

167111

JPRS-TAC-87-028

22 APRIL 1987

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

19990114 091

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

8
112
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

22 APRIL 1987

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

- USSR: Laser, Kinetic-Energy Technologies for SDI Described
(V. Alekseyev; Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 52,
23-29 Dec 86)..... 1
- UK's Labor Party Would Not Recognize SDI Accord With U.S.
(London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 24 Mar 87)..... 6
- Lack of Support for SDI Shown in 1985 Canadian Poll
(Christopher Waddell; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL,
9 Mar 87)..... 7
- Turkish Scientist Examines SDI Impact on Country
(Tolga Yarman; Istanbul MILLIYET, various dates)..... 9

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

- Soviet Journal Editorial on Reykjavik Meeting
(Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 1, Jan 87)..... 16
- India: Gorbachev Offer Termed 'Progressive Step'
(Editorial; Madras THE HINDU, 4 Mar 87)..... 24

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

- Soviet Commentary on U.S. Nuclear Missiles in Turkey
(Yuri Lebedev; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 13, 6 Apr 87)..... 26
- Denmark: SDP's Auken Views Talks With CPSU Secretary Lukyanov
(Svend Auken Interview; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE,
26 Mar 87)..... 27

Canada: Controversy Over Cruise Testing Reported (Various sources, various dates).....	28
Vancouver SUN Editorial	28
Ottawa CITIZEN Editorial	29
Clark Statement in Commons	30
Commons Defeat of Motion, by Iain Hunter	31
Liberal Leader Turner's Position, by Patricia Poirier	32
GLOBE AND MAIL Editorial	32
Ottawa CITIZEN Editorial	34
Canada: INF Proposal, Nitze, Karpov Briefings Discussed (Various sources, various dates).....	35
Ottawa CITIZEN Editorial	35
Windsor STAR Editorial	36
Clark on Government Stand, by Jeff Sallot	37
Ottawa CITIZEN Article, by Jonathan Manthorpe	38
Ottawa CITIZEN Editorial	40
PRC Foreign Minister Urges U.S., USSR To Reduce Missiles (Beijing XINHUA, 26 Mar 87).....	41
PRC Foreign Minister Expresses Fears for INF Accord (Paris AFP, 27 Mar 87).....	43
PRC Media Assess Thatcher's Moscow Agenda (Beijing XINHUA, 24 Mar 87; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 25 Mar 87).....	44
XINHUA Expects Weapons Polemic, by Wang Xinju	44
Missile Strategies Reviewed, by Li Yunfei	45
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
APN: U.S. Continues Preparations for Bacteriological War (Moscow APN MILITARY BULLETIN, No 4 (10), Feb 87).....	47
USSR Accuses U.S. of Creating New Chemical Weapons (Igor Borisenko; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 11 Mar 87).....	50
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
Soviet General Tatarnikov Interviewed on European Arms Cuts (Viktor Tatarnikov Interview; Vienna KURIER, 12 Mar 87)....	51
Briefs	
Soviet Delegate Addresses CD	53

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: Hope for Nordic NFZ, Restrictions on NATO Activities
(Alexander Polyukhov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 13,
6 Apr 87)..... 54

Denmark: USSR's Lukyanov Offers To Withdraw Submarines
(Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 28 Mar 87)..... 56

RELATED ISSUES

Soviet Scientists View Need for Nuclear Winter Research
(Moscow NEW TIMES, No 12, 30 Mar 87)..... 57

'Unpredictable, Dangerous Effects', by Gennady Kurbatkin 57
Laser 'Winter', by Alexander Ginsburg 58
U.S.-Soviet Cooperation Urged, by Nikita Moiseyev 58

Soviet Roundtable on Asian-Pacific Security Issues
(Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, No 6, Nov-Dec 86)..... 60

Soviet Journal on Need for Naval Disarmament Measures
(Aleksandr Mozgovoy; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 1,
Jan 87)..... 74

Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Hold Meeting
(Various sources, various dates)..... 83

TASS Lists Participants 83
Gorbachev Meets With Ministers 83
24 March Session 84
Euromissiles Accord Urged 86
25 March News Conference 86
Poland's Orzechowski Reaction 88
GDR's Fischer Comments on Talks 89
CSSR's Chnoupek Reviews Topics, Bohuslav Chnoupek,
Interview 89
Kashlev Comments 91
Chemical Weapons Ban Statement 91
Call for Vienna CSCE Success 93
Meeting Ends; Ministers Depart 95
IZVESTIYA Publishes 'Communique' 96
U.S. Receives Documents 98

Polish Sejm Delegation Visits Moscow
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 25 Mar 87; Warsaw PAP, 27 Mar 87)..... 99

Discusses INF, SDI With Gromyko 99
Supports CSCE Process, by Slawomir Popowski 100

Denmark's Owen Challenges EEC To Take Defense Responsibility
(Geoff Meade; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 22 Mar 87)..... 101

PRC Position on Peace, Disarmament at UN Conference
(Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 13, 30 Mar 87)..... 102

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: LASER, KINETIC-ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES FOR SDI DESCRIBED

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 52, 23-29 Dec 86 pp 1-3

[Article by Candidate of Military Sciences V. Alekseyev: "Weapons for 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] On 23 March 1983, U. S. President Ronald Reagan presented a television message to the nation from the Oval Room in which he said, among other things: "I have called upon our scientists who have developed nuclear weapons for us to turn their talents and capabilities to the defense of mankind and world-wide peace, and to develop systems that will render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete." What the President had said was given the official title of "Strategic Defense Initiative," which was nicknamed "Star Wars" by Senator Edward Kennedy in association with the popular film series. And what was actually being considered was primarily development of attack space weapons for offensive, aggressive purposes.

In this context, we can talk about two major kinds of such weapons:

directed energy transfer weapons (DETW);

kinetic kill weapons (KKW).

DIRECTED ENERGY TRANSFER WEAPONS

DETW facilities have some new properties and specific features that set them apart from conventional weaponry:

a) practically instantaneous hitting of a target, as energy is transferred at close to the maximum velocity possible in nature -- the speed of light (300,000 km/s);

b) a long strike range that in principle may reach thousands of kilometers.

It is for this reason that DETW facilities are of such great interest to the Pentagon, which is considering them as a major component in the arsenal of offensive space weaponry. DETW facilities are based on two types of weapons: laser and beam weapons. That is, we are talking about weapons based on new physical principles.

Laser weapons. Intense narrowly directed coherent (phase-matched) and monochromatic (single-wavelength) electromagnetic radiation is generated by lasers. The striking factor of a laser weapon is taken to be thermomechanical action on an object. A laser beam generated in short pulses causes a rapid rise in temperature of the target surface, resulting in melting and even vaporization of part of the outer shell. Vaporization of the shell produces an explosion and gives rise to a shock wave that penetrates into the target.

U. S. scientists are considering **X-ray lasers** as a candidate for a space-based antimissile system; this is a fundamentally new weapon, the most promising component of SDI, called a "third-generation nuclear weapon" by Western military experts.

Warheads that use exclusively fissile materials (plutonium-239 and uranium-235) are categorized as first-generation nuclear (atomic) weapons. Their power does not exceed a few hundred kilotons. The second generation of nuclear (hydrogen) weapons includes warheads in which explosive energy is released not just by fissioning of plutonium-239 and uranium-235 nuclei, but also due to fusion reactions. These have higher power (reaching a few megatons), and at present are the basis of the U. S. nuclear arsenal.

But how is third-generation nuclear weaponry fundamentally different from atomic and hydrogen weaponry?

If the hard, high-energy radiation that results from a chain reaction of a nuclear charge, and that drives simultaneously formed heat and shock waves, is "bound up into a bundle," concentrated into a narrow beam, a weapon can be produced that has the capability of striking targets practically instantaneously and at much greater distances than when a "conventional" nuclear warhead of the same power is used.

Western scientists link the solution to this problem with development of a "laser gun" loaded with an atomic bomb. As they see it, this weapon should bind the radiant energy of a nuclear explosion into a beam, amplify it by conversion of some kind of explosive energy (thermal or shock), aim it and focus it on a specified target.

Why is it that such attention has been given to the X-ray laser? The reason is that the energy of this radiation in theory may be hundreds or even thousands of times that of, say, optical lasers.

But laser radiation in the X-ray band is possible only if the active medium is pumped by an extremely powerful source of energy that is capable of setting up a radiation flux with intensity of more than 10^{15} W/cm². And how is so much energy to be "canned" in a mobile military unit? Scientists at Lawrence Livermore Radiation Laboratory have suggested using a conventional medium-power nuclear warhead as such a source.

The action of the X-ray laser weapon can be schematically represented as follows. A combat space station (platform) carries a nuclear device surrounded by lasers with elements of special materials -- thin rods or tubes containing

the active substance. It is these rods that transform random undirected radiation to an X-ray laser.

Explosion of the nuclear device pumps all the lasers, and produces emission of energy in the form of cumulative pulses. This is how targets are hit: satellites, ICBM warheads, orbiting space stations...

The X-ray laser concept has been tested by the Americans during underground explosions in Nevada at least a few times. For example, in 1980 -- the "Dauphine" nuclear explosion in which intense coherent X-radiation was recorded at the output of the laser device; the "Cottage" nuclear explosion set off on the second anniversary of Reagan's SDI program; the "Goldstone" nuclear explosion in June 1985; the "Glen Cove" nuclear explosion of 22 March, 1986 -- the first of the year in response to the routine continuation of the Soviet moratorium. According to a NEWSDAY report, the cost of a single underground test of the X-ray laser is estimated at 50 million dollars.

In contrast to the X-ray laser, in which emission is produced by transitions of electrons from certain energy states to others, the **gamma laser (grayser)** generates power by energy transitions within the atomic nucleus. Some U. S. scientists feel that the gamma laser will have practically all the advantages of the X-ray laser, and will even surpass it with respect to certain parameters. In particular, the emission of the gamma laser is capable of penetrating through the atmosphere without significant deviations and striking enemy missiles on the intra-atmospheric part of the active flight trajectory where the staging engines are accelerating to terminal velocity. Moreover, the gamma laser can be appropriately "tuned" to a wavelength on which its radiation will be quite intensively absorbed by the nuclei of heavy materials (such as uranium and plutonium) that are used in the nuclear charges of strategic missile warheads, with resultant failure (neutralization).

Los Alamos National Laboratory is currently studying the feasibility of two-stage gamma laser pumping in which the nuclei of atoms of the active medium are irradiated with neutrons, followed by transition of the nuclei to an excited state where they may remain for a comparatively long time. A nuclear explosion communicates additional energy to the excited nuclei, bringing about conditions that give rise to intense coherent gamma radiation.

Conventional lasers get their energy in a less risky fashion than nuclear lasers. Some U. S. experts see the **chemical laser** as a prime candidate in the near future for the the SDI space system, at least in a demonstration version. The power source of the chemical laser is the energy of a chain reaction between fluorine and hydrogen, i. e., the laser receives injection, igniting the gases. Such a laser is like a jet engine in operation: the laser working mixture is pumped through the cavity at supersonic velocity. Some of the energy released in the chemical reaction may be obtained in the form of directed streams of electromagnetic energy in the infrared region of the spectrum with wavelength of about 2.4-2.8 μm (in the window of transparency of the atmosphere).

The "Miracle" chemical laser was first tested at White Sands Proving Ground in New Mexico in September of 1985. The beam hit the body of a "Titan-2" missile

at a distance of 1 km. There are now plans to develop a hydrogen fluoride chemical laser with power of the order of 5 MW with requirements that are nearly three orders of magnitude (a thousand times) higher.

In **free electron lasers** developed for use in outer space, a beam of high-energy electrons generated in an accelerator of the same type as those used in elementary particle experiments passes through a "driver" unit made up of magnets arranged one after the other. The magnets are set up to produce contrary magnetic fields that start oscillation of the electrons traveling through the unit, i. e., cause them to swing like a pendulum. When this is done, the oscillating charged particles begin to emit electromagnetic radiation in the direction coinciding with electron beam motion. It is this emission that produces what is called "lasing."

A **beam weapon** is a directed energy transfer weapon with deeper penetration into the target material.

Electron and proton beams propagate without losses only under vacuum conditions, i. e., beyond the limits of the atmosphere at altitudes above 200 km. The striking mechanism of the beam weapon is thermal destruction (burning) of the structural components of enemy space systems.

KINETIC KILL WEAPONS

These are interceptor missiles with ultrahigh initial velocities that are aimed at enemy objects in space, and kill them by mechanical destruction (collision).

Kinetic kill weapons can be classified as follows:

- ballistic interceptor missiles that move by inertia beyond the limits of the atmosphere, and are subject only to the earth's gravitational field;
- guided (homing) interceptor missiles that can be used in the atmosphere or beyond its limits, but do not directly reach the target (the target is destroyed by nearby explosion of the missile);
- guided (homing) interceptor missiles that make direct contact with the target.

The ballistic section (e. g., for ICBMs with flight range of the order of 10,000 km, its duration is 20-25 minutes) where all objects are moving by inertia and over free-flight trajectories, is typified by comparatively prolonged warhead travel (including false targets). The orbit of a target moving along a ballistic trajectory can be precisely predicted. Therefore (in solving the problem of exact initial targeting), KKWs of the first type (unguided interceptor missiles) can be used to strike the warheads of enemy missiles on this section of the trajectory.

The most likely weapon for purposes of antimissile defense on the final flight section of enemy ICBM (SLBM) warheads, when they are entering dense layers of atmosphere, is a KKW of the second type -- ultrafast ground-based interceptor

missiles with nuclear warheads. It was for KKW's of the second type that the first U. S. antimissile defense systems ("Sentinel," "Safeguard") were designed.

To combat attacking enemy missiles on the active section of the trajectory when staging engine operation is producing acceleration to terminal velocity (6-7 km/s), it is proposed that KKW's of the third type -- homing interceptors -- should be used, the homing being done by infrared sensors optimized for the glow of rocket engine exhaust.

Analysis of typical uses of KKW's shows that among the primary issues is the problem of giving the interceptor missile a proper velocity of 10 km/s or more.

As evidenced by the Western press, the successors to the creators of the first atomic bombs -- physicists of Los Alamos and Livermore, scientists of a number of commercial companies and universities -- are seeking the answer to this problem in the creation of a so-called "electromagnetic catapult" or "railotron." The basic idea is that the missile is accelerated not by a solid-fuel propellant or reaction mass (where the pressure of powder gases acts on the missile for a comparatively limited time), but rather by electromagnetic forces, using the principle of magnetic field pressure with duration that may be quite considerable. A missile placed between two "rails" (guides), around which an extremely strong magnetic field is set up, can acquire an enormous velocity that leaves all velocities attainable by explosives far behind.

An experimental model of such a catapult has been built in the laboratories of the electromechanics center at Texas State University. In tests, a spherical "missile" massing about 150 g was shot out with initial velocity of 5 km/s. It is felt that the initial velocity of missiles can be successfully brought to 40-45 km/s.

Electromagnetic systems are plagued by two problems: one is the large mass of the power supply systems, and considerable linear dimensions (e. g., one model of the "Gigi-2" electromagnetic catapult is 39 m long), and the other is low firing rate (it is difficult to have high voltage in readiness when it is discharged during firing in millionths of a second).

Let us stress that there are exceptionally complicated engineering problems in bringing these and other "exotic weapons" to fruition. But the attempts to develop this weaponry have already brought billions in profits to military-industrial monopolies, and hold the promise of trillions. It is because of this that they are so actively supporting the "Star Wars" program.

6610

CSO: 5200/1244

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

UK'S LABOR PARTY WOULD NOT RECOGNIZE SDI ACCORD WITH U.S.

LD240105 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0046 GMT 24 Mar 87

[Text] Mr Neil Kinnock today warned that a Labour Government would not consider itself a party to the secret memorandum of understanding between the United States and Britain on Star Wars research. He was speaking in London three days before his visit to Washington on Friday when he will spell out Labour's opposition to the Strategic Defence Initiative. The memorandum was drawn up between the U.S. and British Governments in December 1985. So far, it understood, Britain has won contracts from U.S. worth \$34 million for Star Wars research.

At a press conference, Mr Kinnock said: "We do not want this diversion of resources and it isn't even businesslike because the scale of the contractual return is minuscule."

But it was made clear that Labour is not likely to interfere with existing contracts. Neither would Labour's policy affect private firms doing deals with the U.S. Government. However, it would mean that a Labour government would not encourage or promote research.

Mr Kinnock made little secret of his distaste for British Star Wars research. He said that what the U.S. was after was not British technology but British technologists.

"We cannot afford to have any further number distracted by involvement in such a project when the need for other technological projects is so great."

He said there was an increasing body of opinion which suggested that Star Wars was undesirable from both a military and technological point of view." [quotation marks as received]

/9274

CSO: 5240/064

LACK OF SUPPORT FOR SDI SHOWN IN 1985 CANADIAN POLL

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 9 Mar 87 p A9

[Article by Christopher Waddell]

[Text]

OTTAWA

A public opinion poll warned the federal Government there was little support for Canadian involvement in the U.S. strategic defence initiative a month before Ottawa decided not to participate directly in the program.

The foreign policy poll, obtained by The Globe and Mail under the Access to Information Act, was requested last October along with other polls dealing with Canadian-U.S. trade issues.

The poll also told the Conservative Government that "new initiatives related to enhancing international trade would likely be responded to positively by Canadians." This finding appears to have provided the basis for the Government's decision to stress Canada's role in international trade negotiations in addition to promoting a Canadian-U.S. free-trade deal.

The wide-ranging survey also warned the Government not to consider the sale of fresh water to other countries. It concluded that the sale of water was "the issue that yielded the least amount of consensus by demographic or regional factors. It is also an issue with the potential to cause considerable controversy and regional polarization."

The August, 1985, study was conducted for the Department of External Affairs by Decima Research Ltd. A sample of 1,500 was asked 123 questions in the poll taken between

July 9 and July 16, 1985. The results are considered to be accurate for the population as a whole within 2.6 percentage points, 95 times out of 100.

The survey concluded that among Canadians there was "no great enthusiasm" for Washington's strategic defence initiative, popularly known as Star Wars, "in large part because of fears related to a renewed arms race.

"As far as the extent of (Canada's) role in SDI, only a minority support both research and development but there is majority support for at least a research role. But given the limited amount of enthusiasm for SDI, any decision not to participate will likely provoke few negative comments," Decima concluded.

In retrospect, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's policy on Star Wars appears to have been tailored to fit the poll's conclusions perfectly.

On Sept. 7, 1985, he announced that Ottawa would not participate in a government-to-government arrangement with Washington in the SDI program. However, he left open the possibility that individual Canadian companies could become involved on their own if they obtained contracts in the \$26-billion (U.S.) research program.

The poll also found significant support for increased international trade but warned "there would like-

ly be extensive public opinion slippage if the emphasis on trade were seen to come at the expense of other foreign policy roles like providing aid to the Third World and seeking solutions to the arms race."

Decima also concluded that "the public is likely to accept a strategy that sees the promotion of international trade as an end in itself but also as a way of gaining a larger voice for Canada on the world stage."

During the past year and a half, Ottawa has focused considerable attention on Canada's participation in the upcoming round of multilateral trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It has also promoted a role for Canada in attempts to solve trade disputes in world wheat markets.

While the poll asked a broad range of questions relating to foreign aid and international trade, it also asked specific questions about the sale of fresh water.

The poll found that 51 per cent of respondents agreed with the statement, "Since we have plenty of fresh water, I think it's a good idea for Canada to sell some to other countries."

But there was considerable variation in support for water sales in different regions of the country. Residents of British Columbia (62

per cent) and Quebec (70 per cent) expressed the most support for such sales, while Ontario (40 per cent) and the Prairies (39 per cent) were least supportive.

On general foreign policy issues, the most common areas of concern were the arms race and global security issues relating to nuclear war, as well as world poverty and hunger. In a warning to the Government, Decima said that "three quarters or more of those Canadians who cite either of those (arms control or poverty and hunger) as the most serious world issue think that their concern is not the major Government priority."

Decima noted that the more highly educated and affluent households were the most likely to believe that the Government was out of step with their views on foreign policy. They were also most likely and able to challenge Ottawa's foreign policy directions, the company said.

"(They) express the greatest interest in international affairs, feel well informed about international issues, provide much of the opinion formulation in this country and . . . have generally greater access to the media and to voluntary associations. (They) are then in the best position to confront the Government regarding their unhappiness with the direction of Canadian foreign policy."

/9317

CSO: 5220/38

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TURKISH SCIENTIST EXAMINES SDI IMPACT ON COUNTRY

Istanbul MILLIYET in Turkish 16, 20, 22 Nov 86

[Article by Prof Dr Tolga Yarman: "The Balance of the Mad"--"Star Wars" as Seen by a Scientist]

[16 Nov 86 p 10]

[Excerpts] [Boxed material] Preface

The nuclear arms race is once again the topic of the day. Following the Reykjavik summit between the representatives of the two superpowers, U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, nuclear rearmament or --as it is popularly known--"Star Wars" has entered the focus of debate in the world. Moreover, the setback of Reagan's party in the recent elections in the United States has raised new questions in people's minds. In the present series of articles Prof Dr Tolga Yarman examines this question, which recent developments have made a burning one.

Who is Prof Dr Tolga Yarman?

He graduated from the Galatasaray Lycee in 1963, the Chemical engineering department of the Institut National des Sciences Appliquees de Lyons in 1967, and the Nuclear Energy Institute of the Istanbul Technical University in 1968. He obtained a BSc in Nuclear Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1972. He became a lecturer in 1977 and a professor in 1982. He has worked at the Nuclear Research and Training Center at Cekmece. He has served as a member of the teaching staff of the Istanbul Technical University, the Middle East Technical University [in Ankara], at the Bogazici University [formerly Robert College, Istanbul], Anadolu University [in Brzorum], and the California Institute of Technology. He has contributed to Turkish and international newspaper and periodicals as well as conferences.

SDI, while still in the research and development stage, is a project that is already on its way. This is a project that concerns NATO members such as Turkey as much as it concerns the Soviet Union.

Will the protective laser umbrella deployed in space be able, in the first place, to protect itself in either peace or wartime against a possible enemy?

The question is truly important. The enemy can hit the war stations not only from the ground but also from space itself. The technical and tactical approach that is known as ASAT ("Anti Satellite) for short is gaining support. The enemy will be able to mine space with satellite or war station hunter-killers. Conversely, in the now classic way in which the adventure called rearmament develops, weapons will in turn be evolved to hunt down these mines. And, to counter these, weapons will be contrived to annihilate these antimine weapons.

An enemy hit against a space station in geosynchronous orbit is relatively difficult. But, as we have said earlier, while such a space station would possess advantages for observation and self-defense, hitting the enemy from it would be very difficult in view of the great distances and the short time involved. Therefore, to place laser stations solely in space is not an attractive option for all these reasons. In our opinion, this is a key point where Turkey is concerned, too.

[20 Nov 86 p 10]

[Excerpt] SDI From the European Viewpoint

It would be appropriate to consider the balances and consequences [denklem ve sonuclar] raised by SDI insofar as Europe is considered under a separate heading.

In our opinion, the Star Wars initiative has two important consequences where Europe is concerned. The first is Europe's reaction to being carried away with the American initiative (to which it has been subjected within the framework of the SDI, as we have indicated earlier). This reaction has emerged with the EUREKA draft-project. (It will be noted that in contrast to the SDI project, which is already underway, EUREKA is a project that is still in the planning stage).

It will be noted that EUREKA is also conceived as an "breeding-ground" for high technology, and that it is basically aimed at organizing and regulating Europe as a whole through its research and development activities. In fact, what comes under the scope of EUREKA are such topics as high-energy lasers, standards concerning minicomputers, medical diagnostics--particularly where AIDS is concerned--atmospheric pollution, and robotization.

Thus, Europe is, while not staying away from the U.S. SDI, aiming to benefit from the technological spinoff of SDI, in addition to avoiding the loss of its scientists to the United States as a result of the SDI. It is, instead, aiming at organizing and employing them in Europe within the sphere of

EUREKA. At the same time, it is unwilling to allow an excessive consolidation of the trans-Atlantic patronage of the United States as a consequence of SDI.

In fact, the economic structure of Europe provides scope for the United States to spread its SDI through the world of its trans-Atlantic allies. Certain European firms have long been engaged in SDI-bargaining with U.S. companies. It is a fact that the European aeronautics and space industry expects big deals from the United States in the SDI field.

What does the United States expect of Europe in connection with SDI?

U.S. Expectations

No one, probably, will dispute that the United States will want to increase its influence in Europe in connection with Star Wars. The basic way this is to be achieved is through drawing the Europeans into the SDI. In this sense, what kind of bridges will the United States be able to establish with what circles in Europe? The answer is summed up as follows:

--Cooperation in the field of high-quality optical instruments with the Zeiss or Leitz firms in the FRG.

--Cooperation in the field of advanced computer programming with the British Secicon firm.

--Cooperation in the field of high-velocity antimissiles with the appropriate British firms.

--Cooperation in the field of advanced electronics with the Dutch Philips, the British Marconi, Ferranti and Racal firms, and with the Italian firm Selonya.

--Cooperation in the field of radar technology and propulsion with the appropriate firms.

Curious equations are emerging at this point. The FRG and Italian Governments are concerned that if firms in their respective countries cooperate with the Americans in the SDI field, they will eventually ask for the support of their own governments, too. On the other hand, we understand that the Italian firms may enter agreements with the Americans only if they can get the support of their own government.

From the viewpoint of Western Europe, the second important result stemming from the SDI initiative in addition to those we have been discussing are the political currents on the European scene. The views on this scene are roughly divided into two groups... Some experts argue that the SDI will push Europe and the United States apart, while others argue that it will bring them closer together.

[22 Nov 96 p 10]

[Text] Before scrutinizing the Star Wars project from Turkey's viewpoint, it would be useful to note together the following crystal points we have been expounding.

--It is still not certain what the effective weapon for SDI will be. In other words, the technical strategy for the SDI effort has not been determined.

--Each technical choice that is under discussion is fraught with innumerable problems. It is not clear if it will prove possible to overcome these problems. Converging on a technical strategy, in fact, depends on finding out which of the problems in question can be solved and which cannot or which are capable of being solved more easily than the others.

--Computer problems within the framework of SDI are proving to be another bugbear, and it is not yet clear if these problems can be overcome. The widely held opinion in specialist circles is that SDI's computer problems appear to require the realization of what is known as "fifth-generation" computers, capable of imitating human intelligence. Even if such computers can be built, it is not certain that the problem can be solved.

--Whether the SDI umbrella to be put up in space will be able to protect itself constitutes a separate and extraordinary key question.

--To look upon the SDI effort as a purely defensive one would be, in our view, to miss a great deal. The truth is that, by SDI, the Western bloc will be reestablishing or even reversing to its own advantage--that is, if it manages to carry through the SDI effort--the nuclear balance that has been upset to its disadvantage; it will be doing this within the framework of what we describe as the square root principle for short--by putting considerable pressure on the adversary through the combined defensive and offensive characteristics of the SDI effort.

--SDI is emerging as a very creative, very comprehensive and--if achieved--a very powerful U.S. synthesis and initiative. Such an initiative presents the spectacle of a dynamism which has enrolled in it almost the whole world in an unprecedented manner.

--The disagreement over the SDI project is not confined to that between the two superpowers. The disagreement exists among technical circles with opposing views in the United States... It is between these technical circles and the government... It is even within government circles (the State Department and the Defense Department) themselves... Between the United States and Western Europe, between the Soviet Union and Europe... Between certain West European governments... Between some West European governments and some sector of the society which they govern.

--SDI is also a weapon by which the United States forces, to its advantage, the Soviet Union to engage in disarmament talks.

--The West European countries do not want, on the one hand, to miss out on SDI and its fruits. They are, on the other hand, striving not to be carried away by such a fascinating American "imperative." To say that the EUREKA project is a "legitimate defensive response" by Europe to the SDI effort by the United States would be an apt diagnosis. Europe, on the other hand, is assuming the part of "moderator" between the United States and the Soviets, but on a course drawn by the U.S. initiative. No West European government is capable of ignoring the trade offs offered by the Soviet Union in relation to the SDI.

However, the fact remains that, for as long as the "fateful dispute" and hostility remain between the Western and Eastern blocks, the Western bloc remains unable to do anything other than to restore--under U.S. leadership and initiative--the nuclear balance that we have said is being upset to its disadvantage. It appears, therefore, that Europe is destined to join the U.S. SDI caravan one way or another, despite both the clashes of interest it has with the United States and its own internal disputes. Under the circumstances, while efforts are being made to accelerate disarmament talks, it is feared that there may be a further escalation of the arms race.

--In this sense, deterrence based on the ability for mutual destruction, irrespective of how horrifying a concept it is, is crying out as the final balance in the present setup. In moving to break this balance, the United States is triggering the machinery for its reestablishment at a more complex higher level.

--To put the thinking in the terms of the imagery chosen by President Reagan to defend SDI... While the U.S. SDI plans to knock out aggressor Soviet missiles by beaming laser rays on them from space (as enormous bows and arrows did to armored French knights)... from the Soviet viewpoint, the SDI umbrella to be deployed in space should, in view of its aggressive nature, be vulnerable to being pierced--just like the aggressor French knights-- by "effective" Soviet counterweapons when necessary.

--Nevertheless, the attractions which the square root principle--with its defensive and offensive characteristics--holds for the United States for nuclear parity within the context of its current technical superiority appear to make an escalation in rearmament, which the SDI attempt may lead to, necessary from the viewpoint of the Western bloc. (Through SDI--if it achieved--the United States will not only be acquiring superiority in defense in the event of a possible attack, but it will also be gaining at the same time, in addition to a nuclear first-strike opportunity that cannot be retaliated against, a strike force capability that is also proof against retaliation thanks to the "defense system" itself.)

We believe that it is necessary to debate the role and place of our country in SDI on the basis of the equations we have cited above and similar complementary ones.

As we are a member of the Western bloc, it is not possible to consider Turkey in isolation from America's SDI.

On the other hand, Turkey is a member of Europe and a NATO ally. These two factors are also reasons for our country to be dragged into the Star Wars effort of the United States.

It can already be observed that the "reflexive" reaction formed in Turkey is along predicted lines.

Contacts have sprouted with the EUREKA project on the diplomatic and financial level, even though nothing definite has been determined as to what will be done at the technical level.

It would be appropriate, we believe, to discuss the position and effectiveness of our country within the SDI framework in the light of the terminology created by the European dynamic and the projections we shall draw for ourselves.

The realization of SDI requires, even at the research and development stage, at least some 10 years. We can find, unfortunately, nothing worth mentioning that our country can contribute to this, including a contribution in a technical sense, except for individual efforts and achievements.

If we pore over the issue of what the United States expects of Europe regarding SDI, it does not seem very likely that one can point out any technical contribution that Turkey can make to the project.

Nevertheless, it will not be possible to ignore the accumulation of knowledge and the more or less favorable moves that have occurred in our universities, research centers, and some state and military establishments.

The first thing that should be considered from this viewpoint is to follow what Europe is doing within the framework of EUREKA and to avoid--as far as possible--losing or sending on duty to Europe or American such of our civilian and military scientific experts that can make a technical contribution to SDI and, instead, to organize them here under the supervision and control of the Chief of the General Staff, the Ministry of National Defense and our Foreign Ministry.

It is possible to envisage that several tens of millions of dollars flowing into our country through SDI research and development channels can be put to work at once--with the military and civilian research groups we have mentioned, science units in our universities and research centers--to generate ideas on a contract basis and, later on, gradually moving along an axis of technical developments.

One can also think of the possibility that certain of our establishments, say our Supply and Service Centers and certain subunits of ASELSAN and similar enterprises, can be guided to achieve substantial concrete contributions within the framework in question.

At the same time, we need to be careful to avoid fixing our gaze on the SDI "space shield" and getting carried away by the illusion that we may be able to manufacture "some important things."

But the truly important issue is, in our opinion, the strategic and geopolitical equations into which we believe our country will be dragged in connection with SDI. We will conclude our study by a scrutiny of this point.

As far as Turkey is concerned, the most important aspect of the subject lies, in our opinion, in the fact that some of the SDI weapons suggest a real need for deployment in Turkey on technical grounds.

If the "pop out" concept we have discussed earlier on is to be used, the laser cannons that are expected to take to the air parallel with the aggressors' missiles and destroy them on direct sighting in space are best deployed, due to the dynamics of the action, very close to the areas from which such missiles are launched. If laser cannons on moving platforms prove to have drawbacks compared to these of stationary laser cannons, then it would be more suitable to envisage laser cannons to operate on land when necessary.

Thus, for instance, firing a laser cannon accurately from a submarine in time of danger will entail more difficulty, from a "ballistics" and "automatic control" viewpoint, particularly if the target is not predetermined, than doing the same thing from a land base.

Having all this in mind, it would be more suitable in our opinion to deploy laser cannons on land. This consideration and proximity to Soviet missiles, brings our country to mind--whether we like it or not--where the siting of laser cannons are concerned.

The laser pistol will have to have an uninterrupted view of the geosynchronous mirror that will be (continuously) facing the territory of the Soviet Union. It will therefore be required to be within view of the mirror and preferably located as close to the territory of the Soviet Union as possible.

Moreover, locating the laser pistol at as high an altitude as possible is the most important condition for avoiding an undesirable level of absorption of its energy in the atmosphere and the related dissipation and loss of efficiency.

When we gather together all the elements we have discussed, the site perfectly designed for the laser cannon turns out to be our highest altitude regions.

We are naturally aware that what we have under consideration are actually assumptions brought to mind by some hypothetical concepts. What is certain is this: one is strongly aware that our country will be considered to assume roles--particularly as a deployment site--in the imaginary weapons of SDI.

It will be appreciated that in the event such a subject gains actuality, pondering the military and political aspects of the subject--particularly at the present stage--is considerably outside the scope of our study.

13184/12948
CSO: 5200/2483

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

SOVIET JOURNAL EDITORIAL ON REYKJAVIK MEETING

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 1, Jan 87 pp 3-10

[Text]

The most acute and pressing of the numerous complex problems facing humanity on the threshold of the 21st century is that of preventing a nuclear holocaust, of preserving life on Earth. This cannot be done without curbing the arms race, which imperialism has whipped up to an unprecedented scale, creating the real danger of all life on our planet being annihilated.

That is why the 27th CPSU Congress determined that the main direction of the Soviet Union's foreign policy must be the struggle against the nuclear danger and the arms race, and for universal peace. Its resolution stressed that there is no alternative to this: "Present-day armaments are of such a kind that no country can hope to defend itself by only military-technical means, by creating even the most powerful defence, since not only nuclear war itself, but also the arms race cannot be won. Its continuation on earth, let alone its spread to outer space, will accelerate the already critically high rate of stockpiling and perfecting nuclear and other types of armaments, with the result that even parity will cease to be a factor of military-political deterrence. Consequently, the safeguarding of security is increasingly seen as a political problem that can be resolved only by political means." The congress pointed to the need to find and use even the slightest chance to halt, while it is still possible, the growing military danger.

The Soviet Union's proposal for an October summit in the Icelandic capital was one of a series of initiatives in keeping with this foreign policy strategy, and was dictated by an understanding of the extreme need to give a powerful, decisive impetus to the constructive process in the main direction of world politics.

The need for this line of action was primarily determined by the fact that although more than a year ago in Geneva the USA acknowledged that victory is not possible in a nuclear war and together with the Soviet Union declared its intention not to seek military superiority, American imperialism's whipping up of the arms race has been continuing apace; what is more, it is approaching a point beyond which a new round—an arms race in outer space—will be inevitable and could have truly unpredictable political and military consequences.

Under the circumstances, the Soviet Union has repeatedly made vigorous efforts to sustain the positive line in international policy evident in Geneva. A central place among these efforts rightly belongs to the CPSU CC General Secretary's statement of January 15, 1986 outlining a concrete plan to liquidate nuclear weapons by the end of the century and the USSR's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, which has been prolonged on four occasions since August 1985.

However, to all appearances the US ruling circles saw the Soviet initiatives merely as an obstacle to their imperial designs, for which Washington must have military superiority and hence the ability to dictate with force. That can be the only explanation for Washington's refusal to respond to the Soviet initiatives on the most vital questions of present-day development, and especially for its actions such as the stated intention not to abide by the most important documents designed to curb the stockpiling of arms, including SALT-2, and for the increased appropriations for military purposes, Star Wars included. The White House is clearly reluctant to hold sincere talks on the most important aspects of disarmament--strategic offensive arms, medium-range nuclear weapons, and the non-militarisation of outer space. The very fact that there has for so long been futile discussion of scores of proposals at the Soviet-American Geneva talks makes it doubtful that the discussions will bear fruit and end with any concrete agreements.

However, even while being pushed towards heightened confrontation, the Soviet Union has always deemed it its duty persistently to continue to seek possibilities for reducing arms, defusing the international situation, and firmly establishing the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with opposite systems, principles which are necessary for a secure world. It understands that in the present situation there is a need to reduce the time spent on reaching political agreements and immediately to move to constructive actions that will clear the way for nuclear disarmament. As Mikhail Gorbachev said in his October 14, 1986 address on the results of the Reykjavik meeting, the USSR was guided by the conviction that the protracted feverish state of international relations harbours the threat of a sudden and doomful crisis, and that practical steps are required to radically improve the international situation.

That this formulation of the problem is timely and realistic is evident in the broad international response to the news that the leaders of the two states were prepared to meet in Reykjavik. Governments and parliaments, public organisations and parties, and state and political leaders expressed the hope that agreements would be reached that could bring about the long-awaited advance in resolving the most urgent problem of the day, and that the summit would offer a real chance for progress in nuclear disarmament. Appeals, letters and telegrams began to pour into Reykjavik from diverse organisations and individuals calling, as did the appeal from Latin American intellectuals for example, for "immediate, resolute and bold action to make the world the one of which poets dream, and to guarantee the human race improvement rather than annihilation".

In a word, if one does not count the arch-reactionaries, who immediately began to implore President Reagan "not to give in to the temptation of detente" and not to allow himself to be drawn into "things that he would later regret", the international community as a whole was very enthusiastic about the new prospects offered by the Reykjavik meeting.

The talks in the Icelandic capital showed conclusively that the struggle for peace is a complicated and multifaceted process, for, as the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress stated, "we are dealing with a society whose ruling circles refuse to assess the realities of the world and its perspectives in sober terms, or to draw serious conclusions from their own experience and that of others".

The Reykjavik meeting saw a clash between two approaches to world politics, two ways of thinking and understanding the world around us, two ideologies. The talks were a convincing illustration of the profound fundamental differences between the Soviet Union's creative and innovative course towards unravelling the most knotty questions in the present inter-

national situation, its responsible attitude to the needs and requirements not only of the Soviet people but of the peoples of other countries, including the American people, and the US course of maintaining international tension, a course based on the vain hope of attaining world domination. It can be said that *Reykjavik fully revealed the contrast between politics in the real sense of the word and political manoeuvring, between real concern for the future of civilisation and peace-making phraseology.*

The proposals made by the USSR in the Icelandic capital are a concrete expression of the new approach to the burning problems of our time and a practical manifestation of the new thinking that is in line with the realities of the nuclear age. The Soviet Union was guided by the conviction that it is now time for major steps and far-reaching decisions bringing substantial progress towards eliminating nuclear weapons rather than for any cosmetic measures to appease the world public. That is why the Soviet Union advanced bold, non-standard initiatives intended to set nuclear disarmament in motion.

The main feature of these initiatives is that they rest not on the principle of nuclear arms limitation, as was the case with earlier treaties like SALT-1 and SALT-2, but on the principle of nuclear arms liquidation and in a relatively short space of time at that. Acceptance of the Soviet proposals would have meant a breakthrough in world politics and ushered in a new epoch in humanity's life—the non-nuclear epoch.

The essence of this package of proposals is well known: the USSR wanted a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms over a five-year period and their complete elimination over the next five years, as envisaged by the January 1986 Soviet programme for creating a nuclear-free world. In order to clear the way for detente in Europe, it was proposed fully to liquidate Soviet and American medium-range missiles on the continent and immediately begin talks on missiles of that kind in Asia, and also on missiles with a range below 1,000 kilometres, their total number to be immediately frozen under this proposal.

Since realisation of these measures would make it necessary to prevent any action that could undermine parity during disarmament and to exclude the possibility of new types of weapons being developed to achieve military superiority, the Soviet side proposed that measures be taken to prohibit nuclear tests and also to strengthen the operative Soviet-American ABM Treaty with an undertaking to abide by it in the course of the ten years during which the Soviet and American nuclear potential would be liquidated. This entire process would be strictly monitored, the USSR declaring its willingness to use any form of verification.

In an effort to facilitate a mutually acceptable compromise, the Soviet side made major concessions on both strategic arms and medium-range missiles, thereby demonstrating anew its responsible approach to humanity's fate and concerns. These were actually concessions to common sense.

In particular, the Soviet Union dropped its former demands to include in strategic weapons the American medium-range missiles capable of reaching Soviet territory and the American forward-based weapons, and to take into account the nuclear weapons of Britain and France. The USSR also agreed to carry out the strategic arms reduction without any special calculations—by a 50-per cent cut at the first stage in each component part of the triad: land-based strategic missiles, submarine-launched strategic missiles and strategic bombers. The Soviet Union met the Americans half way on their proposal with respect to medium-range missiles by accepting the formula of zero missiles in Europe and 100 warheads on medium-range missiles in the eastern part of the USSR and on US territory. Neither did the Soviet Union demand that the United States halt work on the so-called strategic defense initiative so long as it was confined to laboratory research.

The bold, constructive and yet flexible Soviet line in Iceland exposed still further the true essence both of the foreign policy of American imperialism as a whole and of the tactics used by its leaders, which often border on intrigue. The entire course of the Reykjavik talks showed that the US ruling quarters are still nostalgic for the time when the Americans had military superiority and could dream of world domination. It is not for nothing that in his address to the American people shortly before his departure for Iceland President Reagan repeated the familiar collection of anti-Soviet fabrications and reiterated his adherence to the stockpiling of arms, while at a meeting with the most zealous supporters of this policy he spoke ironically of those who were predicting that the meeting could bring epoch-making treaties and historic advances. Many American observers actually saw the US agreement to hold a working meeting in Reykjavik as a clever political move largely aimed to change the situation in the US Congress, where a number of members—obviously mindful of the upcoming elections—had been making demands (including a cut in SDI appropriations) which were at odds with the administration's intention to continue military buildup.

It therefore comes as no surprise that the first few hours of the talks showed that the American side lacked a broad approach and did not understand that it was a unique opportunity to seek solutions which would avert the danger of nuclear war. The USA's unwillingness to decide major questions and its desire to confine the discussion to debating the same—in Mikhail Gorbachev's words—old, stale proposals that have been stifling the Geneva talks made a striking contrast to the Soviet Union's constructive and innovative initiatives. The American position had not a hint of any new ideas that could secure effective progress on the questions under discussion.

The real meaning of the US political course was revealed in its position on nuclear tests and especially on strengthening the ABM Treaty. It was this problem which was the stumbling block that meant, as Mikhail Gorbachev said on television on October 14, 1986 that "being virtually one, two or three steps from taking decisions which could become historic for the whole nuclear-space era, we were unable to take any step. No turning point in the world's history occurred".

The USSR's stance on the ABM Treaty is further evidence of its responsible approach to world affairs. The ABM Treaty acquired key significance once the possibility appeared to elaborate agreements on strategic offensive arms and medium-range missiles, for the sides had to be sure that while these types of arms were being reduced no one would develop new weapons which would undermine stability and parity. That goal of equal security was also what prompted the Soviet proposal to begin full-scale talks on a total nuclear test ban.

The Soviet leadership has repeatedly explained that the view that the USSR "is afraid of SDI" because it cannot compete with the US in technology for Star Wars is nothing but a profound delusion. Our country's extremely negative attitude to the so-called strategic defense initiative stems above all from our categorical opposition to a new stage in the arms race, its spread to outer space.

In Reykjavik, too, the American side obviously wanted to change, and in fact to destroy, the ABM Treaty, whose Article 5 obliges the parties "not to develop, test or deploy sea-, air-, space- or mobile land-based ABM systems or components". The USA wanted to legalise the possibility to develop a large-scale ABM space programme that could be used for its militaristic ends. No assertion that the USA intends to continue the SDI programme only as an "insurance" against hypothetical unforeseen circumstances can hide the fact that SDI is merely a new technological cover for the same doctrine of hegemonism, of military superiority preached by American imperialism. Many people in the USA make no

secret of the fact that this programme is spearheaded against the Soviet Union.

This adds fresh weight to the 27th CPSU Congress conclusion that "imperialism, which was the first to use nuclear weapons, is now preparing to take a new, possibly irrevocable, step- to extend the arms race to outer space and train the sights on the entire planet".

The American position in Reykjavik on SDI once again showed clearly the power and might of the military-industrial complex- the principal force behind adventurism and aggression. It is no secret that the very conception of the Star Wars programme is largely attributable to the fact that a number of giant war corporations felt that the present forms of the arms race no longer brought in high enough profits and therefore fixed their eyes on space programmes as a new gold vein for making fabulous profits. In his day Karl Marx wrote that "capital eschews no profit, or very small profit, just as Nature was formerly said to abhor a vacuum. With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10 per cent will ensure its employment anywhere; 20 per cent certain will produce eagerness; 50 per cent, positive audacity; 100 per cent will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300 per cent, and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged."¹

In spite of the fact that no positive results were achieved in Reykjavik through the fault of the American side, the summit was a major event in international life. It stirred the world, gave a fresh impetus to a more profound analysis and understanding of the essence of the pressing problems of the day, and forced political leaders, the public at large and practically every thinking person to look anew at the tasks, prospects and possibilities of the effort to resolve the urgent problems of our time, to ban nuclear weapons, prevent new spirals in the arms race, and eliminate the war danger hanging over mankind.

The response to the outcome of the Iceland talks confirms the correctness of the conclusion drawn by the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau that *Reykjavik created a qualitatively new situation and moved the struggle for nuclear disarmament to a new stage where it is necessary to muster efforts to effect radical reductions and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.*

The results of the meeting in the Icelandic capital were the subject of lively discussion at government cabinet meetings and, in some Western countries like the FRG, at parliamentary sessions as well, at meetings of party functionaries, in inter-party organisations like the Council of the Socialist International, and at bilateral talks between leaders of various countries.

Reykjavik was thoroughly discussed at the recent World Peace Congress in Denmark, which was attended by over 1,000 anti-war and pacifist organisations from a majority of the world's countries, people of very diverse convictions and political affiliation. The Copenhagen Appeal unanimously adopted at the congress demands an immediate end to nuclear weapon tests so as to halt the arms race on earth and prevent its spread to outer space, elimination of all types of weapons, and dropping of the Star Wars plans.

In a communique adopted at a meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Foreign Ministers' Committee, the socialist community countries firmly supported the USSR's position in Reykjavik, backed its far-reaching proposals, and stated that their realisation would make it possible to effect a radical

¹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1974, p. 712

change for the better in international affairs and in every direction of the struggle for disarmament in a short time span, to avert the danger of nuclear war and begin progress towards a nuclear-free world.

Similar ideas have actually been expressed by many eminent Western political and public leaders. For example, welcoming Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals in Reykjavik, Andreas Papandreu, the head of the Greek government, underscored the significance of the Soviet efforts to rid humanity of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the end of the century.

In its statement, the presidium of the Social Democratic Party of Germany expressed the conviction that the outcome of the Reykjavik meeting is particularly worrying for it was the first opportunity since the war to take "serious, and to some extent even sensational, steps towards disarmament". "The American side," the statement continued, "assumed a heavy responsibility by ignoring the wishes of its European allies and the criticisms of a majority of American scientists and placing the SDI programme above agreements which would have opened the way to greater security and cooperation".

The only applause came from the hawks, the arch-reactionaries and the open militarists, who praised the US President for not reaching agreements which would have slowed down the stockpiling of arms and, what is especially undesirable from their viewpoint, would have blocked the way to nuclear weapons in space. The *New York Times* wrote that the "hard-line conservatives were so relieved that Mr. Reagan 'just said no' in the end, blessing 'Star Wars' for providing the obstacle. There remains a faction in the US that is opposed to any significant accord with the Russians but usually hasn't had to say so because the likelihood was so minimal".

The new situation in the world was primarily created by the Soviet Union's bold and constructive initiatives in Reykjavik. Its programme for ridding the world of nuclear weapons is now a main topic in world politics. And it is only natural that knowledge of it among broad strata of the population has been further enhancing the authority and appeal of socialism's foreign policy and increasing the impact of the Soviet Union's peace-promoting course on the international situation.

It was apparently this which prompted high-ranking US officials to launch immediately after Reykjavik their most intense ever propaganda campaign at home and abroad, to use clever tricks and distortions to convince the American people, American legislators, and their West European allies that it was the USA rather than the USSR that had pursued a constructive line and that it therefore is not to blame for the outcome of the meeting. The US President and his closest aides have been trying to portray the American stance as an example of Washington's readiness to resolve the urgent problems, and the proposals discussed in Reykjavik as American initiatives.

The aim is undoubtedly to embellish the destructionist stand of the US administration, as Mikhail Gorbachev said on October 22, 1986, and to destroy the grains of trust before they germinate while continuing to implement the military programmes, above all those connected with SDI. To this end, the Soviet proposals and the course of the Reykjavik talks are being distorted. What is more, since the summit the US government has taken action which shows that, far from having constructive proposals on the key questions of disarmament, it does not even wish to preserve an atmosphere for normal dialogue.

In other words, the same old situation is being repeated yet again: each time a ray of hope appears in Soviet-American relations and the settlement of questions that affect all humanity, the American side undertakes provocations designed to poison the atmosphere and thwart the possibility for a positive solution.

However, the facts show that despite the American administration's desperate efforts its position is on the whole not supported in the world,

while inside and outside the USA itself SDI and the argument advanced by the US ruling circles to justify it are being more heatedly discussed. For example, Senator Edward Kennedy has said that a "grand and historic opportunity was there in Iceland, but it has been sacrificed... on the uncertain altar of SDI." In a *New York Times* article he wrote that "in choosing the uncertain, unproved and vastly expensive pursuit of a strategic defense system a decade or more in the future over the certainty of deep reductions in nuclear arsenals today, Mr. Reagan has fueled the widespread fears that when the chips are down he is not serious about arms control." For his part, Senator Gary Hart believes that the President made a mistake when he missed the unique opportunity to conclude staggering arms control agreements and thereby drove the USA into a corner so as to protect an extremely hypothetical and very expensive programme.

Many foreign newspapers and magazines note that the Americans are now going to find it very difficult to repeat their earlier claims that it is SDI which forced the USSR to take a serious approach to talks. "After all," wrote the Japanese paper *Mainichi*, "the Reykjavik talks showed that as long as Reagan goes ahead with his strategic defense initiative with the zeal of a religious fanatic, it will not be possible to reach agreement either on medium-range missiles or strategic nuclear arms."

On the whole it can be said that since Reykjavik Washington officials have been made even more aware of "America's alienation in the world", to which many American experts have increasingly drawn attention. It has made itself strongly felt in relations between the USA and its partners, who, according to the West European media, "expected agreement on major reductions in medium-range missiles, which would have been greeted with obvious relief by all countries of the continent". Many commentators forecast that the initial ripple of disappointment caused by the failure of the Reykjavik summit could, as *Newsday* wrote, become a much more destructive political wave for the United States on the European side of the Atlantic Ocean.

It would, of course, be naive to expect that the Reykjavik meeting would be followed by a direct split in the "Atlantic solidarity", for the class identity of the NATO allies is too strong and they are too closely bound up in joint militarist arrangements that constantly increase their political and economic dependence on the USA. But it is also clear that the West European ruling quarters must be feeling the pressure of public opinion and the anti-war movement, especially in a period of upcoming parliamentary elections in a number of countries of Western Europe. One must also take into consideration the very real anxiety of West European leaders over the dangerous and often unpredictable course of the American administration, which, as experience shows, is quite capable of drawing them into its foreign policy adventures. And there is no doubt that the Reykjavik meeting will encourage a rethinking of the reality in Western Europe and on other continents, and that cannot but affect the alignment and forms of cooperation of the political forces in the world.

The talks in the Icelandic capital revealed even more graphically and clearly that humanity's problems are acute and urgent and that it is necessary further to muster efforts to resolve them primarily by political means and to achieve real progress in disarmament, elimination of nuclear weapons, and non-militarisation of space. The world is now more aware of the degree of responsibility borne by the political leaders to find the ways to strengthen peace and security, and also of the extent to which they are able to assume such responsibility.

Reykjavik mapped out the route to a solution to the most important problems on which the fate of humanity hinges. At the same time, the out-

come of the summit highlighted the difficulties on the road to a nuclear-free world and showed the complexity of the situation and of the struggle which will have to be waged for an end to the arms race and nuclear disarmament. The militarist circles were obviously scared by the results which Reykjavik showed to be possible and they are now coordinating their efforts to dampen people's desire for peace, thwart nuclear disarmament, and raise roadblocks to the process begun in Reykjavik.

The Soviet Union believes that it would be disastrous to miss this historic chance to reach a radical solution to the problems of war and peace. The Soviet Union proceeds from the assumption that the Reykjavik meeting will serve as an impetus to the Geneva talks. In these circumstances the significance of the all-European process is also growing. That is why the statement made by Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau Member, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the Vienna meeting of the representatives of the state-participants in the CSCE contained a number of important proposals on practical steps in the field of disarmament on the continent, on establishing all-round cooperation between the European countries in the political, as well as economic and humanitarian fields.

The Soviet people are making a decisive contribution to the prospects for a nuclear-free world by working harder and enhancing the country's economic potential and defence capability.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986
English Translation Copyright; Progress Publishers 1986

/9274
CSG | 5200/1402

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

INDIA: GORBACHEV OFFER TERMED 'PROGRESSIVE STEP'

Madras THE HINDU in English 4 Mar 87 p 8

[Editorial]

[Text]

AT A TIME when a seemingly benighted arms control process needed a break, the Soviet leader, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev—whom fair-minded people round the world would recognise as the most interesting and imaginative leader in international politics today—has come up with a real ace. The offer to delink, or "single out", from the package of complicated nuclear arms control issues the problem of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) in Europe and conclude "without delay" an accord on this highly sensitive issue with the United States has evoked international enthusiasm and, in some quarters where there can be no enthusiasm, a reaction of grudging respect. There is unquestionably a firm strategic baseline for Soviet approach positions on the nuclear arms build-up: there is no question of any top person in the Kremlin not insisting on "equal security" or "strategic equivalence" with the United States—which means rough parity and no unilateral advantage. If there is among the hardline elements in the Reagan administration, or within the American strategic affairs community, a quest for "strategic superiority" or a "first strike" capability or a privileged position in relation to a future generation of nuclear weapons, there is going to be no softening at all on the Soviet side. But the undeniable merit in the Gorbachev approach is the element of flexibility he has brought into the global power picture, which seeks to regain the momentum of the arms limitation and arms control process. Specifically in relation to the INF or Euromissile problem, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has made several adjustments to the Soviet negotiating position from the time he took charge in March 1985. From a Western standpoint, the

USSR made these concessions: it moved from a no-deal position to the acceptance of the proposition that an INF accord could be negotiated without an agreement on the United States' "Star Wars" (Strategic Defence Initiative) project; it then accepted the contention that INF weapons should not be included in the "strategic" balance; and it also lifted its earlier stipulation that British and French nuclear forces would have to be frozen before any INF accord could be concluded. These concessions were not to be taken as signs of weakness or "softness" in the negotiating stance: their impact was to increase the pressure on the Reagan administration to approach Euromissile negotiations seriously and actually to propose a cut to 100 INF warheads on either side. In fact, through much of 1986 and particularly on the eve of the Reykjavik summit (October 1986), a compromise deal involving the Pershing IIs, the Cruises and the SS-20s was speculated upon and predicted. In the wake of the Iceland meeting between Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev, the Euromissile initiative was seen by arms control specialists to have fallen victim to some kind of central breakdown over "Star Wars."

What Mr. Gorbachev has done—at a time when his American counterpart is in quite deep political trouble—is to come up with an offer and a challenge that it would be impossible to ignore as a serious and equitable arms control initiative; there is a substantive appeal to centrist-conservative political forces, including governments, in Europe as much as to peace constituencies and movements round the world. It would be no exaggeration to say that the substance of

the new Soviet offer is to put on the Geneva negotiating agenda a proposition which recaptures, on the one hand, the momentum of the arms control process and, in another sense, promises (if the other side is willing) to return the situation to the positive climate of detente experienced in the early 1970s. Of course, it will take two sides to make possible a real movement towards detente, which in this age inevitably means a limiting or scaling down of global power nuclear arsenals. Given the Reagan administration's record of short-sightedness thus far—on all the substantive arms control issues covering strategic, medium range, space and "defensive" weaponry—what is actually required is a reversal of the trend. Several Western analysts tended to view Reykjavik as Mr. Gorbachev's "way of testing whether Mr. Reagan would really compromise on any central arms control issue"; it also seemed that the Soviet leader had come to the shrewd conclusion that any further summit between the top leaders of the two global powers must involve solid agreements on arms control, or at least tangible progress towards such agreements. Shedding the "linkages," loosening the package approach, is a notably progressive step in the difficult, virtually intractable, arms control process; it is also a chastening reminder that a breakthrough on Euromissiles will still leave unaddressed on a businesslike basis the problem of strategic nuclear weapons, SDI, nuclear testing, the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, verification and so on. The imaginativeness of the Gorbachev offer lies in the sense of constructive timing—and in making it very, very difficult for the other side to say 'No' to the invitation.

/9274

CSO: 5250/0012

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON U.S. NUCLEAR MISSILES IN TURKEY

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 13, 6 Apr 87 p 7

[Article by Yuri Lebedev]

[Text]

The relevant bilateral talk dragged on for almost 18 months. All opposition parties were unanimous in opposing the extension of the agreement. The government came in for vehement criticism in the Turkish parliament for taking the decision.

This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the U.S. military presence in Turkey. There are 60 U.S. military installations in the country today, including air force bases and stations for electronic surveillance of the Soviet Union. There are some 5,000 U.S. personnel, as well as American nuclear weapons: currently nuclear warheads are being installed on Honest John missiles, soon to be replaced by Pershings and Lance-2s.

Besides serving as centres for espionage against Turkey's neighbours, U.S. bases there can provide bridgeheads should the U.S. consider undertaking armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Middle East countries. In this connection Turkish officialdom is insistently emphasizing that the bases will be under Turkish command and that their use "outside of NATO's frame-

work" will not be permitted. However, recent years have demonstrated in practice that national control is a mere formality.

What especially troubles the public in Turkey is the fact that during the negotiations to prolong the agreement Ankara made a range of concessions to Washington. Former Defence Minister H. Esat Isik said the other day that the present relationship with the U.S. is "reminiscent of the relationship between officer and subordinate." Former Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit qualified the new agreement as "a compromise that increases instability and Turkey's dependence on the United States."

Formerly, U.S. military installations have been fairly frequently involved, directly or indirectly, in Washington's ventures. The Irangate revelations have brought to light evidence of the use of U.S. military bases in Turkey for arms transshipments to Iran. Newsweek, for instance, says it is quite probable that U.S. arms for Iran came from dumps in Turkey.

/9317

CSO: 5200/1413

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DENMARK: SDP'S AUKEN VIEWS TALKS WITH CPSU SECRETARY LUKYANOV

PM311555 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 26 Mar 87 p 5

[Interview with Social Democratic Party Deputy Chairman Svend Auken by Carl Otto Brix: "Auken: The Soviet Union's 'No' to Nuclear Arms is Honestly Meant"]

[Text] Plans for a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic region are viewed by the Soviet Union as an important step toward eliminating all nuclear weapons in Europe — not only intermediate-range missiles in Europe, which are covered by the negotiations in Geneva, but also the short-range missiles and the tactical nuclear arms.

The Soviet side stressed strongly that a guarantee of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic region would not depend on the Soviet Union being given the right to inspection, as has been the case with agreements between the Soviet Union and other countries, including Finland.

This is how Svend Auken, Social Democratic Party deputy chairman, interprets the statements made by the Soviet delegation in their talks with the Social Democratic Party over the last few days.

The delegation is headed by Anatoliy Lukyanov, who is secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and is described as Mikhail Gorbachev's right-hand man. Tomorrow he will meet with Prime Minister Poul Schluter (Conservative Party) and Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen (Liberal Party).

Talks will continue today after the Soviets visit Fyn and Jutland to look among other things at Danish industry.

Lukyanov has delivered an invitation from Mikhail Gorbachev for the Social Democrats to attend new talks in Moscow.

"They are very concerned to brief us as thoroughly as possible on what is happening in the Soviet Union, and they have become very skilled ambassadors for their country," Svend Auken said. "My impression is that major changes are on their way in this conservative and totalitarian society."

The Social Democratic deputy chairman added that the Soviet Union's offer to scrap intermediate-range missiles is only the first

step. In the next round the Soviet Union would also like to eliminate short-range missiles and tactical nuclear weapons.

However, as if this were not enough, the Soviet plan also contains the wish to reduce conventional forces — that is, nonnuclear forces.

This means that the Soviet Union is acting to allay worries expressed in many quarters that removing nuclear missiles would simply mean the Soviet Union would gain military superiority due to its stronger conventional forces.

"The Soviet delegation gave me the impression — and I think that it was being honest — that the United States, which itself laid the foundation for negotiations on eliminating intermediate-range missiles, have now become frightened by the Soviet Union's willingness to reach agreement and are making new demands at the Geneva negotiations," Svend Auken said. "I was very sad to hear this, for I am convinced that an agreement should be reached during Reagan's presidency.

"Reagan can be certain of persuading the majority of Republicans and all the Democrats to vote for an agreement. He cannot be outmaneuvered by the right wing — as happened in the case of SALT II, which was agreed to by Carter but never ratified by the U.S. Senate."

Svend Auken is convinced that the link between European and U.S. security will not disappear simply because U.S. intermediate-range missiles are withdrawn from European territory.

"The United States' reaction is not dependent on the missiles in Europe," Svend Auken said, basing his view on the talks he has recently had with prominent officials in Washington, including the conservative security policy expert, Richard Perle.

"If the United States wants to shoot back, it will do so," Svend Auken said.

Svend Auken said that the Soviet delegation has shown great interest in the Social Democratic Party's proposal for nonoffensive defense. These have already been given an international abbreviation — NOD (non-offensive defense).

/9274

CSO: 5200/2515

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADA: CONTROVERSY OVER CRUISE TESTING REPORTED

Vancouver SUN Editorial

Vancouver THE SUN in English 26 Feb 87 p B4

[Editorial]

[Text]

The federal government should reconsider whether testing cruise missiles for the United States is in the national interest.

There seems to be some confusion about this commitment and even a split in the Mulroney cabinet, making a review essential.

There is one report that unless the government acts by Saturday, giving a full year's notice of withdrawing, its agreement with the U.S. to test the cruise will be renewed automatically. But this comes only from public relations men in the external affairs department, and it may not be right.

The whole question might not have come up at this time had it not been for the American test of a cruise missile this week, which focused public attention on the important moral and political issue.

The agreement was made by Pierre Trudeau's government in 1983. At the time, he said the testing was necessary to affirm Canada's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But Mr. Trudeau had his reasons for the NATO argument which don't necessarily hold true today. He was in a phase of high criticism of U.S. policy on arms control and his round-the-world peace mission was in high gear. The missile tests were a sop to Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Reagan doesn't qualify for sops today and with cruise missiles already deployed in Europe, NATO won't stand or fall on Canadian tests after 1988 when the agreement would end.

Canada has a double interest in declaring that it won't be the Pentagon's playground. First, because it would help exert pressure on the U.S. to reach some kind of arms control agreement with a Soviet Union apparently much more willing than four years ago. Additionally because there

is a very real danger that Mr. Reagan's Star Wars program, including testing, will wreck the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Second, Canada needs to assert its sovereign independence at a time when U.S. political action, especially on trade matters, is threatening to usurp it. This is much better done through foreign policy differences that ought to earn respect than through a petty war of retaliatory taxes on each others' trade goods.

Mr. Mulroney, in desperate need of support, should listen to Canadians. He should even listen to his own cabinet. At least one powerful minister, Pat Carney, opposes the cruise tests and her office suggests that Canada could withdraw from this part of its overall defence weapons agreement at any time, without having to repudiate the whole thing a year ahead. That sounds like a good idea.

Ottawa CITIZEN Editorial

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 28 Feb 87 p B2

[Editorial]

[Text]

There was a coincidence this week that supplies, in a modest Canadian way, an insight through the horrific details of the arms race.

In the Mackenzie Valley, the U.S. Air Force tested its cruise missile; and in Ottawa, sources let it be known we are taking steps to guard against Soviet cruise missiles. So the race goes on.

Successive Canadian cabinets have insisted that there is nothing provocative about U.S. cruise missiles, a growing part of NATO's arsenal. Tests in Canada are therefore a benign contribution to alliance defence.

However benign our cruise missiles are, *theirs* have become a dangerous threat that needs to be met. Defence Department officials were saying this week that Canada will establish forward bases in the Far North to handle CF-18 interceptors.

Their purpose will be partly non-military — to give physical expression to Canadian sovereignty. Their military objective? Mainly to deter or destroy Soviet bombers and the air-launched cruise missiles they now carry.

If the arms race were merely a vicious circle, that is where it would end: both sides deploying cruise missiles, both sides deploying defences against them.

The arms race runs on a more complicated dynamic.

Not content with forward-basing CF-18s, or with new radar (and maybe underwater) detection systems, Defence officials are pressing for the purchase of a Canadian nuclear-powered submarine fleet. Their military objective? Among other things, to keep Canadian Arctic waters clear of cruise-firing Soviet submarines.

The Mulroney cabinet has not yet approved any submarine program, and the decision will not be easy.

Defence planners have in mind a fleet of as many as 10 boats. These must be nuclear-powered, because only those have the endurance for under-ice operation. In the words of Robert Fowler, assistant deputy defence minister: "It cannot be done with conventional boats." (Being Canadian, they would not be nuclear-armed.)

Public cost estimates remain vague. Safe to say that building and manning a submarine fleet of any size would cost billions.

It is, on a small scale, a classic arms race action-reaction. We build cruises that should give no offence. They build cruises that give great offence. Both sides are poorer, but neither side feels very much safer.

Clark Statement in Commons

Windsor THE SATURDAY WINDSOR STAR in English 7 Mar 87 p A9

[Text]

OTTAWA (CP) — Canada will continue to test the unarmed cruise missile because to stop the testing at the wrong time would signal weakness in the western alliance, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said Friday.

Clark told the Commons during a debate on the controversial testing program that it would be wrong for Canada to bolt the ranks of NATO and Norad, the North Atlantic and North American defence treaties, and end testing of the American missile.

The Soviets, he said, would exploit an opportunity to portray the western alliance as weak and divided on a key element of the strategic nuclear force strategy.

Set against the backdrop of renewed and optimistic nuclear arms talks between the superpowers in Geneva, such a move by Canada would be damaging both to the security aims of the West and to Canada's strength within the alliance.

"Imagine what the Soviets would do, with a decision by Canada on the eve of the (Geneva) discussions, to break an agreement respecting the testing of the unarmed cruise missile," Clark said.

"That would be broadcast everywhere as evidence of weakness in the West."

While Clark made his clarion call for western solidarity, there was weakness elsewhere in the Commons as MPs debated a New Democratic Party motion calling for an end to the tests.

The Liberal party, agonizing over the testing program the Liberal government approved in 1983, also called for solidarity in the alliance and stifled dissidents within the caucus who favor an end to the testing.

THEIR LEADER, John Turner, said

it would be dangerous to go off in a new direction as the superpowers seem close to an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe.

The tests, subject of complaints by peace groups, have been going on in northwestern Canada for more than two years and are to continue for another six years under an agreement. The tests aim to simulate winter flying conditions over the Soviet Union.

The United States reacted warmly to a suggestion last weekend by Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev that opens the door to talks on medium-range missiles in Europe without linking those discussions to talks in other arms control areas.

Friday, the two superpowers officially recessed their general arms talks in Geneva, while deciding to continue discussions on medium-range forces. Both sides described the mood at the meetings as positive.

Ironically, both sides in the debate in Parliament used that progress to support opposing points of view.

Pauline Jewett, the New Democrat critic on external affairs, proposed the motion to end cruise missile tests. She said progress in Geneva makes the testing program unnecessary and it should therefore be stopped.

She said Canada has every right to pursue an independent policy on nuclear weapons within the alliance, even though the NDP officially supports Canadian withdrawal from NATO.

She said the fact the United States has exceeded warhead limits on the unratified SALT II strategic arms treaty is reason enough for Canada to stop the cruise tests. To justify her motion she said rapid U.S. progress on research into the controversial Star Wars missile defence shield threatens the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

Commons Defeat of Motion

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 10 Mar 87 p A3

[Article by Iain Hunter]

[Text]

Liberal MPs splintered Monday as the Commons voted to continue cruise missile testing.

Their leader, John Turner, kept his head down in Toronto.

Four members of the Liberal caucus broke ranks to vote for a New Democratic motion to terminate testing of the unarmed missile in the Canadian north.

Two of them — both former Liberal ministers — refused to support an amendment proposed by Turner to end tests only after consultation with the U.S. and Canada's other NATO partners.

Turner, meanwhile, was in Toronto for what Liberal MPs described variously as prior commitments, personal reasons and media events.

The Liberal leader's amendment was defeated by a combined Conservative and NDP vote of 118 against 29 Liberal votes. Former cabinet ministers Warren Allmand and Charles Caccia abstained.

Allmand and Caccia, joined by another former Liberal minister, Lloyd Axworthy, and Grit backbencher John Nunziata, voted for the NDP motion to terminate cruise testing.

The motion was defeated 122 to 27.

Besides Turner, eight other Liberal MPs were not in the House for the vote. More than 100 Tories were absent.

NDP leader Ed Broadbent said he was surprised both by the split in Liberal ranks during the votes and by Turner's failure to appear.

He denied a charge by senior Liberals that his party had

brought the cruise testing issue to a vote in the Commons in order to embarrass the divided Grits.

Liberal defence critic Douglas Frith and external affairs spokesman Don Johnston both supported an end to cruise testing at the beginning of last week.

Turner said they were not speaking for the party, and by Friday, Johnston had adopted Turner's position in the debate, arguing that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal to eliminate medium-range missiles, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan's counterproposal with the same objective, meant Canada should not show any weakening of support for its U.S. ally.

Frith repeated this argument Monday.

"Now is not the time for allies to be showing any sign of wavering in their support of Reagan," Frith said.

Frith said Turner had no reason to break his "long-term commitments" in Toronto Monday to return to the Commons for the vote since he had made his position clear last week.

Caccia said the issue of cruise testing divides all Canadians, and the division in the Liberal caucus merely reflects this division.

He said the frank discussion and disagreement among caucus members is a sign of vitality and strength in the party.

As many as 17 of the 40 Grit MPs are considered anti-cruise, according to some party sources.

Prud'homme noted that the November Liberal convention passed conflicting resolutions on cruise testing.

Liberal Leader Turner's Position

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 11 Mar 87 p A3

[Article by Patricia Poirier]

[Text]

OTTAWA

Liberal Leader John Turner says the party caucus will discuss the action of four Liberal MPs who ignored his position and voted for a New Democratic Party motion calling for an end to cruise missile testing in Canada.

Mr. Turner put on a brave face yesterday as he answered reporters' questions about the split within the party on the issue and on disarmament.

"I've said that all resolutions relating to defence, arms control and disarmament had to be reconciled and interpreted under the general commitment of the Liberal Party to NATO," he said.

"I made our position clear in the House of Commons that we favored the cessation of the cruise tests, but in a way compatible with our obligations to NATO and our other allies. . . .

"The timing should be such as to enhance the solidarity of the alliance and in a way to enhance our prospects for peace," he said.

Mr. Turner would not say whether the four rebel MPs would be reprimanded, indicating that the matter would be dealt with in the usual way at caucus today.

Liberals Charles Caccia and John Nunziata from Toronto, Lloyd Axworthy of Winnipeg and Warren Allmand of Montreal voted to put an immediate end to testing of the cruise.

"It's a matter of commitment to them . . . an issue of conscience," Mr. Turner said as he recalled that Progressive Conservatives in opposition had also been divided on cruise testing.

Mr. Turner was not present for the vote on Monday. He said he had previous commitments in

Toronto.

"I already had participated in debate. . . . One more vote against a majority of 211 wasn't going to have made much of a difference."

Mr. Nunziata said he felt uncomfortable when he stood up to vote with the New Democrats on Monday night. But he said he is comfortable with the position he took since "it's the policy of the Liberal Party of Canada."

Mr. Nunziata said he had not spoken to Mr. Turner since the vote on Monday. He said "there may be some personal consequences," for his action but he was willing to suffer them because it was a question of conscience.

"I've had a number of phone calls today from people supporting my position," he said.

GLOBE AND MAIL Editorial

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 10 Mar 87 p A6

[Editorial]

[Text]

The political education of John Turner continues. The federal Liberal leader is trying to beat back those in his party who claim to have reached a decision on cruise testing in Canada, and his embarrassment is, not surprisingly, delighting the federal Conservatives.

A couple of weeks ago, Liberal defence critic Douglas Frith said Canada should end its agreement to let the United States test unarmed air-launched cruise missiles over Alberta. Mr. Turn-

er responded that such people were not speaking on behalf of the party. "We'll have something to say," he said, "when we have something to say." In an unfortunate bit of timing, Liberal external affairs critic Donald Johnston immediately echoed Mr. Frith's call for an end to testing.

Last Friday, during a debate sparked by the anti-cruise New Democrats, Mr. Turner told the Commons that now was not the time to end the testing agree-

ment and betray a rift within the NATO alliance, because the Soviets had just made concessions on medium-range missiles at the Geneva arms talks. Defence Minister Perrin Beatty could scarcely resist the opening. "The Liberal policy," he said, "can best be summarized as ending cruise testing if necessary, but not necessarily ending cruise testing."

Mr. Turner, who endorsed the testing in 1984, is in a tricky position. His party has been riding high in the polls, having an easy time of it while the Conservatives wrestled with unpopular decisions and unexpected scandals. Now, thanks to the NDP's timing of the debate, the Liberals are seen to be indecisive. (The House yesterday defeated a wishy-washy Liberal amendment to the NDP's motion to end cruise testing.) It is not good enough to say, as Mr. Turner did on March 2 when asked about cruise testing, "That was one of the resolutions that was before the convention and it's something that, as we move closer to an election and as we have further deliberations in caucus, we'll be more specific on."

Certainly, the issue is a complex and divisive one. Although Canada subscribed to NATO's 1979 decision to deploy ground-launched cruise missiles as part of its "two-track" strategy in Europe, Canada's agreement to test air-launched missiles is a bilateral one reached in 1983 with the United States. There are those who argue that, since

we have no NATO commitment in this regard, Canada should not be helping with the development of yet another round of new weapons in a world already supercharged with arms.

We share one such concern: the U.S. last year breached the 1979 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) by arming its 131st B-52 bomber with an air-launched cruise. This was a destabilizing act, and Canada might well symbolize its displeasure by calling for a review of the bilateral agreement, as the pact allows.

But it is easier to put pressure on the United States within such a pact than by ending it. While we may have no obligation to NATO itself to test the air-launched cruise, we are assisting a fellow NATO member in its defence strategy — a strategy on which, as friend and close neighbor, we would expect to depend in any war. We may and do quarrel with parts of that strategy, including the U.S. infatuation with its dream of space-based weapons; but denying the United States the least of all possible assistance — lending our terrain for the testing of unarmed weapons — would lose us whatever chance we have of trying to get our arguments across.

Mr. Turner may be trying to maintain a policy distinct from that of the Conservatives, who support testing, and of the New Democrats, who oppose it. But the impression he gives is of a leader who can't make up his mind, and that is the worst of all political worlds.

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 11 Mar 87 p A8

[Editorial]

[Text]

The NDP motion to stop U.S. cruise missile testing in Canada was still-born from its inception. It was ill-conceived, badly timed and the wrong issue on which to test Canadian support for arms control and disarmament.

Not only that, but John Turner's too-slick attempt to ride the two horses of cruise cessation and NATO loyalty proved to be an equally gauche move. It only succeeded in splitting the Liberals and casting doubt on his leadership abilities in foreign affairs.

Only the Conservatives gained from the results of the cruise debate. There are many more worthy international issues that deserve debate in the House of Commons. Our cruise-testing sideshow should now be shelved indefinitely.

Responding last month to Liberal defence critic Douglas Frith's expressed opposition to cruise testing, Turner said Frith did not speak for the party, adding: "We'll have something to say when we have something to say."

That "something" turned out to be a weak attempt to have the best of both worlds. Turner's amendment wasn't even worthy of a high school debate let alone a parliamentary one.

To oppose cruise missile testing "in a manner consistent with Canada's NATO and bilat-

eral obligations" — Turner's amendment — is like saying he is against everything not supported by the alliance or the U.S. Or, to put it another way, that he doesn't disagree with anything that is current American or NATO policy.

It's meaningless unless the Liberal leader was really saying he agreed with the Mulroney government's policy. That would have been perfectly understandable, because the Liberals initiated it. In that event it would have been more honest for Turner to have said so outright, instead of attempting to steer an impossible third course.

This was not Turner's finest hour. He must have known it because he wasn't present for the final vote. In the event, four prominent Liberals led by Lloyd Axworthy supported the NDP motion, and two of them even abstained on their leader's amendment.

The cruise debate revealed that the Liberal party has a lot more work to do before it can present the Canadian people with a clear alternative in foreign and security policy — if that is possible and desirable.

Unless Turner can exercise much more control over his caucus on such issues, his leadership will be found sorely wanting. If his mavericks insist on supporting the ill-conceived ideas of those who would have Canada withdraw from NATO and go it alone, they will do their chief irretrievable harm. If that's the name of their game, let them come out and say so.

/9317

CSO: 5220/39

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADA: INF PROPOSAL, NITZE, KARPOV BRIEFINGS DISCUSSED

Ottawa CITIZEN Editorial

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 3 Mar 87 p A8

[Editorial]

[Text]

Whatever the reason for his timing, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's call for a separate arms accord with the U.S. — eliminating all intermediate-range missiles from Europe — is a welcome development. There won't be an agreement tomorrow, but there could be one this year.

The Kremlin chief dropped his precondition that linked all other arms control agreements to an accord on Star Wars research. By delinking INF, he renewed his 1985 Geneva summit undertaking with President Reagan to pursue the removal of Euromissiles separately.

By making his unexpected announcement just after the Tower commission report appeared, Gorbachev may be trying to bolster Reagan at a time when the president most needs a diplomatic triumph. Or he may believe that now is the time Reagan is most likely to strike a deal to show Irangate has not left him as impotent as many think.

Initial U.S. reaction to the INF offer has been positive and surprisingly swift. This is an area where Washington has been urging separate action since 1979, with the support of its NATO allies. In 1981 Reagan proposed his "zero option" — ridiculed by Western

"peace" groups then, but essentially the same deal Gorbachev is now suggesting.

In Reykjavik, the two sides nearly reached an INF accord: all U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles to be removed from Europe, only 100 Soviet ones to remain in Soviet Asia and 100 American ones in the continental U.S.A. Shorter-range missiles would be frozen at an agreed level and later negotiated downwards.

Unfortunately Gorbachev then reintroduced linkage — no agreement on INF or strategic nuclears without one on Star Wars.

Difficult decisions remain before an INF accord can be reached. There have to be adequate verification procedures. And the issue of shorter-range missiles must also be addressed. The Soviets have a large number of these, mostly in East Germany and Czechoslovakia, that greatly outnumber U.S. ones and include powerful SS21s, 22s and 23s. They weren't in place when NATO decided in 1979 to seek an agreement on INF.

It's a hopeful sign that Gorbachev anticipated this difficulty by also declaring his readiness to negotiate their reduction and eventual elimination. They are almost as deadly as the better-known SS-20s.

The stage is thus set for the first-ever nuclear reduction agreement. Both sides should be ready for compromise to secure such an accord; it could act as a catalyst for agreement on more important strategic reductions and strategic defences.

Windsor THE WINDSOR STAR in English 3 Mar 87 p A6

[Editorial]

[Text]

THE TIME HAS COME to take Mikhail Gorbachev's disarmament initiatives seriously.

In a sudden move that surprised diplomats and governments through the world, not to mention the Soviet bureaucracy, the Soviet leader offered to sign a pact with the United States to remove all medium-range missiles from Eastern Europe and the European area of the Soviet Union.

In the continuing game of winning friends and influence among Third World countries, Gorbachev's initiative was a masterstroke. It showed flexibility, a virtue not reflected in the U.S. reaction to recent Soviet overtures, by retreating from Moscow's long-held stand that arms controls should be linked to cuts in long-range strategic missiles and restrictions on the U.S. strategic defence initiative, the so-called Star Wars program.

Gorbachev's offer came at the end of a series of Soviet concessions, including a moratorium on underground nuclear tests, and calls for the total divestiture of nuclear weapons by the two sides before the end of the century. They resulted in considerable propaganda gains for Moscow.

In itself, Gorbachev's offer may not mean much. Medium-range missiles are too limited to reach the U.S., and their ranges are too long to be effective in close combat in teeming Europe. But from advance sites in East Germany and Czechoslovakia they do cover the whole of Western Europe.

At this time, Gorbachev's offer seems to apply only to European-based missiles, not those located on the Asian side of the Soviet Union. It follows that in a European showdown, Moscow could move those missiles to Eastern Europe much faster than Washington could ship its missiles to Western Europe.

Still, Gorbachev's move could provide the breakthrough needed to reach a consensus in the reduction and eventual elimination of long-range missiles in the arsenals of superpowers.

The fact that the arms control talks, which were to end in Geneva this week, are to continue, is a welcome sign that the U.S. sees the possibility of real progress in Gorbachev's offer.

One of the main stumbling blocks to a disarmament agreement could lie in verification. Will the two sides agree to on-site inspection by the other side's verification team, with the possible participation of United Nations observers?

Gorbachev has suggested in recent months that he would agree to on-site verification. His initiative would provide an anxious world with the assurances it needs that both sides would accept on-site inspection and that disarmament, even in a partial form, is not merely a pipe dream but an achievable goal.

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 6 Mar 87 p A8

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

OTTAWA

Senior U.S. and Soviet arms-control experts conducted separate briefing sessions yesterday with Canadian officials, but only the envoy from Washington talked with Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

Ambassador Paul Nitze, President Ronald Reagan's arms adviser, met Mr. Mulroney, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark and Defence Minister Perrin Beatty.

He left Ottawa last night after getting a strong Government statement of support for Washington's position in the Geneva arms talks.

Meanwhile, Ambassador Viktor Karpov, the director-general of the arms control bureau in the Soviet foreign ministry, was greeted by nobody more senior than a deputy minister, undersecretary of state for External Affairs J. H. Taylor.

Mr. Nitze briefed Mr. Mulroney on Washington's latest counterproposal at Geneva for reductions of superpower nuclear forces in Europe.

He also assured him that there will be no early deployment of the U.S. strategic defence initiative system of ballistic missile defences, known as Star Wars.

Mr. Nitze said the United States will consult Canada and other allies before it abandons the traditional and strict interpretation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union, in order to accommodate SDI.

The strict interpretation advocated by Ottawa and Western European governments limits the scope for Star Wars tests. A debate has raged within the Reagan Administration about whether to reinterpret the accord.

After his hour-long meeting with Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Clark, Mr. Nitze said the Reagan Administration has not decided on whether to adopt the broad interpretation of the treaty.

Mr. Clark wrote to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz last month, urging the U.S. Government to stick with a strict interpretation. "Any move to a broader interpretation could have significant political and strategic ramifications for international stability and security," he said in a communiqué released last night.

That Canadian concern was conveyed again yesterday, Mr. Beatty said in an interview.

Mr. Nitze promised that there will be further consultations with allies before Washington decides what it wants to do about ballistic missile defences.

Meanwhile, Mr. Clark said, "Canada continues to offer its full support" for the U.S. negotiating position in Geneva.

Canadian officials said there was no snub intended to the Soviet Union in the fact that Mr. Karpov did not meet Mr. Mulroney or any of the other elected political leadership in Ottawa.

They said it was strictly coincidence that Mr. Karpov's long-scheduled visit to Ottawa was at the same time as Mr. Nitze's trip, which had been arranged recently.

The meetings with Mr. Karpov yesterday concentrated on the possibility of a breakthrough in the Geneva talks, Canadian officials said. They said they told Mr. Karpov that Ottawa welcomes Moscow's recent offer to talk about a deal on missile forces in Europe separate from a possible agreement on Star Wars.

The Geneva talks had seemed destined for stalemate because the Soviets insisted on linking the so-called Euromissile issue to a demand that Washington abandon SDI.

In an interview on CTV, Mr. Karpov said there is a very realistic chance that Moscow and Washington can reach agreement "within months" on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

He said that the Soviets will go "as far as is necessary" to assure the United States that Moscow is not cheating on an arms agreement, including allowing on-site inspections to verify compliance.

Mr. Karpov will meet more Canadian officials today to discuss such issues as chemical weapons and levels of conventional forces in Europe.

Ottawa CITIZEN Article

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 7 Mar 87 p B1

[Article by Jonathan Manthorpe]

[Text]

The deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe four years ago was always more a political ploy than a strategic military move.

And Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal last weekend for a treaty to remove them, to which the United States has agreed in principle, is more important to the war of political manoeuvring than to real nuclear disarmament.

For if the Soviet Union removed tomorrow the 270 medium-range SS-20s it has deployed in eastern Europe and NATO withdrew its 108 Pershing II and 208 cruise missiles, nothing much would change.

There are still the vast stocks of intercontinental nuclear missiles, the armories of short-range atomic weapons and the legions of conventional forces.

In the world of superpower confrontation, there is something nasty behind every curtain. And the next. And the next.

But the political implications of the Gorbachev move are important nonetheless.

It reinforces the image of Gorbachev as the player holding the initiative in the superpower faceoff, a part he grabbed at the Reykjavik summit last year when he caught Ronald Reagan off-balance by proposing a total nuclear disarmament package.

It is not only grandstanding. For domestic Soviet political purposes, Gorbachev needs a real achievement in foreign policy.

He has failed to persuade the U.S. to halt its Strategic Defence Initiative or to stop them testing nuclear weapons. He is still entangled in a nasty and unpopular war in Afghanistan.

And at home, the forces of reaction to his attempts to reform Soviet society are gathering.

The bait he offered the U.S. administration was substantial — bait which the U.S. took at the end of the week by presenting its own draft accord on medium-range weapons at the Geneva disarmament talks.

Gorbachev made a significant concession by setting aside his constant theme of the past few months that Reagan must stop research into the Star Wars program.

The Soviet leader also offered the beleaguered U.S. president the badly needed recognition that he is still a man in charge, someone with whom the Soviets could confidently attempt to make a deal.

It is in Europe that the Gorbachev proposal put the cat among the pigeons at the beginning of the week, though by the end most western European leaders had decided to view the move as encouraging, in public at least.

In Britain, the Gorbachev initiative and the United States' quick sympathetic response was an unpleasant jolt to Margaret Thatcher.

Her governing Tories, with an election in the offing, have rebuilt their popularity with the help of strongly pro-nuclear policies and by depicting the anti-nuclear Labor opposition as appeasers.

Britain's first reaction to Gorbachev was that the idea was "potentially disastrous" because the removal of the medium-range cover would leave western Europe vulnerable to the overwhelming superiority of Soviet short range and conventional weapons.

But by week's end the imperatives of NATO solidarity had taken hold and the Gorbachev move was being pictured as backing down in the face of "the firmness and resolve of the western alliance."

In non-NATO France, the first reaction was unhappiness too. A foreign ministry statement said: "Bearing in mind the lack of balance in conventional and chemical forces in Europe, the objective must be to avoid a denuclearization of western Europe." Officials added privately that they feared the withdrawal of the cruise and Pershing missiles would "uncouple" the U.S. from its full commitment to defend its European allies.

What is mildly ironic, and illustrative of Europe's very real fear of the unknown, is that when the U.S. sent Pershing and cruise to Europe in 1983 in response to the Soviet deployment of SS-20s, this was seen as "uncoupling."

It was argued by many people then that the medium-range missiles would allow the U.S. to fight a nuclear war in Europe without its own territory being involved.

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 7 Mar 87 p B2

[Editorial]

[Text]

Ottawa may not be the arms control capital of the world but it looked like it this week, when senior Soviet and American arms control experts were here promoting their wares. The visits confirmed that the current drive to eliminate Euromissiles is taken seriously by both sides.

Paul Nitze of walk-in-the-woods fame is President Reagan's chief disarmament adviser. He has been briefing NATO capitals on the U.S. interpretation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty; there were alliance concerns that the U.S. was about to broaden it unilaterally by conducting tests in space.

The American envoy was able to reassure Prime Minister Mulroney and External Affairs Minister Joe Clark on two crucial points: Reagan has not yet decided to abandon the restrictive interpretation of the ABM accord, and there will be no early deployment of a Star Wars system.

Nitze also promised that further consultations with the allies will be held before there is any change in the current U.S. position. In return, he was assured by Canada that it strongly supports the latest American proposal on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF).

Moscow has finally dropped its self-imposed INF linkage to parallel agreements on space and strategic arms. It now favors an independent solution that would rid Europe of Soviet SS-20s and American cruises and Pershing 2s. This is the same as the old U.S. "Zero Option" offer.

Nitze returns to Washington with the united support of the Western alliance for a concerted drive by President Reagan to reach an INF agreement with the Soviets. He can also advise the president that his allies firmly support a narrow ABM interpretation, and thus do not want him to deviate from his current strategic defence research policy.

For his part, Ambassador Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet arms control bureau, explained Mikhail Gorbachev's latest INF move and solicited Canada's support for it. He was told that the Canadian government welcomed the Russian decision and looked forward to a successful outcome in Geneva.

Karpov's private talks with senior Canadian officials were doubtless centred on the crucial questions of verification, shorter-range missiles in Europe, and the dismantling of the Euromissiles.

As the consultations enter a decisive phase, and the superpowers appear at last to have a coincidence of national interests, the pressure must be maintained on both Washington and Moscow to reach out and conclude the first nuclear arms reduction treaty in history. Nothing less will satisfy an anxious world.

/9317

CSO: 5220/40

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRC FOREIGN MINISTER URGES U.S., USSR TO REDUCE MISSILES

OW261711 Beijing XINHUA in English 1651 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Text] Geneva, March 26 (XINHUA) — The Soviet Union and the United States should reduce their medium-range missiles in Europe and Asia simultaneously and in a synchronous and balanced manner, Chinese Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian said here today.

Wu said that security in Europe and in Asia are equally important and the missiles in the regions should be cut until they are totally eliminated.

He said China has taken note of the recent proposals put forward by the two sides.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev proposed on February 28 that the issue of medium-range missiles in Europe be singled out from the package of issues.

The United States suggested on March 4 that the two countries eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe, and cut them to 100 warheads on U.S. territory and in Soviet Asia.

Wu, also China's state councillor, said the two nuclear powers should hear and respect the opinions of European countries on the issue.

"We are still living in a grim international environment and the danger of war still exists," said Wu Xueqian at a meeting of the committee on disarmament being held here.

He pointed out that only the two superpowers are capable of waging a world war. They should take the lead in reducing armaments.

To prevent nuclear war, he said, all the nuclear states should undertake not to use the weapons first and not to use them against states without nuclear weapons and nuclear-free zones, "and then proceed to conclude an international convention banning the use of nuclear weapons."

He also pointed out that conventional disarmament and nuclear disarmament should be carried out "hand-in-hand". He urged NATO and the Warsaw Pact to drastically cut their conventional arms for peace in Europe and the world.

On the recent U.S. and Soviet proposals, Wu said they remain "only on paper." "Fundamental differences still exist between the two sides, although both of them agreed to a half reduction of strategic nuclear weapons as a first step."

The issue of disarmament must not be monopolized by a few big powers, Wu stressed. "All countries have the right to participate on an equal footing in the discussion and settlement of the question."

He said the committee on disarmament in Geneva is the only authoritative organ for multilateral disarmament talks in the world.

Wu Xueqian also criticized hegemonism and power politics and urged to eliminate regional "hot spots."

China needs a peaceful international environment as it has been engaging in economic development, he pointed out. "The arms race, nuclear or conventional, on the ground or in space, should all be brought to an end."

He said, "China will not enter into alliance or strategic relationship with any superpower."

On the issue of disarmament, Wu Xueqian said, China has no intention and will never evade its due obligations and responsibility. China has undertaken not to use nuclear weapons first ever since it possessed them. China has also undertaken not to use the weapons against non-nuclear weapon states and free zones, he said.

In March last year, China declared that it would conduct no more atmospheric nuclear tests. In 1985 it started to cut the size of its armed forces by one million, and not long ago it signed the additional protocols attached to the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty in February, Wu pointed out.

The Chinese foreign minister called for persistent efforts by the people of the world for world peace.

Wu arrived in Switzerland yesterday on the last leg of his European tour.

/9716

CSO: 5200/4014

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRC FOREIGN MINISTER EXPRESSES FEARS FOR INF ACCORD

AU271941 Paris AFP in English 1933 GMT 27 Mar 87

[Excerpt]

Berne, March 27 (AFP) -- China sees a "certain contradiction" in Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's desire to reform and at the same time maintain the Soviet Union as a superpower, visiting Chinese Foreign Affairs Minister Wu Xueqian said there Friday.

Mr Wu's comments were made during meetings with Swiss President and Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Aubert and his colleagues following the Chinese minister's arrival in Switzerland Wednesday.

According to senior Swiss official Paul-Andre Ramseyer, Mr Wu said the Soviet leader could not aspire to make the Soviet Union a model country while supporting the military burden that imposes competition with the United States.

/13046

CSO: 5200/4016

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRC MEDIA ASSESS THATCHER'S MOSCOW AGENDA

XINHUA Expects Weapons Polemic

OW240841 Beijing XINHUA in English 0816 GMT 24 Mar 87

["News Analysis: Soviet Union, Britain Consider Thatcher's Moscow Trip Important (by Wang Xianju)" -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Moscow, March 24 (XINHUA) -- British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on March 28 begins her first to Moscow since taking office in 1979, a trip that could have an impact on arms control negotiations and also affect Conservative Party fortunes in the general election expected for this year.

The five-day visit indicates that Britain intends to play a greater role in disarmament and East-West relations, and is also aimed at bolstering the image of Thatcher's Conservative Party.

Moscow believes that Britain, a nuclear power and the closest ally of the United States, can play an important role in disarmament and also hopes Thatcher's visit will "give a tangible impetus to the effective development of bilateral relations in diverse fields".

The Kremlin is somewhat worried about Thatcher's attitude towards the Soviet proposals on the withdrawal of Euromissiles from Europe.

The British prime minister, while expressing satisfaction with the Soviet suggestion that the medium-range Euromissiles be detached from the overall nuclear arms reduction package, has demanded that a new "NATO package" include, in addition to medium-range missiles, conventional and chemical arms cuts.

Thatcher has also reaffirmed her commitment to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the space-based missile defense program popularly known as the "Star Wars" program.

The official Soviet news agency TASS has criticized Britain and France for "continuing intensively to escalate their nuclear missile arsenals", noting that Britain recently deployed on its submarines 64 new Chevaline A3-TK missiles.

Thatcher will hold talks with Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov on March 29 and 30, and meet with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev March 30, the day before she goes to Tbilisi, the capital of the Soviet Georgian Republic.

Gorbachev and Thatcher will discuss East-West relations and disarmament. Euromissiles, Afghanistan, human rights and bilateral relations are all on the agenda.

A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said earlier this month that Moscow hopes Thatcher's visit will lead to greater Soviet-British political dialogue and make their cooperation "more active".

The spokesman said an expanded Soviet-British dialogue can "promote solutions to many problems, such as the prohibition of chemical weapons, the strengthening of the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the reduction of conventional arms."

However, there are signs that it will not be easy for the Soviet Union and Britain to make marked progress in disarmament during Thatcher's trip.

Just a few days ago, the British leader, known for years as the "iron lady", told a Conservative Party meeting in Torquay that she was planning to discuss arms control with Moscow from a "position of strength".

She described the strength policy as the "surest foundation on which to work for peace".

Her speech in Torquay has been seen as a "keynote" for her Moscow talks and her Conservative Party's preparations for the general parliamentary elections.

Greater progress could be made on bilateral relations, and a British source said here that a British-Soviet trade agreement may be signed during the visit.

Britain has been one of the Soviet Union's smallest Western trading partners, and has run a trade deficit with the Soviet Union since 1982.

Missile Strategies Reviewed

HK260757 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 25 Mar 87 p 6

[Commentary by reporter Li Yunfei (2621 0061 7378): "On the Eve of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's Visit to the Soviet Union"]

[Text] British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher will visit the Soviet Union between 28 March and 1 April. This will be the first visit by a British prime minister to the Soviet Union in the last 12 years. Soviet leader Gorbachev put forth a new proposal on dismantling intermediate-range missiles in Europe last month, and this prompted the United States and the Soviet Union to step up their intensive talks, which has attracted attention from all quarters in the world. Now Thatcher's coming visit to the Soviet Union will become even more noteworthy. On the eve of her visit to the Soviet Union, she will first stop over in Normandy and Bonn to meet French President Mitterrand and FRG Chancellor Kohl separately and exchange opinions on her Soviet trip.

The main purpose of Thatcher's visit is to win some points for the possible general election this year in her country. If Anglo-Soviet relations are improved through her visit, she will be able to show the important role of her government in East-West relations in pursuing a nuclear deterrence policy and consolidating her image as an important international stateswoman. This is undoubtedly very useful for her in striving for a third term as chair of the Conservative Party.

When Thatcher was preparing for her visit to the Soviet Union, Moscow put forth a new proposal on eliminating intermediate-range missiles in Europe, and this brought about a new situation in the U.S.-Soviet talks on intermediate-range missiles. So the European intermediate-range missiles will become the main subject of discussion during her visit to the Soviet Union. The U.S. reaction to the Soviet proposal is positive, and Shultz will visit the Soviet Union to arrange another U.S.-Soviet summit meeting. It is likely that the United States and the Soviet Union will reach an agreement on dismantling intermediate-range missiles in Europe in a number of months. Then, the long-standing "zero option" will, for the first time, probably be realized. West European countries in general have welcomed this development, but they also cherish some misgivings. People have noticed that only after the Soviet proposal was published for 36 hours did Britain officially express its opinion and say that "a step forward has been taken, but a great deal of work will still have to be done." [paragraph continues]

The West European countries are mainly concerned about three aspects: First, will the agreement guarantee effective verification means? Second, after the intermediate-range missiles are dismantled, what step should be taken to deal with short-range missiles and conventional armaments, which represent the advantages of the Soviet Union? And third, the Soviets have changed their original idea and agreed to separate the issue of the intermediate-range missiles from the issue of strategic weapons. Does this mean that the Soviets are trying to break U.S.-European defense ties? And does the positive U.S. reaction mean that the U.S.-European nuclear defense ties will finally come to an end? To put it in a nutshell, once the United States and the Soviet Union reach an agreement on medium-range missiles, will Western Europe become safer or more dangerous?

In fact, the West European countries' misgivings appeared after the U.S. -Soviet summit meeting in Iceland last year. At that time, the United States almost reached an agreement with the Soviet Union on eliminating medium-range missiles without fully consulting the West European allies beforehand, and the agreement was not reached merely because the Soviet side insisted on linking the issue of the medium-range missiles with the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. The development of the state of affairs in recent months has prompted the West European countries to review and reevaluate their defense strategy. Therefore, officials from Britain, France, the FRG, and the European Community have recently held many meetings and made many speeches in this regard. British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe, who will accompany Mrs Thatcher on her visit to the Soviet Union, said in a speech in Belgium on 16 March that Western Europe will have to reconsider the defense strategy that it has pursued for a long time. The West European countries hold that although the medium-range missiles belong to the United States and the Soviet Union, as they are deployed in Europe and concern the security of Europe this issue should not just be handled by the United States and the Soviet Union, bypassing Western Europe. Now they are trying to speak with a common voice on major defense affairs. Before visiting the Soviet Union, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's meetings with Mitterrand and Kohl will help coordinate the positions of the West European countries; meanwhile, this will enable her to go to Moscow in the capacity of a representative of Western Europe as a whole. As her visit will precede Shultz' visit, this will certainly add more international significance to her Soviet trip.

According to news analysts here, during her visit to the Soviet Union Margaret Thatcher will not only hold extensive talks on international affairs with the Soviet leaders but will also personally find out about the state of the Soviet Union's "opening-up policy." No matter what results will be achieved in these two aspects, her visit will produce a certain influence on further East-West relations.

/9716

CSO: 5200/4014

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

APN: U.S. CONTINUES PREPARATIONS FOR BACTERIOLOGICAL WAR

Moscow APN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No 4 (10), Feb 87 pp 9-12

[Text] Having joined the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, the [word omitted] did not stop developing new generations of bacteriological and toxin weapons.

The main U.S. Army centre at which bacteriological (biological) weapons are specially developed operates on the basis of the Dugway testing ground. The Baker biological laboratory functions on its territory, dozens of kilometres away from the military dwelling township of the testing ground and at a sizable distance from the technological centre in Dutt. At the beginning of the 1970's 440 specialists from other U.S. centres of the development of bacteriological weapons--the special bacteriological laboratories of Fort Detrick (Maryland) and the Pine Bluff arsenal of the U.S. Army (Arkansas) were transferred to the Baker Laboratory. It continually builds up the equipment of its units. In the past two-three years alone 300 million dollars were allocated to it for purchasing a large-size chamber making it possible to experiment with the pathogenes of particularly dangerous infections and to carry out research into bacteriological (biological) weapons and to test samples of them. In 1985 the journal of the American Chemical Society wrote that the Baker Laboratory did not need such large-size equipment for testing means of defence and that the aforesaid chamber had been supplied first of all for accomplishing a set of tasks directly relating to the development of bacteriological weapons which are used in practice. It was reported that 50 horses had simultaneously died near that laboratory from a rare African disease. The pathogene of this disease could get into the environment only as a result of the large-scale tests conducted at the testing ground.

The development of bacteriological weapons continues also in the Fort Detrick military garrison, despite the switching of its laboratories to peaceful research which was announced long ago by Richard Nixon. The military-medical research institute of infectious diseases situated in that garrison pays considerable attention to achieving great viability of the viruses of Rift Valley Fever (the strain was isolated during the epidemics in Egypt in 1977-1978), Japanese encephalitis B, Q Fever and Lassa Fever in the aerosol condition. In natural conditions these infections are spread by carriers--mosquitoes and arthropoda.

Analogous research is carried out by the Baker Laboratory which studied the stability of the aerosol reoviruses of types 1, 2 and 3 which affect man's respiratory and digestive tracts.

Research into viral aerosols is conducted at the laboratories of the scientific-technical and testing base of the U.S. Navy in Oakland (California), at North Carolina University and the University of California. Experiments are held to find out the lethal doses of various pathogenes, including Lassa virus.

The U.S. military laboratories conduct research into rerogenous infection of animals with cholera and diphtheritic toxins and staphylococcus enterotoxins. Such a way of intoxication is not found in natural conditions.

The studies of the mechanisms of transmission of viral infections by mosquitoes, arthropoda and migrant birds continue, and the most suitable mosquitoes are selected.

The gene engineering methods are used to inculcate in saprophyte microorganisms, such as the colon bacillus, an ability to produce dangerous toxins. It was reported that a pathogenic strain of the colon bacillus has been developed in the USA through the introduction of the genetic information of Flexner Shigella into the cells of the colon bacillus.

The aforesaid examples show that a great part of the work with microorganisms carried out at the military and civilian laboratories of the USA has nothing to do with health protection. This research is conducted only with a view to developing bacteriological weapons of a new generation.

The Pnetagon does not make a secret of the fact that it carries out some activities in violation of the Biological Convention. In the general budget of medical studies the planning and financing administration of the U.S. Defence Department has a special item of expenditures on "defensive biological systems of weapons." The U.S. Defense Department issues manuals on combat uses of bacteriological weapons and the rules of its storage and transportation. A military school for training specialists in the field of bacteriological weapons exists in the USA.

Production capacities, fit for operation, for manufacturing bacteriological weapons, including ferments, equipping lines and cryogenic installations in the system of underground storages, are preserved on the territory of the Army arsenal in Pine Bluff.

During the preparation of the second conference of the states-parties to the Biological Convention held in Geneva in September 1986 the Soviet Union voluntarily made a statement that it had not transferred bacteriological and toxin weapons, as well as information on the technology of its production, to third countries. At the same time it was stated that the USSR did not conduct research or tests of biological weapons on the territory of the allied or other countries. The USA did not make such a statement. It finances biological research conducted in Taiwan, South Africa, Pakistan and some other countries in

countries in execution of the Pentagon's order. For all that, the Bacteriological Convention to a certain extent restrains the development of biological weapons. This explains the clearly visible desire of the U.S. military to lessen the significance of the Convention, to prompt the idea that it is ineffective. For instance, Douglas Feith, U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, called the Convention false publicity of the idea that the problem of prohibition of bacteriological weapons can allegedly be resolved.

(Military Bulletin's own information)

/9274

CSO: 1812/142

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR ACCUSES U.S. OF CREATING NEW CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Mar 87 p 3

[Article by TASS Washington correspondent Igor Borisenko: "Dangerous Plans"]

[Text] In the middle of 1989 the Pentagon plans to develop full-scale production of the newest weapon of mass destruction--the chemical bomb "Bigeye"--the newspaper DEFENSE WEEKLY reports.

"Bigeye" will satisfy our most important requirements, announced an aide to the U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Barker several days ago at a hearing before one of the subcommittees of the House of Representatives. According to his words, the bombs were intended for "delivering effective strikes at targets deep in enemy territory with the use of stable poisonous substances." The money which the Pentagon requires for production of this new type of chemical weapon is not small: 25 million dollars in fiscal year 1988 only for completing development of the "Bigeye" bomb and another 99 million dollars in 1989, when three facilities will begin production.

But "Bigeye", equipped with highly toxic paralytic-nerve gas, is only one of the "innovations" with which the Pentagon intends to fill its chemical arsenal in the near future. As Robert Barker's statement made clear, in the future fiscal year the U.S. Defense Department has asked for 31 million dollars for development of a chemical warhead for a multi-barrel missile system. This arms system, DEFENSE NEWS notes, will be created in 1991.

Only several months will pass until the time that the barbaric innovation fills the American chemical arsenal. But already now calls are being heard from the Pentagon for development of even more modern chemical systems. According to DEFENSE NEWS, during the hearing Robert Barker stated the assumption that such weapons could be developed by the end of the 1990's.

CSO: 5200/1404

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET GENERAL TATARNIKOV INTERVIEWED ON EUROPEAN ARMS CUTS

AU122009 Vienna KURIER in German 12 Mar 87 p 5

[Interview with Soviet General Viktor Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation to the CSCE follow-up meeting in Vienna, by Wolfgang Broer; date and place not given]

[Text] KURIER: If an elimination of the superpowers' intermediate-range missiles in Europe were to come about, would the Warsaw Pact not be highly superior in conventional forces?

Tatarnikov: This is precisely why our concept provides for a reduction of conventional forces parallel to the elimination of the nuclear missiles. If we reduce the conventional forces in an appropriate manner--that means, so that we are able to defend, and only defend, ourselves--there will be greater stability in Europe.

KURIER: But the talks on a reduction of forces and armaments in central Europe have so far not yielded any results.

Tatarnikov: It would have been better to integrate all of Europe into these talks from the very start. After all, central Europe is not a small area! We can reduce forces there and transfer them to another region. This is a kind of "communicating vessel." We should reduce armaments and forces all over Europe. This is a totally different approach to the problem. Why have there been these difficulties at the Force Reduction Talks in Vienna, which have been going on for almost 14 years without any results? I would say they were condemned to reaching to results from the very beginning, and this will be so in the future too, if they are continued. But let us assume they are successful. We would agree on reduction, verification measures, inspections, and so on in central Europe. But the rest of Europe, the potential battlefield, would still remain outside any control. Is this logical? No. We believe that Europe should be included from the Atlantic to the Urals. We believe that these negotiations could be successful and could yield results.

KURIER: What is the basis on which these negotiations should be conducted?

Tatarnikov: Most of all, reductions should be carried out in the two military blocs (NATO and Warsaw Pact--the editors), which have the mightiest troop

concentrations on this continent. These concentrations have gone beyond all reasonable needs for defense! They are far beyond the means necessary in times of peace.

KURIER: What about the verification of disarmament?

Tartarnikov: Verification is not carried out just for the sake of verification. It is the consequence of a concluded agreement. Our leadership in Moscow is willing to undertake even more radical, even bolder steps concerning the issue of control. Furthermore, verification applies not only to us, but also to our potential opponents.

KURIER: Elimination of intermediate-range missiles, reduction of conventional forces--this is all very well. But then the USSR will still have a threatening preponderance with regard to short-range missiles.

Tartarnikov: Our tactical-operational missiles in the CSSR and the CDR were the response to the deployment of the American Pershing II nuclear missiles and the nuclear cruise missiles. All of them will be withdrawn from the CDR and CSSR. Concerning the other short-range weapons still in existence in Europe, we are ready for negotiations on their reduction or immediate elimination. But we should not only talk about the short-range missiles of which NATO has fewer than we have. We must, for instance, also talk about planes, which are able to deliver nuclear weapons repeatedly. They have to be counted, too. If we add up all these items, the Warsaw Pact is not superior. Concerning nuclear warheads, it is even NATO that has a preponderance.

KURIER: Is it not difficult for a Soviet general to agree that such a powerful and technically highly developed weapon as the SS-20 missile is to be simply destroyed, as Chief of General Staff Akhromeyev promised?

Tatarnikov: This is the new element in our way of thinking: We are willing to destroy weapons. We should get on with it.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1389

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BRIEFS

SOVIET DELEGATE ADDRESSES CD--Geneva, 31 Mar (TASS)--The texts of the communique of the foreign ministers' committee meeting of the Warsaw Treaty member states, the statement for the development of the all-European process and successful completion of the Vienna meeting, the statements by the Warsaw Treaty member states on the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons have been issued at the Disarmament Conference as official documents today. Addressing the plenary meeting of the conference, U. K. Nazarkin, head of the USSR delegation, stressed that the documents adopted in Moscow, are evidence of the further persevering efforts by the Warsaw Treaty member states aimed at putting an end to the weapons race, reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons, preventing the militarization of outer space aimed at scrapping chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production, a cut in the armed forces in Europe. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 31 Mar 87 LD] /9274

CSO: 5200/1389

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: HOPE FOR NORDIC NFZ, RESTRICTIONS ON NATO ACTIVITIES

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 13, 6 Apr 87 pp 5-6

[Article by Alexander Polyukhov]

[Text]

The regionally instituted interparliamentary committee has drafted a paper that sets out succinctly the basic provisions of a treaty for a nuclear-free Northern Europe. This is the first time a common platform has been worked out for subsequent concrete action on the part of the parliaments and governments of the countries concerned. The ten-point draft treaty has now been submitted to the leaderships of the parties represented in the North European parliaments.

The project distinctly specifies that the zone should incorporate all of Northern Europe, including Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Finland and Sweden. It would likewise extend to the territorial waters of those countries, but nonetheless allow the peaceful passage of warships carrying nuclear weapons. Such ships, would, however, be denied both port entry and passage through "internal waters" such as fjords, creeks and bays. The airspace of the zone's states would also be closed to aircraft with nuclear bombs

and missiles on board, which also means that such aircraft would not be allowed to use national airfields. However, special rules to be worked out would allow such aircraft to go through national airspace and touch down in emergencies.

For three North European countries—Denmark, Iceland and Norway—the region's nuclear-free status will necessitate their breaking with NATO nuclear strategy. For the signatories to the treaty would commit themselves not to have their national armed forces trained in the use of nuclear weapons, nor to allow the transshipment of such weapons via their territories, nor the setting up within their national boundaries of installations linked in any way with the use of nuclear weapons. Contrary to their present commitments, these states would have to extend their ban on the presence of atomic military hardware in any form so that it also obtained in time of war. It would be incumbent upon Denmark and Norway to

introduce appropriate amendments to their agreements with the U.S. and NATO on allowing U.S. "backup forces" into their territories in crisis situations.

The draft stresses that the nuclear powers must pledge not to threaten or undermine the status of the zone or use nuclear arms against targets inside it. It is proposed that recognition of the zone by the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO be formalized by a special agreement. Characteristically, MPs have rejected right-wing demands that Denmark, Iceland and Norway only participate in the denuclearization of Northern Europe given NATO's consent.

In the document circulated, several controversial issues are set out in sufficiently general terms, so as to leave room for further discussion and political manoeuvre. The withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons from the Baltic Sea and the "defusing" of atomic arms in adjacent

waters and the territories of other nations is considered desirable. It is believed, however, that these problems will be resolved through negotiations with the nuclear powers and that the negotiations are likely to generate complications in the relations with the U.S. and NATO which are so obstinately clinging to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence in Europe. In practice this implies the saturation with nuclear weapons of the parts of the F.R.G. adjoining Denmark and the seas that wash the shores of Northern Europe. The Soviet Union has no objections against the zone. Moreover, its readiness to take the appropriate steps with respect both to the Baltic Sea and its frontier regions has repeatedly been voiced at the highest level. The U.S.S.R. has already dismantled a large number of medium-range missiles and withdrawn considerable nuclear forces with a smaller radius of operation from the Kola Peninsula and its Baltic

area.

The interparliamentary committee paper also provides for the necessary means of verification and the setting up of a special North European mechanism with possible participation of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The document indicates that the zone being the common concern of the states within the region, its creation presupposes the endorsement of the principles for a nuclear-free Northern Europe by the parliaments of all countries concerned. The zone's opponents will clearly try to use their political positions to frustrate the implementation of the Kekkonen proposal. However, the emergence of a definite platform for a nuclear-free Northern Europe shows that things have got off the ground. If agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe is reached, the movement in the right direction will obviously pick up speed.

/9317
CSO: 5200/1412

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

DENMARK: USSR'S LUKYANOV OFFERS TO WITHDRAW SUBMARINES

PM011453 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 28 Mar 87 p 3

[Ritzaus Bureau, AP, "Kim" report: Soviet Offer: Submarines Out of the Baltic"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is prepared to withdraw its six nuclear-missile submarines from the Baltic if an agreement on a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic region is achieved, CPSU Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Lukyanov said at a news conference in Copenhagen yesterday. The withdrawal would be "a new expression of good will," he said.

Anatoliy Lukyanov is visiting Denmark as the guest of the Social Democratic Party, and the news conference took place after he held talks with Social Democratic Party Chairman and former Prime Minister Anker Jorgensen.

The six submarines he alluded to are old, diesel-powered Golf II submarines. In NATO circles it is believed the Soviet Union keeps them in operation mainly for use in negotiations. Each submarine is armed with three short-range and fairly inaccurate nuclear missiles. They were transferred from the Soviet Northern Fleet to the Baltic Fleet in 1976, probably to prevent them from being covered by the SALT agreements.

A Nordic nuclear-free zone was also discussed when Anatoliy Lukyanov met with Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen later yesterday. The hour-long meeting at the Foreign Ministry took place at the Soviets' request, but it gave the foreign minister the opportunity to point out that it is the Danish Government and not the Social Democratic opposition which shapes Denmark's official foreign policy.

Uffe Ellemann-Jensen used his meeting with Lukyanov to stress that under no circumstances can Denmark's membership of NATO be called into question in talks on a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. The foreign minister also affirmed that sea areas and adjacent territories must be included in all "realistic talks" about a nuclear-free zone.

Human rights were also discussed, and the foreign minister criticized Lukyanov for the Soviet Union's continued refusal to allow Soviet chess journalist Vladimir Pimonov, who has a Danish wife, to leave the country.

Some Danish newspapers have called Lukyanov "Mr Glasnost." The Soviet representative clearly found the name amusing. He explained that the phenomenon of glasnost is part of a wide-reaching democratization of Soviet society.

"Glasnost means a freer existence for Soviet citizens — a feeling that the way has been cleared for initiatives," he explained.

Resistance to the policy of reform will be overcome by the Soviet people.

"They will be encouraged to combat the bureaucrats. All the floodgates will be opened up for criticism and self-criticism. Democratization is partly a tool, partly a guarantee that there will not be a backlash," Lukyanov went on.

He stressed that the "profound renewal" of life in the Soviet Union is so better use of "socialism's potential" is made. It is not a break with "our political system."

/9274

CSO: 5200/2515

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET SCIENTISTS VIEW NEED FOR NUCLEAR WINTER RESEARCH

'Unpredictable, Dangerous Effects'

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 12, 30 Mar 87 p 21

[Article by Gennady Kurbatkin]

[Text]

It is difficult to predict changes in climate due even to simple processes taking place in the atmosphere. Some scientists build modern models of the general circulation in the atmosphere to conclude that serious influences on the weather and the climate are undesirable. Others, however, argue that climate is insensitive to the methods of interference with nature they suggest.

One thing that is recognized by most scientists and experts today is that extraneous effects on the atmosphere are unpredictable and therefore dangerous.

Attempts have been made artificially to destroy tornadoes in their initial stage. All that could be done was to delay or slow down their development. But tornadoes would then arise in other areas. Scientists believe that there is a cause-and-effect relationship here.

Scientists are assessing the possible climatic changes in the event of global nuclear war. They argue about how long and severe the nuclear winter would be, whether it would destroy crops and kill the entire population in all countries, or whether there would be survivors. There may, however, be other consequences that existing models do not reveal, for example, sudden natural phenomena such as storms, hurricanes and catastrophic torrential rains.

Such destructive phenomena may be caused not only by global, but even by a local nuclear war in which a relatively small number of nuclear explosions occur. Specialists know that such cataclysms can be occasioned by far weaker environmental factors as, for example, the thermal effect of cities.

'Laser Winter'

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 12, 30 Mar 87 p 21

[Article by Alexander Ginsburg]

[Text] The "star wars" programme involves the development of various types of laser weapons. The earth's atmosphere is opaque to X-ray and hydrogen fluoride lasers, but all other kinds of laser radiations are not so readily absorbed by the atmosphere. Such lasers can be used to strike low-flying or ground targets and destroy and set fire to fuel dumps. As a result, a vast amount of soot aerosol would be released which would screen solar radiation. This, like the "nuclear winter," would decrease the amount of light to reach the earth's surface and cause a drastic fall in temperature.

U.S.-Soviet Cooperation Urged

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 12, 30 Mar 87 p 21

[Article by Nikita Moiseyev]

[Text]

Cooperation between scientists in the U.S., the U.S.S.R. and other countries is vital in the study of how the biosphere would react to global cataclysms, whether it be nuclear war or the barbaric pollution of the environment as a result of ill-considered economic activities. I suggest, as a first step, convening an international seminar to draw up various scenarios of man's impact on the environment, and set up an international team of scientists. An informal body will probably be needed to coordinate research, store data and collate the efforts of members.

Another area of international effort could be the problem of "local ecological stresses." Today major engineering projects capable of bringing about essential changes in the global ecological situation are a reality.

At the beginning of the next century people will be capable of carrying out projects which seemed fantastic yesterday. These projects cannot be regarded as being within the competence of individual states, as they would affect the ecological situation in many countries, regions, and even the planet as a whole.

Some may feel that this is a matter for the future. But we must prepare ourselves today. We must draw lessons from Chernobyl, Bhopal, and the disaster on the Rhine. Not only nuclear power plants but major chemical enterprises should be regarded as potential "trouble spots."

Finally, we must think of some unique natural phenomena, such as Lake Baikal in Siberia. The value of these phenomena is absolute and their significance for the future transcends national boundaries. We must be able to predict their fate, just as the consequences of large-scale engineering projects and industrial disasters.

Regional problems call for new approaches and new organizational forms of research. Some work is already being done internationally and nationally. We too can make a tangible contribution to international scientific cooperation. We have, for instance, amassed some experience in the quantitative analysis of lake ecosystems and the monitoring of the environment. We are making successful use of computers to analyze the interaction between underground and surface water discharge.

"Institutes of agreement" should have a special role to play in international scientific programmes. The study of natural systems reveals to us the limits of the permissible. But where is the guarantee that everyone will keep within the limits of ecological stability determined by scientists? Collective decisions are necessary to make people act within the frameworks allowed by nature. People have different interests and will not necessarily accept the recommendations of scientists. Meanwhile, agreement to comply with those recommendations on global problems

is particularly important.

We must be realistic and recognize that countries with different political and economic structures and different scales of values due to tradition, geographical conditions and social system will exist in the foreseeable future. Is it possible in these conditions to reach agreements and compromises?

My answer to these questions is, yes, even though I am fully aware that it is an unprecedentedly difficult task.

/9317

CSO: 5200/1394

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ROUNDTABLE ON ASIAN-PACIFIC SECURITY ISSUES

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 86 pp 19-25

["Peace and Security in the Asian Pacific Region"]

[Text]

This was the subject of a Round Table discussion in which prominent Soviet public figures, scholars and journalists took part. The discussion was organised by the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, the Novosti Press Agency, the Institute of Oriental Studies, and the Institute of Far Eastern Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences.

The discussion was chaired by Alexander Dzasokhov, First Deputy Chairman of the Committee. Taking part in it were Academician Sergei Tikhvinsky; Georgy Kim, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Editor-in-Chief of *Asia and Africa Today*; Mikhail Titarenko (Dr. Sc. Philos.), Director of the Institute of Far Eastern Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences; Vladimir Khlynov (Dr. Sc. Econ.); Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Director of the Institute of Economic Research at the Far Eastern Scientific Centre, USSR Academy of Sciences, Valeri Chichkanov; Dmitri Petrov, Dr. Sc. (Hist.) and Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, political analyst for *Pravda*.

ALEXANDER DZASSOKHOV:

The Soviet Union is not only a European but a major Asian state. It is only natural, therefore that as they pursue their foreign policy the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government take the complicated situation that has been arising in the Asian Pacific region into account. Hotbeds of military confrontation and tension

continue to exist in different points of this vast region—from the Korean Peninsula to the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. A detailed analysis proves that the purposeful actions of the imperialist powers, particularly the US, generate conflicts, create an atmosphere of mistrust and animosity, and are the main obstacle to the peaceful development of the countries in the Asian Pacific region. Under the pretext of "guaranteeing the security" of the Asian countries, Washington has been grossly interfering in their internal affairs, and creating seats of war tension. The "Central Command" (CENTCOM), knocked together by the Pentagon, spreads its influence to 19 countries of the Middle East and the Indian Ocean. A Rapid Deployment Force, whose sole aim is to suppress the liberation movement, has been created.

The military build-up in Japan and South Korea along with their military-political cooperation with the United States cause great concern.

While continuing to pursue its policy of whipping up tension and oppressing freedom, the United States came up with the concept of "neoglobalism". It advocates open interference, including armed interference, in those regions and countries where Washington seeks to buttress US domination. The emergence of the militaristic concept of "neoglobalism" on the world scene made itself felt, for example, in the "free association" with the United States, into which a number of Micronesian territories were recently forced to enter. In this way the Washington "guardians of democracy and human rights" have trampled underfoot the inalienable right of yet another people — the Micronesians — to self-determination and independence. The provocative and subversive actions the US has taken against Libya along with the acts of open aggression against that country are also manifestations of "neoglobalism".

Under these complicated conditions, the CPSU and the Soviet government have insistently pursued a line towards a just settlement of conflicts and the liquidation of seats of tension in different areas of the world, including Asia and the Pacific. The USSR has advanced a set of proposals aimed at creating an atmosphere of trust, neighbourliness and cooperation among the peoples of that vast region. These proposals were set forth in a statement made by the Soviet government on April 23, 1986. The USSR invited the states and governments of Asia to join effort in the interests of a political settlement of the problems in that region.

I would like to express my conviction that this discussion will make it possible to examine in detail various aspects of the political situation in the Asian Pacific region and exchange opinions on how peace and security can be guaranteed there.

Now I turn the floor over to Sergei Tikhvinsky.

SERGEI TIKHVINSKY:

The 27th CPSU Congress set forth a fundamentally new programme for creating an all-embracing system of international security, a programme which considers a complex of military, political, economic and humanitarian measures. This complex of measures is relevant to the Asian Pacific region as well. To a certain degree, the region could draw on the experience in the development of international relations accumulated in Europe and formalised in the Helsinki Final Act. However, Asia has its own specific problems. For example, many countries have immense natural and manpower resources and are developing dynamically. Such socialist states as the Soviet Union, China, Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and such capitalist states, as Japan, the USA and Indonesia are located in the Asian Pacific region. Not without reason do some people say that the 21st century will be the century of the Pacific Ocean.

At the same time, a formidable military threat looms over this region. Numerous conflicts that gravely jeopardize the cause of peace flare up there. Hence, the urgent task of organising opposition to the emergence of conflicts, and making the region a scene of peace, neighbourliness and cooperation. The Soviet Union proposes a number of specific measures designed to reduce the threat of war and overcome the dangerous trends which have developed of late in this region. I have in mind the unprecedented military build-up of the US; the provocative military exercises conducted in South Korea; the creation of the aggressive Washington-Tokyo-Seoul military alliance; and US imperialism's incessant attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of sovereign states.

There is another point on which I would like to focus: US imperialism is doing everything in its power to undermine the sympathy the peoples in the region have increasingly shown for the ideas of socialism; to frustrate the development of relations between the countries of that region and the socialist states; to organise, under its aegis, a closed bloc of countries with market economies, and to place them in opposition to the socialist states.

I believe that the other participants in this discussion will deal in greater detail with the concrete proposals made by the Soviet Union, Mongolia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the socialist countries of Indochina, designed to eliminate tension in the region, strengthen trust, and develop commercial, economic and cultural cooperation. Like the proposals set forth in the documents of the

27th CPSU Congress, they envisage bilateral and multilateral measures.

DZASSOKHOV: A new monograph by Georgy Kim on the national liberation movement has recently come off the press. It points to the difficulties encountered in bringing about social emancipation. I would like to ask the author to single out those problems, which are vital for newly-free countries to develop successfully.

GEORGY KIM:

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has stated that the principal task of our day and age is to liberate humankind from the heavy burden of the arms race and to save civilisation on the Earth from being destroyed.

Thus, there is every reason to say that a halt to the arms race is a *sine qua non* for mankind's progress. And this is especially true of the vast region of the developing countries which embraces practically three continents: Asia, Africa and Latin America.

We are on the threshold of the 21st century when humankind is accomplishing the impressive tasks of space exploration, when truly fantastic discoveries are being made in the natural sciences. At the same time, millions upon millions of people suffer from hunger and more than a billion people are below the poverty line.

The question naturally arises: how can this be? Humankind has all necessary material and intellectual resources to employ them to the good of man, rather than to his annihilation. We believe that the "disarmament for development" principle must triumph over the "armaments instead of development" principle, imposed by imperialism.

The following figures illustrate this point vis-à-vis the developing countries: almost a trillion dollars are annually spent for military purposes in the capitalist world, and the developing countries account for approximately \$150-160 billion, or about 16 per cent of the whole sum. Quite recently, in 1980, this figure was under 7 per cent. What a jump! And what does \$160 billion mean for the developing countries, particularly for the Asian states, in which more than 50 per cent of the world's people live? Sometimes our ideological opponents in the West ask us: is it reasonable to lament about military expenditures in the developing countries? After all, they comprise an insignificant share of the total sum spent on defence throughout the world. These gentlemen, however, forget a simple truth: the spending

of one dollar for armaments in the newly-free countries constitutes a greater burden for their economies than the spending of the same sum for military purposes in the developed countries.

Today the armies of the developing countries number 8 million officers and men. This is the most active portion of the male population which could be employed in the sphere of peaceful creative activities. That is not all, however. Calculations show: another 240 million people are engaged in maintaining the army or working in the defence industries of the developing countries. What tremendous human potential has been taken from the sphere of peaceful activities! Whereas some 6 per cent of their GNPs go to defence, the developing countries spend 2.8 per cent on education and only 1 per cent on medical services. That is why if a serious attempt is to be made to eliminate the obstacles to these countries' advance and to put an end to the grave situation they are in, which constitutes a global human problem, then these countries must naturally be excluded from the process of militarisation, first and foremost.

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have been coming to a fuller and fuller realisation of the pernicious nature of the arms race. Whereas 5-6 years ago many people in the developing countries believed that the problems of the arms race and confrontation chiefly concerned the great powers, today the majority of people in the "Third World" are joining the antiwar movement, and the inspiring ideas advanced by the 27th CPSU Congress—the ideas that humanity should enter the 21st century without armaments, particularly without weapons of mass destruction—are becoming their banner.

DZASSOKHOV: We know that other socialist countries as well have advanced proposals aimed at normalising the situation in the Asian Pacific region. I would like Mikhail Titarenko to tell us something about them.

MIKHAIL TITARENKO:

Important proposals have been put forward by Mongolia. One of them calls for a broad and constructive pan-Asian dialogue to be held. Another suggests that a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the countries of Asia and the Pacific be worked out and signed.

The Democratic People's

Republic of Korea has become considerably more active in the sphere of foreign policy, primarily where relations with socialist countries are concerned. It spares nothing in its attempts to create an atmosphere of confidence between the North and the South, to expand the intra-Korean dialogue which is already under way, to relax confrontation—political and military—in the Korean Peninsula. This, in turn, should pave the way for important political solutions vis-à-vis Korea and the achievement of the most important goal facing the Korean nation—its reunification.

At the initiative of the DPRK the negotiations between the Red Cross Societies of the North and the South were resumed in 1985 following a 12-year break. Among the new features of relations between the North and the South is an agreement to enter into negotiations on economic issues and preparations for inter-parliamentary talks. The DPRK holds that at the meeting of MPs a top priority topic for discussion should be the publication of a joint declaration of non-aggression in the interests of detente in Korea and improvement of relations between the North and the South.

For the time being, however, contacts between the two parts of Korea are occurring in difficult conditions. Apart from internal problems, there exists a serious external factor, i. e., the interference of US imperialism in the affairs of Korea and the presence of US troops in South Korea.

The constructive policies of the three countries of Indochina are playing an increasingly important role in promoting peace and stability in Asia. Of paramount importance to stabilising the situation in Southeast Asia is the problem of relations between ASEAN and Indochina.

It is common knowledge that immediately after they triumphed in the liberation struggle the Indochinese countries came out for establishing neighbourly relations with all countries in the region, for making it a zone of a lasting peace, stability and mutually beneficial cooperation. They also expressed readiness to normalise relations with the US.

Major initiatives have recently been made by the Indochinese countries. At the 11th Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea it was announced that the withdrawal of all Vietnamese volunteer contingents from Kampuchea would be completed in 1990, irrespective of whether a political solution to the "Kampuchean issue" has been achieved or not. The government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea has stated repeatedly that it is ready to "enter into negotiation with individual representatives of the Khmer opposition or its organisations", in particular with Norodom Sihanouk and Sonn San, so as to "achieve national reconciliation by removing the Pol Pot clique and holding universal free elections following the complete withdrawal of the Vietnamese volunteer troops from Kampuchea". In addition the countries of In-

Indochina offer to reach an agreement on setting up a zone of peace and stability in Southeast Asia when a peaceful settlement to the "Kampuchean issue" is achieved.

The countries of Indochina are working to normalise relations with the PRC. In their Communiqué at the close of the 12th Conference, the Foreign Ministers of the Indochinese countries stated that they favour the early resumption of Chinese-Vietnamese talks without any preliminary conditions.

The role China plays within the framework of foreign political activities of the Asian socialist countries should not be ignored. On a number of fundamental aspects as regards peace and disarmament the PRC's stand echoes with that taken by the USSR and other socialist countries. For example, the USSR and the PRC have both pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In addition, the two countries hold identical views vis-à-vis the non-militarisation of space, as well as on a number of other issues. All this makes a joint quest for peace in the Far East possible.

DZASSOKHOV: The implementation of the peaceable proposals by socialist countries could be promoted considerably by commercial and economic cooperation between the states in the Asian Pacific region. I would like to ask Vladimir Khlynov to discuss this aspect of our theme today.

VLADIMIR KHLYNOV:

The Pacific region, embracing more than 40 states where over half of the world's population lives, is an important area of the global economy and trade. The countries of the region account for over 50 per cent of world industrial output. Moreover, the region is claiming a bigger and bigger share of world trade.

The Soviet Union, with more than half of its territory in Asia, makes a notable contribution to the development of economic cooperation.

From 1970 to 1980, the Soviet Union's trade with the countries of the Pacific rose by 50 per cent. During the current decade the commercial and economic links between the USSR and these countries will develop further, this testifying to their mutually beneficial nature. Major Soviet imports are machines, equipment, and consumer goods. To the countries of the region the USSR exports machinery and equipment that correspond to the level of their economic development, and also certain types of fuel and raw materials.

Soviet-Japanese commercial and economic ties

are the broadest, accounting for about half of the Soviet Union's entire foreign trade turnover with the countries of Western Pacific. This is evidence that differences in social systems are no obstacle to mutually advantageous commercial and economic relations.

Transportation services is one of the promising fields of mutually beneficial economic cooperation between the USSR and the countries of the Pacific. The present-day facilities of the Vostochny port make it possible to carry out major international shipping operations. For example, the port's container terminal is the threshold, as it were, of the "landbridge" connecting the Pacific with the Baltics. The existence and use of the large-tonnage containers had brought about a 10-to-12-fold increase in freight operations. The shipment of cargoes via Siberia reduces the distance they must cover by more than half (from 20,000-27,000 km to 13,000 km) and lessens shipping charges considerably (by 20-30 per cent). As a result, a considerable percentage of the goods the Pacific countries send to Western Europe and receive from there are shipped along the Trans-Siberian Railway. In the near future the Baikal Amur Mainline will also be used for this purpose, thus making the "landbridge" even more beneficial and effective.

The accelerated development of the industrial base and infrastructure of Siberia and the Far East, as pointed out by the 27th CPSU Congress, will create favourable conditions for these areas to participate in economic ties with the Pacific countries. Truly impressive vistas are opening up. For example, there is a potential for broad cooperation in the areas of chemistry and petrochemistry. It would probably be of mutual benefit if the Soviet Union and the Pacific countries were to build, on a compensatory basis, chemical factories oriented towards exports. As a result, instead of shipping crude oil at great cost, the USSR could supply the countries of the region with various chemical products.

Broad prospects are also opening up in connection with the production of liquid fuel from solid fuel, a process now under way in Siberia and the Far East. The point at issue is the liquification of coal, the extent of whose deposits in Siberia is expressed in truly astronomical figures, trillions of tons. For example, in the Kansk-Achinsk Basin the first installations which produce liquid fuel from coal have already gone into operation.

For mutually beneficial economic relations to develop in the region, a normal political climate must exist there, and the Pacific must be turned into a zone of peace and neighbourliness.

DZASSOKHOV: It seems to me that Valery Chichkanov could add to what we just heard as the range of his scientific interests also covers regional cooperation as an important way of improving mutual understanding in the Far East.

VALERI CHICHKANOV:

We scientists working in the Pacific region realise perhaps better than anyone else its unique nature and significance for the destiny of mankind.

I would like to draw the attention of the participants in this Round Table discussion to the Soviet Far East's foreign economic ties. The region is well situated. It is a neighbour to countries which differ greatly from it in terms of their natural resources, the extent to which these resources are developed, the general level of economic development, and the production structure. The existence of mutually-complementary requirements creates the foundations for the stable and beneficial economic interaction of our region with almost every Pacific country.

Indeed, the Pacific coast and the adjacent regions of the Soviet Union may undoubtedly become major consumers of the high-tech goods produced by Japan and other industrialised countries in the area. The raw materials and semi-finished products of the Soviet Far East may make a vital contribution to the fuel and raw material balance of those countries. Agricultural produce and other goods put out by the socialist and developing countries of the Pacific may make a substantial contribution to the food base of this region, while Soviet machinery and equipment modified for those countries' climatic conditions will undoubtedly help diversify the latter's imports of technology. All commodities can be transported by ship, the cheapest means of transportation.

The bowels of the Far East are rich in iron ore and copper, coal, gas and oil. We believe that natural wealth is nothing but a precondition for the economic development of the territory and for the transformation of the Soviet Far East (particularly the southern part) into a major centre of manufacturing industry and export production. Of great importance here are transport communications. The significance of the Soviet Far East as the major transit zone for air shipments to and from Europe is growing. Within the system of air communications the Khabarovsk airport, which can accept any type of aircraft, is of special significance. The bulk of Soviet foreign trade with the Pacific countries is conducted through the ports of Vladivostok, Vanino, Vostochny, Nakhodka, to name just four.

I would like to deal in greater detail with the development of coastal economic ties between the USSR and Japan. Compensatory agreements and coastal trade—new promising forms of cooperation—are widely employed in the Soviet Far East's trade with Japan. As a rule, agreements of a com-

pensatory nature oblige Japan to provide various technology on credit in exchange for a guaranteed part of the output to be exported to Japan at a fixed time.

From 1968 to 1981 Japanese companies and banks granted the Soviet Union credits in conjunction with seven programmes, and more than half of them were earmarked for projects related to the development of the Far East.

Under coastal ("small scale") trade between the prefectures of Japan's western coast and the Soviet Far East the Soviet Union supplies Japan with locally produced goods and imports goods the Far East needs. The "small-scale" trade is also characterised by the principle of balanced cost. As far as Japan is concerned this form of trade is particularly advantageous for its small and medium-sized companies because it creates a steady customer for the types of production, whose market has been monopolised by big corporations.

It is clear to us the scientists of the Far East that on the whole the region does not yet play the role which its natural resources and advantageous geographic location seem to promise it. We think it is necessary to broaden the assortment of goods exported, improve the processing of raw materials, and develop those branches of mechanical engineering which are most in keeping with the international division of labour that has taken shape in the Pacific.

DZASSOKHOV: We have heard several highly interesting reports on what should be done to bring about a considerable improvement in the situation in the Asian Pacific region, and develop international cooperation there on the basis of equality and mutual gain. In this connection a question arises: what factors hamper the achievement of the abovementioned goals? I would like to ask Dmitri Petrov, whose interests as a scholar are linked with the study of Far Eastern affairs, to say a few words about the military-political alliance between the US, South Korea and Japan as a threat to the cause of peace in Asia.

DMITRI PETROV:

The growth of the significance of the Asian Pacific region in the world economy and politics is accompanied by persistent attempts by the United States to establish its military-political domination there.

The US armed forces deployed in the Pacific region are second only to US forces in Western Europe

in size. They number 474,000 officers and men, 149 warships, and more than 11,000 combat aircraft. More than 2,000 nuclear warheads are deployed on the ships and submarines of the 3rd and the 7th US Fleets which operate in the Pacific.

The US has given its allies an important role in its military and strategic schemes. Of the eight multilateral and bilateral military alliances of which Washington is a member, five are in the Asian Pacific region. The greatest importance within the system of aggressive military blocs is attached to South Korea and Japan — the two major US allies in Asia.

South Korea has been converted into the principal US bridgehead in Asia. An open-ended agreement on mutual defence, which was signed with Seoul on October 1, 1953, gave Washington the right to station an unlimited number of troops and bring in weapons of any types there. At the beginning of 1986 there were 40,500 US officers and men and somewhere between 800 to 1,000 nuclear warheads in South Korea. In addition, two squadrons of F-16 fighter-bombers which have a range of up to 3,000 kilometres, and can carry nuclear weapons, are deployed there. Preparations are under way to build silos for Pershings-2 medium-range missiles and land-based Tomahawk cruise missiles.

South Korea's militarisation is carried out with US assistance. The Seoul regime has an army of about 700,000, the biggest army of any capitalist country in the region. Every year military exercises of various types are conducted in which offensive operations and actions in conditions of a nuclear war are rehearsed.

The United States attaches exceptional importance to its military-political alliance with Japan, which is based on the "security treaty" signed on January 19, 1960, together with a number of other agreements. There are 127 US military bases and installations in Japan, as well as 46,000 officers and men. That country's military potential is being buttressed. In violation of the Constitution, armed forces with a numerical strength of about 270,000 have been set up in Japan. They are equipped with every type of modern weapon, except nuclear. This military build-up is accompanied by a considerable expansion of Japan's functions in the US military-strategic system in Asia. Tokyo has agreed to take part together with the US Navy and Air force, in anti-aircraft and anti-submarine operations in the Northwestern Pacific, i. e., in areas adjacent to the Soviet Union. Japan has agreed to mine the La Perouze, Sangar and Korean international straits "in case of emergency". It makes no attempt to conceal that its goal is to trap the Soviet Navy in the Sea of Japan and to keep it from entering the Pacific. It also adopted a decision concerning Japanese Navy patrolling at a distance of one thousand miles from its shores. At Misawa base in the north of the Honshu Island the creation of two squadrons (48 aircraft) of F-16 fighter-bombers, ca-

pable of carrying nuclear weapons, is being completed. Atomic submarines and atomic aircraft carriers with nuclear weapons regularly call at Japanese sea-ports.

Tracking, observation and guidance stations which are part of a single system serving the US nuclear missile forces in the Asian Pacific region are located in Japan. Thus, South Korea and Japan are the most important links in the US military-strategic system in Asia. At the same time, what this triangle lacks is a military treaty between South Korea and Japan. It would be highly difficult to conclude such a formal alliance today. Anti-Japanese sentiments, a product of the Japanese colonisation of Korea from 1910 to 1945, run extremely high in South Korea.

Moreover, in order to enter into an alliance with Seoul, Japan would have to revise its Constitution, and this is practically impossible as the Conservatives do not have the necessary two-thirds majority in the Diet. In addition, the ruling quarters cannot ignore the fact that the formation of a military bloc with South Korea would lead to a sharp deterioration in Tokyo's international standing, inevitably aggravate its relations with the neighbouring socialist countries and the developing countries of Southeast Asia. Broad masses of the Japanese people resolutely oppose the compact with Seoul and the attempts to knock together a tripartite alliance.

However, the absence of a formal treaty is largely compensated for by intensified unformalised military-political ties between Seoul and Tokyo. Very close ties are maintained through the US. A complete standardisation of armaments has been conducted. Army officers from South Korea and Japan are being trained at American military schools according to a single curriculum. Strategic and operational plans are coordinated. Intelligence is exchanged via the Pentagon. In the course of numerous military exercises forms and methods of coordinated action with the US armed forces are being perfected. Direct military ties between Japan and South Korea are being gradually expanded. Since April 1979, a Japanese-South Korean parliamentary council on security matters has been in existence. Finally, of great importance is the assistance Japan renders South Korea to develop its military-industrial potential. From 1965 to 1985 Tokyo gave the Seoul regime over \$12 billion on a governmental and private basis, as well as in the form of direct investment.

DZASSOKHOV: As we can clearly see from the speeches here, imperialism has created quite a few serious obstacles to peace in the Asian Pacific region. Their elimination could be largely promoted by the implementation of the Soviet proposal on a comprehensive approach to the problems of security in Asia. Here I would like to ask Vsevolod Ovchinnikov to take the floor.

**VSEVOLOD
OYCHINNIKOV:**

Of late US imperialist quarters' attempts to turn the Asian Pacific region into yet another area of military-political confrontation with the USSR, other socialist countries and the forces of national liberation have intensified considerably. The objective of the American strategists is to turn East Asia, the Pacific and the Indian Ocean washing it into an area for deploying forward-based nuclear weapons, the sort Western Europe and the adjacent Atlantic are.

The United States has declared its goal in the Asian Pacific region to be confrontation with the Soviet Union "from the Persian Gulf to the Aleutian Islands", and is trying to make the countries of Asia and Oceania accomplices in its adventures.

Since the Soviet Union has its longest borders in Asia, it wants the Asian Pacific region to be neither a source of tension nor an arena of military confrontation. The Soviet proposal on a comprehensive approach to the problems of security in Asia is evoking a broader and broader response. The point is for all Asian states, regardless of social system or political orientation, to join forces in the name of peace and stability.

A complete ban on nuclear testing—in Asia, the Pacific, the Indian Ocean and every other part of the world—and the declaration by the states of the Asian Pacific region that they will not participate in the militarisation of space would primarily meet vital interests of the peoples in the region.

An agreement to freeze military activity in the Asian Pacific region would be of paramount importance. As is well known, it was the United States' urge to create a nuclear threat to the Soviet Union from the south that led the US unilaterally to break off the Soviet-US negotiations on the limitation and the reduction of the naval activity in the Indian Ocean, and accelerate its militarisation.

For the Asian security system to be reliable it is imperative that its fundamental principles include renunciation of outside support for anti-government and terroristic armed groups. This would pave the way for a political settlement of a number of outstanding problems. In order the Asian peoples can live in peace as good neighbours they must first and foremost be protected from foreign intervention. That is why, in seeking a comprehensive approach to Asian security, the Soviet Union suggested that each great power—the permanent members of the UN Security Council—pledge not to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Asian, Af-

rican and Latin American countries, not to use the threat of force, and not to involve them in military blocs. In turn the USSR expressed its readiness to undertake similar commitments.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union, the concept of Asian security could include the five principles of peaceful coexistence ("pancha shila") set forth by Asian states, the ten Bandung principles along with a number of proposals made by the nonaligned and socialist countries of Asia. Perhaps the oldest of them is the initiative proposed by India and other coastal countries to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. If the UN Declaration relating to that initiative were to be implemented, considerable progress would be made towards strengthening Asian security. The Soviet Union is active in this sphere, and is working to see an international conference on this question convened.

The Soviet programme of nuclear disarmament, whose implementation would enable humanity to enter the 21st century without fearing for its future, opens up qualitatively new vistas for setting up a reliable system of Asian security.

DZASSOKHOV: I would like to express my gratitude to the participants in this discussion for their interesting thoughts and valuable proposals which remind us once again of the timeliness of the programme worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress, which has been called an all-embracing system of international security. By translating it into reality we can prove the accuracy of Karl Marx's prediction that the Pacific Ocean will serve as a means of contacts, rather than of disunifying peoples, and that it will become an ocean of peace and neighbourliness. ■

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1986, No 6

/12828
CSO: 5200/1397

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET JOURNAL ON NEED FOR NAVAL DISARMAMENT MEASURES

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 1, Jan 87 pp 77-84, 103

[Article by Aleksandr Mozgovoy]

[Text] Seafaring is one of the most ancient spheres of mankind's activity. Historians say that it began some 9,000 years ago, i. e. 35 centuries before the appearance of a written language and 45 centuries before the erection of the Egyptian pyramids. It is only natural that man is still eager to explore and use the World Ocean which accounts for over 70 per cent of the Earth's surface and is a major route linking countries and continents and a source of vast biological, mineral and power resources.

It is hard to overestimate the role of the World Ocean in man's economic life today. Sea shipping accounts for almost 80 per cent of world freight turnover. The World Ocean supplies more than 70 million tons of fish each year. Nearly one third of the world's total oil output comes from off-shore oilfields. Large-scale development of mineral resources now hidden on and under the ocean floor is high on the agenda today.

The development of ocean resources calls for joint efforts by the international community. The 27th CPSU Congress stressed: "The need for effective international procedures and mechanisms, which would make for the rational use of the world's resources as an asset belonging to all humanity, is becoming increasingly apparent." A major step in that direction was made at the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea which reaffirmed that the ocean and its resources beyond national jurisdiction should be used in the interest of all countries.

This approach, however, is not to the liking of the Western powers. They consider the World Ocean primarily an arena for imperialist expansion: economic, military and political. The United States and other NATO countries dispatch their armadas armed with the newest types of modern weapons many thousands of miles off their shores, deploy nuclear missile complexes aboard their submarines and target them on the socialist countries. With each passing year, the USA and its allies in aggressive military blocs add to making the World Ocean a source of increased danger to civilisation.

This is why curbing the naval arms race and lowering the level of military confrontation in the World Ocean are one of the most urgent foreign policy problems for the USSR and the rest of the socialist community. The objective has been pursued by the USSR ever since the outset of Soviet power.

The year 1924 saw broad recognition of the USSR by the capitalist countries. In that same year the Soviet Union participated in its first international forum on disarmament, the Rome Conference on Naval Arms Reduction.

What was the cause of the conference in Rome? After the First World War the United States became a leading imperialist power, primarily in the economic field. Washington did its utmost, however, to consolidate its position in the military sphere, too. Addressing the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East in 1919, Lenin said: "Britain and France are victors, but they are up to their ears in debt to America, who has decided that the French and the British may consider themselves victors as much as they like, but that she is going to skim the cream and exact usurious interest for her assistance during the war; and the guarantee of this is to be the American Navy which is now being built and is overtaking the British Navy in size."¹

To "legalise" its leading role in the imperialist world, the United States sponsored a conference in Washington in 1921-1922. Officially, it was to discuss the limitation of naval armaments, and also some Pacific and Far-Eastern problems. Actually, however, it discussed how to complete the redivision of the world following the First World War and terminate British military supremacy at sea and simultaneously augment US naval power.

The United States achieved most of its objectives. Great Britain was compelled to give up the so-called two-power standard under which Britain maintained a navy as powerful as the two next most powerful navies in the world. The USA succeeded in equalising the tonnage of British and American battleships and aircraft carriers.

Western students of history describe the Washington conference as an "outstanding stage" in arms limitations. Thus, writing in the *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, the American author Paul Johnson asserts that the conference made a major contribution to arms control because five countries agreed to reduce naval armaments and outlined their fleet parameters for 15 years. In actual fact, however, the naval arms race was not halted. It was only shifted from battleship fleets (which by then had substantially lost their former significance) to the sphere of cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and other manoeuvrable units.

It became clear immediately after its signing that the Washington treaty had a narrow and unbalanced framework. That was the reason why a new conference on reducing naval armaments was convened in Rome in February 1924. The Soviet Union also participated, seeking exclusively to lighten the burden of the peoples as regards naval armaments. The USSR made a number of constructive proposals in Rome. Specifically, it said that it was ready to cut down its fleet tonnage to 280,000 tons in exchange for some real guarantees for its security. These guarantees included the closure of the Black and Baltic Seas for the navies of all but the littoral states and the demilitarisation of the Korea Strait. The Soviet delegate also sought to limit each country's overall tonnage on a free-transfer basis (transferring part of the tonnage from one category or class of ships to another), which was in the interest of small nations and restricted the hegemonist ambitions of the major imperialist powers which were behind the naval arms race.

The Rome conference adopted no practical decisions, yet it clearly revealed the growing international prestige and influence of the Soviet Union: the Soviet position was based on the just principles of equality and equal security, and this was supported by a number of other countries. This ran counter to imperialist designs, and so they limited participation in subsequent naval arms limitation conferences, such as the 1930 and 1935-1936 London conferences, to include only representatives from the United States, Britain, Japan, France, and Italy. But exacer-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, Moscow Progress Publishers, 1965, p. 156.

bating interimperialist contradictions made the accords reached in London ineffective and incapable of curbing the naval arms race.

The Soviet Union, eager to limit the militarisation of the high seas and thus make a major contribution to strengthening international peace and security, continued to search for opportunities to achieve that goal. In his cable to Ivan Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador in London, the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Maxim Litvinov said: "The USSR, unwilling to be an inequitable party and fully sharing the peaceful powers' striving for a qualitative and quantitative limitation of naval armaments, believes that it would be most feasible in achieving this goal to convene a maritime conference of both large and small countries to work out a relevant agreement... An international conference gives sound guarantees. Besides, verification measures could also be discussed there." But such a conference was never convened. Showing goodwill, the Soviet Union joined (in 1937) the maritime treaty concluded at the 1935-1936 London conference. Curtailed as it was, the treaty imposed some restrictions on the tonnage of the ships and the calibre of the guns.

Experience showed that the United States, Britain, Japan, France, and Italy were far from seeking effectively to reduce naval armaments at relevant conferences held between the two world wars and pursued their own strategic military objectives. Such an approach was bound to nullify the accords already reached. It is hardly surprising therefore that in June, 1935, London signed a maritime agreement with Nazi Germany, granting the latter the right to increase its navy's tonnage from 108,000 tons (as allowed by the Treaty of Versailles) to 420,000 tons. The removal of virtually all restrictions concerning the construction of German submarines had extremely grave consequences: during the Second World War Nazi submarines inflicted heavy damage on the shipping and economy of Britain and other Allied states.



The atomic bombing by the United States of the Japanese towns Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 marked the advent of new lethal weapons of mass destruction. Washington staked immediately on world hegemony and the nuclear blackmail of the socialist countries. US strategists sought to supplement the A-bomb with a navy unprecedented in might. The US magazine *Military Review* boasted at the time that atomic power supplemented with naval power would give the country freedom of action enabling it to easily exercise the god-given right to rule the world. But Pax Americana never materialised. This was prevented by the radically changed balance of forces in the world, caused by the growing economic and defence potential of the Soviet Union, the emergence of the world socialist system, the collapse of US nuclear monopoly, the steep upswing of the national liberation movement, the disintegration of colonialism and the rise of dozens of newly free countries.

Yet the nuclear threat to the very existence of mankind remained. Moreover, it grew stronger with each passing year. For this reason nuclear disarmament became a major foreign policy objective of the socialist community. The problem was closely linked to lowering the level of military confrontation at sea. This is why in the late 1950s and early 1960s the USSR and other socialist countries put forward a series of initiatives to set up zones of peace, above all atomic-free zones in such specific regions as the Pacific Ocean, the Adriatic and Mediterranean seas.

Alongside its constructive and far-reaching proposals to reduce and eventually liquidate the threat of war emanating from the seas and

oceans the Soviet Union set an example for its Western counterparts to follow suit: it liquidated its naval bases in Port Arthur and Porkkala Udd and moth-balled 375 warships.

But this show of goodwill did not prompt the United States and its NATO allies to reciprocate. Pinning all their hopes on having a considerable edge in naval armaments, the Pentagon and NATO headquarters believed that their naval supremacy would last forever. American brass-hats made wide use of the US Navy as a chief strike force during the aggression in Korea and Indochina, against some Arab countries, in the Mediterranean, to suppress democratic movements in the Dominican Republic, and set up a blockade of revolutionary Cuba. Since 1960, the United States has been deploying ocean-going nuclear-powered submarines with ballistic missiles aboard targetted on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This compelled the Soviet Union to take necessary countermeasures. The Soviet ocean-going Navy was developed exclusively to ensure its sea defence capability. However, Soviet leaders continue to stress that their country has never thought it normal for naval ships of the great powers to furrow the seas far away from their shores for lengthy periods and that the USSR is ready to solve this problem, but only on an equitable basis. In other words, the Soviet Union calls upon the United States and its partners to begin a dialogue on that problem, guided by the principle of equality and equal security.

This principle underlies the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. This is the first document in postwar history limiting the naval arms race. More than 70 countries participate in this important international treaty, sponsored by the Soviet Union and signed in Moscow, Washington and London in February 1971.

Of major importance for safe seafaring are the Soviet-American (1972) agreement on the prevention of accidents in the high seas and the air space above them and the Soviet-British (1986) agreement on the prevention of accidents at seas beyond territorial waters. Specifically these documents provide that the ships of the relevant signatory parties keep sufficiently away from each other so as not to impede manoeuvring and strictly prohibit them aiming their guns, missile launchers and torpedo tubes at ships flying the colours of the parties to the treaty. Simulated attacks on military and non-military ships and aircraft are also prohibited. The agreements contain a number of other mutual obligations aimed at ensuring the safety of sea and air navigation over the seas in keeping with the rules and principles of international law. Whatever their importance, however, they are predominantly preventive in nature and cannot stop the naval arms race, primarily the race of nuclear arms.

The problem can be effectively solved if the programme for nuclear disarmament put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in his Statement of January 15, 1986 is carried through. For the time being, however, relevant articles in the Soviet-American SALT-2 Treaty are largely instrumental in limiting sea-based weapons. By refusing to continue to adhere to that Treaty, Washington removes the last brake restraining the strategic arms race.

Guided by the interest of preserving peace and stabilising the international situation, and of ensuring the dependable and free use of major international sea routes, in 1980 the Warsaw Treaty member states made a proposal to the United Nations to consider the problem of limiting and

scaling down the level of military presence and military activities in relevant regions, be it the Atlantic, Indian or Pacific oceans, the Mediterranean Sea or the Persian Gulf. The overwhelming majority of the international community recognises the need to cut down naval arsenals and limit military activities at sea. In 1983, the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly adopted resolutions calling for all UN members to submit their proposals aimed at solving this problem.

The Soviet Union heeded the call. As early as April 1984, a message was sent to the UN Secretary-General spelling out a whole package of measures whose implementation would be conducive to checking the arms race at sea. Reaffirming its previous proposals, the Soviet Union declared its readiness to participate in talks on limiting naval activities and naval armaments. Such talks could be held within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Conference. This, however, does not exclude the possibility of separate multilateral talks and discussion of the problem during the course of a dialogue between the nuclear powers.

Agreement on non-expansion of naval activities in seats of conflict or tension was viewed in the Soviet proposal as a top-priority measure. The Soviet Union pointed to the need to declare certain zones in the World Ocean off-limits for ships carrying nuclear weapons and limit the presence of units of various classes there. Agreement on confidence-building measures and their implementation would be of major political significance, because such measures would facilitate the prevention of conflict situations and enhance the safety of sea routes.

The Soviet message emphasised the need to make use of the real opportunities to limit naval activities and armaments. In this area, too, numerous constructive initiatives are sponsored by the USSR and the other socialist countries. Specifically, as early as the mid-1970s the Soviet Union made a proposal to the United States to agree on pulling out Soviet and American ships and submarines carrying nuclear weapons from the Mediterranean. Washington rejected the proposal, though it was welcomed by many Mediterranean countries and supported by all the Warsaw Treaty member states. At the Warsaw (May 1980) and Prague (January 1983) meetings of the Political Consultative Committee the socialist countries called for speedy implementation of the Soviet proposal to turn the Mediterranean Sea from a seat of military and political confrontations into a zone of stable peace and cooperation.

The recent proposal made by Mikhail Gorbachev to the effect that both American and Soviet ships permanently based in the Mediterranean be simultaneously pulled out gives a new dimension to the solution of this problem. This measure, if effected, will greatly improve the political climate in the Mediterranean, a seat of tension resulting primarily from the US war-ships which are ploughing the waters in close proximity to the shores of the Arab states and staging armed provocations against Libya and Lebanon. The USSR is compelled to keep its ships in the Mediterranean Sea for one reason only: the US Sixth Fleet carrying nuclear missiles and threatening the security of the Soviet Union and its allies and friends is in close proximity to the Soviet border.

In July 1986 the Soviet Union sent a letter to the UN Secretary-General, proposing that a representative forum be held attended by the countries of the region and all interested parties, a forum similar to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. It could agree on specific recommendations concerning the creation of the regime of peace and security in the Mediterranean. Implementation of the practical measures proposed by the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty countries would certainly ameliorate the situation in the Mediterranean and the world at large.

Very close to the Mediterranean basin is the Persian Gulf region whe-

re the situation is still so explosive that a regional conflict can at any moment turn into a global flare-up. To ensure peace in the Gulf zone and in its vicinity the USSR addressed the United States, other Western powers, and all other interested countries with a proposal to conclude an international agreement which would secure a number of important obligations to ease tensions in the region. Implementation of this initiative would not only improve the situation in the Gulf adjacent territories, but would also help scale down military presence in the Indian Ocean, so important for international navigation. To be sure, the Persian Gulf is but a fraction of the vast basin.

In recent years the problem of strengthening security and easing tensions in the Indian Ocean region, the home of peoples who have freed themselves from colonial domination has taken on added urgency. The right of these peoples to a peaceful and trouble-free life, their striving to concentrate their efforts and resources on economic and social development are called in question because of the stepped-up naval presence and activities of the United States and some other Western countries. As early as 1971, the UN General Assembly adopted the declaration on proclaiming the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, sponsored by Sri Lanka. Seeking to implement this important UN resolution as soon as possible, the Soviet Union began negotiations with the United States on limiting and then reducing military activities in that region. Yet in February 1978, when agreement was already in the offing, the United States unilaterally broke off the talks. Washington also torpedoed preparations for an international conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981 and 1983. Today, too, it goes out of its way to prevent such a forum. At this summer's session of the UN Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, the United States and some of its allies refused even to discuss a working paper on preparations for such a conference, drafted by a group of developing countries.

UN imperialism is responsible for the markedly increased military and political tensions in the Pacific, too. The Hong Kong weekly *Far-Eastern Economic Review* wrote that Washington stepped up the activity of its navy in the Western part of the Pacific [i. e., near the Soviet border—A. M.], having brought it up to a record-high level since the Second World War. To be sure, one military demonstration follows another in the Far East and Southeast Asia. Dozens of ships and aircraft from the US Seventh Fleet and US allies in the aggressive alliance participate in naval manoeuvres, such as Flitex, Rimpac, Team Spirit, and Cobra Gold. The Pentagon is trying to expand NATO's "frame of reference" to include the Pacific.

Speaking in Vladivostok, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that it is only natural that the "situation in the Far East as a whole, in Asia and the ocean expanses washing it, where we are permanent inhabitants and seafarers of long standing, is to us of a national, state interest". Above all, the USSR is interested in involving the Asian-Pacific region in the general process of establishing a comprehensive system of international security, whose principles were spelled out by the 27th CPSU Congress. This is why the Soviet Union favoured declaring the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone. Moreover, it called upon all the nuclear powers to guarantee its status unilaterally or multilaterally.

The Soviet Union is an active proponent of the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe and the proposal to strengthen security and stability in that region and the adjacent waters. During his recent visit to Finland Yegor Ligachev, Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC CPSU, stated that the Soviet Union was prepared to withdraw its submarines with ballistic missiles from the Baltic Fleet if agreement was reached on nuclear free North. The USSR

proposes to limit large-scale military exercises in the North, Norwegian, Barents and Baltic seas with the view of strengthening confidence-building measures as applicable to that region.

The United States and other NATO countries stubbornly evade any talks on limiting naval activities and reducing navies. Washington and other NATO capitals seek something quite different. The Pentagon, for one, is aiming at increasing the number of warships in its Navy to 600 units. It is short of slightly more than 40 units today. The US Navy devours the biggest chunk of the American budget military appropriations.

Why does Navy enjoy the honour of being the favourite of the US military machine? What is the aim of stepping up the race of naval weapons by the United States?

Early this year, the US naval institution published a report on the naval strategy by the former Chief of Staff of the US Navy, Admiral James Watkins (on July 1, 1986 Watkins was replaced by Admiral Carlisle Trost). Politically, this is an unprecedentedly impudent document, even given the militaristic hysteria reigning in Washington today. The report lays bare the aggressive essence of US military preparations in the World Ocean. The instability of today's international situation, says Watkins, prompts the thought that the USA will continue to be compelled to make increasing use of elements of its naval strategy in the hot spots of the world. Although the United States is not engaged in combat operations, he adds, the scale of operations today is some 20 per cent higher than during the war in Vietnam, and the US Navy is already forward-based and will remain there in the foreseeable future. According to his estimates, in the period between 1946 and 1982 in 80 per cent of all cases (250 instances) of US military aggression the US Navy was the "chief factor" in combat action because its forward position and high mobility make it possible to use naval forces at any moment in different spots of the world. As compared to the other arm of the service, the Navy's chief advantage is in ensuring the possibility of a protracted global conflict. The Navy is responsible for active offensive operations employing all types of weapons and reducing the probability of a nuclear escalation by tipping the nuclear balance in favour of the USA. To put it differently, the Navy is set the task of neutralising the Soviet retaliatory potential.

There is no need to dwell on Watkins voluminous report in more detail. The strategy's essence is clear: to build up the Navy to help attain the main objective, viz. world hegemony. The facts bear this out. Suffice it to say that more than half the US strategic nuclear potential is deployed on nuclear-powered submarines. The future activities of the US Navy are increasingly tied in with the Star Wars programme Washington so stubbornly clings to. Specifically, submarines are to be used as carriers of missiles equipped with X-ray lasers. They are to be deployed in the Norwegian Sea or in the northern Indian Ocean.

Moreover, by dispatching its armadas to various regions of the World Ocean, the United States is seeking to create conditions favourable for unrestricted extraction by the US monopolies of minerals on the ocean floor and its subsoil. It is not fortuitous that the United States continues to refuse to adhere to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, which, among other things, regulates the exploitation of sea-bed resources.

The selfish interests of the military-industrial complex are also among the "stimuli" encouraging the United States to step up the race of naval armaments. Arms production for the Navy is an extremely lucrative bu-

business for the monopolies. Moreover, military concerns are increasingly active exploiting marine resources. For instance, Lockheed which supplies the Navy with Trident missiles, Orion and Viking patrol and anti-submarine aircraft, and landing ships, is a major participant in the Ocean Minerals consortium specialising in the extraction and processing of ocean resources.

Given the present-day diametrically opposite approaches of the Soviet Union and the United States, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO to limiting the naval arms race and lowering the level of military presence in the World Ocean, is there any hope that talks in that field would bear fruit? Yes, talks can produce tangible results.

Is there any ground for such a seemingly overoptimistic conclusion? As has been noted by the 27th CPSU Congress, today's world is in the process of swift changes, and it is not within anybody's power to maintain a perpetual status quo in it. It consists of many dozens of countries, each having perfectly legitimate interests. And these interests are increasingly at variance with the imperialist designs of the United States. The might-is-right attitude ends up being ineffective more and more often. The United States does have its armadas in virtually all parts of the World Ocean, but what is the real political asset of Washington's naval strategy? The invasion of tiny Grenada? All the other military exploits of the Pentagon seem to be such in the American press alone.

Further glutting of the World Ocean with nuclear arms is bound to increase the risk of a global nuclear catastrophe. It is really much more difficult to ensure the safety of nuclear charges aboard ships than it is on land. Communication with naval units scattered in far-away regions is another serious problem. A single misinterpreted command or order may bring about irreparable consequences.

There is no doubt that the fusion of naval power and the US President's SDI programme will not produce a desirable effect.

Fleet Admiral V. Chernyavin, Commander-in-Chief of the USSR Navy, has stressed: "The American plans to transfer the arms race to outer space, if effected, will change the character of activity of the Soviet Navy as well."

The Warsaw Treaty countries, whose navies are smaller in tonnage as compared with NATO, possess sufficient capability to contain aggression from the sea. Naval supremacy the Pentagon dreams about is untenable.

Today's world is too small and fragile for wars and power politics. The arms race, like a nuclear war, cannot be won. This is confirmed by the conclusion made by the 27th CPSU Congress that the arms race, *"the aspiration to win military superiority can, speaking in objective terms, bring no political gain to anybody"*. There is only one reasonable path, the path of negotiations leading to lower levels of military confrontation, to stronger security. This is the solution offered by the socialist countries as a top-priority task.

Thanks to the efforts exerted by the socialist countries supported by the non-aligned states, the First Committee of the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on curbing the naval arms race and preventing the arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, on strengthening security and cooperation in the Mediterranean, and on implementing the declaration on proclaiming the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

No one argues: the problem of naval disarmament is complex indeed, because it intertwines with virtually all the other aspects of disarmament. But it can be solved, stage by stage, and comprehensively. Many constructive proposals have already been made and many key issues of scaling down the level of naval armaments and military presence in the World Ocean discussed. The mechanism of negotiations should be put in motion now. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries are ready to do this.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986
English Translation Copyright: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274
CSO: 5200/1403

RELATED ISSUES

WARSAW PACT FOREIGN MINISTERS HOLD MEETING

TASS Lists Participants

LD241614 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 24 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 24 TASS -- A regular session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance opened in Moscow today.

Attending the session's proceedings are Petr Mladenov, foreign minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Peter Varkonyi, foreign minister of the Hungarian People's Republic, Oskar Fischer, foreign minister of the German Democratic Republic, Marian Orzechowski, foreign minister of the Polish People's Republic of Romania, Eduard Shevardnadze, foreign minister of the USSR, and Bohuslav Chnoupek, foreign minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Under discussion at the session are matters pertaining to the situation in Europe and in the world as a whole. Particular attention is paid to the issues of ending the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, and enhancing European and universal security.

Gorbachev Meets With Ministers

LD251608 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had a meeting today with those participating in the session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states comprising the foreign affairs ministers of: the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Mladenov; the Hungarian People's Republic, Varkonyi; the GDR, Fischer; the Polish People's Republic, Orzechowski; the Socialist Republic of Romania, Totu; and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Chnoupek.

During their conversation, which passed in an atmosphere of comradeship and complete mutual understanding, the ministers expressed satisfaction with regard to the restructuring work of the Foreign Ministers' Committee, which is becoming more and more creative and envisions enhancing everyone's initiative in the implementation of the jointly elaborated line of the socialist community countries. Note was made of the great importance of the soviet initiatives aimed at ensuring the survival of mankind and guaranteeing reliable security for all people and for all countries, and at the creation of a nonviolent world free of nuclear weapons. Particular stress was laid on the historic significance for the destinies of socialism and for the world today of the

process now in progress in the Soviet Union with regard to the acceleration of socioeconomic development, restructuring, and democratization.

Having expressed satisfaction with the work of the Foreign Ministers' Committee, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev dwelled on the need to impart even greater dynamism and flexibility to it, so that this important instrument for the coordination of the foreign policy activity of the fraternal socialist countries should be fully in accordance with the increased and more complex tasks in the world arena, and with the expanding possibilities for the peace-loving policy of socialism to have an effect on the destiny of the world.

It is a fact that the initiatives of the Soviet Union and of the Warsaw Pact member-states, aimed at avoiding a nuclear catastrophe and at disarmament, are winning sympathy and support from world public opinion, and are changing the very atmosphere of international life.

The Soviet Union approaches the matter of peace and war with full responsibility. It has done and will do all that depends on it to protect humanity from the threat of nuclear destruction. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted that the fraternal parties and countries build their relations on the stable foundation of equal rights and independence, and responsibility, initiative, and coordination. The CPSU and the Soviet Union are invariably true to the line developed collectively by the socialist community countries.

Speaking of the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet people are solving tasks that have long-term consequences for the opening up of possibilities inherent in the socialist system. Restructuring is not a simple matter; it does not move without struggle and without problems insofar as it touches many people and the whole of society. However, the desire of communists and all Soviet people is one: Not to stop half-way, but to take the matter of renewing all aspects of Soviet life right up to the end.

Comrade Gorbachev expressed the wish to participants of the Foreign Ministers' Committee and all diplomats of the socialist countries for creative boldness, an innovatory approach in achieving noble aims, and the nonpermissibility of war. He also asked that a comradely welcome should be conveyed to the leaders of the fraternal parties of the Warsaw Pact member states.

Taking part in the meeting were Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of foreign affairs, and Comrade Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

24 March Session

LD241557 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, 24 Mar (TASS) -- The routine session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee that opened today is centering its attention on essential questions of modern times: eliminating the nuclear threat, saving mankind from the burden of nuclear and other arms, strengthening European and universal security, and developing international cooperation, announced USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman Boris Pyadyshev.

At the session, he said, it was stressed that the major initiatives put forward by the USSR in Reykjavik mark a qualitatively new approach to disarmament problems. Questions relating to the implementation of the proposals contained in the Budapest appeal by Warsaw Pact member-states are being examined thoroughly. The allied states resolutely advocated a ban on chemical weapons, the liquidation of existing stockpiles, as well as the industrial base for manufacturing them. An exchange of opinion concerning the Vienna meeting is in progress.

As was stressed in the speech by Eduard Shevardnadze and the ministers of other allied states, the Foreign Ministry spokesman continued, the international positions of the socialist community continue to be strengthened thanks to the internal processes in the allied states. Domestic policy has not had such a strong and direct effect on foreign policy for a long time. This process is a necessary objective; it is in keeping with the realities and demands of the time. Socialism is strengthening, developing, and perfecting itself on its own ground and simultaneously is exerting an ever growing influence on the worldwide situation and on world policy. Participants in the session pointed out in their speeches that certain Western politicians are in return proposing to search for new, less well-worn avenues. It goes without saying that we welcome this. For other Western politicians, the old, well-trodden rut is still typical; they are thrown from one side to the other, from the myth of a military threat from the East to calls to deal with us from a position of strength. By deceiving itself with a strong-arm policy, the West demonstrates overall its inability to make reasonable compromise decisions, stated the USSR Foreign Ministry representative.

During the discussions at sessions of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee the following was noted: The primary difference now is not simply that the socialist countries have put forward initiatives and proposals which cover the whole range of key security questions; the United Nations approves the idea of a comprehensive system of peace and security. The concept of a nonnuclear world has become the philosophical and practical basis for talks on nuclear and space weapons. The Budapest address has been made a commonplace of specific talks. The plan to strengthen security in the Asian Pacific region is included on the international agenda and is generating contacts and consultations. Dialogue between CEMA and the EEC is developing.

It was noted at the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee sessions that the Geneva talks now have taken on a serious quality even though the U.S. side is making attempts to raise new issues and to stretch the area of discussion artificially. The forthcoming talks with Secretary of State Shultz in Moscow will make it possible to evaluate U.S. intentions and the outlook for the Geneva talks.

The crucial phase of drawing up decisions has been reached at the Vienna meeting. Removing the disarmament problem from the Helsinki process would deform and degenerate [the process] and would undermine our attempts to strengthen the foundations of the European house.

All the participants in the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee session stressed that the Warsaw Pact is constantly expanding its role as one of the major factors in strengthening peace and security in Europe and throughout the world.

Euromissiles Accord Urged

AU241519 Paris AFP in English 1518 GMT 24 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, March 24 (AFP) -- Foreign Ministers of the seven-nation Warsaw Pact alliance Tuesday called for a quick accord on Euromissiles between the United States and the Soviet Union, Soviet spokesman Boris Pyadyshev said. The officials stressed the need for a separate accord between the superpowers to remove medium-range missiles from Europe adding that the forthcoming visit to Moscow by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in April will be a testing ground to sound the American position, Mr. Pyadyshev said.

The Seven said the current U.S.-Soviet talks in Geneva were "serious" but they accused the American side of "raising new issues" to blow up the agenda of discussions. The Pact's meeting in Moscow marks the 10th anniversary of the alliance and talks are expected to resume on Wednesday, Mr. Pyadyshev said. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze inaugurated Tuesday's meeting with a speech covering the situation in Europe, disarmament and the need to reinforce international security.

25 March News Conference

LD251959 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Report by Sergey Pravdin on news conference at USSR Foreign Ministry press center in Moscow on 25 March by Deputy USSR Foreign Minister Loginov on results of session of the Foreign ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states; Loginov remarks recorded]

[Text] [Pravdin] Comrade Loginov, deputy USSR foreign minister, addressed the news conference and, in particular, noted that a sincere and thorough exchange of views had taken place at the session on the situation in Europe and the world as a whole. At the focus of this exchange of views were primary issues of today, such as the elimination of the nuclear threat, banning chemical weapons, strengthening European security, and developing cooperation between all countries. Comrade Loginov went on to say:

[Loginov] This morning the ministers were received by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During the conversation, they spoke of the changes visible in the situation on the European Continent and throughout the world under the influence of the open, honest policy of the socialist countries, and in the interest of the removal of the threat of war and the strengthening of peace and security in the world.

[Pravdin] Having noted the successful work of the participants in the session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee, Comrade Loginov said:

[Loginov] At the session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee it was noted that the Warsaw Pact member states are filled with resolve to struggle for progress and toward the targets attained in the Icelandic capital, to seek profound, radical reductions in and the destruction of nuclear armaments, the prevention of an arms race in space, and the strict observance of the ABM Treaty. There was discussion of the need to do everything to ensure that the accords outlined should be translated into specific agreements on the basis of the continuance and deepening of political dialogue between states.

[Pravdin] Comrade Loginov added:

[Loginov] The Soviet Union's urgent proposal to sign a separate agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States, in accordance with which U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe would be completely scrapped, was supported. The Soviet Union's readiness to remove the increased-range operational and tactical missiles from the territories of the GDR and Czechoslovakia -- of course, by agreement with the governments of these countries -- immediately after the signing of such an agreement met with approval. Our readiness to start talks immediately with a view to reducing and completely scrapping other operational and tactical missiles was supported. It was stated that an early conclusion of an agreement on medium-range missiles would open the way to completely freeing Europe from nuclear weapons.

At the same time, the ministers unanimously spoke out in favor of urgently halting the implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative program and the drawing up of similar plans -- the so-called European Defense Initiative -- and stressed the extremely dangerous consequences of the realization of such plans. They reaffirmed their resolve to seek a complete and universal banning of nuclear tests, and spoke out in favor of talks with a view to signing an agreement on this matter as soon as possible.

The committee session adopted a statement on the question of banning chemical weapons, of declaring the speediest possible end to negotiations on a complete and general banning of chemical weapons -- one of the main aims of the foreign policy of the allied countries. We consider that the essential prerequisites have now been established for a solution to be found as early as the current year, with account being taken of the proposals by the participants in the Geneva disarmament conference to the questions as yet unresolved at the negotiations, and the harmony to result from the completion of an international convention effectively ensuring a complete and universal ban on development [razrabotka] and production of chemical weapons, the elimination of all stocks of them in the near future, and the guarantee that chemical weapons will never be reborn anywhere again.

A real opportunity to eliminate chemical weapons and end forever the chemical threat to all mankind must not be missed. Guided by the wish for a speedy completion to the drafting of a convention banning and eliminating chemical weapons, all states are called upon -- the committee's document states -- to take no steps that might complicate the attainment of a mutually acceptable accord at the negotiations or to slow their progress.

The states represented at the session consider that 1987, the current year, can and should be the year of the start of total and general chemical disarmament.

Now I should like to broach a question related to a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional weapons on the European Continent, in accordance with the proposals contained in the Budapest program of the Warsaw Pact member states: The allied countries have agreed that they will continue to most resolutely seek to ensure that these reductions, affecting both military-political alliances in Europe, reach 20 percent of the present level as early as the beginning of the 1990's, with a corresponding reduction in the military expenditure of the states, and to ensure that the process of reductions, making it possible to reduce, if not completely rule out, the possibility of a surprise attack.

The documents adopted at the session clearly point out that the inviolability of borders and respect for the territorial-political realities that have arisen are

essential conditions for maintaining an enduring peace in Europe. Particular attention was devoted to discussion of all aspects of the general European process and the drafting of a course for the allied countries at the Vienna meeting, which will foster its successful completion.

An appeal addressed to all participants in the CSCE was adopted, calling on them to direct their efforts toward ensuring that the Vienna meeting completes its work by adopting meaningful and balanced decisions.

[Pravdin] Noting the great importance of the documents adopted at the Foreign Ministers' meeting of the Warsaw Pact member-states in Moscow, Comrade Loginov said:

[Loginov] All these three documents are imbued with one concern: to strengthen and preserve peace; to ward off the threat of nuclear war looming over mankind; and to develop and strengthen normal, civilized relations between states, irrespective of their social systems.

[Pravdin] At the conclusion of the news conference, Comrade Loginov replied to questions from journalists. Replying, in particular, to a question from an UNSERE ZEIT correspondent, on the way the socialist countries perceive restructuring in the USSR, Comrade Loginov said:

[Loginov] I can say that the statement by the foreign ministers at their meeting -- or rather at all meetings during this session, since there was not only the plenary session, but of course meetings and conversations in the corridors, meetings in the experts' groups, and finally the meeting with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee -- it was noted everywhere that the decisions of the January Central Committee Plenum are being received with approval by the socialist countries.

I would like to immediately mention another matter: Our course toward restructuring, which is indeed being received with approval by the socialist countries, is an internal affair of our party. We are conducting it within the country, as far as domestic policy is concerned. As for foreign policy, the entire world feels it, and we are not imposing it upon anybody. It is the business of every party, of every country and of every people to decide how to act in its own house. And I repeat: We are not imposing it upon anybody, and therefore the fact that the socialist countries are greeting with approval the decisions of the January plenum of the CPSU Central Committee pleases us.

[Pravdin] Replies also were given to other questions from journalists at the news conference.

Poland's Orzechowski Reaction

LD251946 Domestic Service in Polish 1800 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Text] [Correspondent Stefanowicz] This is Witold Stefanowicz from Moscow. The 2-day session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states ended at 1330 GMT. Mikhail Gorbachev met with the participants this morning. Just after the session, I spoke with Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs Marian Orzechowski:

[Begin Orzechowski recording] I would say that this conversation was the farthest removed from any formal protocol. This actually was a conversation between the CPSU leader, the leader of a great state, and the foreign affairs ministers of the socialist

community about the most important matters for us all, for [words indistinct] and the world. It was also about matters of peace, about matters of disarmament, about a reduction of tension, about the connection between events within our countries and events in the Soviet Union -- which is called reconstruction [przebudowa] and which we at home call renewal -- and international policies, and our desires for peace, detente, and the creation of a safe world, a world without atomic weapons and the specter of nuclear catastrophe. This was a conversation about what should be done so that our efforts, our desires, our wishes -- which correspond to the wishes of all humanity -- actually will become a material force, a material fact; it was a meeting about how to perfect our cooperation, how to get through to all the people, to all groups and social (?parties), to all continents and to all states with our (?matters); how to make use of them for this straightforward, and I would say elementary and fundamental conception. The world of the future can only be a world without war, a world of peace, a world of cooperation, a world of secure existence for all. [end recording]

GDR's Fischer Comments on Talks

LD251815 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1704 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, 25 Mar 87 (ADN) -- After the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty member states Foreign Ministers' Committee in Moscow, GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer told newsmen today that the consultations had centered on basic questions of safeguarding peace, freeing mankind from nuclear and other armaments, and consolidating security in Europe and throughout the world. There had been an intensive and constructive exchange of views on this, as was usual among the allied socialist states.

The most important result of the consultations was the complete agreement among the fraternal states to continue their peace offensive dynamically in accordance with the decisions of the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee. The socialist states want concrete results, especially in the area of disarmament. This was expressed in the documents adopted by the meeting: the communique, the document on the continuation of the CSCE process and on the successful conclusion of the Vienna meeting, and the statement on a chemical weapons ban.

The signing without delay of a separate agreement on the elimination of the USSR's and the United States' medium-range missiles in Europe was assessed as being particularly urgent. The socialist fraternal states thought such a step, as proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, could be a real breakthrough in efforts to safeguard peace. Therefore, it was natural for the GDR to support this initiative effectively with its own contributions. As is known, Erich Honecker had appealed to FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl to press the Western alliance to accept the latest Soviet offer.

The result of the meeting was a renewed commitment by the Warsaw Pact member states to dialogue and dialogue and cooperation with all forces of reason and realism.

CSSR's Chnoupek Reviews Topics

LD260036 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Interview with CSSR Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek by station permanent correspondent Stefan Simak in Moscow on 25 March at the conclusion of the regular session of Warsaw Pact foreign ministers; Simak and Chnoupek both speak in Slovak -- recorded]

[Text] [Simak] At the session, you spoke in detail about the most important problems of our time: Averting the nuclear threat, elimination of nuclear weapons, and reinforcing European and general security. Comrade minister, where do you see the key to tackling these problems?

[Chnoupek] This 10th jubilee session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee was exceptional with regard to the three areas you have mentioned. It was quite strongly influenced by the atmosphere of democratization which dominates (?this sphere) and which manifests itself in domestic and foreign policy. In this sense I was impressed by the reception of General Secretary Comrade Gorbachev, who devoted a lot of time to us -- 3 hours -- where, in an informal and lively discussion we spoke about these three issues. The general secretary said clearly that the USSR wants to follow consistently, in the sphere of foreign policy and disarmament, this principled, flexible path of solving the nuclear threat to the world and Europe.

I think that this basic thesis was reflected in the entire deliberations of the Foreign Ministers' Committee, where everybody could voice his views freely and democratically, and this led to a unified viewpoint expressed on the continuation of the all-European process, on the positive results of the Vienna meetings, and on the issue of chemical weapons. As stated in the document, the treaty on the elimination of chemical weapons could be signed this year; we have gone that far. What matters in Vienna is to give a relevant mandate to the talks on the very important issues of conventional disarmament, as we suggested in Budapest, and all this is marked by the magnanimous proposal of the USSR, described by many of us as the turning point, that is the proposal for the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe.

[Simak] How did you assess the attitude of the United States and the other Western countries on this proposal?

[Chnoupek] We stressed in particular that the proposal submitted by the USSR is fully in agreement with the principles of the Soviet peace policy. The democratization of this policy also rests in the fact that a nuclear superpower wants to give up voluntarily a nuclear monopoly. A number of European states realized what the nuclear threat really is -- and realistic politicians, too -- and we do not even need to mention the European general public, which accepts its spontaneously.

We also said, and I stressed this a while ago, that we believe this is the turning point in the area of disarmament policy, and that it is a proposal with a realistic chance of attaining a specific result. On the other hand, as we have pointed out, on the basis of our Czechoslovak experience, those who years ago fought hardest for the so-called zero option today do not even try to hide the fact that they actually were bluffing and that they proposed these ideas with the aim to lead the policy of the socialist countries up a blind alley. We also added that we think that should this succeed, it could affect the entire scale of disarmament talks: in Geneva, in Vienna, it could affect the entire atmosphere of these talks and it actually could bring about a sort of chain reaction in the entire disarmament policy.

[Simak] The West sometimes describes the changes going on in the USSR and the rest of the socialist countries as an adaptation to an international economic boom [medzinarodna konjunktura]. Have you discussed that too?

[Chnoupek] We paid particular attention to this topic. I think that I will not reveal any secret when I say that Comrade Gorbachev, too, spoke at length to us on this topic. It was stressed unequivocally, whether at the Kremlin table or at the table of the Foreign Ministry Committee, that this is a principled, irrevocable, peaceful and realistic policy; the return to Leninist ideas of the policy of peace, the policy of peaceful coexistence, the policy of the reduction of tension. This is not Bolshevik propaganda, or an economic boom. This is a long-term, promising and permanent path.

Kashlev Comments

LD271614 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1139 GMT 27 Mar 87

[Text] Vienna, 27 Mar (TASS) -- The outcome of the Moscow session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee was perceived here as evidence of the great importance ascribed by the socialist states to the continuation and development of all-European process.

At the Vienna plenary session of representatives of states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE], Ambassador Yu.B. Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation, outlines the contents of the documents approved in Moscow. He focused special attention upon the foreign ministers committee's call for conducting the work of the all-European forum in a dynamic, constructive and businesslike spirit so that its decisions become a manifestation of a new thinking in international affairs and assist the consolidation of peace and security and the development of cooperation on the European continent and worldwide.

A press conference on the results of the session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee was held in the Hofburg Palace the same day.

The documents approved in Moscow, which aroused great interest, were circulated among the journalists at the Vienna meeting.

Chemical Weapons Ban Statement

LD261017 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, 26 Mar (TASS)--Follows the full text of the statement on the issue of a ban on chemical weapons, which was adopted at the meeting of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states held in Moscow on 24-25 March:

S t a t e m e n t [spacing as received]

By the Warsaw Treaty member-states
On the issue of a ban on chemical
weapons

Proceeding from the interests of strengthening international peace and general security, of ensuring disarmament, the Warsaw Treaty member-states resolutely declare for a ban on chemical weapons, for scrapping the existing stocks of such weapons and the industrial base for their production. One of the main objectives of their foreign policy is the speediest completion of talks on a full and universal ban on chemical weapons.

The major initiatives advanced by the socialist states in order to accelerate and invigorate the talks, the proposals of the other countries participating in the disarmament conference have made it possible to eliminate many obstacles in the way to drawing up a mutually acceptable agreement. The necessary prerequisites have been created for completing, with due regard for the proposals of the participants in the Geneva disarmament conference to settle the outstanding issues at the talks already

this year, the work to hammer an international convention that would effectively ensure a full and universal ban on the development and production of chemical weapons, scrapping all of its stocks soon and guarantee that they will never be revived anywhere. The real opportunity to eliminate chemical weapons, to put an end forever to the chemical threat to the whole mankind shall not be missed.

A serious obstacle in the way to the attainment of this goal are the plans to produce and deploy in Europe a particularly dangerous binary type of those weapons. These plans are in conflict with the demands of the world community and the U.N. decisions on the need for an ban and scrapping of nuclear weapons.

The allied socialist states will further do on their part everything in their power to conclude a convention most speedily. To find solutions at the talks on questions which yet hamper the completion of work on the convention, they have put forward fresh proposals at the disarmament conference concerning the announcement of the chemical weapons deposts, ensuring non-production of such weapons in the civilian chemical industry, exercise of control, including international control in places and check-ups at request.

The allied socialist states stand for ridding Europe, its individual regions of chemical weapons. They reaffirm their support for the initiatives made by the GDR and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania on the establishment of zones, respectively in Central Europe and the Balkans, free from chemical weapons -- the zones in which the deployment, testing, production, acquisition and stockpiling of such weapons would be banned -- as a major contribution to the effort to avert the threat of chemical weapons' use.

Proceeding from their principled position the Warsaw Treaty member-states stand for imposing the toughest system of verification, including international verification, to monitor the compliance of the signatory states with their commitments under the convention. They reaffirm their readiness to seek on that basis mutually acceptable solutions to issues related to the observance of the convention by all the parties and to the build-up of trust among its signatories.

Guided by their striving for an early completion of the effort to draft the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on their destruction, and for the creation of the necessary conditions for that, the states represented at the meeting are urging all states:

-- To refrain from all steps that could complicate the attainment of mutually acceptable accords at the talks of slow down their progress;

-- Not to produce chemical weapons, including their binary or multi-component types, not to deploy chemical weapons on foreign territories, to withdraw them from those foreign territories where they have already been deployed, and the states which have no chemical weapons on the territory -- to prevent their deployment.

To ensure resolute progress toward an agreement on the elimination of chemical arsenals it is especially important now that all parties to the talks demonstrate political will, realism and lofty responsibility.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states are emphatically urging the NATO countries and all participants in the conference on disarmament to work together with them in order to overcome by joint efforts the remaining obstacles at the talks, complete the drafting of

the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons in the current year so as to embark shortly on the complete elimination of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture everywhere.

The states represented at the meeting believe that 1987 can and must become a year of the beginning of complete and general chemical disarmament.

Call for Vienna CSCE Success

PM251736 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "For the Development of the All-European Process and the Successful Conclusion of the Vienna Meeting"]

[Text] The foreign ministers of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR note that the Vienna meeting of representatives of states participating in the CSCE has entered a phase of crucial actions and decisions in order to agree and draw up weighty accords across the whole spectrum of the Helsinki Final Act as a unified whole, accords aimed at promoting the further practical implementation of its provisions.

The ministers again confirm their countries' adherence to the further development and deepening of the all-European process, which is capable of strengthening detente and making it universal in scope. This would make it possible to build and develop relations between the participating states on the lasting and reliable basis of all the principles of the Helsinki Final Act with a view to improving the life of all people and of each person individually, so that they may enjoy the benefits of peace and look to tomorrow with confidence.

Under present-day conditions, they see it as the main task of the Vienna meeting to raise the all-European process to a qualitatively new level, to make it more dynamic, and to promote the development of cooperation among the CSCE states in the sphere of security and in the political, economic, and humanitarian fields.

The ministers believe that the proposals of the participants in the Vienna meeting should accord with these tasks and that at that forum pressing problems should be discussed, problems which are of most concern to the peoples of the continent and to every person, such a disarmament, the safeguarding of peace and security, the strengthening of confidence, and the expansion of cooperation in all spheres.

I. Proceeding from the particular necessity to promote disarmament in Europe and the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms, the ministers noted that the accords reached at the first stage of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building measures and Disarmament in Europe orient the participating states to the transition to an integrated system embracing measures to strengthen confidence and security and disarmament measures. They discussed these questions in detail in the light of the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Pact member-states and the proposals put forward by the socialist countries at the Vienna meeting on the transition to concrete talks on a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- within the framework of an appropriate forum or conference. They believe that questions of security and disarmament should be examined and resolved within the framework of the all-European process. In this context, the proposal put

forward at the Vienna meeting by the states represented at the session on amending the mandate of the Stockholm conference in such a way that disarmament questions also are discussed there in concrete terms was reaffirmed.

Such talks would be conducted in parallel with the elaboration of those confidence-building measures on which agreement was not reached at the initial stage of the Stockholm conference or which may be put forward in the future, including the gradual reduction of military activity, especially that of the two military alliances, notification of independent exercises by air forces and naval forces, the application of confidence-building measures to the territories of all the countries participating in the CSCE, and other confidence and security measures. At the same time another subject of consideration would be fundamentally new measures to strengthen confidence and military-strategic stability in Europe directly connected with the reduction of armed forces, conventional arms, and military spending, which would facilitate the attainment of accords and lead to the establishment of military equilibrium at the most basic level.

The states represented at the session advocate the active participation of neutral and nonaligned countries in the examination of the military aspects of European security at all stages, and believe that these countries -- in view of their positive role in the all-European process -- could make a tangible contribution to the cause of disarmament in Europe, too.

The commencement of unofficial consultations among representatives of the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries taking part in the Vienna meeting was a new feature. The states represented at the session hope that these consultations will promote the resolution of questions relating to the transition to concrete talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, and on the understanding that a decision on the mandate for these talks should be taken in the course of the Vienna meeting and should be reflected in its concluding document.

On the basis of equal rights, balance and reciprocity, and identical respect for the security interests of all the CSCE states, the Warsaw Pact member-states are prepared to seek mutually acceptable approaches to future talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms on an all-European scale.

The conclusion of the Vienna meeting with weighty, concrete results would create a more favorable atmosphere for progress at the talks where questions of nuclear arms limitation and reduction and of preventing the placement of weapons in space are being discussed, as well as for the implementation of initiatives to create zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons on the continent.

II. The ministers noted that an important component of European security is the development of the entire range of economic ties and cooperation among the CSCE states. Such ties are the material foundation of detente, security, and peace in Europe.

The further development and deepening of the all-European process is promoted by the socialist states' initiatives on convening an economic forum in Prague, a conference on scientific and technical cooperation in Bucharest, and an ecological forum. The other proposals work in the same direction -- proposals on questions of expanding and enriching with new forms economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, production sharing, and the transfer of technology, as well as on the removal of obstacles in the path of trade and economic exchanges among the CSCE states.

The Warsaw Pact countries note the submission by many other CSCE states of proposals on all aspects of the "second basket," and are prepared carefully to examine them with a view to finding mutually acceptable solutions.

III. The Warsaw Pact states regard cooperation in the humanitarian sphere as an important element of the all-European process and the creation of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. They advocate broad collaboration in this sphere. It is their conviction that everything should be done to safeguard man's right to live and work in conditions of peace and freedom and the full implementation of political, civil, economic, social, and cultural rights in their totality and interdependence, with respect for the sovereignty of states.

The interests of peace and the creation of a climate of confidence, mutual respect, and friendship among peoples require an end to all attempts to propagate anticommunism and preach racism and chauvinist and nationalist theses.

The goals of achieving progress over the whole range of humanitarian questions in all the CSCE countries in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act are served by the proposal to convene in Moscow a conference on the development of humanitarian cooperation, which would make it possible to examine the totality of questions of cooperation in this area among the participating states. The Warsaw Pact member-states call on all the CSCE countries to take a favorable attitude to the convening of a humanitarian conference, and advocate that an all-round discussion, oriented toward practical results, take place at that forum.

The further development and deepening of the all-European process in the spheres of contacts, information, culture, and education also are the aims of the joint proposals of socialist and other countries, including the proposal on convening a symposium in Krakow on their cultural heritage, Hungary's initiative on encouraging the translation, publication, and dissemination of literature created in the less widespread languages of the participating states, and Romania's proposals on convening conferences on the education and training of cadres and on questions of crime, alcoholism, and drug abuse. With the same objective, the socialist countries have put forward a number of proposals aimed at resolving other topical questions, such as unemployment, illiteracy, the situation of young people, equality for women, and cooperation in the sphere of the mass media.

The states represented at the session will seek to achieve mutually acceptable accords with the other CSCE countries on questions relating to humanitarian issues.

The Warsaw Pact member states appeal to all those states participating in the CSCE to make efforts to ensure that the Vienna meeting concludes its work by adopting balanced decisions that are rich in content.

They are fully determined to do everything to ensure that the Vienna meeting takes place in a constructive, businesslike spirit and that its decisions are a manifestation of the new way of thinking in international affairs and will promote the strengthening of peace and security and the development of cooperation on the European continent and throughout the world.

Meeting Ends; Ministers Depart

LD251518 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- The session of the Foreign Ministers Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries ended in Moscow today.

Later in the day the following ministers of foreign affairs left Moscow: Peter Mladenov, of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Peter Varkonyi, of the Hungarian People's Republic, Oskar Fisher, of the German Democratic Republic, Marian Orzechowski, of the Polish People's Republic, Ioan Totu, of the Socialist Republic of Romania, and Bohuslav Chnoupek, of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

At Sheremetyevo Airport they were seen off by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, by official representatives of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by the ambassadors of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, and Romania, and by charge d'affaires ad interim of Czechoslovakia to the Soviet Union.

IZVESTIYA Publishes 'Communique'

PM251701 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

["Communique of a Session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers' Committee"]

[Text] A routine session of the Warsaw Pact member states' Foreign Ministers' Committee on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance was held on 24-25 March 1987 in Moscow.

The session was attended by P. Mladenov, foreign minister of the Bulgarian People's Republic; P. Varkonyi, foreign minister of the Hungarian People's Republic; O. Fischer, foreign minister of the GDR; M. Orzechowski, foreign minister of the Polish People's Republic; I. Totu, foreign minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania; E.A. Shevardnadze, foreign minister of the USSR; and B. Chnoupek, foreign minister of the CSSR.

1. The foreign ministers exchanged opinions on the state of affairs in Europe and in the world in general. The discussion focused on the cardinal questions of the present day -- eliminating the nuclear threat, ridding mankind of the burden of nuclear and other armaments, strengthening European and world security, and developing international cooperation.

The session participants expressed their states' concern at the continuing complex international situation resulting from the intensification of the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, because of U.S. and NATO actions and stressed the need to increase and combine the efforts of all states for the purpose of disarmament and to strive resolutely for the creation of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

The session noted that the major proposals put forward by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik signify a qualitatively new approach to disarmament problems and are a further extension of the program for establishing a nuclear-free world contained in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's 15 January 1986 statement. The Warsaw Pact member states are fully determined to struggle for movement forward from the positions reached in the Icelandic capital, to achieve deep, radical cuts in and the destruction of nuclear weapons, to prevent the arms race from entering space, and to ensure strict observance of the ABM Treaty conditions. Everything must be done to turn the outlined accords into concrete agreements. In this regard, they again advocated the continuation and deepening of political dialogue between states.

The states represented at the session stressed the need for the immediate signing of a separate USSR-U.S. agreement whereby U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe

would be completely eliminated. They support the Soviet Union's proposal on this score and welcome its willingness, the moment such an agreement is signed, to withdraw the increased-range operational and tactical missiles from the GDR and the CSSR by agreement with those countries' governments. As for other operational and tactical missiles, the USSR is prepared to embark right away on talks aimed at reducing and completely eliminating them. The speediest conclusion of an agreement on medium-range missiles would pave the way for completely ridding Europe of nuclear weapons.

The session participants advocated an immediate end to the implementation of SDI and to the development of projects like the "European Defensive Initiative," in view of the extremely dangerous consequences of the implementation of such plans.

The Warsaw Pact states confirm their determination to seek a complete and general ban on nuclear tests and advocate starting talks aimed at concluding an agreement on this matter as soon as possible.

2. The session thoroughly examined questions connected with promoting the proposals contained in the Warsaw Pact member states' Budapest Appeal. They reaffirmed their determination to substantially reduce armed forces and conventional armaments on the European Continent in such a way that the reductions, applying to both military political alliances, reach 25 percent by the beginning of the nineties compared to the present level, with a corresponding reduction in states' military expenditure, and that the reduction process continues in the future.

3. The allied socialist states advocate the gradual reduction of the level of military confrontation in Europe, with the constant maintenance of military equilibrium at an increasingly lower level. They believe that, wherever imbalance exists in any elements, it is necessary to remedy the situation via appropriate reductions. The Warsaw Pact states attach great importance to the premise that the reduction of the level of military confrontation should be accompanied by measures primarily in the area of arms reductions, which would make it possible to reduce, if not to fully rule out, the chance of surprise attack.

4. The ministers emphasized their states' desire to achieve positive results at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

5. The conference participants believe that the creation of nuclear and chemical weapon-free zones in the Balkans and in the center, the north, and other parts of the continent would accord with the goals of reducing military confrontation in Europe and strengthening all-European security. They declared their countries' determination to aim for implementation of the proposals made on this account by the GDR and the CSSR and by the Socialist Republic of Romania and the Bulgarian People's Republic.

6. The Warsaw Pact member states advocate that the agreements being elaborated on questions of disarmament should make provision for a rigorous and efficient system of monitoring [kontrol] to correspond with the essence of disarmament measures, right up to on-site inspections. [inspektsii].

7. The conference participants emphasized that the inviolability of borders and respect for prevailing territorial and political realities are a necessary condition for the preservation of lasting peace in Europe. The activity of revanchist forces, primarily in the FRG, and the encouragement of revanchism anywhere are a threat to peace and international security.

8. The Warsaw Pact member states are fully determined to aim, in collaboration with other countries, for the shaping of an all-embracing system of international peace and

security, and will continue to assist in the expansion and deepening of international cooperation in all areas -- military, political, economic, and humanitarian -- for the purpose of creating such a system. The spread of constructive dialogue within the world community -- both bilateral and multilateral -- about the foundations of a safe world for all would make it possible to define the most efficient ways and specific measures to restructure international relations in line with the aspirations of all peoples under the realities of the nuclear and space age.

9. The conference participants emphasized again the need for all states to strictly respect the principles of national independence and sovereignty, the nonuse of forced or the threat of force, the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, the peaceful solution of disputes, noninterference in internal affairs, equality, and other principles and goals of the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act, and other universally recognized norms of international relations.

10. The ministers discussed in detail the course of the Vienna meeting of CSCE representatives, which is meant to provide a new stimulus to the all-European process, and adopted a statement on this question.

11. The conference participants examined the question of banning chemical weapons and adopted an appropriate statement.

12. The ministers examined and agreed on specific measures aimed at strengthening the Warsaw Pact member states' unity and cohesion and their friendly, allied relations and at reinforcing their collaboration in the implementation of coordinated policy for the purpose of disarmament, the strengthening of peace, and broad international cooperation.

The Foreign Ministers' Committee conference proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation. The next session will be held in Prague.

U.S. Receives Documents

LD310633 Moscow TASS in English 0622 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Washington March 31 TASS -- The charge d'affaires of the USSR to the United States visited the U.S. State Department on March 30 and officially handed over the documents of the foreign ministers' committee session of the Warsaw Treaty member states held in Moscow on March 24-25, 1987. These included the communique, the statement "For Furthering the CSCE Process and Bringing the Vienna Followup Meeting to a Successful Outcome" and the "Statement by the Warsaw Treaty Member States on the Issue of a Ban on Chemical Weapons".

It was emphasized that the documents adopted at the foreign ministers' committee session demonstrated the Warsaw Treaty member states' persistent efforts aimed at halting the arms race, reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons, preventing space militarization, abolishing chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production, drastic reduction in the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

These efforts are an expression of the allied socialist states' unwavering and principled course of establishing an all-embracing system of international security, creating a nuclear-free and non-violent world.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1385

RELATED ISSUES

POLISH SEJM DELEGATION VISITS MOSCOW

Discusses INF, SDI With Gromyko

PM261105 IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Mar 87 Morning Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "Polish Sejm Delegation in Kremlin"]

[Excerpts] On 23 March, A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received in the Kremlin a delegation from the Polish Sejm headed by Roman Malinowski, marshal of the Sejm.

The participants in the meeting exchanged opinions on topical questions of the international situation and examined a broad spectrum of its present-day problems. The need was stressed to continue to build up the joint efforts of the socialist countries and primarily of the Warsaw Pact states and all peace-loving forces to halt the arms race, spare mankind from the nuclear threat, and strengthen international and European security.

"Poland has an important place in this process," A.A. Gromyko said. "The pact on the socialist countries' defense alliance is rightly called the Warsaw Pact. We live by the same thoughts as the Polish people on the question of the inviolability of borders in Europe and on the problems being discussed at the talks in Stockholm, Vienna, and Geneva."

R. Malinowski said that the Polish Sejm enthusiastically supported the new Soviet initiative on the immediate conclusion of an agreement between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. Such an agreement would impart powerful positive impetus to the advance of a historic cause -- nuclear disarmament.

A.A. Gromyko: In advancing this proposal we proceed from the premise that man invented this weapon and man can also destroy it. The responsibility of those figures who are placing obstacles on the path of the solution of this imposing task of all mankind is great, very great.

R. Malinowski: The USSR's position is gaining the peoples' broad support. I recently visited West Europe. I heard how even statesmen of the capitalist countries support the Soviet proposals and express surprise that the United States is openly earmarking funds to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government.

Both sides described the U.S. "Star Wars" program as an aggressive plan aimed at putting nuclear weapons in space.

During the conversation the mutual desire was expressed for the further consolidation of contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Polish Sejm, which will promote the more effective development of the entire complex of Soviet-Polish cooperation.

The conversation was attended by P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; L.N. Tolkunov and A.E. Voss, chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and Wlodimierz Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR.

Supports CSCE Process

LD271456 Warsaw PAP in English 0030 GMT 27 Mar 87

[By PAP correspondent Slawomir Popowski]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 26 Mar--Polish parliamentary delegation led by Sejm Speaker Roman Malinowski, had further talks in the Soviet capital today as part of its ongoing official visit to the Soviet Union.

The chairmen of both chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet gave a luncheon in honour of the Sejm delegation.

Addressing the luncheon, Tolkunov stressed his country attached big importance to furtherance of the all-European process. In this connection, he singled out as very important Poland's proposal to the Vienna meeting to expand the mandate of the Stockholm conference onto disarmament issues.

Expressing concern over complex international situation, Malinowski stressed that Soviet and Socialist states' peace initiatives opened a realistic way for saving the world from nuclear catastrophe.

Poland's Ambassador Wlodzimierz Natorf gave a banquet to the delegation tonight.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1385

RELATED ISSUES

DENMARK'S OWEN CHALLENGES EEC TO TAKE DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITY

LD221416 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1335 GMT 22 Mar 87

[By Brussels staff reporter Geoff Meade]

[Text]SDP leader Dr David Owen today challenged the Common Market to break America's domination of Europe and take control of its own security. He said the "overblown rhetoric" of the Reaganites about leading the free world was no longer credible and warned "for better or for worse, the U.S. has never before interfered with such vehemence".

In a speech in Brussels, Dr Owen said the EEC could no longer afford to have its nuclear policy decided by Washington and he urged the revival of the seven-nation Western European Union, led by France, West Germany and Britain.

His call comes in the week that Mrs Thatcher will be pressed to re-launch the union as the best vehicle for European defence co-operation, when she meets French President Mitterrand and West German Chancellor Kohl before going to Moscow for missiles talks.

Dr Owen told his party supporters that America's resistance to the re-emergence of the union was founded on Washington's doctrine of "atomise and rule" within NATO "where, by bilateral, often secret, diplomacy, the U.S. dominance has been maintained". He added: "Now in 1987 it is clear that the highest point of the Reagan presidency's dominance over Europe

has passed. No longer, after Irangate, will Europeans take kindly to American moralising about not doing deals over hostages. No longer will the overblown rhetoric of the Reaganites about leading the free world be given so much credence. President Carter's readiness to work with Europe, too easily derided at the time as weakness and lack of leadership, will henceforth be seen as more in keeping with the mood of the approaching 1990s."

Dr Owen emphasised the "vital need" to lock the U.S. into any defence arrangement for Europe. But he said: "If European unity is to progress, then it has to develop a defence identity to merge with its economic and political identity. The overriding need is to balance the U.S. impact on NATO through their overpowering influence on nuclear deterrence. That can only be done if Europe's two nuclear weapon states, France and the UK, and the country with the largest and most effective conventional defence force, the Federal Republic of Germany, speak with one voice to the U.S."

He said the UK and France should be encouraged to participate as of right in all major arms control agreements, speaking as Europeans. "In this way European thinking in defence matters will become a positive force uniting Europe and creating the conditions for genuine detente and disarmament."

/9274

CSO. 5240/070

RELATED ISSUES

PRC POSITION ON PEACE, DISARMAMENT AT UN CONFERENCE

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English Vol 30, No 13, 30 May 87 pp 14-16

[Article: "World Peace and Disarmament"; first paragraph BEIJING REVIEW introduction]

[Text] China's Vice-Foreign Minister Qian Qichen spoke on the position of peace and disarmament at the United Nations regional conference for the World Disarmament Campaign which opened in Beijing on March 23.

Today, I would like to share with you some of my views on the question of peace and disarmament and join you in the discussion.

Despite the absence of a new world war in the past 40 years or more since the end of the Second World War, the world is still in the grip of turbulence and intransquility, and mankind is yet to achieve genuine peace. Regional conflicts and local wars occurred one after another, and the arms race has kept escalating worldwide. The international situation has remained tense, and the danger of war is still seriously threatening world peace and security. It is precisely because of this that the people all over the world are making unremitting efforts in various ways to safeguard peace. The World Disarmament Campaign initiated by the United Nations is part of this extensive effort. We are convinced that as long as the peace-loving peoples of the world are determined to take their destiny in their own hands and go into action, international peace and security can be maintained, and a new world war

can be prevented. We are optimists. Although the road ahead is tortuous, the world has a very promising future, and the prospect for mankind is bright.

Having suffered untold tribulations in wars of foreign aggression in the past, the Chinese people cherish peace and security all the more deeply. As a developing socialist country, China is today whole-heartedly engaged in a drive for socialist modernization which requires hard work of several generations and an enduring and stable international environment of peace. Being aware of the heavy task entrusted by history, China is determined to contribute its share to the maintenance of peace, security and stability of the world.

The Chinese government pursues an independent foreign policy of peace. The basic objective of China's foreign policy is to maintain world peace. We have always maintained that all countries in the world are equal. We are opposed to the big bullying the small and the strong lording it over the weak. We are ready to develop friendly relations with all

countries of the world on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. Standing firmly by the third world, we will never enter into alliance with any superpower. We are opposed to the use or threat of force in international relations and interference and aggression against other countries. We are in favour of a peaceful settlement of international disputes.

China has consistently opposed arms race and will never take part in it. We stand for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear, chemical, biological and space weapons and for a drastic reduction of conventional weapons. As early as in 1964, China declared explicitly on the very first day when it came into possession of nuclear weapons that at no time and under no circumstances will it be the first to use nuclear weapons. China has also undertaken not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states or nuclear free zones. China has successively signed the relevant protocols to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty. China does not advocate or encourage nuclear proliferation, nor does it help other countries develop nuclear weapons. China supports whatever actions and initiatives that are conducive to the realization of disarmament and elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

China has taken a number of steps to cut its military expenditures on its own initiative. The important decision made by the Chinese government to reduce China's armed forces by a million men is being implemented smoothly. China has not carried out any nuclear test for years. Furthermore, it declared last year that it would conduct no more atmospheric nuclear tests in future.

All this has fully demonstrated China's sincerity for peace and disarmament and its determination to take concrete steps in this regard.

To put an end to nuclear arms race, bring about nuclear disarmament, remove the threat of nuclear war and avoid a nuclear holocaust have become the strong desire of the peoples of the world and their most important task.

The ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament should be the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all types of nuclear weapons. Let us first of all take a look at the reality of the nuclear armaments in the world today. The most important fact is that the two superpowers possess the largest and most sophisticated nuclear arsenals, amounting to over 97 percent of the total nuclear weapons in the world. Their nuclear weapons have long reached the level of oversaturation and overkill. With the piling up of nuclear weapons, continued arms race is not only absurd but also a mockery of human wisdom. The extension of the arms race into the outer space will trigger off its spiralling escalation. The grim realities are that whatever their intentions, only these two have the strength and capability of launching a nuclear war. The latent possibility that the world civilization will be ruined by a nuclear war is like the sword of Damocles, posing a constant threat to peace and security of mankind. As a Chinese saying goes: "It takes the one who tied the knot to untie it." Naturally, they must assume the primary responsibility and obligation for nuclear disarmament. The UN General Assembly unanimously adopted at its 41st session a resolution which clearly set forth the special responsibility of the superpowers and urged them to take the lead in substantially reducing their nuclear armaments. This has fully

reflected the strong desire of the world people and the common will of the international community.

Therefore, we are of the view that the two superpowers should take the lead in halting immediately the test, production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons and drastically reduce and destroy all types of nuclear weapons they have deployed anywhere inside and outside their countries so as to create conditions for other nuclear states to take part in nuclear disarmament. After that, a broadly representative international conference on nuclear disarmament with the participation of all the nuclear states should be held to discuss further measures for the thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. China as a nuclear state will not shirk its responsibility and will strive to make its due contribution to this end.

In recent years, the Soviet Union and the United States, while stating that nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought, have both put forth a number of proposals and plans, one of which is a 50 percent reduction of strategic nuclear weapons as the first step. However, the two sides have so far reached no substantive agreement, and their basic differences remain as serious as ever. Of late, the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on intermediate-range missiles and their related proposals have attracted much attention. It should be pointed out that the question of the intermediate-range missiles has a direct bearing on the security of countries in Europe as well as in Asia. International security is indivisible. While the security of Europe is important, the security of Asia is equally important. We insist that in accordance with the same principle, there should be a simultaneous and balanced reduction of the intermediate-range missiles deployed in both Europe and Asia until their complete destruction.

We hold that in order to reduce the risk of a nuclear war, all nuclear states should, at present, undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states or nuclear-free zones. And then on this basis they could move on to conclude an international convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons with the participation of all nuclear states.

An increasing number of countries are calling for the establishment of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace. This gives expression to their just aspirations against nuclear war and for the peace and security of their own regions. We maintain that nuclear states should respect the propositions and demands of these countries and undertake corresponding obligations. China unequivocally supports the proposals for the establishment of nuclear-free zones in Latin America, the South Pacific, Africa, the Middle East, South Asia and the Korean Peninsula.

Like many other countries, China is for the principle of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. China's nuclear co-operation with other countries is confined only to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. At the same time, we also hold that the legitimate rights of numerous developing countries of using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes should not be impaired. As for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, it has been justly pointed out that the obligations nuclear states and non-nuclear states should assume under it respectively are imbalanced and unfair. The treaty only limits horizontal proliferation and places no limits at all on the continuous expansion and improvement of the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers. That is why China has reservations on and is critical of this treaty.

While emphasizing nuclear disarmament, one should not overlook the importance and urgency of conventional disarmament. There is in fact an organic link between nuclear and conventional disarmament.

First, both conventional and nuclear armaments are basic elements in the military might which prop up the two major confronting military blocs.

Second, with the development of science and technology, conventional weapons have become increasingly more lethal and destructive.

Third, there is no insurmountable barrier between conventional and nuclear wars. Should a conventional war break out in certain highly developed regions, it will probably escalate into a nuclear war.

Fourth, conventional armaments are also frequently used as a means to interfere in, subvert, invade or occupy a sovereign state. In the post-war years, the use of conventional weapons in regional wars and conflicts has taken a toll of tens of millions of human lives.

Fifth, military expenditures in the world every year now total nearly US\$1,000 billion, most of which are spent on conventional armaments. An enormous amount of human wealth is thus wasted. One cannot but regret that enormous wealth should be devoted to arms race when there are still starvation and poverty on earth.

Obviously, it is absolutely necessary that conventional armaments be reduced drastically along with nuclear disarmament. Conventional armaments of any country should be used only for self-defence. It goes without saying that the superpowers and military blocs which possess the largest and most sophisticated and conventional should take the lead in drastically reducing their

conventional armaments. This is of crucial importance to the maintenance of world peace.

While mankind is faced with the threat of a nuclear war, the outer space is haunted by a spectre, namely, the imminent or on-going arms race. This is an extension and development of nuclear arms race which will lead to a more complex situation characterized by a progressive escalation of the arms race involving offensive nuclear weapons and defensive weapon systems. This race will further destabilize the world and increase danger of war. To check this race has become a most urgent task for mankind.

The outer space is the common heritage of mankind, and its development and utilization should bring benefits to mankind. It is against the will of mankind if any country should develop, test, produce or deploy outer space weapons in any way. It is hoped that an international convention on the complete prohibition of outer space weapons can be concluded at an early date.

It is a complicated and arduous task to check arms race and promote disarmament. Having a direct bearing on peace and security for all peoples, it calls for concerted and unremitting efforts on the part of the people of the world. All countries, big or small, strong or weak militarily, should have the equal right of participating in the discussion and settlement of the disarmament question which should not be monopolized by a few big powers. No disarmament agreement should be reached at the expense of other countries' interests.

Finally, I wish to further point out that while disarmament contributes to peace and security, disarmament alone is not enough to preserve peace and security. World peace and national security are closely inter-related. Encroaching upon a nation's independence and sovereignty will undoubtedly jeopardize world

peace. Therefore, to safeguard peace and security, it is essential to oppose any form of interference by one country in the internal affairs of others and any form of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of others, and to oppose in particular any country's using its military means to subject others to war of aggression.

The World Disarmament Campaign is developing in breadth. To maintain world peace and oppose war has been taken by billions of people as their objective and sacred duty. The people all over the world must take their destiny in their own hands so that civilization will triumph over brutality, co-operation will prevail over confrontation, and peace will replace war. The Chinese people are determined to work with the peoples of all countries and strive to build a world that has lasting peace, co-operation on the basis of equality, prosperity and development. ■

/13046
CSO: 5200/4015

- END -