some of the men of the Strategic Air Command and of the Polaris submarines were constantly on the alert—in the air, on land, and under water—to be able to respond to a Soviet nuclear attack within a few minutes. Within the framework of his comprehensive disarmament initiative, President Bush has lifted that state of alert. At the same time he ordered the scrapping of all tactical nuclear missiles.

Bush reacted to the changed world situation with a bold gesture. What was not possible in the past without years of tough haggling over every individual warhead has suddenly been realized through a single unilateral decision. The vast number of short-range missiles, artillery systems, and other destructive weapons were mainly designed to stop a Soviet tank invasion in Europe. That dangerous stuff has now become superfluous. The world will be more secure once the arsenal is scrapped.

The U.S. initiative will not remove all nuclear weapons from the globe, however, but a reduced number of intercontinental missiles will also ensure deterrence. It will be much more important in the future to keep all the small potential owners of nuclear weapons under control and to develop efficient defense systems that can be used worldwide.

Bush Seen Exchanging Deterrence for Confidence

AU3009100191 Vienna DER STANDARD in German
30 Sep 91 p 24

[Georg Possanner article: "Historic Chance"]

[Text] With a single television speech, George Bush unexpectedly banished the United States' and NATO's defense strategy into the archives of military historians. He is not relying on deterrence any more, but on confidence in the relationship with the new Soviet Union.

That is what the discontinuation of the round-the-clock combat readiness of parts of the strategic bomber fleet, which was ordered more than three decades ago, means. The one-sided elimination of all theater nuclear weapons marks the end of the doctrine that constituted the sword of Damocles of a nuclear counterstrike hanging over any possible Soviet aggressive plans in Europe.

The concept of "flexible response" was based on the Warsaw Pact's considerable conventional superiority. That is why NATO always rejected the Soviet Union's repeated demand that tactical nuclear weapons be reduced. Now that the pact has been disbanded, and the Soviet troops are withdrawing from central Europe, it is hard to defend further deployments.

Following the failed putsch in the Soviet Union, President Bush saw and used an historic opportunity. The economic need in the Soviet Union and the concern that in the wake of ethnic conflicts, such weapons could get into the wrong hands, demonstrate a certain harmony of interests between Washington and Moscow.

Such a harmony of interests warrants the unique arms control initiative. It is unique because it proceeds from the assumption that an example could be set, and because it is not based—as was the case in the past—on prolonged negotiations, comprehensive agreements, and pedantic verification that they were being observed, but on confidence. Bush has opened a new security policy chapter.

Bush Seeking Security Cooperation With USSR

AU3009114391 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German
30 Sep 91 p 1

[Peter Krotky article: "Post-Nuclear Dreams"]

[Text] More than a decade ago, people taking to the streets to demonstrate for peace called for "petting instead of Pershings," and thus gave expression to their dreams of a nuclear-free Europe. However, the peace movement has subsided, and realpolitik has remained and is about to implement the peace movement's ideals. That is, at least, the impression that U.S. President Bush has created with his initiative, which has already been called "historic."

However, viewed more closely, we see that too much enthusiasm—above all about the approaching end of the nuclear age—is uncalled for for the time being. The peace movement's demands were based on naive idealism, and Bush's statements are based on sober calculations.

One of the central points of the U.S. disarmament plans is the abolition of all land-based short-range nuclear weapons. That sounds spectacular, but it is not. NATO has long prepared for replacing its land-based missiles with air-based systems. The implementation of the respective concepts has advanced well, and initial plans on deploying them on aircraft have been drafted. It is this "modern" category of weapons that Bush not only excluded from his disarmament proposals, he even stressed expressly that in the future, it would play an important role in Europe.

The situation is similar with the sea-based short-range nuclear weapons, which "under normal circumstances" (Bush) will in the future no longer be on board U.S. ships. Whatever "normal circumstances" may mean—because part of these weapons will only be stored but not be destroyed, they will continue to be ready for use.

It is doubtful whether the U.S. President will force open doors in Moscow by another point of his initiative, namely negotiations on the reduction of land-based multiple warhead intercontinental missiles. Most of the USSR's strategic arsenal is land-based, whereas the United States relies primarily on the nuclear missiles that are based on its submarine fleet. This means that disarmament in this case would primarily be at Moscow's expense.

Even though George Bush's recent disarmament proposal, if analyzed in a matter-of-fact way, is bound to meet with certain reservations, it is a welcome step in general. It takes the political realities—detente in East-West relations—and the economic situation into account. The United States and the USSR can no longer afford to step up their armament, which is becoming increasingly sophisticated and increasingly expensive. While Washington has to fight with gigantic budget deficits, Moscow must reconstruct the country, which is economically ruined after decades of communist rule. Both powers need the much-quoted "peace dividend" badly.

The fact that they are about to capitalize on them now has also something to do with the nuclear fear which, strangely enough, seems to be greater today—at least within the governments—than it was during the times of the Cold War. Soviet nuclear weapons in the hands of new, independent states on the territory of what was once the USSR alarms politicians not only in Washington but also in Moscow. That is why they prefer to scrap the arms systems, which are not required anymore anyway.

The threat by the "imperialist class enemy" has ceased to exist. Since the Gulf war, the powers have been seeking to act jointly. Thus George Bush's suggestion to create a Soviet-U.S. joint system as a protection against limited nuclear attacks by third countries was an expression of the "big powers" emerging concerns. They are afraid of people like Saddam Husayn everywhere on the globe—people who are powerful and unscrupulous enough to cause violent storms in the mild international climate.

CANADA

Prime Minister Backs Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative

LD2809164291 Montreal Radio Canada International in English 1600 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Canada's prime minister has offered Canada's full support for President Bush's plan for arms reduction. Brian Mulroney said the cuts are a major contribution to world peace.

Mr. Mulroney is currently on a four day visit to the U.S. State of California; while there he will address the graduating class of Stanford University.

CYPRUS

Government Calls Bush Initiative 'Significant Step'

NC3009115591 Nicosia Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation Radio Network in Greek 1130 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Text] The Cypriot Government assesses President Bush's announcement on the reduction of the U.S. nuclear arsenal as a particularly significant step toward achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament. In a statement today, government spokesman Akis Fandis also said that

the government joins its voice with that of the international community and welcomes this decision by the U.S. President as a significant contribution to international peace and security.

FRANCE

President Mitterand Greets Bush Arms Cut Initiative

Notes Call for Four-Power Nuclear Talks

LD2809123991 Paris Antenne-2 Television Network in French 1100 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Statement by French President Francois Mitterrand on U.S. President Bush's nuclear disarmament plan in Evry on 28 September—recorded]

[Text] I am pleased, as already stated in a communique, with the U.S. President's initiatives proposed to the part of the world which was recently called Soviet. This is remarkable, but there is another element that has not been stressed, but I think will be stressed in the future. This is that the U.S. President, following Gorbachev, accepted my proposal given at a news conference concerning a four-nation meeting of the nuclear powers which have forces in Europe. A conference will therefore take place soon where the representatives of these nations will meet. We will simplify this by saying Russia and others, United States, Great Britain, and France.

Says 'France Rejoices'

AU2809105491 Paris AFP in English 0036 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] Paris, September 28 (AFP)—French President Francois Mitterrand on Saturday hailed the sweeping arms initiatives and proposals announced by U.S. President George Bush as "a real turning-point in nuclear disarmament" and said France would be ready to take part in reducing arms of mass destruction.

"France rejoices at this, and will examine the proposed measures, and the reactions they bring, with great attention," the French leader said in a statement.

"France approves any possibility of progress towards a reduction and effective destruction of nuclear arms, in which it is ready to commit itself, at the appropriate time," the statement said.

Nation To Join Effort

LD2809131891 Paris France-Inter Radio Network in French 1100 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Statement by French President Francois Mitterrand on U.S. disarmament plan; place not given—live]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] We are really on the right path, and we must thank the foreign leaders who took this initiative. I add, and repeat here, that France will join the destruction of nuclear forces as soon as the efforts of our two main partners, the Russians and the Americans, have reached a sufficient level so that we can compare what can be compared.

Radio: Plan 'Not Disappointing'

*LD2809084691 Paris France-Inter Radio Network
in French 0800 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[Excerpts] The U.S., with immediate and unilateral implementation, is scrapping short-range nuclear arms on land as well as on sea. Radical changes were expected in the U.S. defense strategy, and George Bush did not disappoint us in his speech last night. [passage omitted]

France announced in a presidential communique that it is satisfied at this turning in nuclear disarmament. [passage omitted]

Further on Response to Bush Disarmament Proposals

Elysee Communique

*PM3009112691 Paris LE MONDE in French
29-30 Sep 91 p 6*

[Unattributed report: "France 'Contributed To This Move' Toward Disarmament"]

[Text] In a communique issued on the night of Friday, 27 September, the president's office welcomed the American proposals described as a "real turning point" in nuclear disarmament. However, this turning point will not bring about any immediate review of French nuclear arms policy which, Paris reaffirmed, was recently amended.

George Bush informed his allies of the measures he planned to announce and in particular spoke with Mr. Mitterrand by telephone on Friday. "France welcomes President Bush's initiative and will carefully examine the measures proposed and the reactions they produce.... These proposals should make it possible to speed up the reduction of redundant nuclear arsenals," the Elysee communique states in particular.

With regard to the possible effects on French policy, the text states that France is itself prepared to take the course of nuclear disarmament "when the time comes on the conditions which it spelled out to the United Nations in September 1983." At that time, Mr. Mitterrand stressed to the UN General Assembly the enormous disparity between the nuclear arsenals held by the two superpowers and the French strike force. He also referred to this disparity in his press conference on 11 September when he said that when the United States and the USSR "have reached a certain figure, France will take part in the negotiations." This figure has apparently not yet been reached with the measures announced by the United States on Friday, especially since we do not yet know what response they will receive on the Soviet side.

Slowing Down of Modernization

The communique published by the Elysee on Saturday reaffirms that Paris recently took initiatives which, it states, "go in the same direction" as the measures announced by the U.S. President. Similarly, in a communique published Saturday [Defense Minister] Pierre Joxe said he "welcomes the fact that France contributed to this move."

He was referring to the slowing down of the modernization and development of the deterrence arsenal and, in general, to the decision—often for financial reasons—not to replace many of its nuclear weapons which have become obsolete. For instance, last July, France decided not to build the new S-45 surface-to-surface [a tir tendu] strategic nuclear missile which was to have replaced the S-3 missiles buried in silos on the Albion Plateau, Haute Provence, at the end of the century. Next October, the submarine *Le Redoutable* will finally be withdrawn from service. In the prestrategic sphere, comparable reductions have been made and, at the beginning of September, it was decided not to deploy the Hades missiles in the two artillery units scheduled to be operational and to store them under guard in a military camp in eastern France.

In his 11 September press conference, Mr. Mitterrand also proposed that the four nuclear powers in Europe should meet "to discuss the safety of Soviet weapons." Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin expressed his country's interest in this proposal during the meeting he had with [Foreign Minister] Roland Dumas in New York a few days ago. The two other powers involved—Britain and the United States—did not reject this idea but made it known that they attached priority to consultation within NATO. George Bush's speech shows that disarmament is still primarily a matter between the United States and what remains of the other big nuclear power.

Editorial Commends Initiative

*PM3009103691 Paris LE MONDE in French
29-30 Sep 91 p 1*

[Editorial: "Taking the Initiative"]

[Text] As Mr. Bush demonstrated in the Gulf war, he knows how to react to a new situation before being forced to do so by political pressure. Taking the initiative once again, he acted on the recent changes in Moscow by announcing major nuclear disarmament measures on Friday, 27 September.

He has overtaken the agreements signed in Moscow barely two months ago, but he cannot be blamed for that. Since the 1989 revolutions in Eastern Europe, diplomats have constantly been overtaken by events. Like last year's CFE treaty on conventional arms in Europe, the START treaty was overtaken by the collapse of the Soviet system as soon as it was signed. Are not the new men in power in Moscow, notably General Kobets, Mr. Yeltsin's right-hand military man, envisaging reducing the former USSR's nuclear arsenal to 10 percent of its present size?

We have not yet reached that stage, but it is a fact that the accumulation of all kinds of nuclear weapons seems fairly ridiculous now, as do the disaster scenarios put forward to justify them. How could a nuclear "exchange," in other words mutual annihilation, be conceived and planned now when there is nothing but talk of friendship and cooperation among free peoples?

However, Soviet chaos made new reductions even more urgent, notably in so-called tactical nuclear weapons: Compared with the huge quantities deployed in Eastern

Europe—over which the political authorities have notoriously inadequate control—the equivalent weapons deployed in Western Europe have always been seen as the most dangerous. By unilaterally liquidating his weapons, Mr. Bush has won on two counts—in the eyes of his allies and over his former enemies who are bound to be encouraged to do likewise.

France recently abandoned the deployment of its Hades short-range missile but intends to continue to manufacture it and will thus continue to be the only country in Europe to have a weapon of this type. Calling it a "prestrategic" missile, as Paris does, or "tactical," to use American terminology, does not change the perception of the potential victims who are all situated in friendly countries.

Having said that, nobody, neither Mr. Bush nor what remains of the "center" in Moscow, envisages abandoning a minimal strategic deterrent. In the uncertain and divided world of the future, nuclear weapons look like a valuable and relatively cheap means of protecting yourself from surprises, in particular from dictators, of which Saddam Husayn is the most obvious example. The Baghdad dictator has also succeeded in giving second wind to the idea of ABM [anti-ballistic missile] defense which has now been included in Mr. Bush's proposals in a way which should no longer displease Moscow.

President, Defense Minister on Bush Initiative

Mitterrand: 'On Right Path'

PM0110102091 Paris LE MONDE in French
1 Oct 91 p 6

[Unattributed report: "Mitterrand: 'A Little More Effort, Gentlemen'"]

[Text] During his visit to Evry on Saturday, 28 September, Francois Mitterrand commented on the U.S. nuclear arms reductions announced by the U.S. President, stating in particular: "George Bush and I spoke on the telephone four times in the first five days of the week..., and I welcome the initiatives which the U.S. President has proposed to what was until recently the Soviet world. That is a remarkable effort...."

"The U.S. President, like Mr. Gorbachev before him, accepted my proposal for a meeting of the four nuclear powers with forces in Europe. There will therefore shortly be a conference attended by representatives of the Union of sovereign republics—Russia and others to simplify things—the United States, Britain, and France.

"We really are on the right path and we must thank the foreign leaders who took this initiative. I repeat that France will join the destruction of nuclear forces when the effort made by our main Russian and American partners has reached a comparable level.

"In the nuclear weapons sphere, the reductions so far bring the two most powerful countries down to several thousand nuclear warheads whereas we only have a few hundred. I feel like saying to them: More effort, gentlemen! And we

will be happy to sit down at the table with you. I hope we will shortly sit down at the table to discuss nuclear security in the world."

Defense Minister Comments

PM0110104091 Paris LE MONDE in French
1 Oct 91 p 6

[Unattributed report: "We May Be at a Historic Turning Point"]

[Text] Defense Minister Pierre Joxe, who was the guest on the Luxembourg Radio-LE MONDE "Grand Jury" program on Sunday 29 September, said it was "understandable" that Mikhail Gorbachev's reaction to George Bush's disarmament proposals was "cautious," knowing that the START negotiations "at best envisaged a 25-30 percent reduction" and that the U.S. President is now suggesting "cutting strategic nuclear arms by half." "I would like to add," he said, "that there are different kinds of strategic nuclear weapons. In particular there are those which are on submarines. Mr. Bush does not mention them."

Mr. Joxe continued: "France, which has a very small number of missile-launching submarines, and which has a very small number of tactical nuclear weapons, approves of Mr. Bush's proposals which validate our recent analyses and proposals, but it is entitled to add: 'More effort!' The Soviets need to examine this more closely.... Faced with a situation which seems to be improving after constantly worsening for decades, I say: Let us be patient! We may be at a historic turning point. The next few weeks will confirm that." For the defense minister, "the most dangerous proliferation, which is implicitly mentioned in Mr. Bush's statement, is ballistic proliferation."

Mr. Joxe explained that "as soon as disarmament by the main nuclear powers reaches a significant level, France will be able to join such discussions" but that "for the time being, France is not part of that game." Questioned on the criticisms made by General Jean Salvan, former commander of the Atlantic military defense region, the minister said that this officer "seems to be losing his head" and that "all those who read his article will realize that it was time he went."

GERMANY

Local Impact of Troop Withdrawals, Reductions

91GE0449A Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
ALLGEMEINE in German 5 Sep 91 p 17

[Article by Klaus Broichhausen: "Many Local Governments in Distress: Structurally Weak Areas Especially Hard Hit by Troop Reductions and Base Closings"]

[Text] Bonn, 4 September—More than 200 bases of German and foreign armed forces are to be eliminated in the course of the next few years, or no later than 1997. The Bundeswehr is giving up 116 bases in the old and new laender, 50 of them major ones with more than 500 soldiers. The Americans want to eliminate 38 garrison sites. The British Army of the Rhine will close 21 bases in

Lower Saxony and North Rhine-Westphalia by spring. In a first withdrawal phase the French are completely or partially giving up four bases, respectively. By 1994 the Belgians want to be gone completely from their properties in Hesse and to a large extent from North Rhine-Westphalia, and three Dutch bases are included in the withdrawal plan. The Canadians want to keep their three principal bases for now.

Hammelburg on the Bocksbeutel Road has been a garrison city for centuries. A troop exercise area has been located there as well for almost 100 years. The city of Hammelburg was also among the Bundeswehr sites from the very beginning. Mayor Waltraud Herrmann says: "Hammelburg and its citizens live with and off the Bundeswehr." With 950 jobs, the Bundeswehr is also the largest civilian employer in Hammelburg. Only 11 of the 411 places of business have more than 50 employees. Annually 1 million German marks [DM] [as published] is paid in wages and salaries to soldiers and civilian employees. The base administration budget fluctuates between DM20 million and DM30 million. That means purchasing power and investments which largely benefit the economy in and around Hammelburg.

The worst thing that could happen to the city and the kreis would be for Hammelburg to be eliminated as a military post. Even the vintners would have had to fear losses, since a large part of their sales result from soldiers stocking up on wine before going home.

Hammelburg remains a Bundeswehr base. But, with the newly introduced base organization, the number of soldiers will be reduced by 1,100 to 1,627, and the civilian employees by 110 to 840. The mayor regards this as bleeding Hammelburg and its surroundings. Although the stationing plan was subsequently revised, Hammelburg is one of the municipalities hardest hit by the troop reduction.

The business and finance editorial staff of the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE conducted an inquiry into the consequences for the economies and budgets of communities from which the armed forces are being completely or partially withdrawn, questioning companies, administrative heads, and municipal politicians in the affected areas. All the municipalities are preparing for a major restructuring effort, and none of them neglected to mention that it would not be possible without the financial support of the Federal Government and the laender.

For Flensburg the troop reduction is particularly unfavorable, in the opinion of the city council, because the city's development is simultaneously suffering from changes resulting from the unification. The fringe location of the Flensburg region is becoming even more evident since the unification. Economic activities are shifting in a west to east direction. Companies that are prepared to invest understandably utilize the massive state support in the new laender.

This reorientation is said to be hitting the region after it succeeded in undergoing a remarkable structural change.

In the past years, unemployment dropped from nearly 20 percent to 12 percent. But the consequences of the stationing plans were softened, says Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg, because out of the 5,688 short-term and career soldiers 2,299 instead of the originally intended 1,800 have remained. The city council objects by saying that the port city of Flensburg will lose the naval base and other important navy installations, which is particularly hard. The fact that the number of soldiers will drop by "only" not quite 61 instead of 68 percent is due to the transfer of a motorized infantry regiment to the traditional naval base of Flensburg, it was said.

Oldenburg in Lower Saxony will also continue to be a military post, but with 2,200 instead of 4,600 soldiers and with 180 instead of 730 civilian employees. It is not yet clear what will happen to the 800 positions at the kreis recruiting office and the base administration. The city of Oldenburg is one of the major bases of the Bundeswehr. Chief city administrator Heiko Wandscher explains the economic importance of the armed forces for the city by the fact that the annual salary payments by the Bundeswehr to the Oldenburg base total more than DM300 million and that up to DM100 million are spent on acquisition, construction and management of the properties. The loss of this purchasing power, Wandscher says, has to be a disadvantage, in particular for this region, whose social product per inhabitant is 10 percent lower than the average in Lower Saxony and 25 percent below the FRG average.

The northwestern region around Oldenburg could recover economically but has not found a way to tie in with the general development. For such structurally weak areas, the Defense Ministry follows the principle that the number of armed forces should be preserved if possible or cautiously reduced, and in individual cases even increased, while, in contrast, the congested areas will have their burden eased.

Even so, throughout the entire Oldenburg region with the Oldenburg, Brake, Delmenhorst, and Varel bases, 8,000 soldiers are affected by the troop reduction. Initially it was to be 9,000. Even with the remaining 12,360 soldiers, the region is noticeably weakened, Wandscher complains. These are the reactions everywhere. All municipal politicians and administrative chiefs are expressing their satisfaction with disarmament, to be sure, but it really should not have affected their own district, they say.

Even greater uneasiness prevails in the communities which are completely crossed off the list of bases. Iserlohn in Westphalia will lose two bases in one blow, because the British forces will presumably also withdraw from there. Iserlohn is not only being abandoned by 2,370 soldiers, reports City Manager Heiko Wetekam, but when family members are included about 5,000 persons are involved. In addition there is the loss of 570 civilian jobs. The loss of purchasing power from eliminating the income of soldiers and civilian employees is estimated at DM40 million to DM50 million annually. Construction investments and payments by the base administration for maintenance and management of properties was on the order of DM20 million.

The Deutschorden barracks on the Trillberg outside the gates of Bad Mergentheim are to be closed. The city and many citizens supplied the land for building these barracks in the year 1957. Forest had to be cut down. All of that took place on the basis of the very close relationship between the population and the military in this spa and tourist city, which has been a garrison since 1684, mayor Elmar Mauch relates. With 700 soldiers, the Bundeswehr has both economic and social importance in Bad Mergentheim. The military is part of the daily life of the citizens and forms a part of the urban culture. When other communities turned against the stationing, Bad Mergentheim courageously offered itself as a Bundeswehr garrison. Today the city is being punished for that.

Two garrisons are being closed next to each other in Herborn and Wetzlar. Furthermore, in central Hesse, the Marburg base is being eliminated. That means the departure of 5,000 soldiers. The entire Hessian region feels this as a bitter loss. The first city councillor of the city of Herborn, Heinrich Roth, says that closing the Aar valley barracks in Herbornseelbach is connected with economic losses for the entire city and its surroundings. For Wetzlar, as the largest Bundeswehr base in Hesse, mayor Walter Froneberg fears a crisis, because the base closing coincides with the announcement of considerable cutbacks in personnel by some companies in the city. The Wetzlar Chamber of Industry and Trade predicts an annual loss in purchasing power of between DM210 million and DM240 million.

Spending by the Foreign Armed Forces¹

Kreis/City	Spending in million DM	Gross product in million DM
Mannheim	240-320	17,909
Landkreis Ortenau	324-434	12,738
Landkreis Rastatt	163-218	6,254
Bamberg region	201-268	5,306
Ansbach region	154-205	5,306
Nuremberg region	457-611	48,158
Schweinfurt region	155-208	5,187
Wuerzburg region	182-244	8,760
Landkreis Kitzingen	186-249	1,924
Augsburg region	175-234	17,830
Berlin	340-455	81,012
Frankfurt/Main	364-487	62,786
Wiesbaden	302-404	13,076
Landkreis Main-Kinzig	445-596	10,991
Landkreis Wetterau	311-416	5,914
Landkreis Heinsberg	207-277	4,574
Muenster	151-201	11,800
Landkreis Soest	264-353	7,271
Kaiserslautern	278-371	4,237

Landkreis Birkenfeld	274-366	2,218
Landkreis Bitburg-Pruem	189-253	1,920
Landkreis Kaiserlautern	366-490	1,485

¹To bases, for which annual spending totals DM200 million and more.

For the city of Marburg the Philipps University and offices of the public authorities are more important than the military base. Mayor Hanno Drechsler is of the opinion that the departure of the Bundeswehr will not make a very deep breach in the economic structure. Even so, the city council is filled with sadness over the closing of the Marburg garrison, because the city has a relatively low density of industries and businesses, and there is a continuing reduction in personnel in the higher government offices.

A deep cut in the base structure with economic consequences is also imminent for the southern area of Lower Saxony in the administrative district of Braunschweig. Five of seven garrisons along the former inner-German border are being eliminated: Wolfenbuettel, Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Northeim, Goettingen, and Hannoversch Munden, while Osterode and Goslar will remain, Goslar even with a larger number of soldiers.

The city of Goettingen does not oppose the closing of the base. The objection of the other cities is expressed by the city manager of Northeim, Werner Hesse, who states that the Defense Ministry has not sufficiently considered the economic consequences. Thus, the closing of the motorized infantry battalion stationed in Northeim was primarily decided from the military point of view.

Other municipalities are for the moment declaring themselves unable to make any statements about the economic consequences of the troop reductions. Thus, the city of Achern reports that detailed studies must first be undertaken as to what the effects of the base closing in Achern would be. To the city of Wildbad, in the northern Black Forest, the base closing means that a Bundeswehr hospital will be shut down. The task now is to find another use for the facility as quickly as possible. The city of Passau, which also will no longer be a Bundeswehr post, is, like all the other affected municipalities, pushing for compensation measures from the Federal Government and the land. Mayor Willi Schmoeller says, however, that commerce and industry will not be seriously harmed. Passau does not have as much importance as a Bundeswehr base as do the neighboring garrisons of Freyung and Regen.

The wholesale and retail trades, manufacturing, service enterprises, and the construction industry will be hardest hit when the troops withdraw. Eighty percent of the Bundeswehr's construction projects in Iserlohn, for example, are done by local construction companies, construction workers, and suppliers. Bakers and butchers, in particular, have to expect sales losses, as do restaurants, bars, and barbers. In Cologne-Porz, the Belgian armed forces base, the effects of the troop departure can also be

seen in the fact that there will be an overabundance of "french fry stands," which were visited mainly by Belgians.

In Wetzlar and other communities losses are also anticipated in the home heating and automobile fuel business, in the clothing and equipment trade, the cleaning business, the supply and waste disposal enterprises, as well as for the physicians. The extent of the food deliveries to the troops in Wetzlar is illustrated by the fact that the five large kitchens of the brigade stationed there prepare food worth DM5 million each year.

Troop Reductions in Foreign Armed Forces

Foreign Armed Forces	Overall Strength ¹	State of Partial Reductions	Remaining Number of Soldiers
United States	250,000	175,000	— ²
Great Britain	66,000	33,000 ³	33,000 ⁴
France	44,200	33,200 ⁵	19,200 ⁶
Belgium	27,300	—	3,500 ⁷
Netherlands	7,700	4,500 ⁸	5,200 ⁹
Canada	7,700		6,300 ¹⁰

¹Before the beginning of the troop reduction

²Not yet known at this time

³By 1995

⁴Final number not yet known; if possible, more than 33,000 soldiers will be withdrawn

⁵By the end of 1991

⁶By 1992

⁷By 1995

⁸By 1992

⁹By 1997

¹⁰By 1995

Regarding the finances of the municipalities, there will be shortfalls mainly in five areas, according to information from the top administrators: in trade tax revenue, in revenue from charges and fees, in the income tax share, in formula allocations and lump-sum appropriations of budget funds. The last four items are based on the number of residents. For every resident the city loses, its income is reduced by about DM800 annually, as was stated in Hammelburg. When 1,150 soldiers and 110 civilian employees leave, as is planned, a loss of approximately 1,000 could be the result. This applies to those of the soldiers who lived in Hammelburg, plus their family members.

Several municipalities have determined that with such reductions in the number of inhabitants public installations from swimming pools to recreation parks will be less visited, so that less of their cost can be covered by income. The delivery of power, water, and gas from municipal works will also decline, of course. The total losses of the individual communities cannot be reliably estimated. Alternatively, the following calculation is being drawn up in Marburg: Without secondary effects, such as would become evident in trade tax losses, the following losses are impending: DM1.68 billion in fees, DM3.5 million in formula allocations, DM200,000 in general investments

and DM1.78 million from the income tax share. For Wetzlar it is estimated that the shortfall in the years after the base closing would total DM10 million in 1994.

In order to compensate for economic disadvantages from the troop reduction, the following measures, above all, are demanded by the municipalities: The properties to be vacated should become available as soon as possible for civilian use at favorable real estate prices, preferably for the development of industry and trade. Offices and public institutions, as well as scientific institutes and educational and research centers, should be located at the vacated military posts.

The Federal Government and the laender should support the locating of new companies and jobs, including in housing construction. The decreasing economic power should be compensated for with special funds, which should be allocated to investments and urban development projects. The Federal Government is also expected to take care of retraining employees who are leaving the Bundeswehr. Furthermore, there are demands for state subsidies for renovating the military housing being vacated. The fact that the housing market in the communities will become less strained for a time, when soldiers and civilian employees leave town, is today held to be the most important advantage of the troop reduction. In the communities which the troops are leaving there is scarcely any talk of encroachment by the military any more.

Soviet Forces Completely Vacate 5 Former Bases

LD2309224991 Hamburg DPA in German 1144 GMT 23 Sep 91

[Text] Chemnitz (DPA)—In the administrative area of Chemnitz, five of the former 12 bases of the Soviet Forces' Western Group have so far been completely vacated. This means that 20 percent of the 12,500 members of the Army and 1,500 civilian employees have been withdrawn. Hartmut Foertsch, head of the German liaison command for the Soviet forces in Germany, announced this to journalists in Chemnitz today. In addition, the withdrawal from the Plauen basis will be completed by November. Foertsch added that the withdrawal plan for 1991 is being partially overfulfilled by the Soviet side, even though there are considerable transport problems. For example, Poland's refusal to let transports pass makes it necessary to divert the equipment transports via the sea ports of Mukran, Rostock, and Wismar. Personnel are leaving Germany, mainly by air. The general says training activity of the Soviet forces decreased drastically in the last few months. Military exercises are limited to a strength of 2,000 men, and they are being carried out exclusively on the Army's own exercise grounds. The Soviets are using public roads only for driving instruction. The Federal Government made 70 million marks available to determine the environmental damage in the vacated army grounds, Foertsch added.

Soviet, German Foreign Ministers Urge Total SNF Ban
LD2409210491 Hamburg DPA in German 2013 GMT
24 Sep 91

[Excerpt] New York (DPA)—In New York today Foreign Ministers Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Boris Pankin emphasized their agreement on the need to completely eliminate all short-range nuclear weapons [SNF] in the East and West. During this, their third meeting since Pankin assumed office three weeks ago, the question of better distributing Western aid in the USSR was also discussed. [passage omitted]

NATO Nuclear Weapon Bunker Construction Denied
AU2509104791 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
RUNDschau in German 25 Sep 91 p 6

["ha" report: "Construction of Bunkers Continues"]

[Text] Brussels, 24 September—On Tuesday [24 September] circles of the German NATO Embassy in Brussels denied reports about a NATO construction program for bomb-proof protective bunkers for the storage of the planned nuclear "stand-off weapons." However, the construction of protective bunkers, which were planned in the 1980's, will be continued in the FRG and in "all other" states of the military alliance where U.S. or British nuclear weapons are stored.

Excitement had been caused by reports by a press agency and the Berlin newspaper TAZ that last week the German representative in the NATO working group of high-ranking officials for the protection of weapons agreed to a decision that in several NATO countries, including the FRG, the construction of bunkers for the so-called stand-off weapons (TASM) is to start now. These weapons are missiles with warheads, which, fired and controlled by airplanes, reach the range of the former Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range weapons. Since the new systems are to be ready for use as late as in 1997, they were not included in the Soviet-U.S. "zero option," which was agreed on by treaty.

The construction of bunkers for such weapons in the FRG is in contradiction to several statements by Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, according to whom a decision by the alliance on the introduction of the TASM will not be made before 1994 and that stationing on German soil is out of the question in view of the situation in Europe, which has changed since 1990. Because in 1994 the withdrawal of Soviet troops from eastern Germany is to be concluded, a change in Bonn's attitude might be very serious, in the view of observers. For some time circles of NATO experts have stated that the political reasons of the German attitude are known and accepted.

The continuation of the bunker construction program "according to plan" is justified by circles of the German NATO delegation by referring to the necessity to improve the protection of the existing British and U.S. nuclear weapons against accidents and terrorist acts. The NATO program is jointly financed by the member states and also concerns Great Britain, Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

Reaction to Bush's Disarmament Announcements

Kohl: 'Of Historic Proportions'

LD2809074491 Hamburg DPA in German 0651 GMT
28 Sep 91

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Chancellor Helmut Kohl (Christian Democratic Union) described the disarmament announcements by President Bush and the unilateral reductions in U.S. nuclear systems as a "decision of historic proportions." In a statement made public today by the Federal Press Office, Kohl said: "As a result of these drastic cuts in nuclear armament, we are on the threshold of a historic change in security policy. Peace will become more secure." Bush's decision meant that all U.S. nuclear short-range missiles and nuclear artillery will be withdrawn from the Federal Republic. "I warmly thank the President for that on behalf of all Germans," Kohl said. As a result of his initiative, Bush has again put himself at the head of international disarmament policy. The Soviet Union must now also undertake correspondingly far-reaching steps.

Genscher: Fulfilled Our Hopes

LD2809075191 Hamburg DPA in German 0303 GMT
28 Sep 91

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher expressed satisfaction with President Bush's disarmament announcement. Bush "fulfilled all our hopes," Genscher said early this morning on returning from his visit to Canada. Genscher underlined his gratification about these "most far-reaching disarmaments so far" in nuclear weapons systems. Genscher registered deep satisfaction, particularly over the elimination of U.S. nuclear short-range missiles, which are almost exclusively deployed in Germany, and nuclear artillery ammunition, which is difficult to monitor. Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin assured Genscher support in his demand for a worldwide zero option for nuclear short-range missiles in New York on Wednesday. Following Bush's speech, both superpowers are now on the same course, diplomats accompanying Genscher stated. The U.S. administration informed the German, French, and British foreign ministers about the content of the disarmament plans in New York yesterday morning. The ministers were attending the UN General Assembly in New York since the start of the week. Genscher then flew on to Ottawa. Genscher and his host in Ottawa, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, referred to the "unprecedented" breadth of the U.S. proposals to the press yesterday at noon.

Further Genscher Remarks

LD2809103691 Berlin ADN in German 0932 GMT
28 Sep 91

[Text] Cologne (ADN)—For Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the U.S. disarmament initiative is an "historic decision." Nobody would perceive this in the same way as the Germans, who suffered particularly as a result of the deployment of those weapons, Genscher said in an interview with West German radio today. For him, personally, Bush's proposal means fulfilment of a great

political objective. The foreign minister estimated there was not the slightest doubt that the Soviet Union would respond to the proposal. He was given relevant indications of that during his talks in Moscow two weeks ago.

Finance Minister: Bush on Offensive

*LD2809150991 Hamburg DPA in German 1426 GMT
28 Sep 91*

[Text] Munich—CSU Chairman Theo Waigel has welcomed George Bush's disarmament initiative as an expression of the U.S. President's great leadership. Bush had already regained the leadership for the United States and the West some time ago, Waigel said in Munich on Saturday at the Catholic Academy of Bavaria. The West, previously having merely reacted to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals, and Bush with "intelligent superiority" had now gone on the offensive with calculable proposals, including in the disarmament area.

On the sidelines of a Europe festival in Magdeburg, Genscher spoke on Saturday of a "historic change", adding that the Federal Government proceeded from the premise that the Soviet Union would accept the U.S. offer.

NATO Chief, Finance Minister Comment

*LD2809130791 Berlin ADN in German 1135 GMT
28 Sep 91*

[Text] Munich (ADN)—NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner and FRG Finance Minister Theo Waigel, the two main speakers at a Christian Social Union [CSU] defense policy congress in Munich, have underlined NATO's indispensability for security and peace in Europe. Woerner described President Bush's announcement of far-reaching disarmament in the nuclear sphere as an effective response to the new security policy situation in the world. Bush's initiative opens up the prospect of a world with a minimum of nuclear weapons "that are maintained in a state of balance and help to ensure that nuclear wars would be unthinkable." As a result of this initiative, the Western alliance has resumed a leadership role "in the sphere where disarmament is necessary in the interests of security." The fact that the United States is withdrawing its artillery and short-range missiles from Europe is in the interests of Germany and Europe. Air-launched nuclear weapons continue to be necessary for minimum security. NATO, Woerner said, is "the real source of stability" for Europe. A new Europe can only build on other international organizations, such as the United Nations and the CSCE, with NATO as the "decisive pillar of stability." Russia remains the strongest military power in Europe, even after the break-up of the Soviet Union. "However, power that is not balanced leads to temptation," Woerner said.

In view of the radical changes still underway in the Soviet Union and the tensions erupting in the region, Theo Waigel, CSU chairman and federal finance minister, also expressed clear support for the trans-Atlantic alliance and a continuing U.S. nuclear presence in Europe. The West European Union, Waigel said, must not enter into a

competing relationship with the Atlantic alliance. The Federal Republic must meet its international obligations: "Germany must be prepared to place Bundeswehr units at the disposal of military operations to implement U.N. resolutions and to safeguard world peace, as well as the peoples' right to self-determination." That could also take place in the framework of European troop contingents. Waigel still does not see a change to the constitution as necessary.

SPD Spokesman Comments

*LD2809120191 Berlin ADN in German 0916 GMT
28 Sep 91*

[Text] Frankfurt/Main (ADN)—Karsten Voigt, foreign policy spokesman for the Social Democratic Party [SPD] parliamentary group, said on Radio Hesse today that George Bush's disarmament measures must now have consequences for European security policy. It affects, among other things, the French Hades short-range missiles, which must not be produced. Those nuclear-tipped missiles can only reach German and Belgian territory, and in Germany's case it means that the Eurofighter "must not be developed." In addition, Britain must examine its nuclear potential. Above all, Voigt said, the nuclear-equipped bombers and the bombers stationed in the Federal Republic must go. For NATO planning, that means that both the concept of the rapid intervention force and conventional strategy must be reviewed.

SPD, FDP Leaders

*LD2809114991 Hamburg DPA in German 0925 GMT
28 Sep 91*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Hans-Jochen Vogel, Social Democratic Party [SPD] parliamentary group chairman, has strongly welcomed President George Bush's disarmament proposals. The initiative met the demands long advanced by the SPD, Vogel said in Bonn today. The elimination of tactical nuclear weapons now appears to be particularly pressing. SPD Chairman Bjoern Engholm described Bush's initiative as a clear step toward nuclear disarmament "and a renewed sign of political vision from George Bush." The U.S. initiative must now also have consequences for European security policy, Engholm said in Bonn today. Both France and Britain should review their nuclear capacity and join the disarmament initiative. The proposal for a far-reaching unilateral reduction in nuclear weapons makes it clear "that the European states should no longer mess around, but get involved."

Free Democratic Party [FDP] Chairman Count Otto Lambsdorff welcomed the disarmament plans as "the right answer to changed times" and expects that a positive reaction from Moscow will not be long in coming. "What the U.S. President is now proposing sets standards behind which the Soviet Union cannot lag," Lambsdorff said in Bonn today.

FDP Praises Initiative

*LD3009103991 Berlin ADN in German 0951 GMT
30 Sep 91*

[Excerpt] Bonn (ADN)—The Free Democratic Party [FDP] national executive has assessed the disarmament initiative of U.S. President George Bush as a courageous step forward. The disarmament proposal was an example for other nuclear powers, the body said at its session in Bonn on Monday.

The positive reactions of Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin gave confidence that Bush's initiative would meet with a willingness to act by Moscow. The U.S. initiative was proof of confidence in the young eastern democracy, which no longer emanated any real dangers to peace and security in Europe. [passage omitted]

Survey of Press Reaction

AU3009160791

[Editorial Report] The commentaries on President Bush's latest disarmament initiative carried by FRG papers SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG, FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, DIE WELT, and HANDELSBLATT, all in German, on 30 September are generally positive.

Munich SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG on page 4 carries a 950-word commentary by Josef Joffe headlined "The Bomb in the Angelic Circle." The commentary says that "the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact and the disintegration of Soviet power were reflected in Bush's speech. If the Soviet Army disappears from the Elbe, the nuclear artillery will also be deprived of its objective and purpose. At the same time, a window of opportunity has been opened wide: For the time being, the reactionaries are discredited, the iron of disarmament must be struck now."

The paper concludes that "the world will not become safer because of Bush's speech, but it is the other way around: Precisely because the Russia/USSR structure is no longer able to play the part of a superpower today and tomorrow, Bush has been able to present a program that is praised as 'historic' and 'trailblazing' from Beijing to the party shack of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. If power disappears unilaterally, unilateral disarmament can follow. Europe profits most because all the short-range weapons that can only destroy the neighborhood will disappear. And if the American step is followed by Soviet-Russian steps, the stage will be really free for the 'new world order,' where not more and more, but increasingly fewer nuclear weapons preserve peace."

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU on page 3 carries a 800-word commentary by Martin Winter headlined "The Logic of the Post-Bloc Time." The paper notes that "with his step, Bush put pressure on the Soviet leadership to follow suit. It is in the interest of the United States and its allies that the small [klein] Soviet nuclear weapons not be distributed among 10 or more new republics. This would clearly increase the danger of a nuclear war."

At the same time, the paper criticizes FRG Defense Minister Stoltenberg's lack of imagination in his reaction to the end of the Cold War and states that "it is time to examine the Army's conventional armament and structure" and that a "beginning could be made by stopping the Fighter-90." U.S. and FRG budget problems are also pointed out.

In conclusion, the paper notes that the "EC and the CSCE must develop their political instruments in such a way that they are efficient. The idea of Genscher and his Soviet colleague Pankin to dissociate oneself from the strict principle of consensus in the CSCE is a good beginning. It might lead to an entire system of political and economic measures." The paper calls for the "states' preparedness to renounce national egoism and a little sovereignty."

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE on page 1 carries a 1,100-word commentary by Werner Adam headlined "Insight and Farsightedness." The commentary pays tribute to Gorbachev's and Bush's reactions to the changes in Europe. It notes that "the U.S. President's initiative is undoubtedly a move that was influenced by the latest events in the Soviet Union and seems to be paradoxical at first sight. On the one hand, Bush complied with the finding, which is undisputed in the Western alliance, that no serious threat to Europe and the rest of the world has to be expected from the disintegrating Eastern superpower. On the other hand, however, a new kind of threat, which was hardly a smaller motive for the nuclear disarmament initiative of the President in Washington, developed: political instability after the frustrated coup in Moscow."

The paper concludes that "the importance that the U.S. President attaches to the abolition of nuclear weapons in particular provides the Soviet President with a better guarantee for the control of his own remaining nuclear potential."

Hamburg DIE WELT on page 2 carries a 1,000-word commentary by Fritz Wirth headlined "America Is Taking the Lead." It praises President Bush by stating that "he, as the chief of the last remaining superpower, demonstrated that the political and strategic leadership in the new world order he promised need not be a demonstration of unconcealed military strength, but of good examples and reason." It calls his initiative the "so far boldest decision of a man who has the reputation of being a cautious, careful, and prudent president."

The paper concludes that the credit for the fact "that it has now been possible to finally break the resistance against" the elimination of U.S. short-range nuclear missiles "goes not least to the German chancellor and his foreign minister, who put the relevant pressure on Washington for a long time."

"At the same time, however, Bush's decision is a binding example for the governments in London and Paris, which, after this U.S. initiative, have to examine more intensively than before how far their nuclear capacities still serve the security of their countries or their national prestige," the commentary adds.

Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT on page 2 carries a 450-word commentary by Rainer Nahrendorf headlined "An Infinitely Long Way." It says that "the initiative may become the most important and greatest step toward a new 'age of security policy.'"

The commentator notes that the "danger that a nuclear confrontation will primarily take place on German territory has been clearly reduced. It remains irritating that French President Francois Mitterrand does not even now use the opportunity to completely renounce the new 'Hades' short-range weapon. This short-range missile, which can hit targets in the FRG, remains a strain on German-French relations. However, it is understandable that the two 'small' nuclear 'powers,' France and Great Britain, do not yet think that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached a level of nuclear disarmament that would also require them to make drastic disarmament steps."

The commentary says that "Bush's initiative is confidence advanced to the reform forces in the Soviet Union and an important contribution to their stabilization."

However, the paper adds, "after the overcoming of the East-West conflict and the desired security partnership between the United States and the Soviet Union, the danger of a nuclear world war is increasingly emanating from the development of new nuclear powers. This has become more than clear by Iraq's example," it concludes.

USSR Said To Still Have Short-Range Nuclear Arms in East

Allegation by SPD Official

AU3009083991 Munich SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 28-29 Sep 91

["cas" report: "SPD: Nuclear Weapons Still in Eastern Germany"]

[Excerpt] Bonn—According to the findings of the Social Democrats, Soviet nuclear weapons—Scud B and SS-21 missiles—continue to be deployed in eastern Germany. The Scud B has a range of 300 km, and the SS-21 a range of about 120 km. Norbert Gansel, deputy chairman of the Bundestag Group of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD], quoted "reliable sources" in Bonn on 27 September, stressing that Soviet indications concerning the complete withdrawal of warheads and the carrier systems had repeatedly turned out to be "false, incomplete, and contradictory" in the past. Gansel mentioned "half a dozen" locations where nuclear weapons continue to be deployed. He supposes that one location is in Altengrabow, where Soviet sentinels some time ago fired shots at Bundeswehr officers who observed the site of the depot.

The deputy chairman of the Bundestag group criticized the Federal Government, which, for inexplicable reasons, had always contented itself with the statements of Soviet politicians. However, now the government must see to it that the promises concerning the withdrawal of nuclear weapons are kept and that the removal can be verified.

Gansel suggested that representatives of the Bonn and Moscow Defense Ministries jointly inspect the locations in question. In addition, he called on the government to make it clear to the Soviets that it will have an "impact" on German helpfulness to the USSR and the republics. [passage omitted]

Soviet Commander 'Dispel' Concern

LD0110005391 Berlin ADN in German 1930 GMT 30 Sep 91

[Excerpts] Eberswalde (ADN)—Concerns about Soviet nuclear weapons suspected to be in the new federal laender have been dispelled. Social Democratic Party leader Bjoern Engholm stated this in Eberswalde today after talks with the Soviet commander-in-chief of the Western Group of Forces in Germany, Colonel General Matvey Burlakov. Engholm does not see any reason for mistrusting Burlakov's assurance that the last stocks were withdrawn months ago. Burlakov issued an invitation to visit any Army installation at any time in order to dispel any remaining doubts. Engholm said that he would recommend that this be done. [passage omitted]

According to Engholm, the colonel general expressed confidence that there will be a unified commando structure for nuclear weapons in the future Soviet Union. There will not be decentralized availability in individual republics. Engholm stressed the necessity of "several new powers not suddenly emerging with nuclear weapons in Europe."

Burlakov renewed his willingness to cooperate with the Bundeswehr. German soldiers can come to the Western Group for training, which will also help to remove the concept of the enemy.

The minister-president of Schleswig-Holstein said that the subject of extremism vis-a-vis Soviet soldiers was also discussed. [passage omitted]

GREECE

Bush Nuclear Arms Cut Initiative Hailed

Government Statement

NC2909132091 Athens Elliniki Radhiofonia Radio Network in Greek 1230 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Text] The government has issued a statement on the U.S. initiative to reduce nuclear arms. The statement begins: The Greek Government welcomes with great satisfaction President Bush's announcement on the reduction of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. This initiative substantively contributes to the efforts to consolidate international peace and security, especially following the historic political changes in Europe over the last few years, the statement says.

The statement adds: The important measures and proposals that have been announced constitute a great step in the direction of enhancing mutual understanding and trust between the United States and the Soviet Union and represent a milestone in the course of eliminating the nuclear nightmare.

Greece, the statement concludes, which has always actively supported every effort to reduce nuclear arms, applauds the U.S. President's initiative and expresses the certainty that these courageous measures and proposals will meet with a complete and immediate response so that our planet may become safer and more peaceful.

Prime Minister Calls Plan 'Historic'

NC2909091091 Athens Elliniki Radhiofonia Radio Network in Greek 0500 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] In Athens, Prime Minister Konstandinos Mitsotakis applauded the U.S. President's decision and called it historic. The prime minister was briefed on the plan by a letter from George Bush handed to him by U.S. Ambassador Michael Sotirhos.

SPAIN

Government in 'Total Agreement' With Bush Initiative

LD2809185191 Madrid RNE-1 Radio Network in Spanish 1800 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] We should conclude by saying that here in Spain the reaction to the U.S. proposal to reduce nuclear arsenals has also been satisfactory. In statements to RNE, the government spokeswoman, Rosa Conde, has said that the government expresses total agreement with the U.S. proposal and trusts that the international community will also give a positive welcome to the process. Rosa Conde said that Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez was personally informed of the initiative by George Bush hours before the U.S. President made it public on television.

Political Parties React 'Favorably' to Proposal

LD2809193991 Madrid RNE-1 Radio Network in Spanish 1900 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Text] In Spain, the different political parties have reacted favorably to the announcement by the U.S. President. The Spanish Government hopes that the offer will be received favorably by the interlocutors of the international community given its extreme importance. In the opinion of the Popular Party, Bush's decision is the first real possibility in history of nuclear disarmament and the United Left hopes that it will create a new climate of dialogue to which the USSR and the rest of the European powers will respond immediately in what could be the beginning of a chain of events leading to the end of the nuclear nightmare throughout the world.

TURKEY

Government 'Welcomes, Supports' Bush Initiative

TA2909160991 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1555 GMT 29 Sep 91

[Text] Ankara (A.A)—Foreign Ministry under secretary Ferhat Ataman said today that U.S. President George Bush has taken a courageous and radical step towards

eliminating the danger posed by nuclear arms and that Turkey supported this initiative fully. In a statement on the announcement of September 27 of the U.S. President on reducing nuclear arms substantially, Ataman recalled that in the light of recent developments in the Soviet Union, Bush had announced that his country was to make a number of unilateral cuts in nuclear arms and to take trust-building measures.

Ataman said that the measures announced by Bush will make an important contribution to peace, stability, and security in Europe and the world, as desired by everyone and in line with the changing global conditions and the new world philosophy of the Soviet Union.

"For this reason Turkey welcomes this initiative and supports it completely.

"We expect the Soviet Union to respond equally to this historical initiative and believe that this would eventually reinforce Turkey's security further," he said.

UNITED KINGDOM

Official Response to Bush on Nuclear Arms Cut

Prime Minister Hails Initiative

LD2809003991 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0002 GMT 28 Sep 91

[By PRESS ASSOCIATION diplomatic correspondent Tom McMullan]

[Text] The prime minister hailed President Bush's proposals for severe cuts in nuclear weapons as far-reaching, historic and imaginative. Mr Major, in a statement issued by Downing Street early today, urged President Gorbachev and the Soviets to respond "with equal imagination". He said: "If they do it will be a turning point in our history, bringing enormous benefits to mankind."

But Mr Major stressed that Britain will continue to retain the minimum—but adequate—conventional and nuclear forces "as the bedrock of our security". He praised the role of NATO in providing Western defence, commenting that "sound defence and solidarity, rather than pacifism and unilateralism" made [words indistinct] that remain stay under the tightest control.

"For some time we have been consulting with our American and other allies how we can best consolidate the historic changes which have occurred in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. We all agreed that we should take further imaginative steps in arms control, while preserving the essentials of our defence in a world which is still unstable. These consultations have borne fruit in the bold initiatives just announced by President Bush.

"I would stress three points: First, the enormous strides we are making in arms control have been made possible by the policies of NATO—policies based on sound defence and solidarity, rather than pacifism and unilateralism. We will need NATO and the habit of consulting with allies as much

in the future as in the past if we are to capitalise on the hopeful trends now before us.

"Second, the aim is to keep only the minimum of nuclear weapons needed to make sure that Europe never again faces large scale war—adequate conventional and nuclear forces remain the bedrock of our security. The government will ensure that Britain retains both.

"Third, these moves—exciting though they are—do not exhaust the possibilities.

"The government's agenda has other important arms control initiatives on it including an arms transfers register, a ban on chemical weapons and a programme to ensure that the weapons we are controlling or banning in Europe do not spread to countries elsewhere in the world."

Gerald Kaufman, Labour's shadow foreign secretary, said President Bush's decision was one of "great statesmanship and vision". He added: "I believe that urgent talks should now take place between the United States and the Soviet Union to ensure that the abolition of these weapons is speedy and reciprocal."

He said discussions should take place to establish what part Britain and France could play in the next round of talks with the Soviet Union. "President Bush's announcement is especially welcome to the Labour Party, which has been advocating such a policy since the policy decisions arrived at in our 1989 policy review," said Mr Kaufman. The government should set up a Defence Diversification Agency to enable industries involved in defence work to make a smooth transition into other fields, he added.

Liberal Democrat leader Paddy Ashdown said: "The government should now announce immediately that the Trident programme will go ahead on a scale no greater than the current Polaris system, and we should be prepared to take further steps if the Soviet Union responds to Mr Bush's initiative and the process of disarmament gathers pace."

UK To Scrap Own Short-Range Arms

LD2809092691 *London PRESS ASSOCIATION*
in English 0816 GMT 28 Sep 91

[By PRESS ASSOCIATION defense correspondent Charles Miller]

[Text] Britain is to scrap its short-range and battlefield nuclear weapons and will cease to carry nuclear depth bombs aboard Royal Navy ships, Defense Secretary Tom King said today. The move came after President Bush announced sweeping reductions in the United States's nuclear arms stockpile—a statement hailed by the prime minister as far-reaching, historic and imaginative. Mr Major urged President Gorbachev and the Soviets to respond "with equal imagination." But he stressed that Britain would continue to retain the minimum, but adequate, conventional and nuclear forces "as the bedrock of our security." Mr King said there would be no let-up in the proposal to replace the RAF's WE177 nuclear free-fall bombs with a new missile system and the government

would continue with plans to replace the Polaris nuclear submarine with the more potent Trident system in the mid-1990s. "What we need to have is a credible deterrent," he told Radio 4's Today programme. The main threat in the past came from the huge Soviet nuclear arsenal and that has remained in place. "We now worry about who has control over that nuclear arsenal in the Soviet Union and republics," said Mr King.

Mr Major said the government would promote further initiatives to make the world safer, including an arms transfer register, in a bid to curb regional conflicts. He also urged a ban on chemical weapons, and a programme to ensure weapons now being banned or controlled in Europe did not spread to other countries. Mr Major said: "We have a unique chance to maintain our security at much lower levels of nuclear weapons and to ensure that those weapons that remain stay under the tightest control." For some time we have been consulting with our American and other allies how we can best consolidate the historic changes which have occurred in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. "We all agreed that we should take further imaginative steps in arms control, while preserving the essentials of our defence in a world which is still unstable." Mr Major stressed the importance of NATO and said the enormous strides made in arms control were possible because of policies based on "sound defence and solidarity, rather than pacifism and unilateralism." Mr King said there was scope for reducing Britain's defences but despite changes in the Eastern Bloc, the Soviet Union was "a very dangerous and unstable place and it still has huge stocks of weapons and huge stocks of nuclear weapons as well." Maintaining one nuclear armed submarine at sea at any one time was the absolute minimum deterrent which could not be reduced, he said. It was widely known that a decision to scrap short-range and battlefield nuclear forces would be agreed at the NATO summit of heads of government in Rome in November. Under the plans, Britain will get rid of its 12 elderly Lance nuclear missile launchers and about 70 missiles currently based in Germany. Artillery shells for the Army's M109 Howitzers will be destroyed. The Royal Navy's nuclear depth bombs will be taken off vessels and put in a central store. These controversial weapons, believed to number no more than about 30, could be dropped by Sea Harrier jump jets and Sea King helicopters to attack enemy submarines. However, their effectiveness has been increasingly questioned in recent years and embarrassing protests made when British ships visited foreign ports. There is also going to be a gradual reduction in the number of American nuclear forces in Britain. Poseidon submarines based at Holy Loch on the Clyde will be withdrawn over the next few years with their 1,100 nuclear warheads. US nuclear depth bombs, which could number as many as 200, will be taken back from Britain to the US and the number of tactical free-fall bombs is also certain to be cut.

Gerald Kaufman, Labour's shadow foreign secretary, said President Bush's decision to cut the US nuclear stockpile was one of "great statesmanship and vision". Liberal Democrat leader Paddy Ashdown said the government should announce immediately that the Trident programme

would go ahead on a scale no greater than the current Polaris system. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament also welcomed Mr Bush's proposals but "noted he remained committed to retaining air-launched nuclear systems, many of them in Britain".

Bush Plan Moves Emphasis to Submarine Systems

*PM3009103091 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH
in English 30 Sep 91 p 14*

[Editorial: "A Safer World"]

[Text] The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament never faced up to the basic truth of superpower relations during the Cold War: that Nato relied on nuclear weapons as the cheapest way to deter aggression by the land forces of the Warsaw Pact, which were deployed in vast numbers, in an offensive posture, equipped with weaponry suited to the seizure of territory. Unless Nato power were prepared to meet this threat with a drastic increase in spending on conventional forces, never likely, there was no alternative to the strategy of "flexible response", a ladder of escalation from nuclear artillery up to the final deterrent of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The collapse of the Warsaw Pact has now eliminated the threat of surprise ground attack by the Red Army, making it possible for President Bush to offer a massive reduction in nuclear weapons. He has no intention of moving toward a nuclear free world, however. Even if all his proposals are carried out the United States will still retain land-based missiles, nuclear bombers, and the Trident D-5 submarine system. Most of the weapons systems he has offered to scrap were already in jeopardy. Nato was moving towards the elimination of battlefield nuclear weapons - the Lance missile and nuclear artillery - neither of which can be used in the European theatre without destroying parts of Europe itself. In Washington the Senate has cut funding for the mobile MX missile, and momentum has been building in the Democratic-controlled House for sweeping disarmament. While Mr Bush's initiative is a bold gesture that

captures the historic moment, it is also a deft move to pre-empt indiscriminate cuts by the democrats, and to save the B-2 bomber and the Strategic Defence Initiative. He wants a reduced arsenal, but a better one that continues to maintain America's technological edge. The offer has been welcomed cautiously by Mr Gorbachev, who may have some difficulty persuading the Soviet armed forces to co-operate. Mr Bush has proposed the eventual abolition of all land-based multiple warhead missiles, an area in which the Soviet Union has a great advantage. But he had declined to off-set this by including submarine-launched ballistic missiles, a category dominated by the United States.

Before the August coup such unequal cuts would have been dismissed out of hand in Moscow. But Mr Gorbachev might now favour drastic cuts as the new republics try to assert sovereignty over nuclear weapons on their soil. Indeed, the recent consultations between President Bush and both Mr Gorbachev and Mr Yeltsin suggest that Washington, which has stressed immediate cuts in battlefield weapons, is aiming to bolster the position of Soviet reformers as they move to gather in the vast stockpile of battlefield nuclear weapons scattered around the Soviet Union and available to divisional commanders in the Red Army. It is also likely that Mr Gorbachev is looking for a formula that defuses the problem of the 250 or so SS-18's in fixed silos on Ukrainian and Kazak soil.

If cuts are carried out on anything like the scale proposed by Mr Bush the world will be rid of the most dangerous types of nuclear weapons: those that can be used to advantage in battle, and those (landbased ICBM's) that can be used for a nuclear first strike. The emphasis will move to submarine systems, like Trident, that are designed for retaliation rather than fighting wars. Cuts in land systems would also enhance the relative importance of Britain's nuclear capability, deployed on submarines. It seems unlikely, however, that Mr Bush will be able to keep submarines off the negotiating table indefinitely. Sooner or later, Britain will come under heavy pressure to start cutting too.