

259093

JPRS-TAC-86-058

21 JULY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 111

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

3
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.

21 JULY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

- USSR's Lt Gen Volkogonov Attacks U.S. SDI Plans
(D. A. Volkogonov; Moscow OKTYABR, No 1, Jan 86) 1

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

- USSR: Further Criticism of Reagan Glassboro Speech
(Moscow PRAVDA, 26, 29 Jun 86; Moscow Television
Service, 29 Jun 86) 25
- White House 'Maneuvering', by Tomas Kolesnichenko 25
Reagan's Tone, Actions Contrasted 26
'Reagan Cannot Make Up His Mind', by Stanislaw Kondrashov 27
- USSR: U.S. Stance Strains Relations
(V. Dodonov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Jun 86) 29
- TASS: Yugoslavia Backs Gorbachev on Eliminating Nuclear Arms
(Moscow TASS, 20 Jun 86) 30
- Karpov Comments on Fifth Round of Geneva Talks
(Various sources, various dates) 31
- 27 June Interview 31
29 June Remarks 32
Remarks to GDR Television 32
Briefs Pact Ministers 33
Sees No Progress 33

TASS Reports on Group Meeting 17-26 June (Moscow TASS, various dates)	34
Space Arms Group 17 June	34
Strategic Arms Group 18 June	34
Medium-Range Group 19 June	34
Space Arms Group 23 June	34
Strategic Arms Group 24 June	34
Medium-Range Group 25 June	35
5th Round Ends	35
Gorbachev in Poland Criticizes U.S. Response to Latest Proposal (Warsaw Television Service, 30 Jun 86; Moscow Television Service, 30 Jun, 1 Jul 86)	36
Comments on Summit Outlook, Mikhail Gorbachev Interview	36
Gorbachev Speech to Congress	37
Gorbachev Speech at Factory	40
USSR's Petrovskiy Discusses Arms Issues in Rome (Rome ANSA, 27 Jun 86; Moscow TASS, 27 Jun 86)	43
Press Conference	43
TASS Report on Press Conference	44
Briefs Italian Parliament	45

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: Further Criticism of Reagan SALT II Decision (Moscow in English to North America, 21 Jun 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Jun 86)	46
'Lack of Political Vision', by Valentin Zorin	46
Financial Burden on U.S.	47
TASS: ASEAN Foreign Ministers Call for SALT Observance (Moscow TASS, 25 Jun 86)	48

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS Reports Speeches at CDE Assailing U.S. (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 19 Jun 86; Moscow TASS 24 Jun 86)	50
CSSR's Chnoupek	50
USSR's Petrovskiy	51
USSR: Reportage on June CDE Proceedings (Various sources, various dates)	53
Rakhmaninov Preview	53
'Obstructionist' Stand	53
U.S. Touts 'Lopsided' Proposals	54
News Conference on Pact Initiative	54
Hungarian Delegate on Pact Proposals	54

News Conference	55
Gen Tatarnikov Speaks	55
Europarlament, USSR Envoys Confer	56
Grinevskiy Reports to Politburo	56
CPSU Central Committee Approves Warsaw Pact Appeal (Moscow PRAVDA, 17, 21 Jun 86)	57
Text of Resolution	57
PRAVDA Editorial	58
USSR: Western Reaction to Warsaw Pact Proposals Viewed (Various sources, various dates)	61
NATO To Consider Proposals	61
Austrian Foreign Minister	61
European Response Urged, by Eduard Mnatsakanov	61
Vienna, Bonn, N.Y. Reports, Nikolay Novikov, et al. Interview	62
PRAVDA: 'Tremendous Response', by Nikolay Baragin	65
Resistance Movements Secretariat	68
FRG: SPD's Egon Bahr	69
FRG's Bundeswehr Tanks	69
FRG CP Leader	70
NATO: 'No Intelligible Answer', by Viktor Levin	70
Soviet Press Lauds Warsaw Pact European Arms Cuts Proposals (Various sources, various dates)	72
Military Paper Editorial	72
PRAVDA Editorial	74
Matveyev Comments, by Vikentiy Matveyev	76
TASS Commentary	78
USSR: East Europeans Back Warsaw Pact Arms Cuts Appeal (Moscow TASS, various dates; Moscow PRAVDA 21 Jun 86) ...	80
PZPR Politburo	80
CPCZ Presidium	80
Romania's Ceasescu	81
Romanian Central Committee	81
PRAVDA Roundup	81
Soviet General, Deputy Foreign Minister on Pact Proposals (Nikolay Chervov; Budapest Domestic Service, 14 Jun 86) .	84
USSR: MBFR Stalled by West's 'Overblown' Demands (N. Oskarov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 19, 19 May 86)	90
TASS Reports Soviet CSCE Committee Meeting (Moscow TASS, 23 Jun 86)	94

TASS Cites Bulgarian Delegate's Speech on MBFR Talks (Moscow TASS, 12 Jun 86)	95
Soviet-Finnish Consultations on CDE, CSCE Questions (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 18 Jan 86; Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET, 19 Jun 86)	97
TASS Report	97
Finnish Report	97
IZVESTIYA Reports on CSCE Disarmament Forum in Brussels (V. Antonov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 3 Jun 86)	99
Japan: Envoy to Geneva Talks Calls for Test Ban Organ (Tokyo KYODO, 17 Jun 86)	100
Briefs	
Gorbachev, Kadar Speeches Published	101
RELATED ISSUES	
Academicians View Advantages of Disarmament (Arbatov, et al.; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 24, 22-29 Jun 86)	102

/7310

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S LT GEN VOLKOGONOV ATTACKS U.S. SDI PLANS

Moscow OKTYABR in Russian No 1, Jan 86 pp 164-178

[Article by Lt Gen D.A. Volkogonov, doctor of philosophical sciences, under the "Publicist Activity and Essays" rubric: "Dreamers and 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] Humanity can be thought of as a center of priceless reason speeding through the endless universe in a spaceship named "Earth." Our civilization is unique and apparently alone in the limitless cosmos. So far, no one has proved otherwise. All around, in the impenetrable blackness of space, there are no inhabited islands and ships similar to the earth, and therefore any attempt of people to throw that part of the earth's inhabitants who live and think differently than they do on the "garbage heap of history" can extinguish this priceless center. Rational people can prevent such an outcome.

The Error of the Dreamer

At the turn of the century, in 1898, the renowned English visionary H. G. Wells wrote the novel "War of the Worlds." His powerful artistic imagination sketched a scene of an uncommon and dreadful war that came to the earth from the boundless cosmos. But up to that time, writes the visionary, people could not imagine that "beings with a highly developed, cold and unfeeling intellect looked upon the earth across the depths of space with eyes full of envy" and prepared their plans to invade our planet.

It is not difficult for anyone who read Well's book, "War of the World's," to recall the pages that speak of "ominous explosions" on Mars, "fiery lines" in space, and "cylinders" falling on the earth. All of these collisions take place at the moment when the hero of the novel was thinking about the connection between the development of morality and the progress of technical civilization. He received the answers to his ideological questions very quickly, just as soon as the "cylinders" from Mars brought to the earth beings that were virtually "all head" possessing enormous intellect. An intellect that, being entirely devoid of feelings, was capable of using the cosmos for transportation (apparently rockets), of creating deadly rays (laser cannons of course) and poisonous gases (probably binary technology), of exchanging thoughts without the use of physical organs (how could one get along without telepathy here?), and of building operating machines that no one controlled

(could that be robots?). Without even completely destroying everything that they came across, it was as if the Martians, in the words of the protagonist, "had cut the hamstrings of humanity." The invasion of "pure" technical reason, not knowing what is morality, feelings, or humaneness, led to a situation on earth about which one of the book's heroes said: "Cities, states, civilization and progress all belong to the past. There may be no concerts for the next million years or so." There will be nothing.

The renowned visionary (in the words of V.D. Nabokov, who knew him, by the nature of his talent he represented a synthesis of the idealist, skeptic, optimist and stinging critic) perspicaciously saw that a "greedy civilization" threatens the future. H. Wells was not just a visionary but also a prophet. Many of his prophecies were surprising guesses that nevertheless came true. It is enough to speak of his prophecies in regard to the atomic bomb, the artificial brain, "death rays"--the laser, "devilish calculating machines"--the computer, etc. Some of his vague prophecies of coming catastrophies became the frightening reality of the end of the 20th century, including that which threatens humanity from space today. But he could not imagine that the threat from space would not come from Martians or other exotic extraterrestrials but from those earthlings whose address is perfectly well-known on our planet today. This was his only major "error" that, from today's point of view, can be seen in "The War of the Worlds."

The writer could not suppose that the "War of the Worlds" might not be between planets but between communities that are different in their life styles, views and ideals. The classical author of fantasy (he died almost 40 years ago, in August 1946) could already see the new menacing danger that was hanging over humanity after the realization of the Manhattan Project--the building of a nuclear bomb--in the United States. An outstanding visionary and great humanist, H. G. Wells became convinced in the last years of his life that still another of his menacing prophecies can come true. American politicians had released the nuclear genie from the bottle of madness and cruelty.

Mankind has the most bitter fruit--nuclear weapons--grown under the specific conditions of social reality. And if the United States, possessing a monopoly on the "nuclear club," as H. Truman put it, had agreed to the proposal of the Soviet Union to prohibit forever the new barbarous means of mass destruction, then today the situation in the world would be different. For nothing threatened the United States at that time; it was practically invulnerable even without nuclear arms. But its hopes for world supremacy, which soon turned out to be chimerical, prevailed. What the American writer Young called "brighter than a thousand suns" blinded not only millions of Japanese but also the political views of politicians in Washington, for it was precisely they who started the monstrous game of nuclear poker, where the losing side may be all of humanity. And just because of the "hawks," the world community is completely unable to establish a reliable defensive system against nuclear war, whose Damocles sword has already been hanging over the planet for several decades.

The endless pursuit of military superiority drew Washington not only into a cosmic snare but into a political trap as well. The "hawks" can get out of it if they can solve the dilemma: by showing true wisdom, they can make genuine

efforts in the joint creation of a mechanism guaranteeing peace or, in continuing to slide down the previous track, they can bring the world closer to an unthinkable cataclysm. So far, unfortunately, there are no reliable signs that would indicate their capability or--the main thing--willingness to resolve the fateful dilemma of the century in a wise and worthy manner: to be or not to be? In Washington, in betting on space, they are continuing to search not for a strategy of peace but for a strategy that would make it possible to achieve a military victory.

On banks of the Potomac in Washington, there is a bronze of T. Jefferson, the author of the American Declaration of Independence and third president of the United States. It was he who, in thinking about war and peace, uttered the celebrated sentence: "The Creator made the earth for the living and not for the dead." In helping design the national emblem of the United States, he and B. Franklin proposed that there be an olive branch in one claw of the eagle and 13 arrows of war in the other. At the same time, however, the "founding fathers" insisted that the head of the eagle be turned in the direction of the olive branch, the side of peace, which, to be sure, did not prevent the rapacious bird from using the arrows of war repeatedly during the last century.

The "error" of T. Jefferson was corrected by H. Truman at the height of the "cold war." At his insistence, a fundamental change was made in the emblem: they turned the head of the eagle in the direction of the arrows, needed by the state when it goes down the warpath. The old emblems remained in use, misleading simpletons.

This act symbolized the long-standing struggle of two trends in the foreign policy of the main imperialist predator. The first, which prevailed in the 1970's, personifies bourgeois realism and the ability to make a sober evaluation of the process of the changes taking place in the world. The second trend--it became predominant at the beginning of the 1980's--reflects the worship of crude force to achieve political goals, which is capable, in the view of the current masters of the White House, of changing the course of social development in accordance with the scenarios now being prepared in the Pentagon. The eagle, which in the 1970's sometimes took a sidewise glance at the olive branch in its claw, again fixed its bronze gaze in the arrows of war. The "hawks" of war quickly removed the brake blocks that it had appeared would soon be needed and the war chariot rolled even more rapidly to that line where the unthinkable can happen. The creators of the military doctrines continue to seek a way to achieve victory in a nuclear war but sooner or later they will be forced to admit that these efforts are illusory.

The "victory" disappeared at that moment when the Soviet Union achieved strategic military parity with the United States. The high-placed planners in the military department of the United States understand this but they cannot resign themselves to it. A feverish search began for new versions and approaches that would permit Washington to ensure decisive superiority over the Soviets."

American militarists love to create models and scenarios of a possible war. They are usually abstract, with a pronounced overestimation of their own

strengths. After all, the Americans do not know real war: scars of trenches have not furrowed their land, thousands of cities did not lie in ruins, and on the other side of the ocean they did not see the despair of millions of widows. In the Pentagon scenarios, just as in children's games, one can "die" and "rise again" an endless number of times. But, if Washington ever decides to put on the monstrous show using this score, then the stage may remain empty forever. At one time, however, the Pentagon believed that it had finally found the desired model for nuclear war with a wreath of victory. It is a matter of the so-called "limited nuclear war." What is its essence?

This militaristic concept graphically expressed the cynical striving of the Pentagon to impose upon the opposing side conditions for nuclear war that would suit only the United States. There were also attempts to attain public recognition of the intentions of the United States to deliver nuclear strikes at military targets only and in a limited territory. Some people even came to the understanding that "a strike against a limited number of targets means only the decapitation" of the enemy and inflicts the least possible damage to the population, which gives the adversary the possibility of "surviving as a nation." It was thereby assumed, of course, that by no means will the United States be the object of decapitation. The most insidious meaning of the concept of "limited nuclear war" was in establishing a limited spatial and geographic scope for it. In deploying first-strike nuclear missiles in Europe, Japan, South Korea, Turkey and other places outside the territory of the United States, Pentagon planners hoped that this, as a weapon, will divert to itself a significant if not the major part of the nuclear means of the Soviet Union. In the event of a conflict, in their scenario, war can be limited by the borders of the USSR and Western Europe as well as several other regions outside of the United States. "We are in some region of the globe not to defend some interests," said U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger in explaining this concept. "We are there to defend ourselves."

This model of nuclear war appeared most desirable for the United States. But understanding that, in the event of a conflict unleashed by it, such a model will hardly suit the opposing side, the doctrine of direct resistance provides for the possibility of different types of wars: conventional (nonnuclear) war; conventional war leading to nuclear war; limited nuclear war; and protracted all-out nuclear war. As C. Weinberger sees it, the transition from one type to another will mean an unlimited "horizontal escalation," the essence of which is to "wage war not only where the conflict arose but also to shift it to where the enemy is vulnerable."

If one deciphers this cannibalistic language, it turns out that the Pentagon is constantly involved in the search for more and more new "vulnerable places." According to available information, more than 40,000 targets in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have been plotted on the Pentagon's single integrated operational map. They include political centers, cities, military facilities, bridges, ports, dams, industrial complexes, etc. Each American warhead has a main and auxiliary targets. And in the initial launch alone, the American nuclear missiles are capable of sending more than 12,000 nuclear warheads to these targets. And might one ask: If the Pentagon "finds" not 40,000 targets but 60,000, let us say, then does this really increase the security of the United States? An extrinsically paradoxical

situation has arisen: Washington's military possibilities are growing but its ability to achieve political goals with the help of military force does not increase. But the general threshold of security is lowered and, with the adventurism of some American politicians, it is easier to cross it. One does not need a lot of imagination to understand what would happen on the planet if the path of the crusaders were not blocked by the solid bastion of socialism, now personifying the most profound hopes of people of labor--hopes for the preservation of peace and civilization.

Thanks to the arms race unleashed by the "hawks" in Washington, the world in the last quarter of the 20th century has reached "nuclear abundance" fraught with the very worst. The nuclear Herostrat is capable of scorching not only an individual cathedral but of blowing up the temple of human civilization. It is not at all simple to do this, of course, but this possibility is increasing with the intensification of the atmosphere of military hysteria and psychosis (and it was precisely on the grounds of political paranoia that U.S. Secretary of Defense J. Forrester killed himself in 1949, having once "seen" Soviet soldiers on the banks of the Potomac). In the atmosphere of high military and political tension, the role of chance is increasing: a computer error, a miscalculation in the evaluation of a new strategic situation, and also the adverse role of leaders blinded by hatred and fear.

The firm countermeasures taken by the Soviet Union showed that the United States could not achieve a victory over its antipode even if it tried to carry out the concept of "limited nuclear war." A crushing counterstrike would inevitably catch up with the aggressor. But this did not lead to Washington's realization of an incontestable truth: one can attempt to destroy an adversary with the help of nuclear weapons but the attacker is also defenseless against a counterthreat. Thus, security is not in the capability of gaining a victory but in the capability of preventing a nuclear cataclysm. For the situation today is such that the choice is not simply between victory or defeat but between destruction or existence. But these obvious truths were rejected and the search for "victory" is continuing.

At the beginning of the 1980's, at the request of the American administration, the conservative research center "Heritage Foundation" drew up an ambitious document entitled "High Frontier." Its essence is that to ensure the complete security of the United States, it is essential to establish a global orbiting antimissile defense system capable of covering all probable trajectories of intercontinental ballistic missiles that can reach the United States. The recommendations of the "High Frontier" doctrine were based upon the assertion that the United States "simply will not survive" without such a defense system. Each page of the document, the basic content of which was widely publicized, stressed the defensive orientation of the concept, saying that the new defense system will permit the United States to ensure "guaranteed survival" instead of a "balance of fear." Not everyone paid attention to the sentence that was the basic sense of the document: "In establishing an equilibrium between strategic offense and strategic defense, the application of the means of strategic retaliation is expanded." This is the entire thing: try to secure yourself against a nuclear counterstrike while striving to smash your adversary once and for all.

It appears that this document played a significant role in the numerous meetings that the American president had with representatives of industrial, military and scientific circles formulating the new concept of pursuing an ephemeral victory. Pentagon analyses and meetings with military assistants, scientific advisers, members of the Committee of Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council and several theoreticians made it possible to polish the "star wars" idea. In particular, as the NEW YORK TIMES reports, Reagan met four times with Dr Edward Teller, considered the father of the hydrogen bomb in the United States. Teller's thinking on the possibility of establishing a new strategic concept was, in his words, accepted by the President. Herman Khan, the well-known futurologist and director of the Hudson Institute, publicly told the administration that "the time has come to develop a concept of space war." And after all, he is a great expert at composing scenarios and developing models of nuclear wars. One of his books, "Thermonuclear War," came out in America almost a quarter century ago. The "star wars" concept ripened in the calm of the offices of assistants, in numerous centers and foundations brought in for calculations and analyses, and in the bunkers of the Pentagon.

When, according to Herbert Wells, the Martians were preparing to come to the earth from space, they were motivated by very definite goals. Mars was getting colder and the living conditions on the planet were becoming more and more severe. The exhaustion of this center of the universe had become the main problem for the Martians and, under the pressure of urgent necessity, their minds worked extremely intensely, their technology improved, and their hearts hardened. Looking into outer space, they saw nearby, at a distance of some 35 million miles, a morning star of hope--our warm planet. Green from vegetation and gray from water, with a hazy atmosphere indicating fertility, it attracted the extraterrestrials, devoid of feelings but endowed with an incomparable cold intelligence. We people, wrote H. Wells, seemed just as monstrous and primitive to them as the lemurs, let us say, do to us. Their world began to cool off and the earth is teeming with life but a life of lower creatures. To conquer this world closer to the sun is their only salvation from an inexorably approaching death. That is how the writer and visionary defines the deep-seated reasons for their attack from space. But this is fantasy and beyond that in a book written 87 years ago! What are the motives for going into space with weapons today? After all, not one of the visionary writers of our time would dare something like that!

There is a famous sentence in the UN Charter: "Inasmuch as wars originate in the minds of people, the means of defending the peace must be put into the minds of people." It seems that such means are not yet needed on the hill of power in Washington.

A Front in the Universe?

On 23 March 1983, President Reagan presented his sadly well-known speech, which journalists immediately named the "star wars" concept. And although the administration tried to give it a more seemly and peace-loving name--"Strategic Defense Initiative"--its essence, of course, did not change. It consists in the establishment of an antimissile shield that would "free" the

world from the Damocles threat of an incinerating nuclear war. With the help of such a defense system, one can "deprive nuclear weapons of force and make them obsolete." In the words of the President, the realization of the idea would give "new hope for our children in the 21st century." That is the plan intended for propagandistic use. By the way, the current American president cannot be considered a pioneer in the generation of ideas for cosmic warfare. The people occupying the Oval Office in the White House before him made their own contribution to their propaganda. Thus, back in 1964, Lyndon Johnson declared that "the British dominated the seas and controlled the world. We dominated in the air and have led the free world from the time that we gained this supremacy. Now this position will be taken by the one who will have dominion in space." President Reagan decided that this time has come.

If one speaks of the true meaning of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), it was a new attempt to put into effect an old idea: that of obtaining unilateral strategic advantages over the USSR and of finally catching the phoenix of escaping victory. Whereas in the 1970's the preceding administrations were de facto forced to recognize the idea of strategic parity, a balance expressed in the doctrines of "nuclear restraint" and "mutual guaranteed destruction," the Reagan administration again took the course of returning to the possibility of winning a nuclear war. The preelection program of the Republican Party approved in August 1984 stated directly that one must "do everything necessary so that in the event of a conflict the United States will unequivocally be victorious." This principle flowed directly from the statements made by the President prior to the preelection campaign for a second term. What is the value, for example, of this assertion of his: "The coming years will be decisive for the West. We will finish with communism as a sad and freakish chapter of history, the last pages of which have just been written."

The gamble on "star wars" means nothing short of a long-term preparation for the possibility of resolving the fundamental conflict of the age--the conflict between socialism and capitalism--by the nuclear path. That is how things are. The people advancing and approving the "star wars" idea decided to develop a new and vast front in the universe by the end of this century, without trenches and shelters and saturated with numerous technical systems that may seem fantastic to the naive person. But the peculiarity of this front is that Americans intend to occupy all of the positions in it, aiming at every target in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It is not a matter of a defensive but of an acutely offensive concept, the main and ultimate task of which is to provide for a first-strike potential and not to allow a counterstrike. By the way, 2 years after the declaration of the "star wars" program, in his July speech, the American president was no longer talking about the necessity of making nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" with the help of SDI. Declaring that the realization of the "star wars" idea can "change the course of history," he did a poor job of hiding the essence of these desired changes. They must, of course, follow the course of conservative philosophy, the crest of whose wave has now risen exceedingly high in the United States.

In the thinking of the American public, great importance has always belonged to myths, cults and traditional values mixed in with enterprise and religion

that make it possible to understand the phenomenon of the "hawks." Their ideological positions are expressed most completely in the philosophy of conservatism. In 1960, Senator Barry Goldwater, one of the pillars of American conservatism, published a book, "Conscience of a Conservative," that was received enthusiastically by the "hawks." In this opus, he tried to set forth the "true credo of real Americans." It turned out to be rather primitive and ingenuous: the social inequality of people will always exist; the highest of values is free individualism, being especially manifested in the possession of private property; America has the messianic role of running the world; and "military power is the muscles of true conservatism," asserted the author. These and other postulates of the "hawkish" philosophy are literally imbued with a spirit of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism.

It was precisely in those years that Ronald Reagan, chairman of the guild of movie actors, went over from the camp of the democrats to that of the republicans, which represented a strange transformation of a person from a liberal democrat to an extreme conservative. It was precisely then that he became a supporter of people of the B. Goldwater type and in time he himself was to lead that sort of people. In the opinion of those who study the person of R. Reagan (in the late 1970's and early 1980's alone, more than 30 books by bourgeois authors were published about today's indisputable leader of the conservatives), the meeting with B. Goldwater was of decisive importance in his fate.

In 1964, R. Reagan carried on an active campaign for the nomination and election of B. Goldwater as president of the United States. In October of that year, he gave a speech, "Meeting With Destiny," in which he showed with inspiration that Goldwater was precisely the person who could not only "lift up America" but also "stop the reds." The speech was not extemporaneous. For a period of 8 years up to that time, he had appeared on television every week, proclaiming the "God-given America as the most nearly perfect society in the world" and, at the same time, sending "thunderbolts against world communism." And all of these addresses, synthesized into one whole, were poured out into the speech, "Meeting With Destiny." Many years later in this connection, on 20 January 1981, the WASHINGTON POST newspaper, in illuminating the inauguration of the new president, wrote that "Ronald Reagan is becoming president only as a result of his half-hour 1964 speech in favor of the presidential candidate Barry Goldwater." The newspaper is exaggerating, of course, but it is correct in one thing: the speech caught the increasing new wave of conservatism, the yearning of the bosses of the military-industrial complex for a strong hand, and the striving to take social revenge for the defeats of imperialism in the 20th century. In essence, this was the philosophical credo of the "new right."

For Reagan, destiny is the possibility of doing everything in the American way: at home, in Vietnam, Grenada, Lebanon, Europe and, finally, in all the world. The "American destiny," in the mouth of the conservative, is claiming the role of a messiah, a prophet, an apostle and, of course, a nuclear eagle with the "right" to shoot its rocket arrows at the communism that it so hates. That is why he also called his reelection a "meeting with destiny," thereby emphasizing that "either we persevere for our children the best hope of mankind or we doom them to the final step--thousands of years of darkness." In this

cosmetic bombast is expressed the straightforward formula of conservatives: "Rightwingers are right and leftwingers are never right," and therefore any steps and means are admissible and morally justified for the struggle with the "non-Right" (and if possible, to remove them from the world scene.

The philosophy of American neoconservatism, representing the intellectual platform of the "hawks," is not very original. Its creators think that the current conservative renaissance is simply a continuation of the tradition extending from Plato and Thomas Aquinas to today's realia. The basic postulates prayed to by the "hawks" (and those who are board chairmen of military-industrial concerns as well as those who in Pentagon bunkers seek ways to win a nuclear conflict and those who approve aggression against socialist, democratic and simply liberal reason) are simple. They, these postulates, are rather candidly stated, for example, in the four-volume anthology, "Wisdom of Conservatism," and in the so-called "Portland Declaration" expressing the views of the most conservative circles of the United States. In summarizing the many pages of the concepts of neoconservatism that gained strength in the United States at the start of the 1980's, one could note the following.

Contemporary conservatism appears as a unique class reaction to the continuing process of revolutionary changes in the world. President Coolidge, the precursor of conservatives, said in 1927: "We have accepted the mission of taking away the desire for revolutions!" Conservatives resolutely declare their striving to maintain the existing status quo and to conserve unequal relations. As George Gilder writes in his book, "Wealth and Poverty," the striving for social justice is a utopia and it cannot be the program of a free society gravitating toward conservative ideals.

The philosophy of conservatism accepts the idea of progress only to the extent that it ensures the preservation and stability of the traditional values of the bourgeois world: private property and the market economy; the demarcation of classes and the necessity of an elite, a white-collar bureaucracy, and religion; the preservation of the traditional family; and the existence of the current political institutions of the capitalist state as the "highest expressions of human freedom."

The contemporary doctrinal conclusions of conservatism emanate from the imperious necessity of a more resolute "rebuff of the reds" as a condition for the existence of the capitalist system. The "new Right" is characterized by the increase in conservative convictions, frequently going as far as the pole of extreme reactionary behavior and assertions of the "possibility of sending world communism to the garbage heap of history." In the textbook, "What Is Communism," it is asserted that "every American must remember that he is paying one-third of his taxes to the communists. After all, it is because of their threat that we have to maintain an army and create new armaments to save the world and America from the grasp of the reds." This is the foundation of the impenetrable anticommunism that is the social and political essence of conservatism in the United States, in whose soil grow ideas like the "star wars" doctrine.

The ideological aims of conservatives, in fact rejecting all values other than their own, expressing the readiness to remake the world with the help of force, and being transposed to the music of strategic military concepts, are extremely dangerous for the fate of the world. It is not without reason that the conservatives are in such a hurry to carry out the "star wars" concept. The forces that put the current administration into power understand that the dominion of the ultrareactionaries cannot last forever. And these forces are striving to impose and consolidate the current conservative policy for coming administrations. And the "star wars" doctrine is precisely that sort of means that can make new militaristic steps irreversible. With a view to the future, they are trying to consolidate today's policy with hundreds of billions of dollars, which they plan to throw on the cosmic altar of war. Presidents come and go but the military-industrial complex remains.

In speaking of the core of the conservative thinking of the current "star wars" strategists, it is expressed in the apologetics of strength and the cult of economic, military and political power. In this sense, conservatism appears as one of the most important bases of hegemonism. In the American public consciousness, there has long been a persistent myth about a certain exclusivity of their history and people. This myth is usually supported in the schools and colleges through reasoning to the effect that the United States is a "true model" for the entire world. A model of democracy, freedom, power, authority (here use is made of the theme of noninvolvement in the colonial plundering), etc. And, they say, this exclusivity gives them the right "predetermined by destiny, the Most High, and history" to control the world. The American sociologist P. Berger notes that "Americans have long been accustomed to think that they have been endowed with the special mission of saving the world." By the way, the conservative wave rose over several NATO countries as well. It is no accident that in 1983 all of the reactionary parties of the NATO countries united in an "international democratic union" that set for itself the goal of stopping communism. As the philosophical credo of the union, the kindred spirits took Reagan's anti-Soviet speech to the British parliament in June 1982, in which he proclaimed a "crusade" against communism.

Conservative thought, becoming reactionary on the rails of anti-Sovietism, literally adores strength, the fist, military power, and the potential for the intimidation and possible destruction of its antipode. The entire history of the United States of more than 200 years, when they lived surrounded by weak neighbors and great oceans, gave the nation a feeling of military invulnerability and of being more secure than anyone else. Now the realities are different and the conservatives cannot get used to them. Their ideological principles, extremely deformed by anti-Sovietism, do not even agree with general human interests and values. For if one proceeds from the reality of today's world, then one can, perhaps, assert that in the case of the nuclear cataclysm historical evolution can flow backwards, in the reverse direction. Perhaps this should be called not evolution but a giant leap backwards into the past of the civilization, where extraordinary efforts are needed for humanity to survive. A. Einstein warned that if humanity destroys itself, the universe will not shed a single tear.

But the philosophy of the "hawks" emanates from the postulate: "Better dead than red." And although no one is seriously proposing to Weinberger, Nitze, Rogers and other prophets of war that they turn red" or even "turn rose-colored" socially, the deadly threat to Western freedom that they themselves have invented can push them into something irreparable. R. Russell, former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared, in defending the possible course of resolving the basic conflict of the age by the nuclear path: "If we have to start it all over again with another Adam and Eve, then I want them to be Americans and not Russians and I want them to live on the American continent and not in Europe" If the thinking and reasoning are working in this direction, then there is nothing surprising in the fact that doctrines like SDI come into being.

Such is the philosophical credo of those who now see space as the new theater of military operations and who are preparing to develop a limitless front there, incomparably more dreadful than the one established by the aliens of Herbert Wells.

The structure of this front was set forth in detail by the authors from the Heritage Foundation in the 175 pages of the "High Frontier" doctrine. With technical refinements, it has virtually been approved by the Pentagon and at the presidential level. Several of its basic details are worthy of mention.

It is planned to put several hundred stations (satellites) of the "Telon Gold" type into orbit around the earth. There they will set up laser or "cluster" weapons--there is still no common opinion in regard to the armament to be deployed. In criticizing the project, M. Kaku, professor of nuclear physics at New York University, points out that the creators of SDI intend to deploy on the satellites weapons based on high-energy rays: hydrogen fluoride lasers, subatomic particles, x-rays produced in an atomic explosion and focused with the aid of lasers, and clusters of electric waves or electromagnetic pulses resulting from nuclear explosions. All of this highly exotic armament is already in the development or testing stage.

It has not been ruled out that the combat stations will carry several thousand small interceptor missiles for targets in space. It is planned to put the stations into many different orbits (with different angles to the plane of the equator) so as to make it possible to create a global "fan" capable of intercepting the trajectories of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The "defense" must be multilayered.

The first layer is made up of system elements that will have to destroy Soviet missiles at the moment when they are launched. The strong infrared radiation of the missile flames makes it possible to locate and determine their coordinates with sufficient accuracy--the active part of the missile's flight is the most vulnerable. This is the most important part of the cosmic "pie," which will be given the task of destroying up to 70 percent or more of the missiles and warheads being launched.

The second layer of the "pie" is intended for the destruction of the surviving warheads in the passive middle portion of the trajectory. It is thought that this is a more complex part of the task, inasmuch as the number of targets can

become very large after the separation of the nose cones and the ejection of special means for overcoming the antimissile defense. Especially since, as the authors of SDI think, questions in the recognition of actual and false warheads have not been resolved even theoretically.

It is proposed that the third layer of SDI be composed of earth-based means for the defense of specific point targets (missile shafts, control centers, etc.). This, in essence, is the final active echelon of SDI. In this section, the braking action of the atmosphere begins to be felt and "halos" of hot plasma can form around the warheads. As intended by the authors of the doctrine, it is here where one must intercept those warheads that were able to penetrate the two preceding layers and chiefly over strategically important facilities.

Finally, they feel that these three basic layers for the interception of missiles should in fact be supplemented by a fourth, passive layer using the means of civil defense, which is now being intensely developed and built up in the United States.

We presented a very sketchy outline of the structure of SDI, to which it should be added that a large part of this system can also be utilized for a strike in relation to the ground and not just missiles. The final objective of the "strategic defense initiative" is perfectly obvious. They write about it in the United States as well. In the article "Betting on Delivering the First Strike" in the journal PROGRESSIVE, the above-mentioned Prof Michelle Kaku writes that the main idea of Washington's global strategy is clear: "To ensure an effective first strike against the Soviet Union; to intercept the surviving 10 or 20 percent of its counterstrike missiles with the SDI system; and to use civil defense means to protect itself against individual penetrating warheads. "In the thinking of its creators," writes M. Kaku, "this version can ensure the United States a victory in a nuclear war." But what does all of this have to do with "defense"? After all, the United States wants, with the help of SDI, not simply to deliver a nuclear first strike but an unpunished strike.

The scientist calls this plan the most dangerous adventure ever undertaken in history, "a gamble involving all of our lives on earth." The development of the cosmic front in the universe is being prepared by people with distorted political thinking. But they are not taking into account today's realities, which are expressed in the fact that not a single challenge threatening our security and the security of our allies can remain without the proper response.

Held Captive By Chimeras

In the novel "War of the Worlds," everything ended happily. The emigrants from space were simultaneously and suddenly defeated by bacteria, against which they had no immunity. As H. Wells wrote, "after all of humanity's means of defense were exhausted, the aliens were destroyed by the tiniest creatures with which the wise Lord had populated the earth. Death came just in time." Having paid billions of lives for his thousands of years of evolution,

concluded the visionary in a philosophically deep and up-to-date way, man bought the right to live on earth and this right belongs to him against all others.

"The right to life..." is a basic right. Life is a child's laughter, sunlight on the face of a mother, the whisper of raindrops, the load of weariness on one's shoulders, expectations and hopes, disappointments and quests, ascetism and the struggle against meanness. We see, hear and feel life and we carry it in ourselves--in our emotions, will and thoughts. In the endlessly vast and multicolored carpet of life, some threads are broken and new ones appear.... Life is not just when you and your friends and relatives are but it is what was and what will be. Life is also what will remain after us. Tomorrow. Afterwards. Always. The earth will exist after a hundred and a thousand years. Life is when there will be people on it. To be on earth is their right. And today those who see the mirage of victory in a new and already cosmic adventure are making an attempt against this "right to life."

The impracticability and extreme danger of the calculations of the authors of SDI are seen not just in the Soviet Union. There are many serious critics of cosmic adventurism throughout the world and in the United States itself. This relates, for example, to one of the influential groups of scientists in the United States, the "Union of Concerned Scientists," which includes a number of people of world renown, Nobel Prize winners, outstanding physicists and specialists in electronics, communications and other areas of knowledge. They include first-rate stars of science: H. Bethe, V. Weiskopf, F. Morrison, S. Smith, R. Becker, K. Bainbridge and many others. The American president and those supporting the "star wars" idea are counting on people of precisely these qualifications. In his radio address to the nation in July 1985, Reagan declared: "I proposed to the scientific community that it change the course of history. We will be the greatest of fools if we do not do this." For the President, as American publications write, the idea of SDI has become an object of maniacal and fanatical faith, his favorite creation, which, as he hopes, will make his name immortal. But he understands that the realization of his obsession is impossible without the maximum mobilization of the country's intellectual potential.

In this connection, here is the thinking of Prof Hans Bethe from Cornell University, Nobel Prize winner and one of the main participants in the "Manhattan Project" that resulted in the appearance of the atomic bomb in the United States. In his book, "The Fallacy of 'Star Wars'," he asserts: "Absolute defense in space is unattainable but the very attempt to develop it stimulates a mad race in the area of offensive weapons." The members of the "Union of Concerned Scientists" prepared a lengthy report in which they emphasize two aspects. The first is the unprecedented danger from a historical perspective of the very concept of SDI, which can only accelerate the arms race in space and on earth in uncontrolled dimensions. The second is that of the limited technical possibilities for the establishment of an absolute antimissile shield. Here are some of the general physical arguments that the members of the "Union of Concerned Scientists" present in their report:

--because of the rotation of the earth and the movement of artificial satellites in orbit, the latter cannot always be over the regions of the missile launch facilities;

--the laser emission in the X-ray spectrum is largely absorbed even by the thin layer of the atmosphere;

--the movement of electrically charged particles is distorted under the influence of the earth's magnetic field;

--as the laser rays spread, they get out of focus. There are also many other arguments that cast doubt upon the scientific validity of the concept.

The authors of the report analyze in detail the special features of the flight of missiles in different sections of their trajectory as well as the possibility of their being intercepted with absolute reliability. The report notes that "the Soviet Union will not stand still but will undertake the most decisive measures to neutralize American achievements in the area of antimissile defense. For this reason, the antimissile defense system that can be established in the United States within 10 years will have to destroy completely different strategic missiles of its adversary. The political and strategic consequences of the preparation for 'star wars' are as dangerous as technical mistakes. And here they are proposing to commit everything to a myriad of very complex systems where errors are quite possible. SDI will give a new and uncontrolled impulse to the arms race. The world will slip ever closer to the point beyond which only one thing remains--nuclear war," believe the scientists.

The prominent scientists and members of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States (and there are several hundred of them) united in the "Union of Concerned Scientists" turned to M.S. Gorachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President of the United States R. Reagan with an appeal for the USSR and United States to come to an agreement on the complete prohibition of the creation [sozdaniye] and testing of space armaments.

In his response, M.S. Gorbachev, in supporting the justified demands of the scientists, stressed that in resolving the problem of the prohibition of the militarization of space, "yesterday's yardsticks are hardly applicable and neither are notions of one-sided advantages and privileges, illusory ones at that." It was declared on behalf of the Soviet leadership that the Soviet Union will not be the first to go into space with arms. And anyone doing this is taking a fateful step that increases the threat of nuclear war. More than 2 years ago, the Soviet Union unilaterally declared a moratorium on the introduction of antisatellite weapons into space. "We," stressed the Soviet leader, "are not creating cosmic strike armaments, a large-scale antimissile defense system, or the basis for such a defense." He also called upon the American leadership to join us in this matter.

However, the comments of the masters of the White House on the wise warnings and appeals of the Soviet Union and their own scientists were maintained within the traditional tones of the current administration. If one disregards the peace-loving cosmetics, then the main thing remains: the work on the

militarization of space will continue. Caspar Weinberger called all of the arguments of the "Union of Concerned Scientists" the "usual nonsense" not worthy of serious attention. And the President, in rejecting the considerations of the scientists out of hand, appealed to history and the "Apollo Program." At that time, he said, there were also a lot of skeptics and doubters. H. Bethe later responded to this argument, saying that "on the moon during the time when the program was being carried out there was no great power capable of ruining our plans."

The arguments of the scientists are not "nonsense," of course. In emphasizing the boundlessness of human possibilities, we nevertheless know that they cannot go beyond the limits of physical laws. For we could not and will not be able to create a perpetual motor, give man physiological immortality. or overcome the fundamental laws of nature. In this sense, there can be no absolute defense and no absolute weapon. For within one or two decades, when the Americans plan to have created a "space shield," their antipode will already possess other means immeasurably more advanced. Therefore, their intentions of inflicting a first strike and of hiding from a counterstrike behind antimissile armor is an absurd hope. Many American analysts are asking whether this system will not be a "high frontier" but a cosmic Maginot line worthless in historical practice. This is even recognized by many who are thinking along the same lines as the President. Nuclear physicist Harold Brown, former secretary of defense of the United States and Nobel Prize winner, who has long worked on the creation of a ray weapon, calls the "star wars" concept a completely unreal dream. It can therefore be said that the doubts about the possibility of the establishment of an absolute defense expressed by the "Union of Concerned Scientists" are well founded. To their credit, they are not merely criticizing the unreality of the ambitious plans but are also warning against the danger of the arms race in space started by the United States.

It is enough to recall the Space Shuttle program--a reusable shuttle craft capable of having a serious impact on the adversary's satellite system. The shuttle test flights, which have been going on for some time now, have a clearly militaristic character. Col Jack Lusm, commander of one of these crews, candidly told journalists after landing: "Space is a place from where one can hold the entire world in fear." In the rocky canyons of the Santa Susanna Mountains not far from Los Angeles, there is a center with the code name "Sigma Tau," where, as the NEW YORK TIMES reports, they are developing a laser weapon that could be placed on the shuttles and space stations. Scientists and designers from the Martin-Marietta Company are working on an electromagnetic cannon capable of using powerful magnetic fields for the ejection of projectiles along metallic rails into space, where there is no friction. At Livermore Laboratory (state of California), founded in the 1950's by E. Teller, they are close to solving the problem of the creation of an x-ray laser using the energy of a nuclear explosion in space. The firm Thompson-Ramo-Woolridge firm is engaged in the development of supercomputers for SDI capable of performing extremely complex operations in the tracking, control, coordination, guidance and target reentry of destructive elements. This list can be continued for a long time. The "financial pie" of SDI promises to be fantastically rich and a fight for this pie has already started

among the numerous firms, corporations, and scientific laboratories working in the system of the military-industrial complex.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger is one of the most ardent supporters of SDI. A graduate of prestigious Harvard University, he quickly made a career in the field of business. For a long time prior to going to the Pentagon, he was vice president of the Bectel Corporation, a superconcern in military construction that has built thousands of strategic facilities. And although C. Weinberger was only a captain at the close of World War II, his financial, industrial and organizational experience in combination with a solid reputation as an anticommunist "hawk" opened the way for him to reach the highest levels of power in Washington. SDI, according to Weinberger, "is what we need. With its help, we will ensure true security." C. Weinberger, a millionaire, is the typical figure of a businessman and politician for whom the interests of the military-industrial complex are above everything else. It is hard to remember a week when this "star strategist" might not have presented a pitch for the infamous "strategic defense initiative."

Lt Gen James Abrahamson, formerly manager of the project for the building of the space shuttle, heads all research and testing work of the SDI program. He has been granted great powers. For example, he recently sanctioned the establishment of a 4-year program for research by five universities on the problem of the creation [sozdaniye] of powerful supply sources for space systems. The program has already been started and research, design and testing work has already begun on a broad front in the country for the creation of various elements of SDI--work that can lead to an extremely dangerous militarization of space. Energetic attempts are now being made to bring Japan and the NATO allies into the project.

There is still no SDI system as such (even optimists believe that it will be established no sooner than the year 2000) but the U.S. Air Force already has a KOSKOM (space command). It was established on 1 September 1982. As the journal AIR FORCE reports, its staff is located in the mountains at Colorado Springs (state of Colorado). Gen James V. Hartinger, who is also commander of aerospace defense for the North American continent, was put in charge of it. The command already has more than 10,000 specialists working on the development of a concept for the waging of "star wars," the processing of information on the missile and space facilities of the Soviet Union, the coordination of the systems being established within the framework of SDI, and the preparation of their utilization for strategic purposes. Numerous bases in Greenland, Alaska, Hawaii and many other regions of the world are establishing the necessary conditions for KOSKOM to control and utilize space strike systems. The number of these bases is increasing all the time. Quite recently, the Pinochet junta in Santiago obligingly offered the legendary Easter Island, this gigantic open-air museum and unique enigmatic monument of an ancient culture, as a shuttle airport. From now on, the huge stone figures will stand next to American radar, space antennas, reflectors of laser rays, and the rest of the "star wars" environment.

It is significant that very many honest people who have the "K. Easley complex" (the American pilot who dropped the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima and then, years later, suffered terribly under a rebellious conscience)

supported the idea of the "Union of Concerned Scientists" that space must be a reservation without weapons. To be sure, there were also some who think that "star wars" is a logical fatal link in the tragic evolution of humanity. Prof Carl Sagan from Cornell University, an astronomer well known in the United States, thinks that there have already been analogous catastrophies in the universe. In his opinion, technical civilizations similar to ours destroy themselves in reaching a high level of technological maturity. Sagan's arguments, of course, belong more to the realm of fantasy but his formula for avoiding catastrophe is worthy of more attention than the hypothesis of the fatal end. He thinks that it is necessary to change the traditional thinking of those who intend to preserve life on earth by achieving victory in a nuclear war. There is a portion of truth in this assertion of the astronomer, for even A. Einstein noted that "the atomic bomb changed almost everything except human thinking."

Herbert Wells wrote a little-known work entitled "Tale of the 20th Century," written almost 100 years ago, in 1887. Its plot is simple but prophetic, as always with the visionary. A young scientist made an invention that was quickly picked up by those who know how to profit from science. He designed a completely different train: rapid, economical and comfortable. The selfish mercantile interests of the factory owners accelerated the materialization of the idea. And here the train speeds through underground tunnels: faster and faster but unable to stop. In their hurry to carry out the new idea, they failed to pay attention to the installation of brakes. In the end, a horrible explosion shakes the city.

Scientific achievements outside of a moral context are dangerous. History is evidence of that. Precisely such discoveries are embodied in the mobile gas chambers of the Nazis, the nuclear tornados that carried away Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the "yellow rain" that destroyed hundreds of thousands of people in Vietnam. I think that, in accordance with the reality of the philosophical warning, one of the first essays of Wells could successfully be called "Tale of the 21st Century."

Scientists, the priests of science, are protesting against the ominous plans. In May 1985, the newspaper DEUTSCHE VOLKSZEITUNG-TAT in Duesseldorf published an article and declaration of naturalists of the FRG entitled "SDI--Fraud on Humanity." It reported that in a short time the Goettingen appeal of scientists for the prevention of the placement of all types of arms in space was signed by 10,834 scientists from the FRG and 31 other countries. According to the information of the authors of the article, a significant share of the scientists in the United States, if not the majority, does not approve of the "strategic defense initiative." The declaration states, among other things, that "SDI is nothing other than an attempt to establish the conditions for a victorious first strike and therefore the defensive nature of the concept is a very great deception." In answer to the creation of SDI, the scientists write, the opposing side will respond with decisive countermeasures and therefore the establishment of a space defense and arms control are practically mutually exclusive. The authors of the declaration note that SDI is supposed to work automatically. It will never be possible, however, to test the complete system under realistic conditions. The only test will be war. But can one really entrust the existence of an entire civilization to a

technical system? Scientific specialists justifiably point out that security cannot be attained through technical but only through political means.

The adherence of the leading echelon to the space "initiative" is also understandable in that this, in essence, is an endless source of profit and superprofit for monopolies. More than \$70 billion are being allocated just for the research work on the SDI program. Let us remember that \$14 billion were appropriated for the Manhattan Project and about \$30 billion (in today's prices) for the Apollo Project. One must not forget that the power of the extreme right wing of contemporary conservatism is the power not simply of "hawks" but of millionaires as well. In his article in the magazine STERN, the West German journalist Klaus Lidtke writes that "one can find 28 millionaires and 22 multimillionaires among the 100 main assistants of the President." To a considerable degree, their political face and extreme conservative positions are determined by not only by their ideological positions but also by the size of their bank accounts. The world of the rich values and supports only those colors of the political spectrum that are to the right. Such people include Charles Wick, director of the USIA; William Casey, director of the CIA; Frank Carlucci, first undersecretary of defense; and dozens of other close associates of the American president who profess a "hawkish" position. It was they and people like them who gave a new impulse to militarism, which, in the words of V.I. Lenin, is the "vital manifestation" of capitalism. Lenin's thinking on American jingoism--personifying an extremely militant militarism and representing a deadly threat to socialism--although expressed back in 1920, is still exceptionally current today. A synthesis of monopolies, reactionary militarism, and state bureaucracy represent the main foundations of the jingoistically thinking leaders of contemporary America.

It is sometimes asked: Why, despite the protests of sober-minded people, does a significant portion, if not the majority, of the U.S. population support Washington's militaristic initiatives, as is indicated by the public opinion polls of the Harris service, Gallup and other centers of analysis?

This is not a simple question. It would, of course, be naive to think that, in the range of political possibilities that now exists for the development of the future, the ordinary people as the "strong of the world" of America are inclined only to a "nuclear" resolution of the basic conflict of the age. On the hill of power in Washington, they cannot fail to know how a frontal "crusade" against communism would end.

In the last decade, American public consciousness, which was raised on ideas of the exclusivity, Messianism, world leadership, all-power and might of the United States, experienced a series of powerful shocks. The disgrace of defeat in the Vietnam War, Watergate, the energy crisis, inflation, the taking of the hostages in Teheran, a number of major foreign-policy failures in Central America and the Middle East, the weakening of economic positions in competition with Europe and Japan, and the fact of the achievement of strategic parity by the Soviet Union began to be perceived in a political context as a national tragedy and psychologically as an inferiority complex. New realities--natural in our multicolored world of many currents, where change is the only thing that is permanent--were perceived by the ordinary

consciousness as a sort of "challenge," as a certain "threat" to the American way of life and thinking. The disappointment with reality also fed chauvinistic feelings of aggressiveness, which needed an outlet. And they found it in a noticeable shift to the right, from the pole of bourgeois liberalism to the pole of open conservatism and reactionary behavior.

This shift in public consciousness was first perceived by the "hawks" and all those forces that stand behind them. The slogan, "Give America Back Its Greatness," with which the current American administration came to the White House, was based upon chauvinism, anticommunism and unrestrained demagoguery. They made use of the bourgeois theme of "rebirth" and manipulated the ideals and postulates of the pioneers, who felt that there was no task that they could not solve. "Simple answers" were given to the most complex questions of our time. Communists, as the "center of evil," were blamed for all the failures that are haunting the United States throughout the world from Beirut to Managua. All of the domestic disorders were explained by failures of previous administrations, the forgetting of Christian values, and the "lack of the will to save on the poor." These false truths, transferred to the music of social and political demagoguery, were accompanied by huge stimulatory actions for large monopolies and military business.

On the other hand, they are continuously manipulating this public consciousness, feeding it with anticommunists cliches, myths and legends. A "constant enemy mortally threatening America" was needed to carry out the hegemonic goals. Such an enemy, of course, was found--the reds, communists, everything Soviet. "If this enemy did not exist," said Z. Brzezinski with frankness, "our generals would simply be forced to invent him." It is therefore no accident that in the policy of international gangsterism the pharisaic legend "of the Soviet military threat" has long figured as the main, constant and invariable argument. They constantly sustain, "enrich," modify and cultivate it. Many are involved in this, from the secretary of defense to the editor of the cheap tabloid and the commercial theater. When SDI was made public, the country's movie screens were flooded with films suggesting to the viewers that the cosmic theater of military actions with fronts in space had already been decided. The counters of the bookstores were loaded with an abundance of "space novels" of the type "Star Wars" by G. Lukas, "Master of the Galaxy" by D. Hill, "Aliens from Other Worlds" by M. Cousins, and others. Of course most of these films and books showed cosmic vampires with a five-pointed red star on their space suits.

To make this threat appear more convincing, they also involve the "public" in this shameful creation of myths. For example, the so-called "Committee for the Present Danger" established by a group of "hawks" took upon itself the function of formulating philosophical conclusions on the "threat tendencies," the channels and windows of the U.S. "space vulnerability," and the ways for a "worthy response" to Moscow's challenges. This is one of the most powerful lobbying organizations of the "hawks" in America, coming out in favor of "the United States playing a dominant role in the world based upon resistance to communism," as P. Nitze, one of the committee's founders, declared. In the report, "Concept of Peace," P. Nitze, the former head of the American delegation in the Geneva negotiations on intermediate range missiles, asserts that "in the understanding of the Soviets, the word 'peace' means the

domination of the communists. In short, Soviet 'peace' is our slavery." As they say in such cases, no comment is needed. These people are engaged in propagandizing the SDI program as the "great and practically only hope of Americans in the 21st century," whereas the true hope lies not in the area of fear but in the triumph of human reason.

Solar Sails

Arthur C. Clark, one of the most outstanding contemporary visionaries and the author of almost half a hundred books written primarily on space themes, sees space not as the arena of deadly competition but as a limitless field of international cooperation. His books--"Creation of the Moon," "Challenge of the Space Ship," and "Sands of Mars"--brought him world fame. In his meetings with Soviet cosmonauts, the writer invariably stresses that "space can be a powerful factor in uniting humanity. Our generation already knows how one can destroy all life on earth. We must think more about the future, which is not possible without peaceful space." And Clark carries out this idea in an original way in his books. It is also expressed very originally in the story, "Solar Sails."

An unusual space race is taking place with the participation of four continents and two worlds representing the earth and Mars. There is a sporting race from the earth to the moon in spaceships. The motive power of the ships is solar sails. The solar wind (the pressure of the sun's rays), in filling the giant weightless sails, accelerates the space gondolas to fantastic speeds. Clark writes that based upon a discovery by the Russian scientist Petr Nikoayevich Lebedev it became possible to catch the solar wind not just theoretically but in practice. And his discovery serves all continents and worlds. Finally, two ships took the lead: the Russian apparatus commanded by Dmitriy Markov, and the American system with John Merton on board. The play of the flashing sunlight on the gigantic sail was captivating in its unique beauty. The intelligence that created these enchanting ships had not lost the ability to admire the charm of the purple twilight, the green oasis of the distant earth, or the endless scattering of the Milky Way. The two ships were dead even, like race horses. But the race was not destined to come to an end. The sun became stormy and eruptions of plasma made further travel dangerous. The race was stopped and "a huge sigh of disappointment crossed the entire solar system." But millions of spectators knew: there will be more peaceful races in space. And it seemed that they could indeed begin. Ten years ago, after 3 years of preparation, the Soviet-American space expedition "Soyuz-Apollo" took place. And when Aleksey Leonov and Thomas Stafford firmly shook each other's hands after having opened the hatches of the docked spaceships, it seemed that a new era was beginning in the history of space. That was an hour of great hope.

For the good of earthlings in space, one does not need "Telon Gold" battle stations with laser weapons on board but, in the words of Clark, "solar sails." Space is already serving people: satellite communications, television, geodesic and topographic surveys, meteorology, navigation of ships and aircraft, help to those in distress, environmental control and many other things useful to earthlings. Space is indispensable for many industrial and

scientific experiments. It is possible that in time a space industry might arise whose enterprises will make use of the unique qualities of weightlessness, the sterile cleanliness of space, the better vacuum, etc. Soviet and American cosmonauts have already given encouraging examples of the peaceful use of space. The "solar sails" have something to carry and the "solar wind" has someone to work for. In 1986, for example, Halley's Comet will pass near the earth. Joint efforts in the study of this phenomenon would make possible an even greater increase in our knowledge of the universe in which our little planet is rushing along at a fantastic speed. And all of this can be wiped out by those who, in tearing the weightless fabric of peaceful sails, are trying to step into space with weapons. The Pentagon has already made a start and in the foreseeable future the impenetrable blackness of space may be entangled in the trajectories and orbits of American strike systems.

Humanity, in ascending the endless steps of social progress, has for thousands of years dragged behind it a bloody train of wars and conflicts. Mars, the god of war, reaped a rich harvest over the course of many centuries. In the past five and a half thousand years, in the judgment of historians, mankind has gone through 14,000 fires of war in which more than 4 billion people died, that is, approximately as many as the total number of inhabitants now living on our planet. The 20th century was especially "generous" in large wars. Two world wars in this century carried away more than 60 million human lives. Marxism-Leninism showed long ago that the fundamental source of all these wars was and remains the system of exploitation. And in the light of the not illusory but real threat of a new world war, to which the United States is pushing the world community, the conclusion of communists that a nuclear cataclysm is not inevitable seems especially important. The time has come when it is simply essential to put an end to the fateful succession of wars, which, as F. Engels expressed it, have become "the permanent business" of exploiters.

How can one maintain peace, the basis of the future on earth? Is there a mutually acceptable and objective basis for general security? In the endless kaleidoscope of views, doctrines and concepts, two diametrically opposing lines can be seen clearly. One of them boils down to establishing own's own security through the absolute lack of such on the part of the potential adversary. Precisely therein is the hidden meaning of the "star wars" concept. In essence, Washington is saying (and the main thing, is also doing) that it is necessary to arm oneself to maintain the peace. But that is the same thing as trying to prevent the destruction of humanity by preparing for its destruction....

The other line of policy, which is personified by the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries, proceeds from the fundamental possibility and necessity of finding a mutually acceptable formula for general security. If one considers the nature of all of the peace-loving and construction proposals of socialism, their essence is extremely clear and simple: the immediate task is to diminish the threat of nuclear war, the next task is to do even more to remove the probability of its occurrence, and the following, final task is to exclude nuclear war from the life of the human community. At the present time, some of those in power in the NATO capitals think, as a rule, that

foreign policy is when one side loses and the other side wins. But something else is needed: for peace to be everyone's gain. And for this purpose, today it is important to have the capitalist world agree in fact and not just in words to the absolutely fair principle of equal security, which must be expressed in parity and a balance of strategic forces. This is the only real basis for the possible security of states in a nuclear age. This objective causality appears as a unique law for the preservation of peace, on the basis of which one could subsequently attempt to lower the level of nuclear confrontation gradually and proportionally. Security does not consist in the ability to pursue an ephemeral victory in a nuclear war but in the ability to prevent it on the basis of strategic balance and the renunciation of the intention of achieving superiority. Equilibrium, of course, cannot always stop an attacker but in a nuclear war he will be forced to pay such an inadmissibly high price that only a suicidal aggressor could decide on it.

The United States was always at the head of the arms race. Judge for yourselves: the United States created the nuclear weapon in the mid-1940's but the USSR did not do so until the end of the 1940's; intercontinental strategic bombers and atomic submarine missile carriers appeared in the United States in the mid-1950's but not until the late 1950's in the USSR; individually targeted dividing nose cones were developed in the United States at the end of the 1960's but not until the mid-1970's in the USSR. The Americans "are leading" in arms-race initiatives in other elements of military power as well: they have already created a neutron weapon, returnable spaceships for military purposes, long-range cruise missiles, etc. Colossal sums have now been thrown into the creation of a very precise weapon (of the Copperhead type of guided missiles) whose effectiveness approaches that of nuclear weapons.

Historical experience shows, however, that the advantage is temporary and not decisive. We are also forced to answer the challenges of those elements of contemporary strategic power that we consider to be determinant and we catch up with the side attempting to attain a substantial advantage.

Of course, if Washington does not listen to the voice of reason and takes the course of the practical realization of the "star wars" program, then the Soviet Union, stressed M.S. Gorbachev, "will have no other choice than to take countermeasures, including, of course, the strengthening and improvement of offensive nuclear arms." The aim of these measures will be to guarantee that the Pentagon's adventuristic strategy in space fails. We will select those means of resolving this task that we consider the most nearly optimum and not those to which the creators of SDI would like to persuade us.

The transoceanic politicians and their allies are doing everything they can to block the reasonable constructive proposals of the socialist countries. Let us take just three well-known historically important proposals of the USSR: the obligations not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; to freeze strategic nuclear potentials at the present level; and not to permit the militarization of space. Their acceptance by the United States would greatly diminish the threat of a nuclear conflict and would create a fruitful foundation for arms-control negotiations. But this is not happening. The United States, as indicated by two rounds of negotiations in Geneva, wants to

achieve decisive superiority first and then consolidate it through negotiations. In this way, Washington intends to create a new and extremely dangerous class of armaments. The placing of space strike weapons capable of hitting targets in all areas in orbits around the earth would definitively wreck the agreement on the limitation of antiballistic defense systems signed by the USSR and the United States in 1972. And today everyone is saying that Washington is moving in this direction.

That is how the "hawks" are reacting to the USSR's proposals presented to the United Nations on the prohibition of the application of force either in space or from space in relation to the earth (1983) and on international cooperation in the peaceful opening up of space under the conditions of its nonmilitarization (1985). It may be that the adoption of the Soviet proposals is a rare historical chance for the fate of the world that will not come again in the future. For experience shows that if a new spiral in the arms race is not blocked in the very beginning, it is subsequently much more difficult to do so.

It is therefore extremely important not to permit the militarization of space. From the realm of military preparations, notes the draft of the CPSU Program (new version), "space should be totally excluded, so that it does not become an arena of military competition and a source of death and destruction. The investigation and opening up of space must be carried out only for the peaceful purposes of the development of science and production in accordance with the requirements of all peoples." Humanity does not need "star wars" but "star peace."

Today the greatest guarantees of security in the face of the militaristic challenge of the United States and NATO lie in the plane of the ability of socialism to support the strategic military equilibrium in the form of parity. The highest political leadership of the USSR has repeatedly let the potential aggressor understand that we will be as strong as is required of us and for as long as necessary. The Soviet Armed Forces hold an important place in the defensive mechanism blocking the terrible wrath of war. In the postwar years, imperialism has unleashed about 100 local wars and conflicts, has repeatedly put the world on the edge of a dangerous confrontation, and has carried out global exercises of its offensive strategic forces (of the type "Global Shield 84"), putting in the air many hundreds of bombers with nuclear weapons on board and aiming hundreds of missile complexes with multiple nuclear warheads at real targets. Many of these local wars could detonate a large war and the exercises could be the prelude to a massive attack against the Soviet Union and its allies. War has silently approached the threshold of the world, for no one can know whether it is an exercise or an insidious preventive strike. But each time, in running into the might, determination and vigilance of the countries of socialism and its armed forces, imperialism was forced to retreat. We know that at critical moments we must be prepared to act extremely resolutely and quickly so that history will not leave time for failure. And the fact that we are being successful in preserving at least the fragile peace that we have today is determined to a decisive degree by the political will of socialism and the might of its armed forces.

People, of whom progressive humanity has a right to be proud in speaking of the sublime, noble and triumphant, used in their creative work expressions that have become proverbial--"stellar hour," "bright star of hope," "star of captivating happiness".... For man, a romantic and lofty relationship to the reality that surrounds him is linked with the stars, the eyes of the universe. For him, the human being, the question never did exist: to go or not to go into space, to strive or not to strive for the far stars. The vastness of the universe always drew the human mind to understanding its endless secrets.

And into this great harmony of the human spirit--truth, good and beauty--creeped, or better, surged "star wars." Not the fantastic kind and not those that flash like a kaleidoscope on Western screens but those that can become a threatening reality in the form of a stellar apocalypse. The story, "Miracle Worker," written by H. Wells immediately after "War of the Worlds," persistently pursues the warning thought: the people of a "selfish civilization" with authority and the force of science represent a deadly danger for humanity. For life and death are separated by an invisible, thin and fragile line that can be crossed in only one direction. There is no way back.

The shadow of the cosmic threat that is being cast on the earth has outlined in even more relief three basic possibilities that exist today in the struggle to preserve civilization: peaceful coexistence, a balancing on the edge of war, or a nuclear cataclysm. Which of these possibilities will be realized in the future depends not only upon the "star wars" strategists but above all upon those forces that embody the rejection of war as a means of resolving the fundamental conflict of the age.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda". "Oktyabr", 1986.

9746

CSO: 5200/1289

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: FURTHER CRITICISM OF REAGAN GLASSBORO SPEECH

White House 'Maneuvering'

PM301541 Moscow PRAVDA in Ruwsian 26 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Tomas Kolesnichenko "Commentator's Column": "Last Straw"]

[Text] Zeal is a risky business. They must be pondering that now in the White House, where the architects of the "hard line policy" in the sphere of strategic arms limitation and reduction talks who zealously declared SALT II "dead" have found themselves in an extremely unseemly position. According to the opinion of observers these hawks clearly underestimated not only the negative reaction to this step from the U.S. allies and world public opinion, but also the attitude to it within the country, including U.S. legislators.

"Currently," THE WASHINGTON POST notes, "the President is concerned not so much about the Russians as about Congress. His decision in the strategic arms limitation sphere was the straw that broke the backs of those who were concerned at his brusque manner of conducting talks." Indeed, the House of Representatives adopted a resolution calling on the President not to annul SALT II. Moreover, this resolution was ratified by the Senate Armed Services Committee, which, incidentally, is controlled by Republicans. A paradoxical situation has emerged, to put it bluntly. U.S. legislators, by opposing the President's actions in a most important foreign policy sphere, are effectively showing their lack of faith in him, while in response the U.S. chief executive has publicly accused the inhabitants of Capitol Hill of "attempting to undermine U.S. nuclear might" and "aiding and abetting the USSR."

Just why was the U.S. Administration's decision to no longer observe the provisions of the 1979 SALT agreement the last straw for the world-weary congressmen?

The fact is that in this case it was a question of the future of the entire process of limiting and reducing the arms race and removing the threat of nuclear war. The bandonment of SALT II violates the principle of equal security, simultaneously removes an obstacle to an arms race that could get out of control, and threatens to undermine subsequent talks in the disarmament sphere. These consequences ultimately run counter to the security interests of the United States itself. That is understood by millions of Americans, whose voice of protest has finally echoed in Congress.

The White House is now maneuvering. The other day the President even delivered a speech in Glassboro that his entourage is propagandizing as "conciliatory." But judgements are made on the basis of actions, not words. The attitude to SALT II is the touchstone against which the White House's loudest "peace-loving" statements are checked.

Reagan's Tone, Actions Contrasted

PM281640 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korionov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] The normalization of Soviet-American relations continues to occupy a leading place among the current problems of international relations. However, a clear obstacle in the path of such a normalization is presented by the shortage of responsibility and new political thinking discernible in Washington in the face of the arrival at an extremely dangerous and unpredictable spiral in the arms race.

In this respect a recent speech by the U.S. President in Glassboro draws attention. Certain organs of the Western press, in the United States particularly, have endeavored to create the impression that this was virtually a policy [programmy] speech that opens a "new" page in Soviet-U.S. relations. But just what in fact was contained in this speech?

"If both sides genuinely want progress, we may now have reached a turning point... Evidently, a new atmosphere really does exist that will allow for serious discussions," the President declared. "Talk alone is not enough," he proclaimed, and stated: It is time "to switch to actions in behalf of peace." Such statements could only be welcomed if they were backed up by practical actions in favor of peace. But the point is that it is impossible to detect even a sign of such actions in the policy of the present administration.

The special assistant to the President and the secretary of state on arms control problems [as published], General Rowny, retired, one of the most violent of Washington's flock of "hawks", said outright of the President's Glassboro speech: "Despite the mild tone of the speech, Reagan's ideas have not altered since he arrived in the White House."

As for the "mildness" of tone of the President's speech, the reason for this should be seen primarily in those difficulties the administration has encountered in the implementation of its foreign policy course.

Relations within the Atlantic camp have deteriorated. The administration's statement of its intention to smash the treaty obstacles established by the SALT agreements rang out like a funeral bell for the West Europeans who are still not losing hope that reason will prevail in Washington. At the same time the White House is meeting with growing resistance in the country, where protests against the unrestrained arms race and against the reckless course of "star wars" preparations are becoming louder. Even in Congress which, as was shown by the vote on the question of the allocation of \$100 million for banditry in Nicaragua, is yielding to the White House's unprecedented pressure -- sentiments "are characterized by a patently anti-Pentagon thrust, and it is desperately necessary for the President to head off cuts in the military budget," the newspapers write.

But it appears that there is yet another, decisive factor that had to be taken into consideration by the compilers of the speech for the Glassboro orator. This factor is the impact on the international political climate of the socialist countries' intensifying peace offensive. As the French magazine LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE remarks, following the meeting in Geneva the U.S. President can no longer simply shrug off Soviet initiatives.

All this, however, by no means indicates that the U.S. militarists are inclined to review their aggressive plans. For immediately after the speech in Glassboro the earth shook again in Nevada: The United States, in conjunction with Britain on this occasion, carried out yet another nuclear weapons test, the 6th officially announced test this year and the 13th since the Soviet Union's unilateral introduction of its moratorium.

The millions of people on earth who are awaiting, not bombastic phrases, but real steps toward peace can in no way agree with such a development of events. All those who genuinely seek to avert the danger of war advocate that the positive line emanating from the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva not be dissolved in the whirlpool of international life. It is natural that people are turning their gaze toward Moscow with ever increasing hope. A typical admission was even heard the other day in the offices of the Bonn government: With Moscow, the West is dealing with a leadership whose reaction is very flexible and which is prepared to take serious steps. There's no denying that!

'Reagan Cannot Make Up His Mind'

LD292118 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Jun 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislaw Kondrashov]

[Text] Comrades, as I promised, I return to the current political issues in the United States. I have already mentioned the public opinion poll carried out by THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC television during the week. Apart from attitudes to Nicaragua, it also pinpointed another aspect of the dissension of the Reagan administration with Americans. Two to one, Americans opposed not only the aid to the rebels of Nicaragua but also the White House plan to renounce observance of the treaty with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation, SALT II. Two Americans to one believe that their government should observe this treaty until another American-Soviet agreement is worked out on nuclear arms control. Nothing new in this conclusion: The people are more sensible than the government. Remember that the President did not receive support in Congress on this question either. In the House of Representatives the Senate Armed Services Committee, too, advocated observance of SALT II, although it is a conservative group and the majority belong to the President's party, the Republican Party.

It is in the context of this growing opposition that many observers interpret Reagan's speech at Glassboro on 19 June, and which they believe sounded conciliatory toward the Soviet Union. In his speech the U.S. President spoke approvingly of the latest Soviet proposals submitted at the talks in Geneva. Remember the gist of them was expounded by Comrade Gorbachev in his speech at the June CPSU Committee Plenum.

Reagan said at Glassboro that the Soviet Union was proposing serious efforts in the field of arms control, an appraisal extremely rare for him. He called the new Soviet proposals a turning point.

There is continuing broad comment in the West on the Glassboro speech. Many are seeking in it and would like to find what was lacking and is lacking in the American position, especially against the background of the Soviet initiatives: a constructive approach, a constructive reply. U.S. allies are concerned at American negativism and militancy, and now they are hastening to praise the U.S. President for praising the Soviet proposals. Such official and semi-official appraisals have come from London, Bonn, and Rome, and also have been confirmed at the Hague meeting.

Explaining the conciliatory tone of the Glassboro speech, American observers also write that the White House would like to avoid the growing dissension with public opinion in the United States and in Western Europe. But there is yet another explanation and another point of dissension. Dissension within the Reagan administration where moderate conservatives do not get on too well with superhawks. The President speaks of a turning point by the Russians, but shrewd observers have not so far managed to detect a turning point in his tough, unconstructive policy. Reagan cannot make up his mind.

This is what THE WASHINGTON POST warns: "None of Reagan's decisions are construed as final either by rivals within his administration or the opposition in Congress." Or a comment from London, the FINANCIAL TIMES: "The American Administration long seemed like a two-faced Janus in the form of the unconcealed conflict between the adherents and opponents of arms control." Correction: It did not seem to be but really was a two-faced Janus and remains so until it demonstrates the opposite. It is not words that should be conciliatory, but deeds. But the Glassboro speech was not followed by deeds. The Americans have not given a reply to the new Soviet proposals. The latest round of Geneva talks ended without result on Thursday. They will be resumed on 18 September.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: U.S. STANCE STRAINS RELATIONS

PM301046 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 86 Second Edition p 5

[V. Dodonov article: "An Extra Mile Washington-Style"]

[Excerpt] The Soviet Union firmly adheres to a policy of searching in practice for a mutually acceptable arms limitation agreement. The American side at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms has been offered an interim version of an agreement under which, first, an accord is reached not to renounce the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years, while work in the SDI field is confined to the level of laboratory research, and, second, strategic offensive arms (ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers) are confined to equal levels. The question of medium-range arms capable of reaching the other side's territory, including long-range ground-based cruise missiles, is to be resolved separately in this case. A Soviet draft agreement aimed at ridding Europe of Soviet and American medium-range missiles has been placed on the negotiating table in Geneva. The Soviet Union has agreed that, given a zero ratio between the USSR and the United States regarding this kind of weapon, the British and French nuclear missiles will remain in the European zone at present levels. The Soviet side has also declared that it will not increase the number of medium-range missiles in Asia.

The United States, however, has not advanced a single new mutually acceptable proposal at the Geneva talks. What is more, the virtual rejection of SALT II is, in fact, further evidence that the White House not only does not wish to undertake new accords in the sphere of limiting and reducing arms but does not even wish to preserve the structure of the already existing Soviet-American agreements. Such a shortsighted policy on the part of the U.S. leadership merely complicates already strained Soviet-American relations. "If the American side ignores our initiatives this time too," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his report at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, "it will be obvious that the present U.S. Administration is playing an unworthy game on a very serious issue on which mankind's future depends."

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS: YUGOSLAVIA BACKS GORBACHEV ON ELIMINATING NUCLEAR ARMS

LD202237 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Belgrade June 20 TASS -- Yugoslavia, energetically contributing to the solution of all the questions of the practical termination of the arms race and calling for universal and complete disarmament, supports the Soviet Union's program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, Raif Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia's federal secretary for foreign affairs, said at a press conference in Belgrade.

Yugoslavia, he stressed, is welcoming the foreign policy steps of the USSR, presented by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the June plenary meeting of the Central Committee, which are directed at searching mutually acceptable accords on the termination of the arms race and on disarmament. The federal secretary also noted the breadth of the program for the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, approved by the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest. We are closely studying these proposals, he said.

Commenting on the U.S. obstructionist stand on the SALT-2 treaty, the federal secretary noted that renunciation of that treaty could lead to the escalation of the arms race with unpredictable consequences. The course of seeking unilateral superiority, he noted, has never contributed to stronger world security or better relations between the great powers.

Dizdarevic stressed that the forthcoming non-aligned summit in Harare would center first and foremost on international economic relations, including the indebtedness of developing countries, and also on the situation in southern Africa, aggravated by the aggressive policy of the racist regime in the Republic of South Africa.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

KARPOV COMMENTS ON FIFTH ROUND OF GENEVA TALKS

27 June Interview

LD271757 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 27 Jun 86

[Text] A routine round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons has ended in Geneva. Comrade Karpov, leader of the Soviet delegation, granted an interview to our correspondent:

[Begin recording] The most clear and noticeable characteristic of this round is the fact that the Soviet side in the 1 and 1/2 months of talks has pursued an energetic line in trying to achieve practical decisions in all three directions in the talks: space, strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range weapons in Europe.

On space the Soviet delegation has submitted specific proposals that could provide the opportunity to resolve the problem of strengthening the operation of the ABM Treaty, the prohibition of antisatellite systems, and the prohibition of weapons of an offensive character of the space-to-earth class. These would undoubtedly have been major shifts in the business of resolving that main task in this sphere, that is, preventing an arms race in space.

On strategic offensive weapons we submitted a new intermediate proposal that was intended to overcome the deadlock at the talks and in this direction too our main proposal is the proposal for 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms. We have a preference particularly for this kind of solution. But because the U.S. side is not now prepared for this, we propose seeking an interim way out of the situation in order to provide the first step at least on the road to 50-percent cuts. This is the meaning of our new proposal that we are ready to carry out in the event the United States agrees to strengthen the ABM Treaty and simultaneously cut its strategic offensive weapons.

At the beginning of this round the Soviet Union proposed a specific draft for an agreement on the elimination of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles in Europe. This proposal of ours is on the table at the talks, but the U.S. delegation has just not begun practical discussion of it as in other issues, despite our insistent offer to get down to just precisely practical elaboration of a joint draft of a text for an agreement.

So here too it is up to the U.S. side. [end recording]

29 June Remarks

LD292919 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Jun 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Vladimir Dmitriyev report from Geneva]

[Text] The fifth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons has ended in Geneva. And so 1 and 1/2 months of work during the fifth round of Soviet-U.S. talks has ended. Specific proposals were put forward by our side with the aim of seeking mutually acceptable solutions. The USSR's proposals to the U.S. side include mutual agreement to strictly observe the ABM Treaty, and not to withdraw from it for at least 15 years. Strategic offensive weapons would be restricted to equal levels.

We also submitted a draft agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, confirming at the same time that the numbers of such missiles will not be increased in Asia. In other words, the Soviet Union has embarked upon fresh steps with the aim of making progress at the Geneva talks and improving the international climate.

[Begin Karpov recording] The Soviet Union has consistently demonstrated once again its aspiration to achieve practical results which could, in accordance with the task of the talks, open the way in the very near future for solving the problems in limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, while preventing an arms race in space at the same time. Meanwhile, one cannot fail to mention that we have not met with the due cooperation from the U.S. side in this direction. I would say, rather, that the U.S. side's line has been to throw a "monkey wrench" into the Soviet proposals as far as possible, to protract the talks, and in essence we have not received a response in this round to a single one of the Soviet proposals that we submitted at the beginning of the round. Thus, if one is to talk about a material outcome, there is none so far. But it seems to me that the main outcome is that the Soviet line consistently opens up the way toward solution of the issues with which the delegations are charged. It is up to the U.S. side. [end recording]

Remarks to GDR Television

LD272159 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1733 GMT 27 Jun 86

[Text] Berlin, 27 Jun (ADN) -- Following his arrival to take part in the meeting of the deputy foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact states in Berlin, Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation at the USSR-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons, told GDR television the following about the round of negotiations in Geneva that recently ended:

The fifth round did not conclude with genuinely positive results. However, that is only part of the answer. One must look deeper. What actually happened during the negotiations? It must be said that during the entire period of this round of negotiations the U.S. side showed no positive approach whatsoever to the solution of those tasks the conference was established to solve.

What is more, I would say that the tactics of the Americans consisted in avoiding a solution to these issues. They were trying to prolong the discussion. In contrast, the Soviet side showed a different approach. Throughout the entire negotiation round the Soviet side actively searched for ways to establish positions that would lead to a

21 July 1986

solution of the issues with which we are confronted. We made concrete proposals concerning all three directions of the negotiations -- space, strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range missiles.

Concerning medium-range missiles in Europe, we made a whole series of proposals, including specific proposals on verification. Regrettably, this group of concrete proposals was not accepted by the U.S. side. Regarding space, the problem with the U.S. delegation is that it was not prepared to discuss the main problem -- namely, the prevention of the militarization of space. Therefore, we proposed partial solutions: an agreement on meetings about SALT, on antisatellite weapons, and on banning offensive weapons in space of the space-to-earth class. We are still waiting for a reply to these proposals.

We also proposed an interim solution on strategic missiles and weapons. We would prefer a radical solution, a 50-percent reduction of the strategic nuclear weapons of the USSR and United States. But since the United States is not prepared for such a solution, we are prepared for another solution of limited effect, but pointing in the same direction. Mikhail Gorbachev spoke about this interim solution at the recent Central Committee session.

To this we received a half-answer from President Reagan. This reply is being studied. We are of the view that regarding U.S. confirmation of the validity of SALT II, a willingness has finally been expressed to find a solution. Time will show how matters unfold. It is up to the U.S. side to make the next move.

Briefs Pact Ministers

LD271547 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Deputy foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact countries have had a meeting in Berlin, the capital of the German Democratic Republic. They were briefed on the results of the latest round, just over, of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. The meeting heard the chief Soviet delegate, Viktor Karpov. At the talks on nuclear and space weapons, the United States hasn't yet made any positive proposals directed at stopping the arms race. This is said in a statement of the Soviet delegation to the talks. The document says that during the fifth round that ended on Thursday, the United States delegation continued to block progress at the talks. On the other hand, the Soviet Union made proposals that could serve as a good foundation for stopping the arms race in all directions in the nearest future. It called for keeping within the limits set by the anti-ballistic missile treaty for at least 15 years. It also proposed equal cuts in the strategic offensive armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Sees No Progress

AU260912 Paris AFP in English 0910 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, June 26 (AFP) -- The final session of the 5th round of U.S.-Soviet arms control negotiations began here Thursday, with no sign of progress. The round opened on May 8. Asked about possible progress, Soviet chief delegate Victor Karpov replied, "I haven't noticed any." The U.S. side is led by Max Kampelman in the talks at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS ON GROUP MEETING 17-26 JUNE

Space Arms Group 17 June

LD171143 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 17 Jun (TASS)--The group on space arms has met for a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Arms Group 18 June

LD181303 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 18 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 18 Jun (TASS)--A meeting of the group of strategic arms was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Medium-Range Group 19 June

LD191133 Moscow TASS in English 1123 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 19 Jun (TASS)--The medium-range nuclear armaments group had a meeting here today within the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

Space Arms Group 23 June

LD231118 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 23 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 23 Jun (TASS)--The space weapons group at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons had a meeting here today.

Strategic Arms Group 24 June

LD241122 Moscow TASS in English 1113 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 24 Jun (TASS)--A meeting of the group on strategic arms was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

JPRS-TAC-86-058
21 July 1986

Medium-Range Group 25 June

LD251103 Moscow TASS in English 1047 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 25 Jun (TASS)--A meeting of the group on medium-range nuclear arms was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

5th Round Ends

LD261053 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 26 Jun (TASS)--The fifth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments ended here today with the delegations' plenary session.

It has been agreed that the talks will be continued from 18 September, 1986.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GORBACHEV IN POLAND CRITICIZES U.S. RESPONSE TO LATEST PROPOSAL

Comments on Summit Outlook

LD302000 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1730 GMT 30 Jun 86

[Interview with CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev "during one of the recesses in the proceedings" of the PZPR Congress by an unidentified reporter; Gorbachev and reporter speak in Russian with superimposed Polish translation --recorded]

[Excerpts] [Reporter] What about the Soviet-U.S. meeting? We get many reports from our viewers and they are all very interested in this question.

[Gorbachev] That is an important question too. We are all living in an unsafe world and that worries everyone. From the speeches by delegates at your congress, I can also see that it worries the Polish people, not just party members but all people. Unfortunately, there are grounds for that state. There are many weapons in the world. If, however, the arms race moves to a new sphere -- into space -- if new types of weapons are created with new features, then it will be very difficult to sit down at a negotiating table. Even today it is already difficult. That is why even the smallest opportunity for halting the arms race, (for peace), must be taken. That is what our conception of eliminating nuclear weapons by the year 2000 is built on. It is an idea which we thought up and elaborated together. We presented it in January this year. Precisely because the Soviet Union has a special role in this field, we cannot, on the other hand, negate the role of the United States. That is why not just dialogue is necessary but productive dialogue is necessary. Productive talks are necessary. Realistic accords are necessary so that some two or three specific steps can be taken and the process started. We think that that is precisely what the new meeting should bring about. If it does not do so, it will be of no use to anyone.

[Reporter] If I understand the language of diplomacy, there is no pessimism in this statement?

[Gorbachev] No. I think that that which we see, which is happening in the U.S. society itself, and even in the Congress, shows that there, too, such worries exist. If there are such worries, we hope that reason will finally prevail.

Concluding his speech, Comrade Jaruzelski said what optimism was based on, the PZPR's optimism. I would like to add that our optimism, too, as far as matters of peace are concerned and its prospects, is not just wishful thinking. We are building on a strong foundation, on our strength, on our will for peace, on our constructive policies and on the fact that all people possess reason -- the U.S. people and all other people. For us this is a basis for hope. We have that hope.

[Reporter] I do not want to detain you any longer. Thank you very much.

[Gorbachev] I would like to wish all Poles, all our brothers in Poland many successes.

[Reporter] Thank you very much.

[Gorbachev] And that Poland may flourish.

Gorbachev Speech To Congress

LD301105 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 30 Jun 86

[Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the 10th PZPR Congress at the Congress Hall of the Palace of Culture and Science in Warsaw--live]

[Excerpts] [Soviet announcer] The delegates of the congress will now be addressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, head of the CPSU delegation and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Voice in Polish in Congress Hall] Comrades, we are resuming the deliberations. Please take your seats. I kindly request Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee...

[Soviet announcer interrupts] The platform is given to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. [applause as Gorbachev mounts rostrum]

[Gorbachev in Russian] Esteemed comrade chairman! Dear comrade delegates and guests of the congress. On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee I cordially greet the 10th PZPR Congress. [applause]

In addressing you, I would above all like to express the sincere respect and friendly feelings that Soviet Communists felt for their Polish like-minded partners and comrades-in-arms. [applause]

The close cooperation, the alliance of Poland and the Soviet Union, the two biggest European socialist states, is the essential condition for the successful development of our countries, and for stability and peace in Europe. It is for this reason that in the postwar years, including the period of sharp crisis when imperialist circles brought down torrents of lies on Poland, and hit it with economic sanctions, the Soviet people were alongside you, supported your country, and helped it as best it could.

It has also been confirmed in full measure that socialism today appears as an international reality, as an alliance of states closely linked by political, economic, cultural, and defense interests. To threaten the socialist order, try to undermine it from outside, and tear one country or another from the socialist community means encroachment not only on the will of the people but also on the entire postwar order and, in the final analysis, on peace.

Comrades! At the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states in Budapest 3 weeks ago, we jointly discussed the development of the international situation, and came to an agreement on how we should all behave in the future. As everyone knows, the UN declared 1986 Peace Year. The socialist states adopted a very serious approach to this. In January, we proposed a program for stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the century. In February, at the 27th CPSU Congress, the idea was announced of setting up a comprehensive international security system. This was followed by radical proposals facilitating the possibility of an agreement on the removal of medium-range missiles from Europe. The possibility was not neglected of the search for special accords with the West European nuclear powers, Britain and France. Measures were proposed for the removal of the chemical threat. In May, the Soviet Union, for the third time, extended its moratorium on nuclear tests, which will thus cover a whole year. And finally, in June, our countries proposed a comprehensive plan for the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons on the entire European Continent, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

What more ought to be needed, it would appear? But, alas, the cause of disarmament has not moved forward, not even by a single millimeter. It has not moved forward because of the open obstruction from the American Administration. Worse than this, Washington is frustrating the last brakes that have still been holding back the arms race, the SALT II treaty and other Soviet-American agreements. This position cuts across the vital interests of the world community, and accords in no way with the spirit of the accord that was reached last year in Geneva. American figures are liberal with their grand-sounding statements about their desire for peace and disarmament, but they act in an opposite way, and they try to justify their sabotage of this sacred cause by fabrications about imagined violations by us of this or that provision in the treaties concluded with the United States. They also talk about the last word having apparently not yet been said, about a change in their position being possible if the Soviet Union behaves well.

One could be humorous about such claims by the U.S. Administration to act as a school-teacher, allotting marks for behavior to sovereign states. But this is not a subject for jokes. After all, what is at risk is no more, no less than the survival of mankind, and we think that all politicians are obliged to approach the problem with supreme seriousness. This concerns, of course, not only Washington. It is impossible not to express regret at the fact that the governments of other NATO states, including those who, in words, distance themselves from the dangerous extremes of U.S. policy, in the final analysis yield to pressure from across the ocean and thus take upon themselves their portion of responsibility for the intensification of the arms race.

The ancient Greeks have a myth about the abduction of Europa. This fairy tale subject has unexpectedly acquired contemporary content. It goes without saying that, as a geographical concept, Europe will remain where it is. But one gets the impression that the independent policy of some West European states has been kidnapped and is being transported across the ocean, that under the pretext of protecting security, both the national interests and destinies of the 700-million-strong population of our continent, and the civilizations that have been developed here since time immemorial, are being sold off.

Let no one misunderstand us, we are not attempting to drive a wedge between the United States and its NATO allies. In holding talks, we proceed from the political and military realities that exist on the continent. At one time, the socialist countries welcomed the participation of the United States in the general European process. At that time it was a matter of the contribution of all its participants to the cause of security and cooperation in Europe.

Now, however, it seems that the U.S. Administration has conceived the idea of acting toward directly contrary goals; the whipping up of the arms race and confrontation.

Who benefits from this? Do the European peoples really have an interest in such a development of events? It goes without saying that the Soviet Union and other socialist states are drawing their own conclusions from the challenging militaristic actions of Washington. We will provide the firmest resistance to the adventurist and destructive actions of the United States. It must not be permitted that U.S. imperialism should determine the fate of the world according to its own caprice.

Our policy will continue to be a responsible policy, patiently laying the foundations to smooth out Soviet-U.S. relations. We are in favor of dialogue, but this should be a dialogue in which both sides want to reach real results. It must not be permitted that talks turn into a smokescreen concealing the arms race. We are no partners for Washington in such a deception of the world public.

Peace can only be preserved by joint efforts of all states and all peoples. It is necessary for everyone in the West to understand. Any launch of a missile carrying nuclear weapons is in fact an act not only of murder but also of suicide.

The Chernobyl accident has given a fresh reminder of the awesome power of the atom. Comrades, I would like to thank you for the solidarity displayed in connection with this disaster that befell us. We know that the edge of our disaster touched on you as well, and so your support is all the more dear for us. [applause]

When we speak of Chernobyl, we must bear in mind that only the tiniest part of the destructive force contained in the nuclear weapons which have been accumulated in the world, went out of control. We resolutely advocate their elimination. We sincerely hope that the alarmed voices, both of our own and of their public, will finally reach responsible political circles of the countries of Western Europe. But as long as there exists a real threat of imperialist aggression, the socialist states are forced to concern themselves with their own security. That is the aim served by the Warsaw Pact, in the context of which our troops, together with their brothers-in-arms, are doing their service for peace, including service on the territory of a number of allied states. The socialist countries will not allow anyone to look upon them as living space for alien appetites and for revanchist aspirations.

We say to the West: Take seriously our proposals about eliminating medium-range nuclear missile weapons; take seriously the proposals about reducing conventional armaments and the possibility will be opened up for a substantial reduction in tension on the continent. Our troops in other countries do not stand at a dead anchor: But if the anchor is to be raised this must be done simultaneously, and by everyone. The socialist states consider it their duty to facilitate good and mutually beneficial cooperation of the peoples of the continent, to build bridges of cooperation everywhere possible: in sports, cultural exchange, trade, scientific-technological cooperation, industrial joint production, and contacts among people. It is thus, and only thus, that we will be able to consolidate everything that unifies Europe, regardless of the differences in social structure that exist.

21 July 1986

Comrades! Human civilization has arrived at a fork in the road of history, not only in what concerns issues of war and peace.

We have entered an age in which the inseparable connection between the right to life and the right to development is being felt increasingly keenly.

Can one reconcile oneself to the fact that colossal financial resources are channeled into arms while hundreds of millions of people in the world are starving and millions die each year from hunger. It is chiefly the peoples of the developing countries that are poverty-stricken. But the problem of poverty has not bypassed developed imperialist states, including the United States, either. A state that allocates more than \$300 billion per annum for arms cannot -- or even worse does not wish to -- feed its hungry, teach its illiterates, or provide a roof for its homeless.

Long live socialist Poland. Long live peace and progress! [applause]

Gorbachev Speech at Factory

LD011203 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1030 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Speech by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at Karol Swierczewski high-precision measuring instruments factory in Warsaw on 1 July--recorded]

[Excerpts] Dear comrades! Thank you very much for your cordial greeting. In this friendly atmosphere, it is particularly pleasant for me to impart to you and all the people of Warsaw, the working class and laboring people of Poland, ardent greetings from the working people of our country, and the entire Soviet people. [applause]

It must be said openly -- in some respects touching on integration, the capitalist countries have succeeded in going further. We have never been shy of learning, but we shall not be content just to copy and simply take the whole thing over. Integration in the West frequently encroaches on the sovereignty and national independence of the weaker states, and its economic efficiency is largely achieved at the cost of intensifying the exploitation of the working man.

In speeding up the processes of integration, we are obliged to take our own, socialist, path, and see our own socialist aims. In Budapest, the leaders of the fraternal countries discussed the situation in multilateral cooperation, and agreed to keep this most important matter within the field of unremitting attention, confident that a common interest would allow decisions to be found which would give a new rhythm and pace to the whole of the process of socialist economic integration. Comrades, all of our plans, undertakings, and hopes will have value only on condition that peace is preserved.

Another thing is certain, too -- the quicker and better they are fulfilled, the stronger the revolutionary gains of our peoples, and the more reliable the barrier to the nuclear threat. Soviet Russia, from the very first day of its existence, came out in favor of a world without weapons and wars. But at that time many considered this revolutionary idea a utopia. Political thought was tightly constrained by the caveman laws of crude force and worship of military might. Neither the menacing signals of

history given by the destructive World War I, nor World War II, which caused uncountable sufferings to the peoples, served as a lesson to the ruling classes of the West. They have continued to gamble on the arms race--primarily nuclear arms.

The Socialist states, whose arguments in favor of disarmament were rejected by the West, were left with no choice but to try and achieve a strategic balance of forces. Today the shadow of nuclear threat has visibly loomed over the political horizons. It is important that everyone in the world should understand that more weapons now means not more, but less security. A global nuclear war can no longer be a continuation of sensible policies, for it endangers all life, and for that reason, all policies.

The old political thinking is pernicious to the fate of Europe. It prevents many governments in its western part from rejecting support for a course directed at confrontation. But can one close one's eyes to where this course is leading in our nuclear age? Who does not understand that on the European Continent the use of even conventional weapons, not to mention chemical weapons, will provoke consequences no less grave than a nuclear war? This is why we are proposing with such insistence the beginning of mutual disarmament. This idea has today ceased to be a utopia. The only thing that remains is for the governments of the Western countries, which call themselves Christian, to make the commandment "Thou Shalt Not Kill" the real theme of their policies.

We appeal to them to stop at the pernicious line beyond which the arms race may go completely out of control. Militarism is dangerous not only in itself, it also inflicts terrible damage on human morals, it multiplies malice and violence in the world. It is not the fire and the sword that will save mankind from perishing, but peace, cooperation and mutual respect for each other's interests.

The voice of the socialist states participating in the Warsaw Pact was again to be heard with all its weight recently. Following a set of measures concerning ending nuclear explosions and reduction and elimination of mass destruction weapons, we have proposed a specific plan for the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe.

President Reagan of the United States, speaking recently in Glassboro, recognized, although not without reservations, the seriousness of the fresh proposals we have put forward for the reduction of nuclear weapons. He stated that now there may come a turning point in efforts aimed at strengthening security and peace worldwide, and in this connection he again raised the issue of a Soviet-U.S. summit. We will only welcome it if Washington begins to have a more serious and responsible approach to problems of disarmament.

Mr Reagan rightly observed that more talks are now not enough. This is precisely what we have never ceased repeating almost all the time that has passed since Geneva, reaffirming our own desire for disarmament and for constructive steps. I recently sent the President a letter containing specific proposals on how to bring things out of a blind alley, and finally commence the elimination of the mountains of weapons. We hope that the U.S. Administration will join in with our initiatives, and will make

possible the holding of a meeting and the drafting of agreements which are awaited with hope by the peoples of Europe and the whole world. Peaceful coexistence of the states of the socialist and the capitalist world is possible; what is more, it is necessary. There simply does not exist any other sensible alternative. We shall unflaggingly seek ways to assert the norms and principles of it in the practice of international life.

Socialism was born for creation, for just relations between people. It is not for nothing that Marx has it that communism is equivalent to the kingdom of freedom. In socialist society there is no place for forces which need quarrels, confrontation, and war.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S PETROVSKIY DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN ROME

Press Conference

AU270835 Rome ANSA in English 0834 GMT 27 Jun 86

[Text] (ANSA) -- Rome, June 26 -- Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy told the Italian House Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday that the Soviet Union "is deeply convinced that it is possible to reach an agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe, independent of the outcome of nuclear arms limitation talks in Geneva."

Petrovskiy, in a press conference following his appearance, added that "an agreement to eliminate both American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe could be reached in the eventual summit between American President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev." The Soviet diplomat went on to say that the summit "must have content." According to Petrovskiy, the Americans want to have the summit in December, "but the meeting would have no sense if it does not resolve specific problems, such as the elimination of missiles or the ban on nuclear experiments". The Soviet deputy foreign minister observed that "dialogue for dialogue's sake serves no purpose".

Petrovskiy accused the Reagan administration of wanting only a dialogue of words, "not backed up by facts".

He went on to say that the American Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) was not all "defensive", but would allow the U.S. "greater protection for a first-strike nuclear attack". It is for this reason, the Soviet diplomat repeated, that the Soviet Union is opposed to SDI and in favor of "an international organization which would have the task of developing the peaceful use of space."

During the House Foreign Relations Committee meeting, held behind closed doors, Petrovskiy, according to Socialist Deputy Valdo Spini, said that the Soviet Union might accept the research stage of SDI, "but only if it is limited to the laboratory stage and not that of producing prototypes". During his press conference, the Soviet deputy foreign minister also touched on the problems in the Mediterranean and terrorism. In answer to a question on whether the Soviet Union would send more powerful missiles to Libya, Petrovskiy said that "no decision has been made and none would be made which would appear unfriendly to Italy."

Petrovskiy then repeated the Soviet proposal for an international conference to guarantee security and peace in the Mediterranean as well as examine the problem of terrorism.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister had been invited to appear before the House Foreign Relations Committee by its chairman, Giorgio La Malfa, as part of a series of meetings between house members and international political figures to examine East-West relations. The committee has already received U.S. Ambassador Paul Nitze, and has scheduled meetings with NATO's Secretary-General Lord Carrington and former West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

Petrovskiy praised the committee's initiative and underlined the "special" importance of dialogue in the present political situation, "in which the arms race risks making all of us prisoners of the chance of errors." The Soviet deputy foreign minister then said that the April 26 Soviet nuclear disaster at its Chernobyl plant "showed how necessary it is that we all work together for the safe development of nuclear energy and for true nuclear security". Petrovskiy then rejected all charges of an information gap by the Soviet Union and ended his press conference by calling for "cooperation between the press and diplomacy."

The Soviet ambassador to Rome, Nikolay Lunkov, was also present at the press conference and recalled that "Gorbachev has said that the USSR is ready to cooperate with Italy on international problems, on the Mediterranean and the Middle East". The Soviet ambassador then said that there had been no new developments regarding the eventual visit to Italy by Gorbachev. He limited himself to saying that the visit would take place, "but no date has yet been fixed".

TASS Report on Press Conference

LD271027 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT 27 Jun 86

[Text] Rome June 27 TASS -- A press conference of Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Vladimir Petrovskiy has been held here.

Vladimir Petrovskiy, who came to Rome at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Chamber of Deputies of Italy's Parliament, drew the journalists' attention to the programme of establishing a comprehensive system of international security which was put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress. He stressed that the way to a safe world was through the limitation of armaments and through disarmament. Representatives of the press were briefed on the Soviet Union's latest steps in different areas of the struggle for disarmament.

Much attention at the press conference was paid to new initiatives of the fraternal socialist countries, advanced at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty-member states in Budapest.

Realisation of these proposals would help reduce the strength of the opposing military groupings in Europe by one million not later than the early 1990's.

The European aspect of the Soviet foreign policy was noted and our country's allegiance to continuation of the process ushered in Helsinki was emphasized.

It was said that the European peoples should exert joint efforts so that in the present-day complicated international conditions the European Continent should be an example to others, that it should become an edifice of detente.

Briefs Italian Parliament

LD271237 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 27 Jun 86

[Text] Rome June 27 TASS -- The Foreign Affairs Commission of the Chamber of Deputies of the Italian Parliament has held a session at which Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, made a speech at the commission's invitation. He acquainted the Italian parliamentarians with the Soviet peace initiatives aimed at laying reliable foundations of a safe world, at limiting arms and achieving disarmament, and informed the deputies of the Soviet Union's approach to the problems of the current talks on disarmament. "In the current complex international situation," the Soviet representative said, "we attach special importance to a dialogue between various countries and to the efforts of one and all in the name of overcoming the existing tension and strengthening universal security. A continuation of the arms race is fraught with disastrous consequences for the whole of mankind. Attempts are being made to transfer the arms race to outer space. Hence the need to take urgent measures to prevent the orbiting of weapons and to reach agreements leading to the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction."

The deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR drew the parliamentarians' attention to the urgent nature of the problem of banning nuclear weapon testing and to the use of the U.S. negative policy in this matter. At a time when the USSR has been abiding by the moratorium on nuclear weapon testing from August 6, 1985, the United States has carried out 13 explosions. He singled out the political importance of the new Soviet proposals the aim of which is to expedite progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

Vladimir Petrovskiy spoke in detail of the programme for a reduction of the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, the programme which was put forward at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries in Budapest, and emphasized that the implementation of the programme would lead to a considerable cut in the number of troops and arms in the European Continent already in the nearest period.

The Soviet representative answered numerous questions asked by members of the Italian Parliament who showed a lively interest in the USSR's stand on key security issues. On the same day Vladimir Petrovskiy had a meeting with Nilde Iotti, president of the Chamber of Deputies.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: FURTHER CRITICISM OF REAGAN SALT II DECISION

'Lack of Political Vision'

LD251121 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 21 Jun 86

["Moscow Viewpoint" program prepared by Valentin Zorin, political observer of Soviet radio and television]

[Excerpts] The Reagan administration's decision to abandon SALT II continues to be the subject of extensive comment in the United States. If the administration goes ahead with this decision, the entire structure of strategic arms control will go. Having annulled the results achieved by four previous administrations in one fell swoop, the Reagan administration has, in the opinion of many political analysts, made one of the gravest errors in America's recent history. In an attempt to shed responsibility for that reckless move, Washington is trying to persuade public opinion at home and abroad that it [the U.S. decision not to observe SALT II] was a response to what is described as Soviet violations of SALT II.

Secretary of State Shultz made claims to that effect addressing the New York Foreign Policy Association. But is that really so? According to Eugene Carroll, deputy director of the Washington Center for Defense Information, the Soviet Union has been dismantling nuclear submarines, aircraft and missiles on a regular basis in order to remain within the numerical limits of SALT II.

But the number of dismantled launchers is now very important. You may recall that Ronald Reagan rejected SALT II as he was running for president, and therefore his administration's attempts to shift the responsibility for annulling SALT II to the Soviet Union are not likely to convince anyone. At a recent briefing, a spokesman for the State Department made it clear that Washington's aim in killing SALT II is to pressure the Soviet Union into making concessions at the arms talks. The lack of political vision on the part of those who believe that any form of pressure in relations between the great powers can be effective is truly amazing.

Some critics of the Reagan administration's decision are claiming that it plays into the Soviet Union's hands because it will be able to considerably expand its nuclear missile potential. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Soviet Union is not seeking any advantage arising from a continued arms race, but on the other hand this country will never allow the present strategic parity to be broken. Earlier this week, the Soviet Union once again demonstrated the peaceful nature of its policy. Addressing a full-scale meeting of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev announced that the Soviet delegation tabled new proposals at the Geneva talks aimed at clearing the way for nuclear weapon reductions.

The events of recent days enable world public opinion to compare two courses of foreign policy under which one side is destroying what has been achieved in the past, and the other is advancing constructive initiatives to strengthen the security of nations today and in the years to come. This no doubt is food for thought for millions of Americans.

Financial Burden on U.S.

PM260857 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Reason Must Prevail!"]

[Text] Washington, 24 Jun -- The Reagan administration's decision to refuse to observe SALT II will lead to a sharp escalation in the arms race and an increase of at least \$128 billion in the U.S. military budget in the next 10 years. This is stated in a report prepared by the Washington center for budget and political priorities.

The document points out that the rejection of the limitations stipulated by the treaty will make it possible for the Pentagon to considerably expand its current programs for building up its strategic arms; deploy by 1996 a total of 320 MX ICBM's, 336 B-1B strategic bombers, and 4 Ohio-class nuclear submarines; buy 144 missiles more than the planned level for Trident-2 (D-5) submarines; and halt the dismantling of Poseidon nuclear submarines. U.S. military expenditures may become still higher, the report notes, if the administration activates the implementation of its programs to produce Midgetman ICBM's, the latest Stealth strategic bomber, and work on the "star wars" program.

In the opinion of one of the authors of the report, the center's Executive Director Gordon Adams, with the country's unprecedented budget deficit such expenditures will place a heavy burden on American taxpayers. The refusal to observe the limits imposed by SALT II, he stressed, will also have an extremely negative influence on USSR-U.S. relations.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1451

21 July 1986

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: ASEAN FOREIGN MINISTERS CALL FOR SALT OBSERVANCE

LD251645 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS -- TASS News Analyst Vasilii Kharkov writes:

Foreign ministers of the six members of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) condemned the nuclear arms race and made a call to the USA and the USSR to observe strictly the agreements reached. A joint communique was adopted at a meeting of the heads of the foreign policy departments of Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines and Brunei that ended in Manila on Tuesday. The communique expresses serious concern over the dangerous scope of the arms race that threatens mankind's future. Emphasizing the importance of the SALT-2 treaty for the cause of strategic arms limitation, ASEAN countries made a call to the USA and the Soviet Union to honour the obligations assumed under the treaty.

The declaration of developing South East Asian nations in support of the SALT-2 treaty, against Washington's undermining the entire process of arms limitation and reduction is a new evidence of the fact that peoples come to realize that an outbreak of nuclear conflict would be of mortal danger for the USSR and the USA and also for all other countries and peoples.

The decision of the White House to refuse to observe the obligations under the SALT-2 treaty has been sharply criticized and condemned even by the closest allies of the USA. But in other countries, too, it is realized ever more clearly to what fatal consequences the irresponsible action by Washington might lead. Peoples demand security for all -- for the West and the East, the North and the South, for countries large and small.

Washington's violation of arrangements in the sphere of strategic arms limitation has the aim of opening the gate for the uncontrolled strategic arms race which, undoubtedly, would aggravate international tension still more. In these conditions all other countries, including ASEAN countries, would have to increase the military expenditures that are huge as it is, to squander on military requirements material and financial resources that are so needed for development purposes.

Washington's intention to outstep the limits of the SALT-2 treaty, to disregard the restrictions on the nuclear missile weapons race complicates considerably the situation at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. ASEAN countries that welcomed the opening of these talks emphasize that they link great hopes with them.

The positive outcome of the talks will be of great importance for the security of the entire world community, including small non-nuclear countries, says the joint communique of foreign ministers.

ASEAN countries, just as many other countries are aware that Washington's decision to refuse to observe the SALT-2 treaty represents a very dangerous step toward destruction of the entire existing regime of arms limitation and toward undermining the possibilities of concluding in future new, more comprehensive agreements. The constructive stand of ASEAN countries on this burning question of the present merges with the efforts of entire humanity aimed at averting nuclear catastrophe.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1451

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS REPORTS SPEECHES AT CDE ASSAILING U.S.

CSSR's Chnoupek

PM230945 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Appeal to NATO Countries"]

[Text] Geneva, 18 Jun -- CSSR Foreign Minister B. Chnoupek has pointed to the extreme importance of the radical program for reducing armed forces and armaments in Europe put forward by the Warsaw Pact states.

Addressing a plenary session of the Conference on Disarmament, he urged NATO countries to refrain from conjecturing about propaganda motives behind the program and seeking out weaknesses in it, as had, unfortunately, become the practice, but rather to respond to it constructively.

The CSSR foreign minister condemned the Western states' acceleration of the arms race, particularly the continuation of nuclear tests, the implementation of U.S. "star wars" plans, the modernization of NATO's chemical arsenals, and the further deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. Washington's attempts to nullify strategic arms limitation agreements were sharply criticized.

B. Chnoupek urged the conference to begin specific talks on banning nuclear weapons tests. He advocated the creation of a sound material, political, and organizational foundation for "peace in space" in keeping with the phased program of joint practical actions for the peaceful conquest of outer space proposed by the USSR.

The minister supported the Soviet proposal on concluding an international agreement ensuring the immunity of satellites, prohibiting the creation [sozdaniye], testing, or deployment of new antisatellite systems, and eliminating existing ones.

The CSSR foreign minister noted the Geneva disarmament conference's increased importance at a time when the question of whether the policy of reason will triumph over the policy of force is being posed so acutely.

USSR's Petrovskiy

LD241934 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 24 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo

Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, addressed the plenary session of the disarmament conference here today. He said that ensuring security through disarmament in the inter-related world called for concerted effort and contribution by each and every one, called for setting into motion the entire disarmament mechanism.

That was especially important today, when the world was experiencing the justified sense of anxiety due to the fact that the U.S. and NATO war machine was not only unwilling to slow its pace but, on the contrary, was speeding it up -- in all directions of the arms buildup.

The "star wars" program was being carried out at a high pace, and the development and creation of new systems of strategic offensive weapons were being boosted.

Simultaneously, the U.S. and its closest allies were moving toward stalling, rather than accelerating progress, as agreed upon at the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva, in the political and diplomatic sphere.

The Soviet representative said that "we attach top priority to the task of ending nuclear tests and believe it is legitimate that this issue is placed first on the agenda of the conference.

The Soviet Union is prepared for any talks -- bilateral Soviet-American, trilateral -- between the USSR, the U.S. and Britain, or multilateral. We again call on the disarmament conference to start work immediately, upon multilateral talks and draft a treaty."

Petrovskiy drew attention of the conference to the political essence of the state of affairs at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments and stressed the importance of the latest Soviet proposals directed at accelerating them.

It was proposed to reach an agreement on staying within the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years and agree, in order to strengthen the agreement, on where lies the border between the allowed and banned developments.

The Soviet side also proposed an agreement on equal limits on the ICBM's, SLBM's heavy bombers and submarines armed with long-range cruise missiles, fixing the number of nuclear warheads for each side at 8,000.

The Soviet side tabled a draft agreement on another separate item of the talks -- the elimination of American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe.

The proposals, formulated at the Budapest meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, on reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, became an important follow-up to the Soviet programs for a total elimination of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the 21st century, said the Soviet deputy foreign minister.

The speaker gave special attention to the tasks facing the disarmament conference in preventing an arms race in other space, ending the nuclear arms race and preventing nuclear war. Shaping a safe world would be impossible without chemical disarmament, stressed the Soviet representative. The Soviet Union was setting a good example in this field, too.

The new approaches to the problem of banning chemical weapons, tabled by the Soviet Union, would allow the disarmament conference to reach the level of principled accords and advance towards working out a multilateral convention so as to outlaw chemical weapons in this century.

Averting the threat of war and establishing a stable and secure world, that would be based on respect for one another's interests and observance of agreements and international law, rather than on force, should become the top-priority objective in the policy of all states, the Soviet representative concluded.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: REPORTAGE ON JUNE CDE PROCEEDINGS

Rakhmaninov Preview

LD051210 Prague CTK in English 1113 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jun (CTK)--The United States should abandon its present inflexible stand and show more will to reach agreement at the Stockholm disarmament conference, a Soviet delegate to the conference, whose 11th round is to be opened next Tuesday, told CTK today.

The delegate, Yuriy Rakhmaninov, said the past rounds of talks had shown many of the conference's participants including some member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) were willing to make efforts to reach an agreement. But success has so far been limited to marginal problems, Rakhmaninov said.

"The U.S. has to renounce its maximalistic demands and respect the principles of equality, balance and respect to other countries' interests so that the conference may end successfully," he stressed.

He added the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had always been striving for tangible results at the talks. "During the debates on all issues, the socialist states have always presented constructive proposals," Rakhmaninov said, but added all sides must show good will to reach agreements.

"Objective possibilities to reach positive results still exist though the political struggle might be sharp during the final phase of the conference," Rakhmaninov said.

'Obstructionist' Stand

LD092255 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2205 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 10 Jun (TASS)--The United States intends, as before, to take an obstructionist position and block the achievement of positive results at the conference on measures for the strengthening of trust, security and disarmament in Europe. As is shown by the statement of a personal representative of the President circulated by the White House in connection with the beginning of a regular session of this conference in Stockholm, there has

been on change in the position of the U.S. Administration. The White House is again proclaiming extremely one-sided proposals that the United States, together with its NATO allies, is trying to foist on the conference participants.

U.S. Touts 'Lopsided' Proposals

LD100611 Moscow TASS in English 0546 GMT 10 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 10 Jun (TASS)--The United States intends to keep to its obstructionist stand and block the efforts to achieve positive results at the conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe.

It follows from a statement by the President's personal envoy, circulated by the White House in view of the opening of a regular session of this conference in Stockholm, that no changes have occurred in the stand of the U.S. Administration. The White House touts once again extremely lop-sided proposals which the United States tries, jointly with its NATO allies, to impose on the participants in the conference.

News Conference on Pact Initiative

LD131753 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Text] In the Swedish capital a press conference was held by the Soviet delegation to the Stockholm conference on measures to strengthen trust, security and disarmament in Europe, dedicated to the decisions of the Budapest conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states.

Ambassador Grinevskiy, head of the USSR delegation, pointed out, in the light of the decisions at the Budapest conference, the important role which falls to the Stockholm conference in facilitating the strengthening of trust and security in Europe and the creation of more favorable conditions for making progress in resolving questions of disarmament on a European scale. Numerous representatives from the foreign press, radio and television showed great interest in the various aspects of the program put forward at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee.

Hungarian Delegate on Pact Proposals

LD161646 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 16 Jun 86

[Text] Stockholm, 16 Jun (TASS)--Karoly Szigeti, the leader of the Hungarian delegation, made a speech today at the Stockholm conference on security- and confidence-building measures and on disarmament in Europe. He drew the attention of the participants in the conference to the important estimates of the European and international situation contained in the documents of the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries.

The program put forward by socialist countries for a large-scale reduction in the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, the Hungarian representative said, gives an opportunity to make a real step to getting out of the military confrontation impasse in the continent.

News Conference

LD171832 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Commentary by N. Kepko; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The work of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe has entered the final stage. The entire attention of its participants is currently focused on working out the formula of the final document. The beginning of the session's work coincided with an event of particular importance -- the conference of Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states. They addressed a program to the NATO member-states and to all European countries that provides for reduction of the Armed Forces and conventional arms in Europe.

At a press conference held here, Comrade Grinevskiy, the head of the Soviet delegation, emphasized that the Stockholm conference was, likewise, expected to play a part in the process of turning Europe into a continent of stable peace. As has been stated in Budapest, a successful completion of the Stockholm conference would make a contribution to strengthening security and trust in Europe and would create more favorable conditions to move into the examination of the disarmament question on an all-European scale.

[Begin Grinevskiy recording] We are not among those who paint the Stockholm forum's prospects in gloomy colors and who already predict that it will fail, referring to the time factor. After all, time can also act as a catalyst for those who know how to value it.

Acting in this spirit, a constructive spirit I would say, I would add, we put forward new proposals for the forthcoming session too. We expect steps to be taken in response and the ball is now in our NATO partners' court. [end recording]

Gen Tatarnikov Speaks

LD201431 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Stockholm June 20 TASS -- Today's sitting of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe was addressed by the member of the Soviet delegation Major General Viktor Tatarnikov.

He said that the Warsaw Treaty Member countries, wishing the first stage of the conference to bring concrete results, had put forward new concrete proposals on one of the key questions -- the notification on the exercises of the air force and ground forces, on the movements and transfer of troops in Europe.

However, the United States and some other NATO countries continue to evade under all kinds of invented pretexts the quest for mutually acceptable solutions dealing, specifically, with the activities of the air force. The Soviet representative stressed that this non-constructive stand hampered the progress of the work at the Stockholm conference.

Europarlament, USSR Envoys Confer

LD242021 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Stockholm June 24 TASS - Representatives of the European Parliament headed by member of its Political Committee F. Boesmans, during a conversation with member of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-and-Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, Ambassador Vladimir Yerofeyev, positively assessed the programme of the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, advanced at the Budapest Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states. The importance of achieving results at the Stockholm conference was emphasized during the conversation.

Grinevskiy Reports to Politburo

LD251802 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Excerpts] In the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee: At its meeting on 26 June, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee considered the question of improving the party political education of leading cadres in light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

Comrade Gorbachev reported on the meeting with P. Shiv Shankar, India's minister of foreign affairs and trade. The Politburo expressed profound satisfaction with the dynamically developing, traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India and stressed that Soviet-Indian interaction is becoming an increasingly major constructive factor in international relations. A high appraisal was made of the role of the Nonaligned Movement in world affairs, as well as of the efforts of the Delhi Six in the struggle against the nuclear threat and for disarmament.

The Politburo heard information from Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation at the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe. Instructions were given to the delegation to actively seek a positive outcome on a reciprocal basis to this important international forum.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo also examined certain other matters of economic and cultural construction and of the implementation of foreign policy activity directed toward strengthening peace and the security of peoples.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE APPROVES WARSAW PACT APPEAL

Text of Resolution

LD170859 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Resolution of the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty members held in Budapest 10-11 June 1986]

[Text] Having studied the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states (Budapest, 10-11 June 1986), the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee fully approves of the activity of the Soviet delegation headed by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev and the documents adopted by the meeting.

The plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee stresses the big importance of the collective analysis of the international situation that is taking shape and the main causes of the present tension rooted in the dangerous foreign policy course and imperial ambitions of the U.S. administration, which refuses to take into account the will of the peoples and act in the spirit of the Geneva accords.

In these complex conditions, the fraternal countries will not be drawn onto the path of deepening confrontation and consider it their duty persistently to continue the search for possibilities of reducing armaments, improving the international situation, and of constructive cooperation among countries.

This principled course is determined by the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the ruling parties in other socialist countries outlining the ways and real means of creating a safe world.

The plenary meeting notes with satisfaction the resolve of the allied countries to invigorate the joint course directed at ending the arms race and radically restructuring the entire system of inter-state relations on the basis of all-embracing security equal for all. The countries of the Warsaw Treaty are unanimous in their conviction of the need for still greater dynamism and a bold approach to the solution of both old and new problems connected with the struggle against the danger of war, for asserting peaceful coexistence in inter-state relations.

The raising of the level, quality and scope of the interaction of the fraternal states is today a source of the further acceleration of the development of each of them, an imperative precondition in the struggle for the international interests of world socialism.

The foreign policy line of the 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of other fraternal parties of strengthening peace, liquidating weapons of mass annihilation and creating an all-embracing system of international security was fully supported during the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries.

The further coordination of the positions and practical actions of the Warsaw Treaty countries on the main problems of current politics -- the ending of nuclear tests, the full elimination on a mutual basis of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone, the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, the liquidation of chemical weapons and the strengthening of the international regime of the safe development of nuclear power generation was a substantial result of the meeting.

The joint initiative concerning the large-scale reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- is of special importance. The address adopted at the meeting on this matter weightily supplements and shores up the program of fully liquidating nuclear and other types of weapons of mass annihilation.

The meeting confirmed the importance of further strengthening the defensive military-political alliance of socialist states, the development of their cooperation in all fields, the significance of the still more vigorous interaction of the fraternal countries in international affairs, in formulating and implementing the agreed-upon foreign policy course directed at ensuring security, eliminating the danger of nuclear war and consolidating universal peace.

The plenary meeting instructs the appropriate Soviet agencies and organizations to work out and adopt measures to implement the decisions of the Budapest meeting, to extensively disseminate these documents inside the country and abroad, to ensure a coordination of actions with the fraternal parties and carry out other measures of an international, diplomatic nature.

The plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee expresses confidence that the friendship and cohesion of the fraternal countries of socialism, the further development of their interaction with all peaceloving states and broad public forces will bring about a further intensification of socialism's peace offensive, the development of international cooperation with the aim of attaining mutually acceptable accords in the field of arms limitation, in the name of all mankind's development and progress."

PRAVDA Editorial

PM231421 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Key Questions of the 5-Year Plan"]

[Excerpts] A routine plenum of the CPSU Central Committee took place 16 June 1986.

The plenum discussed the following questions:

The State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-90 and the party organizations' tasks in connection with its implementation;

The results of the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee [PCC] held in Budapest 10-11 June 1986.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report on these questions at the plenum.

The plenum participants unanimously adopted the CPSU Central Committee Appeal to the working people of the Soviet Union on launching a nationwide socialist competition for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of plans for the 12th 5-Year Plan. "Let us work," the appeal says, "in such a way to ensure that Soviet people live more richly, both materially and spiritually, that the country's economy grows steadily stronger, and that its defensive shield is firm. Our every success along the path mapped out by the 27th party congress is a new step toward consolidating socialism's positions and the cause of peace on earth."

Summing up the results of the Budapest Warsaw Pact PCC conference, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted that the 27th CPSU Congress proposed sensible ways of resolving the problems facing mankind.

The most important of them is the problem of war and peace. The path to resolving this problem in favor of peace lies through broad international cooperation advantageous to everyone; disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons. That is our course in the international arena.

The Soviet Union has taken steps to ensure that the positive line starting from Geneva does not disappear. This refers to the concrete plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the century, the moratorium on nuclear explosions, and the proposal to destroy chemical weapons. These initiatives have worked and will work to improve the international climate.

The ruling circles of imperialism, and above all the U.S. Administration, saw the Soviet initiatives as a mighty obstacle in the path of the implementation of their own imperial intentions of achieving world domination and social revanche. They pin their hopes on the possibility, albeit illusory, of hampering the implementation of our plans, retarding the socialist countries' development, turning us aside from the 27th congress' course, and keeping us fettered by the arms race.

To thwart these dangerous intentions must be the main aim of the Soviet Union's foreign policy. It will continue to persistently implement its initiatives, which meet the cherished hopes of our people and all the planet's peoples. But we will never allow U.S. nuclear missile superiority. Here our Leninist foreign policy course and our defense might are based on the reliable foundation of the strategy of accelerating socioeconomic development.

In the course of the PCC conference in Budapest, there was full support for the foreign policy line of the 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the other fraternal parties of consolidating peace, eliminating weapons of mass destruction, and creating an all-embracing system of international security.

Particular significance is attached to the joint initiative on a large-scale reduction in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The unity and creative cooperation of the socialist community countries were once again manifested in Budapest. This cooperation enriches socialism's international policy, and gives still greater weight to its actions in the world arena.

The plenum adopted a resolution which fully approved the activity of the Soviet delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the documents adopted by the conference.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: WESTERN REACTION TO WARSAW PACT PROPOSALS VIEWED

NATO To Consider Proposals

LD122338 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] The official representative of the NATO general secretary, having refrained from comment, stated that the Warsaw Pact proposals will be studied in the proper manner. The U.S. State Department representative noted that the address of the Warsaw Pact participant states is a development of the provisions contained in the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 18 April on reducing armed forces in Europe. He also said that a special high-level NATO group on the control of conventional weapons will consider the proposals contained in the aforementioned speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and in the address.

Austrian Foreign Minister

LD131327 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Text] Vienna, 13 Jun (TASS)--Leopold Gratz, foreign minister of Austria, has declared in support of the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member-states contained in the address to the NATO member-states, all European nations and a cut in the forces and conventional arms in Europe. Speaking in Vienna, he expressed conviction that the attainment of these aims should become a solid component part of the whole disarmament process. Gratz also stressed that neutral states, in particular Austria, have a stake in a settlement of issues in connection with a cut in conventional weapons.

European Response Urged

LD131703 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 13 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Excerpts] Hello, Comrades! It has been stated at NATO headquarters that the results of the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states should be carefully studied. Well, then, let them study it, let them ponder most carefully every proposal and every word and phrase in the documents of the conference of the supreme leaders of the socialist countries. Only, let's hope that this study does not become drowned in a sea of logomachy, as has happened more than once, unfortunately.

The Warsaw Pact countries proceed from the fact that it is still not too late to put international relations back on the path to peace. Mankind can and must block off the road to nuclear catastrophe.

I will not set out all the details of the new proposals of the socialist community countries, which the British GUARDIAN newspaper calls far-reaching. They are summarized in the address of the Budapest conference and in newspaper articles. I would merely like to emphasize that these proposals are dictated by good political will and a sincere desire to improve the situation in Europe, and to help to consolidate military-strategic stability on the continent.

In putting forward their proposals the Warsaw Pact states are at the same time prepared to examine in a constructive spirit other ideas and proposals which might be forwarded by the NATO countries and other European states. And we will hope that the capitals of the Western countries will cease to blindly follow Washington's obstructionist course, which is detrimental to their own sovereignty and to the peace and prosperity of their own peoples.

Vienna, Bonn, N.Y. Reports

PM161415 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Suvorov report on telephone interviews with IZVESTIYA's own correspondents Nikolay Novikov in Vienna, Yevgeniy Bovkun in Bonn, and Viktor Soldatov in New York -- no date given: "Days of Revived Hope. Vienna, Bonn, and New York on the Line" -- first paragraph is an IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The world, and the European Continent in particular, is now living with revived hope. Hope that right now it is possible to immediately take a real step toward a release from the deadlock of military confrontation. The texts of the documents of the conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee, containing new and major peace initiatives, are now on the desks of heads of state and government of Western countries. What will be their answer? Will they attempt, as in the past, to close their eyes, or to brush the documents aside on the basis of far-fetched arguments? Will they heed the voice of reason and the aspirations of people in their own countries? What are ordinary people in the West saying, what does the press write? The IZVESTIYA Editorial Office asked these questions of its own correspondents in Vienna, Bonn, and New York.

[Editorial Office] Vienna, you are the first to speak. Austria, with its status of neutrality, lies in the very heart of Europe. How did people in Austria react to the socialist countries' new initiatives?

[Vienna] The Austrians are very perturbed by the fact that this densely populated continent has become literally the most explosive spot on the globe, because it overflows not only with nuclear weapons but also with the latest conventional arms, whose combat specifications rival those of means of mass destruction.

Answering an IZVESTIYA question at a press conference in Vienna, Austria's newly elected President K. Waldheim said that he studied with great interest the proposals contained in the documents of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee and that, on the basis of these initiatives, it is possible to create prerequisites for the achievement of agreement on disarmament problems. It is very important, K. Waldheim stressed, to overcome the deadlock in East-West talks on this question.

[Editorial Office] What has been the reaction of the mass news media?

[Bonn] Virtually all mass news media in the FRG reported the conclusion of the Budapest conference and outlined the essence of the documents adopted there. But the tone of commentaries at times varies greatly. There is no doubt that the majority of newspapers carried sufficiently objective evaluations, noting not only the proposals on the question of conventional arms reduction put forward in Budapest, but also the fact that Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee proposed to expand international cooperation in the sphere of ensuring security through the participation of neutral and nonaligned states.

At the same time, some bourgeois-conservative publications, adhering to deep-rooted traditions, greet with mistrust all initiatives by socialist countries and, maybe anticipating the reaction by official Bonn, attempted to simply brush off the Warsaw Pact states' proposals. The FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, for example, saw "nothing new" in them, while DIE WELT's observer (R. Moniak) even deemed it possible to entitle his commentary "A Step Backwards in Budapest," referring to the "unrealistic nature" of the proposed measures in the sphere of military detente.

[Editorial Office] It is easy to understand people like (Moniak): They write not for those who read but for those who "call the tune." Nonetheless, DIE WELT's observer was aiming at discrediting the main feature of the socialist countries' new proposals -- the feasibility of military detente in Europe.

[New York] A very similar situation has developed in the United States. Anonymous experts, whose opinions are quoted by the mass news media, say that the Warsaw Pact countries' proposals "do not take into account" the Western viewpoint and that they "evade" the problem of the verification [proverka] of the implementation of the proposed agreements. Another fact is also noteworthy: the attempt to deliberately play down the significance of the Warsaw Pact states' address. THE NEW YORK TIMES, for example, reported the address on page 13.

[Editorial Office] Are there any objective evaluations?

[Bonn] Definitely. The WESTPHÄLISCHE RUNDSCHAU, for example, writes that the Warsaw Pact has offered the West "far-reaching measures in the sphere of the reduction of armed forces and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe" and notes that people in NATO are showing "real interest" in the disarmament program put forward in Budapest. The newspaper's observer stresses that the measures of effective verification [kontrol] with the help of on-site inspections are of particular interest. "This," he declares, "is the key to overcoming the stalemate at the Vienna talks."

[Editorial Office] The question of verification [kontrol] and inspections has been for a long time the West's favorite nobbyhorse at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Whenever they were stuck for convincing arguments, they came out with deliberations that the Soviet Union did not -- or so they claimed -- accept the "effective" forms of verification [kontrol] proposed by the West.

The socialist countries have trumped this card held by the opponents of military detente. Will this have an effect on progress at the Vienna talks?

[Vienna] I asked this question of V.V. Mikhaylov, head of the Soviet delegation at the talks. He believes that the new major initiative by the socialist countries must lead the Vienna talks out of the prolonged stalemate. The Warsaw Pact countries, having declared their readiness to utilize all available channels and forums for the sake of reducing their level of military confrontation, have thus reaffirmed their interest in achieving positive results at the talks. But this requires, the Soviet delegation head noted, that the Western participants should finally take a stance of businesslike and constructive cooperation, which has been lacking so far.

[Editorial Office] Is there any difference in the way the Warsaw Pact countries' proposals have been greeted by public and government circles in the country?

[Bonn] The Budapest documents encountered unanimous support among the democratic public circles. The West German antiwar movement, I was told by Gert Samuel, member of the Committee for Peace, Cooperation, and Disarmament, is well aware that the implementation of the measures proposed by the socialist countries would not only lead to a reduction in the level of military confrontation in Europe, but would also help to release funds which could be used for the solution of social problems.

[New York] U.S. peace supporters also make a high assessment of the program for armed forces and conventional arms reductions contained in the Warsaw Pact appeal to the NATO states and all European countries. "The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries have made a very important initiative," M. Myerson, executive director of the U.S. Peace Council, told me. "The Peace Council intends to extensively popularize the new Warsaw Pact proposals in order to ensure that as many Americans as possible know about them."

As for official Washington's reaction, President R. Reagan clearly only learned about the existence of the new proposals at a press conference when he was asked what his attitude to them was. The President started to talk... about the Soviet proposals submitted for discussion at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

Later, State Department spokesman B. Kalb tried to correct the blunder. He stated to AP correspondents that "the United States will seriously examine any specific arms reduction proposal which would promote the strengthening of security and increased stability in Europe." How many times have we heard such words!

[Bonn] The reaction of West German official circles is still restricted to promises to "seriously study" the socialist countries' new proposals. However, the attitude of the conservative ruling parties to them can be judged already. FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner, for instance, used the government forum to come out for the umpteenth time with clumsy and crude slander against Soviet foreign policy.

This shows that Bonn is not showing serious interest in real disarmament, preferring to follow the hard line pursued by the United States.

PRAVDA: 'Tremendous Response'

PM161455 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Baragin "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Time of Action

Two major international events last week attracted the special attention of the world press and public: M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Hungary and the subsequent conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee.

Commenting on the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's speech during his meeting with the workers and employees of Csepel Machine Tool Building Plant, the Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO wrote: "In his speech at the Csepel plant M.S. Gorbachev once again pointed out that the socialist countries consider it their chief task to ensure lasting peace and prevent the danger of nuclear war and the militarization of space."

The words of the Soviet Union and its allies are never at variance with their actions, the progressive press of many countries states. "The Warsaw Pact states," L'HUMANITE points out, "believe that decisive actions and specific measures aimed at ending the arms race, proceeding to real disarmament, and removing the threat of war are now more necessary than ever."

This is confirmed by the documents adopted by the Warsaw Pact states at the Political Consultative Committee conference which ended in Budapest 11 June: the appeal to NATO states and all European countries with a program for reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, and the conference communique. They reflect the peoples' innermost aspirations: for lasting peace and a world without wars or violence. The Warsaw Pact states declare most responsibly that never, under any circumstances, will they start military operations against any state -- whether in Europe or in any other part of the world -- unless they themselves become the object of aggression.

I will remind you that the Warsaw Pact Organization came into being in 1955 as a countermeasure to the NATO bloc knocked together by the United States and its West European allies in 1949 and to the increased aggressive actions of imperialist states. The inspirers and leaders of that bloc have turned it into an instrument for preparing for war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The territory of Britain, the FRG, and a number of other West European countries has been crammed with nuclear missile weapons on a scale that has nothing to do with the task of "defense." These weapons are offensive in nature and are targeted on the east -- against the Soviet Union and its allies.

It is perfectly natural and law-governed that the Warsaw Pact states are taking all the necessary measures to ensure their security and to ensure that Europe does not again become an arena of a world conflagration.

The socialist community countries -- and this was confirmed at the Political Consultative Committee conference in Budapest -- are persistently striving to advance the large-scale program to eliminate nuclear weapons by the beginning of the 21st century and to end nuclear tests. The conference participants supported the Soviet delegation's stand

at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms. They made a proposal to the NATO members and to all European countries to begin talks on a significant reduction in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe on the territory from the Atlantic to the Urals.

This new initiative has elicited a tremendous response both inside and outside Europe. The West has started speaking once again of the broad "peace offensive of the Soviet Union." Yes, our country and its allies are really pursuing an active, assertive policy in the struggle to preserve peace. This policy accords with the interests not only of the peoples of the socialist community but also of the whole planet. The Soviet Union and the socialist community are ready to hold talks on all issues, and there are no forbidden subjects for them. And this, as many realistic figures in Europe now believe, creates good conditions for a favorable response both to this Political Consultative Committee appeal and to the socialist countries' other arms reduction and disarmament proposals. "The USSR and its allies," the American ABC-TV network was forced to admit, "have helped to strengthen the conviction in Europe that it is the East, not the West, that is really interested in disarmament."

"The large-scale program advanced by the Warsaw Pact states," Britain's DAILY MAIL writes, "has stunned NATO observers." However, those of them who are accustomed to thinking in obsolete terms of East-West military confrontation are incapable of understanding the hope with which this program has been received by the public of West European countries, which is realizing increasingly clearly that the way to ensure genuine security is to carry out disarmament, not escalate the arms race.

Western countries, Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany -- the leading FRG opposition party -- declared, must make a very careful "study of the Warsaw Pact states' new far-reaching proposals" and "enter into serious talks with them on this question." He condemned the policy of Washington, which "gambles on a policy of force and jeopardizes its allies' interests."

The future will show how the NATO leaders will respond to our proposals. It is clear that they are now faced with the real possibility of following the Warsaw Pact states' appeal and starting talks on considerable mutual reductions of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

A session of the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space ended this week.

Its participants, as well as, on the whole, the world public, greeted with tremendous interest the comprehensive program for turning space into an area of "star peace" proposed by the Soviet Union to the world community. This program, as the letter from N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the UN secretary general points out, is based on the firm conviction that earthly civilization must enter the 21st century with just this and not with foolhardy plans for "star wars."

Strategy of Foolhardiness

Unfortunately, it has to be stated that the United States and certain NATO allies of Washington have still not displayed understanding of the entire profundity of the responsibility that lies with all states at the present extremely acute time in the international relations.

It should be said very definitely that it is plainly insufficient now to confide oneself to vague promises to "examine," in the indeterminate future, the proposals advanced at the Budapest conference, as the U.S. State Department has done. Particularly as these promises are accompanied by dubious claims that "real opportunities for making progress in the arms reduction sphere are contained in the Western countries' proposals submitted for consideration at the Vienna talks and at the Stockholm conference." But is anyone unaware that the stand taken by the Western countries remains a stumbling block in the way of really constructively solving the problems of reducing arms?

In Washington and certain other NATO Capitals certain circles are trying to discredit the socialist countries' proposals and lessen their attraction in the eyes of the European peoples. Todenhoefer, expert on disarmament issues for the Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union faction in the FRG Bundestag, went so far as to accuse the USSR and its allies of seeking to achieve "the treaty consolidation of their superiority in the sphere of ground and air forces in Europe." Indeed, as the ancient Greeks used to say, if a god decides to punish someone, he first of all deprives him of reason.

Reports reaching the editorial office nowadays show over and over again that the "hawks" have plainly gained the upper hand in the U.S. corridors of power. It is they who are now conducting a frontal attack on all agreements and accords limiting the arms race.

Thus, speaking at a White House press conference on 11 June, the U.S. President tried once again to justify the U.S. refusal announced by him to observe the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II). At the same time, he resorted to unworthily accusing the Soviet Union of "violating" individual provisions of that treaty. Being unable to cite any convincing confirmation of that-- not that there could be any, for the USSR has strictly abided by the treaty's provisions -- R. Reagan called the SALT II treaty neither more nor less than "legitimation of the arms race." "I was always opposed to that specific treaty," he was forced to admit under pressure from journalists.

A large group of Democratic Party congressmen and senators and also a number of Republican Party representatives have come out against Reagan's decision. "The President's foolish step," Senator Cranston pointed out, "jeopardizes the security of the United States itself. We intend to do everything possible to revise the administration's decision." Congressmen meeting on the Armed Services Committee supported a bill giving Congress the right to demand that the administration observe the restraints on strategic arms in accordance with the SALT II treaty.

But Washington, to all appearances, does not intend to take any notice of these sentiments.

The ideology of military superiority preached by the present U.S. Administration is pushing its most bellicose representatives into another risky step undermining the very foundations of stability of the present balance of forces in the international arena. I mean the intention to attack the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems, as U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger just declared.

Conscious of the danger of the strategy of foolhardiness being followed by Washington, more and more countries in Europe and throughout the world are advocating that "strategic equilibrium be established at the lowest possible level" and urging the United States to take a businesslike attitude to the Soviet Union's initiatives which accord with this aim.

Unfortunately, the Japanese newspaper ASAHI states, the U.S. Administration is not only displaying readiness for a constructive dialogue but is traveling the path of wrecking previously reached agreements.

The "nuclear lobby" in Washington does not hide the fact that supporters of an arms buildup intend to continue pushing the country along a dangerous path, ignoring the sober voices of those people in Congress who emphasize the advantage of SALT II for the United States itself. The U.S. Administration also displays striking disregard for the position of advocates of this treaty in Western Europe.

Is this not indicated by the cynicism with which on Friday the White House deputy press secretary declared literally the following: "The specific restraints envisaged by the SALT II treaty for the United States no longer exist."

But the more stubborn actions of the nuclear maniacs on the other side of the Atlantic, the more significant the opposition to their policy is becoming not only among the broad people's masses but also among political circles in Europe and throughout the world.

Resistance Movements Secretariat

LD161035 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 16 Jun 86

[Text] Vienna, 16 Jun (TASS)--If negotiations on a considerable reduction of troops and armaments in the whole territory from the Atlantic Ocean to the Urals, proposed by the Warsaw Treaty countries in Budapest, are held and if positive results are attained at the negotiations, this would be an important step in averting the threat of war.

That is noted in a statement, passed at a meeting of the Secretariat of the International Federation of Resistance Movements (FIR), which was held in Austria's capital. Its participants discussed problems linked with the struggle for peace and detente, against nuclear war.

The statement denounces the American strategic defense initiative which entails escalation of the arms race and its spreading to outer space. The Washington Administration's allegation that the SDI program makes nuclear offensive armaments unnecessary contradicts the truth, the statement says.

The FIR Secretariat welcomes the Soviet Union's actions aimed at stopping any nuclear explosions. It notes the great international significance of the Soviet Government's decision on a new extension of the moratorium of such explosions.

The Chernobyl accident and accidents at atomic electric power stations in the United States, Britain and other Western countries enable mankind if a nuclear war breaks out. Complete elimination of nuclear weapons would be in these conditions the best means of averting a nuclear catastrophe, the statement stresses.

21 July 1986

LD170929 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 17 Jun (TASS)--"The address of the Warsaw Treaty member states to the NATO member states, to all European countries with a program of reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe was made in conditions of the complex international situation", said Egon Bahr, chairman of the Bundestag subcommission on disarmament and arms control, director of the Hamburg Institute of the Problems of Peace and Security.

"The directions of further movement are determined now: whether mankind will follow the path of cooperation in questions of arms control and disarmament or the path of building up armaments unilaterally".

In a talk with TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy Egon Bahr noted that the program of reducing armed forces and conventional armaments, put forward by the Warsaw Treaty member states, was a meaningful and weighty supplement to the USSR's proposals designed to rid mankind of nuclear armaments by the year 2000.

"The proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member states accord with the position of the Social Democratic Party of Germany--defusing tensions and scaling down the level of armaments, above all in Europe. All this should have a considerable role to play in promoting world peace", said Egon Bahr.

"Reducing conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe first among the Warsaw Treaty member states and the NATO member states and then among other countries is a quite real undertaking. In so doing, it is necessary that the experience of the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe be taken into account: not to engage in fruitless debates, but to direct efforts at the realization of the Warsaw Treaty member states' proposals", he said.

FRG's Bundeswehr Tanks

LD181929 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 18 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn June 18 TASS -- The Bundeswehr is to get another 250 advanced Leopard-2 tanks in addition to those it had bordered earlier. Reporting the fact, the newspaper SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG says that the West German Defense Ministry has already requested 842 million marks from Bundestag commissions. The purchase of additional tanks was not envisioned by the Bundeswehr's rearmament plan. It is symptomatic that at a time when the Warsaw Treaty countries have put forward new proposals on substantial cuts in the armed forces and conventional armaments, Bonn is taking steps in the opposite direction.

FRG CP Leader

LD181630 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT 18 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn June 18 TASS -- Tass correspondent Georgiy Sosnovskiy reports:

Chairman of the German Communist Party Herbert Mies welcomed the new initiatives in the sphere of disarmament advanced at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states in Budapest. Addressing a regular plenary meeting of the board of the German Communist Party in Duesseldorf, Herbert Mies said that socialist countries which proposed the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, made a new important peace initiative.

The proposals of socialist states in the sphere of nuclear disarmament, for the conclusion of arrangements on an immediate end to nuclear testing, on banning and eliminating chemical weapons and all other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, for the creation of an all-embracing system of international security and cooperation mean a vast programme of a new comprehensive approach to disarmament that makes it possible to achieve a turn for the better in the present complex international situation, Herbert Mies said.

The leader of the German Communist Party criticized the aggressive militaristic course of the U.S. Administration in the international arena, Washington's intention to abandon the Soviet-U.S. Salt-2 Treaty. He said the Reagan administration is conducting an anti-European policy and bears the responsibility for the fact that the international situation, far from improving, continues aggravating.

The plenary meeting of the board of the German Communist Party also discussed the tasks for the coming election campaign. It noted the resolve of communists to make an effective contribution to the implementation of the policy aimed at peaceful interests of the FRG people. The plenary meeting urged all members of the German Communist Party to support candidates of the democratic organization peace list at the coming parliamentary elections.

NATO: 'No Intelligible Answer'

LD260834 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] According to DPA news agency, a conference was held in Brussels by a top level working group on the question of conventional arms control. This group was founded on the decision of the last session of the NATO Council. Here is Mayak commentary with Viktor Levin at the microphone:

[Begin Levin recording] The task of this group, as is stated in the decision for its formation, includes the search for a way to limit conventional arms in all of Europe. However, a proviso is made here that the group has by no means been called to propose the summoning of a conference on disarmament or to draw up new proposals for negotiations. Its aim is first to study the Vienna negotiations to reduce armed forces and arms of central Europe, which have been going already for almost 13 years, and the Stockholm conference to strengthen trust. But, again, it's quite unclear in what way the group should be doing this.

Other tasks of the working group have also been formulated in just the same broad and unspecified way. If we add this that nothing, essentially, has been communicated about the first conference either, a fully definitive conclusion can be made that the NATO countries have created yet another talking shop summed by a flood of words to conceal an absence of substance. Take note of the fact that up to now there has been no precise or intelligible answer from NATO on concrete proposals from the socialist countries.

Let us take, as just one example, a question that should be included within the competence of this particular working group that was in session in the Belgium capital -- the question of reducing arms in Europe. At first the Soviet Union -- as you obviously remember it was Comrade Gorbachev's speech in Berlin at the SED congress, and then the socialist community as a whole at the Budapest conference Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact made far-reaching proposals envisaging a 25 percent reduction by the beginning of the 1990's of armed forces and arms in all of the European Continent, from the Atlantic to the Urals. In fact, NATO circles speak of this initiative positively, but aside from words there is no action. Many such examples can be given. An impression is being formed that with the creation of various groups like the aforementioned working group, NATO wants to create the outward appearance of activity in the absence of such activity. [end recording]

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET PRESS LAUDS WARSAW PACT EUROPEAN ARMS CUTS PROPOSALS

Military Paper Editorial

PM171445 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 86 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Responsibility for the Fate of Peace"]

[Text] Socialism constitutes a society whose thoughts and actions in the international arena are directed toward supporting the peoples' desire for independence and social progress and dedicated to the main task of maintaining and strengthening peace. This conclusion, contained in the new edition of the Party Program adopted at the 27th CPSU Congress, received graphic new confirmation at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference in Budapest.

On 10-11 June the attention of the whole world was fixed on the Hungarian capital, where the seven fraternal countries' top leaders restated their determination to take specific practical measures to remove the threat of war. The decisions and initiatives approved at the Political Consultative Committee conference in Budapest reflect the desire of the fraternal parties and countries to strengthen peace and the peoples' security and enhance the socialist community's unity and collaboration. The conference proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation. It demonstrated the unity of the Warsaw Pact states' views on the problems of European and world politics under discussion.

After examining at its session yesterday the report of the Soviet delegation which participated in the routine Political Consultative Committee conference, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted the great importance of the collective analysis of the prevailing international situation carried out by the allied countries' top leaders.

The important documents adopted in Budapest -- the communique issued by the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference and the "Appeal by Warsaw Pact States to NATO States and all European Countries Concerning a Program for the Reduction of Armed Forces and Conventional Armaments in Europe" -- have generated the broadest response throughout the world. These proposals have considerably augmented the historically significant Soviet-proposed program for the complete elimination everywhere of nuclear and other kinds of mass destruction weapons.

The Warsaw Pact's constructive new initiatives are the latest evidence of their high sense of responsibility for the fate of their peoples, the whole humanity, and the world. Resolute actions and specific measures aimed at halting the arms race, moving on to real disarmament, and removing the threat of war are now required more than ever before.

The conference participants expressed concern at the tense world situation resulting from the intensification of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. The main cause of this tension is the dangerous foreign policy course and imperial, globalist ambitions of the U.S. Administration, which refuses to act in the spirit of the Geneva accord or take account of the peoples' will. The NATO bloc states are avoiding giving a positive response to such a major initiative as the Soviet-proposed program to completely eliminate mass destruction weapons by the end of the 20th century. American medium-range missiles continue to be sited in Europe, manifestations of the imperialist policy of force and crude interference in other states' internal affairs are multiplying.

The militarist preparations being carried out by imperialism under cover of the false thesis of a "threat" stemming from the socialist countries are very dangerous for the cause of peace.

In Budapest the Warsaw Pact states declared with the utmost responsibility that they will never in any circumstances begin hostilities against any state, either in Europe or in any other region of the world, unless they themselves are the object of aggression. The proposals they put forward stem from their consistent policy aimed at removing the threat of war and creating a stable and secure world and from the defensive nature of their military doctrine.

The allied states favor a comprehensive approach to the disarmament problem and advocate that the elimination of mass destruction weapons be backed up by considerable reductions in armed forces and armaments. The Warsaw Pact states propose a substantial reduction of all components of the land forces and tactical strike air forces of European states and corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces and facilities deployed in Europe. Operational-tactical nuclear armaments with an operational range (radius) of up to 1,000 km would be subject to cuts at the same time as conventional armaments. The geographical zone for the reductions would include the territory of the whole of Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The fraternal countries also believe that the implementation of measures such as the creation of zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons on the continent, the gradual reduction of military activity by both military alliances, and the establishment of cooperation among their members on questions of arms limitation and disarmament would help strengthen military-strategic stability on the European continent, build up confidence, and create more favorable conditions for the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe.

The fraternal countries' top leaders made a major new contribution in Budapest to accomplishing the key task of our time -- the task of defending peace, ending the arms race, and moving on to specific disarmament measures, particularly in the nuclear sphere. The world has entered a phase in its development when avoiding answering the fundamental questions of the present is tantamount to gambling with the destiny of all civilization. In the present-day situation there is no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence among states. That is why the appeal made by the socialist states in Budapest to halt the trend toward increasing danger of war and to return international relations to a course of detente is so topical.

The Budapest conference paid special attention to questions of strengthening the unity and cohesion of the Warsaw Pact states and their defensive alliance and developing cooperation in all spheres. Stress was placed on the significance of more active collaboration in international affairs and in elaborating and implementing a coordinated foreign policy course aimed at ensuring their peoples' security, removing the threat of nuclear war, achieving disarmament, and strengthening world peace.

The USSR Armed Forces are developing as an integral part of the combat community of the armies of the Warsaw Pact socialist states. Strengthening the unity of the fraternal armies and their joint training in defense of the gains of socialism, the 27th CPSU Congress noted, will continue to be our constant concern in enhancing our defense potential. Fervently approving the fraternal countries' coordinated peace-loving course, the servicemen of the Warsaw Pact armies, in single combat formation, steadfastly mount guard over peace and the peoples' security.

PRAVDA Editorial

JPRS-TAC-86-058

21 July 1986

PM161425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 86 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Socialism and Peace Are Indivisible"]

[Text] Mankind has no task more important than that of strengthening international security and averting the threat of nuclear war. The cause of peace has no more reliable and tireless defender than socialism.

During CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's friendly visit to Hungary there took place a thorough, meaningful exchange of opinions on the current issues of the day, and primarily on how to render the socialist countries' international collaboration still more profound and fruitful, and on what conclusions should be drawn from the major changes taking place in the world.

Speaking in Csepel, the Soviet leader declared: "Comrades, we are living through difficult and complex times. But I say with all conviction: Mankind is capable not only of surviving but also of learning to live in a way that befits mankind -- that is, in conditions of peace and freedom. But this is something that has to be fought for; fought for stubbornly and concertedly. Not just against the threat of war but also for the deeper international collaboration of states, for the sake of the development of both our planet and of space."

The entire planet resounded with the Warsaw Pact states' call to do everything possible in order that -- by approaching the realities of the nuclear age with due responsibility -- Europe might be transformed into a continent of lasting peace and all-around cooperation and the path to nuclear war might be blocked. Testimony to such an approach is provided by the documents of the latest conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee held in Budapest 10-11 June, which aroused the enormous interest of the international public. After considering the report of the Soviet delegation that took part in the work of the conference, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee noted the great significance of the collective analysis of the prevailing international situation made by the allied countries leaders.

Aware of their responsibility to their own people and to mankind for the fate of peace in Europe and throughout the world, the Warsaw Pact states are posing the question most positively: The world has entered a phase of development wherein to evade the solution of today's fundamental issues means gambling with the destiny of all civilization. It is possible to resolve the principle task of our time -- defending peace and breaking the trend toward the increased danger of war. However, for this to occur, decisive actions aimed at halting the arms race and switching to effective disarmament are now more essential than ever before.

The chief cause of tension in the international situation is the dangerous foreign policy course, the imperial, globalist ambitions of a U.S. Administration that is unwilling to act in the spirit of the Geneva accords and to heed the will of the people. In these complex conditions the fraternal states adopted an appeal to the NATO member-states and to all European countries concerning a program for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. The participants in the Budapest conference declared that they support the program submitted by the Soviet Union for the full and universal elimination of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons before the end of the current century. They are convinced that the cessation of nuclear tests, the achievement of nuclear disarmament, the prevention of an arms race in space, the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons, and other disarmament measures would lead to the creation of a safer world for the European people and for our entire planet.

The particular attention of the participants in the Budapest conference of the Political Consultative Committee was, naturally, directed toward the formulation of proposals aimed at building a peaceful Europe. As a result of the criminal policy of the U.S. and NATO militarists, the densely populated European Continent is now so saturated with nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons that it has become the most explosive place on earth.

Decreasing the level of military confrontation in Europe is one of the decisive areas of the struggle to avert the nuclear threat. It is in this area that the Warsaw Pact countries have come forward with a new initiative whose significance is hard to overestimate. Measures have been submitted for the consideration of states and people whose implementation opens up the practical possibility of halting the present dangerous course of events and changing, for the better, the development of unfavorable trends in Europe and in the entire system of international relations.

The Warsaw Pact states are proposing a substantial reduction in all components of the European states' ground forces and tactical strike aircraft, and also of the corresponding forces and means of the United States and Canada sited in Europe. The geographical zone of the proposed reduction is the entire territory of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Specific timetables for this reduction both as an initial step and subsequently have been submitted for the NATO states' examination.

The cessation of nuclear tests; the complete elimination on a reciprocal basis of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone; the achievement of specific accords at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms; the elimination, in this century, of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture; a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments at the global and regional levels; the implementation of effective monitoring [kontrol] in all areas and at all stages of arms reduction and disarmament -- such are the basic areas in which the socialist community states are expressing the willingness for very broad collaboration with other countries.

The Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact's supreme organ demonstrated anew the fraternal countries' unity on all the issues discussed, and their undeviating determination to continue to proceed shoulder to shoulder in the noble battle for peace and for life.

Armed with the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, Soviet people are devoting their maximum efforts to the cause of communist creation. They well understand that each new success in the struggle for peace meets the interests both of our country and the entire socialist community.

21 July 1986

Matveyev Comments

PM161430 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion: "From the Atlantic to the Urals"]

[Text] Europe, particularly central Europe, has the highest concentration not only of nuclear arms but also of conventional arms in the world. That situation has persisted for 40 years but does not denote a static or stable situation, rather a confrontation of colossal forces representing the most serious source of the arms race and thus of the danger of war.

The material, physical cost of this confrontation is growing constantly. In the seventies the NATO members' military spending doubled.

In the same period those countries, according to the figures of F. Holzman, professor of economics at Tufts University in the United States, "spent in total (?40) [first figure illegible] billion more on military items than the Warsaw Pact states."

"New nuclear weapons for NATO, the increase of nonnuclear armaments -- when will we reach the point at which governments will be unable or unwilling to pay more?" was the question put 2 years ago by the West German magazine STERN to General Rogers, NATO commander in chief in Europe, and it has an even more topical and insistent ring today.

"There is no way to avoid great financial hardship..." That was how a U.S. NATO representative tried to explain the arms race spiral to his allies some time ago: It is apparently destined to go on spiraling.

Accepting this viewpoint means viewing the arms race as a fiendish robot, an automaton in the face of which governments and peoples are powerless.

"The world has entered that phase of its development when avoiding answering the fundamental questions of the present day is tantamount to gambling with the destiny of all civilization." The Warsaw Pact states made that statement at their conference in Budapest. Their comment also applies to the possibilities of progress in curbing the arms race in Europe. The need for radical steps along this path on our continent is particularly great.

The West European governments, including politicians in Bonn and London, America's closest allies, have responded in generally positive terms to M.S. Gorbachev's comment at the SED congress in Berlin on the USSR's willingness in principle to negotiate considerable reductions in armed forces and armaments over the entire continent -- from the Atlantic to the Urals.

This willingness has now been confirmed by the Warsaw Pact states and given concrete form in their program offered to the NATO states and all European countries for reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. No prior conditions are required for a specific discussion of the new proposals to begin. A willingness has been expressed to examine other proposals on this problem in a constructive spirit, too.

The program put forward by our country for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the 21st century has been augmented by far-reaching proposals aimed at substantially reducing all components of the European states' ground forces and tactical strike air forces as well as the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces and facilities deployed on the continent. The proposed measures are reinforced by a package of other measures designed to help boost confidence in the military sphere in Europe by reducing the danger of a surprise attack and by reinforcing military-strategic stability.

These are steps to reduce the concentration of troops along the line of contact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, to limit large scale military exercises, and to exchange more detailed information on exercises while also organizing reliable and effective monitoring of armed forces and conventional arms reduction using both national technical means and international procedures, including on-the-spot inspections [inspektsiya na mestakh].

If you take into account the broad geographical framework of the planned reductions, it is not hard to see the scale of the measures proposed by the socialist states that develop the essential points of the Helsinki accords in the military sphere -- the crucial sphere for ensuring European security.

At the NATO Council session in Halifax (Canada) at the end of May, the bloc countries' foreign ministers stated their "desire for a lower, more balanced level of armaments" in Europe. It is not the first time this has been said at such a forum. However, nothing ever changes because the NATO governments do not go beyond general declarations. Words are not enough to stop and reverse the war machine, which has grown to unlikely proportions.

Those same people go on giving assurances that they do not harbor aggressive intentions but are concerned instead with defense considerations. The best protection against the threat of war is the physical destruction of the means of war rather than the stockpiling of increasingly sophisticated equipment for destruction and annihilation. The Warsaw Pact states propose bold steps based on reciprocity and motivated by a sincere desire to free the European Continent of the most terrible threat that it, and indeed mankind, has ever faced.

We harbor no illusions about how easy that path will be. Suffice it to mention, for example, the pressure constantly exerted by U.S. military circles on America's West European allies to get them to implement military preparations at an ever faster pace. Washington demands that the FRG, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Denmark, and Norway, as countries without nuclear weapons, step up the conventional arms race. Over 100 different new programs in this sphere were introduced at the NATO Council in mid-1978. Since then other programs of that kind have been added.

However, even those people fiercely committed to the Atlanticist course are forced to acknowledge that such programs do not increase their countries' security. The reverse is true. The conclusion here is obvious -- urgent measures are needed to lower the level of military confrontation on the continent. This is what the Warsaw Pact countries urged when they put forward their proposals showing Europe the way to lasting peace and reliable security.

LD201655 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 20 Jun 86

["Arms Reductions From Atlantic to Urals" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people began 45 years ago. Winning victory in that most fierce battle, the Soviet Union defended its freedom and blocked the way of the Hitler reich to world dominance. The lessons of history today are a stern warning to the peoples, first and foremost to the Europeans.

Today Europe, which more than once was a scene of gory wars over the centuries, has become through the fault of imperialism the epicentre of armed confrontation between the two military-political alliances. The concentration of troops and armaments has reached especially dangerous proportions here.

The scaling down of this confrontation and the prevention of the threat of war is an urgent political and military-strategic problem of extreme importance.

In view of this situation, the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries approved an address to the NATO member-countries and all the other European countries with a program for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. This program is very important due to a number of factors.

First, though independent, it is sumultaneously is a substantial addition to the Soviet Union's program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction before the end of the current century. The relationship between nuclear and conventional weapons plays an important role. If a comprehensive approach is taken, with parallel processes of the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and substantial reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments, cuts in one field would stimulate progress in the other. Meanwhile, the ground has now been cut from under the feet of those Western politicians who until now have been covering their unwillingness to reduce nuclear weapons with the argument that such reductions would enhance the risk of conventional war.

Second, the formulation of appropriate accords under that program will make it possible already as early as the beginning of the 1990s to reduce the armed forces in Europe by more than one million. Substantial cuts already at the very start in the tactical attack air force of both military and political alliances in Europe and reductions in troop concentrations along the line of contact of those alliances would diminish the threat of a surprise attack, build up mutual trust and strengthen stability in the European Continent.

Third, the area of reductions suggested by the socialist countries -- from Atlantic to the Urals -- makes it possible considerably to broaden international cooperation in ensuring European security through the active participation of all the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries (some of them are now attending, for instance, the Vienna force reduction talks only in an advisory capacity).

Fourth, the European countries which do not participate in military groupings, that is, neutral and non-aligned states, will be able to take part in talks on the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in the continent and in the verification of compliance with the decisions which could be taken.

Time will show whether the West is ready to accept the program proposed by the socialist countries and the NATO countries are prepared to embark on a realistic path and give up their claims to military advantage. It is time to realize that the world has entered a phase of development when avoiding the solution of vital problems of our time means risking the fate of civilization as a whole.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: EAST EUROPEANS BACK WARSAW PACT ARMS CUTS APPEAL

PZPR Politburo

LD190934 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] Warsaw June 19 TASS -- The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party at its meeting here has approved the Polish delegation's activity at the Budapest meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee and expressed full support for its decisions.

It was observed that the PCC-adopted programme of large-scale reductions of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe along with the Soviet January 15, 1986 proposals constituted a comprehensive programme for ridding the people of Europe and the entire world of the threat of war.

Poland would do everything necessary to carry out the proposals which met the vital interests of the Polish people, said the report on the Politbureau meeting.

The Budapest meeting reaffirmed with fresh vigour the unity and cohesion of the defensive military-political alliance of the fraternal socialist countries and their striving to continue developing interaction in all spheres, the report concluded.

CPCZ Presidium

LD192108 Moscow TASS in English 1914 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] Prague June 19 TASS -- The Presidium of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee and the Czechoslovak Government have approved of the activity of the Czechoslovak delegation at the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee and the documents adopted at it, says a report issued here today.

It says that the Warsaw Treaty states indicate in their proposals concrete ways to reach mutually acceptable agreements designed to arrest the arms race, improve the international situation and ensure equal security for all. This is evidence of their high responsibility for mankind's peaceful future.

The address, adopted in Budapest, constitutes a new imposing foreign policy initiative of the socialist community, which leads to a drastic reduction in the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. This initiative organically complements the Soviet proposal on the complete elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the end of the current century and indicates a real way to turning Europe into a continent of durable peace and cooperation, the report says.

21 July 1986

Romania's Ceasescu

LD241158 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Excerpt] Bucharest, 24 Jun (TASS)---The address of the Warsaw Treaty member states to the NATO member countries, to all the European countries which contains a program of the 25-percent reduction of the armed forces, conventional armaments and military expenditures by 1990 is of major importance. It opens up for the first time real prospects for proceeding to the substantial reduction of conventional armaments along with the reduction of nuclear weapons.

This has been stated by Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of Romania. He spoke at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party now under way in Bucharest which is discussing Romania's development plan for 1986-1990.

Romanian Central Committee

LD202343 Moscow TASS in English 2205 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Bucharest June 20 TASS -- The documents approved by the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Countries in Budapest are opening broad vistas for the struggle for peace, disarmament and international cooperation, a meeting of the Political Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Romania, which took place here today under the chairmanship of Nicolae Ceausescu, the Party's general secretary, stressed.

Having unanimously approved the documents, the Political Executive Committee stressed that the proposals put forward by the Warsaw Treaty member countries on reduction in the armed forces and armaments would contribute to stronger trust and broader cooperation and help release huge material, financial and human resources and ensure their use for the economic and social development of all the peoples.

PRAVDA Roundup

PM240809 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Roundup of 20 June TASS reports: "Constructive Stance"]

[Excerpt] Budapest -- The friendly visit to Hungary by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was an outstanding milestone along the path of the development of ties between the CPSU and the MSZMP, the Soviet and Hungarian peoples, and the USSR and Hungary. The talks held during the visit between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Kadar helped to strengthen the firm unity based on common principles and were evidence of the common views of the CPSU and the MSZMP on questions of social development and international relations. This is stated in an information report published here on the MSZMP Central Committee plenum held under J. Kadar's chairmanship.

The MSZMP Central Committee expressed confidence, the document notes, that the talks between the two countries' leaders will give new scope to the dynamic development of political, economic, and cultural ties between the USSR and Hungary and promote the creation of more highly developed forms of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation. The MSZMP Central Committee placed a high value on the fact that the USSR and Hungary are jointly waging the struggle to improve the international situation.

Approving the activity of the Hungarian delegation at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee [PCC] conference, the MSZMP Central Committee stressed that the documents adopted at the conference and the initiatives put forward accord with the vital interests of the Hungarian people and of all mankind. Together with the other Warsaw Pact states, Hungary will continue to come out resolutely in favor of continuing East-West dialogue. The MSZMP Central Committee, the document notes, approves and supports the important Soviet proposals aimed at disarmament, the ending of nuclear weapon tests, and the prevention of the militarization of outer space.

The appeal adopted at the PCC conference in Budapest is a major initiative whose implementation would, to a significant degree, help to strengthen peace and security on our continent, the report says. The Hungarian people expect the NATO countries to consider these proposals with a full sense of responsibility and to give a constructive answer to them.

Prague -- The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government have approved the Czechoslovak delegation's activity at the PCC conference in Budapest and the documents it adopted, a statement issued here stresses. These documents, based on a profound analysis of the present-day international situation and the results of the fraternal communist and workers parties' congresses, are a further convincing indication of the constructive approach of the Warsaw Pact states to the resolution of the most burning issues of today.

Today the reactionary and militarist U.S. circles and their NATO allies resort increasingly frequently to the dangerous "position of strength" policy, the policy of confrontation, and to whipping up the arms race. In this situation the Warsaw Pact states indicate in their proposals concrete ways of achieving mutually acceptable agreements aimed at ending the arms race.

The appeal adopted in Budapest is a major new foreign policy initiative of the socialist community, leading to a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals.

This initiative fits in organically with the Soviet proposal for the total elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and CSSR Government expressed support for the results of the Budapest conference.

Ulaanbaatar -- The results of the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact PCC are a vivid manifestation of the Warsaw Pact states' profound concern for mankind's future. This was stated by J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium, at an election meeting of the capital's voters held here. We fully share the evaluations and conclusions contained in the Budapest conference documents, he said.

Given the growth in international tension due to the militarist course of imperialism headed by the United States, no task is more pressing than to step up the people's struggle to preserve and strengthen peace. This is what the USSR and the other socialist community countries seek to achieve, as was confirmed by the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the supreme forums of the other fraternal communist and workers parties. Implementing the foreign policy course of the 19th MPRP Congress, the People's Mongolia devotes great attention to questions of strengthening mutual trust and developing cooperation among the states of Asia and the Pacific.

Characterizing the election campaign in the country, the Mongolian leader noted the high political and labor mood of the Mongolian people.

The indissoluble friendship and all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, J. Batmonh stressed, are an important factor in the intensification of Mongolia's socioeconomic development and its successful progress along the path of completing the creation of the material and technical base of socialism.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET GENERAL, DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER ON PACT PROPOSALS

LD141525 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0930 GMT 14 Jun 86

["In the Background of the Appeal" program; announcer introduces correspondent Joszef Barath report on his interview with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, "departmental head at the USSR General Staff," USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, and USSR academicians Jozsef Legasov and Sagdayev; date and place of interview not specified; Soviet participants' recorded remarks in Russian fading into Hungarian translation]

[Excerpts] [Barath] The documents adopted at the 1969 Budapest session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee opened a new historical phase. We can view them as marking the beginning of the Helsinki process. How do the experts see the significance of the present session, of the present documents? This is the question I put to Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, group chief of staff of the Soviet Union's Armed Forces.

[Chervov] If I want to answer the question briefly then I can say that personally I find it conceivable that the present, highest, forum of the Warsaw Pact will lead to a new phase of detente. Therefore, there could be a repetition of everything that happened in 1969. At least it is good to hope this.

[Barath] Tell me, please was the stand of the Western countries taken into consideration in the new proposals? In other words, can the present initiative be described as a compromise?

[Chervov] Definitely. In nearly every issue, every single proposal was worked out by the Warsaw Pact in such a way that at the same time it also kept in view the declaration of the Western side to date. Such, for example, is the issue of nuclear weapons. In the communique the leaders of the socialist countries declared that the Warsaw Pact advocates the preservation of all the treaties and agreements that have guaranteed the balance of strategic nuclear armaments. It appeals to the United States to do the same. Therefore, the objective is that we not destroy what we have managed to create; that we preserve the system of treaties. That is the first important sphere of issues. The second is that in our new proposal about the significant reduction of European armed forces and armaments, we have taken into consideration all the initiatives of the NATO countries up till now. They asked that the discussions be comprehensive, that is to say that they relate to all Europe, from the Atlantic Ocean, beyond the Soviet borders, right up to the Urals. You will remember that this issue was raised by the French side, and that West Germany also advocated it. The Warsaw Pact member-states have now accepted this demand. The other important issue is the matter of control. The Budapest session fully took into account what the Western countries wanted earlier in connection with control. What is more, they went beyond that.

[Barath] Here is the opinion of Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy.

[Petrovskiy] I see the significance of the documents just adopted to be that they have expanded the sphere of activity of the Political Consultative Committee, have augmented it with new areas. In connection with this, too the Warsaw Pact member-states' appeal about the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe is of great significance. If the West accepted these proposals it would open up the possibility toward the rapid normalization of the European situation, and with this it would speed up the process of nuclear weapons disarmament as well.

[Barath] What is the novelty of these proposals?

[Petrovskiy] The novelty is that the socialist countries are now proposing a significant reduction of armed forces and of conventional weapons. It would be a question of withdrawing 100,000-150,000 soldiers, possibly immediately. By the beginning of the nineties the present forces could be reduced by even as much as one quarter. If, therefore, NATO accepted the socialist countries' proposal, as a result of, by the start of the nineties, there would be 1 million fewer soldiers in Europe than there are today. This, I think, would be a very realistic, tangible thing, really palpable, as the saying goes.

[Barath] Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy, before the microphone and Budapest Radio, answers the question: In what concrete areas of disarmament does he see a chance for advance?

[Petrovskiy] In the wake of the new proposals of the socialist countries there might open up a possibility first of all for ending nuclear weapon testing. For a long time, with the objective of evading a solution, the West has made use of the pretext of control. Now the problem of control simply does not exist for us; we have said that we are ready to make possible the control of the ending of nuclear weapons testing in any form whatsoever, even with international means. With this, the realistic path of agreement has opened up. Another prospective area, to my way of thinking, is the elimination of the medium-range missiles deployed in Europe. Our new proposal in many new elements shows a similarity to the so-called zero option proposed by the West. For this reason, if the declarations often repeated earlier by the NATO countries that the Soviet SS-20 missiles impede the cause of armament reductions really accord with the truth, then with the solution proposed by us, here is the opportunity for the removal of these missiles. I think that the chances of banning chemical weapons are hopeful, though NATO's latest decision on the manufacture of so-called binary weapons has brought into question the honesty of the intentions of the United States and its allies. And finally another possibility for advance has opened up, and this is the radical, significant reduction of the armed forces and armaments deployed in Europe, in the whole territory of the continent, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Urals. In this area we expect that the program of action proposed by the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee could bring about a change. These are the issues in which an advance could now be made, if it is a question not of a one-way but of a two-way street, or if the NATO countries, the United States and their allies, show a readiness for discussion similar to ours.

[Barath] How do you view the chances of the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces? Col Gen Chervov replies.

[Chervov] If the United States renounces its absurd position, the demand that it has direct control over eight Soviet military districts in the country's northern part, from Leningrad up to the military district below the Caucasus, if in other words it accepts the Soviet proposal, which, in accordance with the mandate of the discussions, relate to central Europe, then we can expect positive results. If Washington sticks to this, I repeat, absurd demand, we can not expect success, because we will not give in on this. We can not make concessions at the expense of our security. One can not heap concession on top of concession, compromise on top of compromise without this endangering our security. This is our stance.

[Barath] Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy replies:

[Petrovskiy] The socialist countries have put concrete proposals on the table in Vienna in connection with central European armed force reduction. Unfortunately, this was not followed on the Western side by any kind of constructive step. NATO showed a lot of activity after our initiative had been made, only in quite a different area. Not in military policy, in discussions, but in armament.

They responded to our initiatives with new outbreaks of the arms race, with further militaristic steps by the United States. The unilateral steps, among them first and foremost the moratorium on nuclear tests, affect, what is more to a certain extent also undermine, not only our military but also our national economy plans.

[Barath] Chervov, departmental chief of staff, replies to the question on whether the Soviet Union's security is not endangered by its unilateral steps in the interest of disarmament.

[Chervov] The situation now is that about one third of nuclear tests serve peaceful objectives. We have not carried out explosions for 1 year. Imagine what the situation is. One side continuously gains newer information, while the other one has decided, 12 months ago now, to renounce such experiments. It does without saying that it will fall significantly behind. This damages its interests, its military and national economic interests, too. The question is self-evident: Then why did we undertake this? Because our opinion is that the political benefit of our unilateral undertaking of commitments is much greater than its military or economic damage. That is why we consciously undertook this.

[Barath] With the infringement of SALT II, the United States is preparing to upset the contractual bases of the strategic balance. It is my conviction that the Soviet Union already has plans at its disposal as to what it should do in that case.

[Chervov] There is every foundation for your conviction, naturally. The Soviet Union has all the means for not allowing the United States to gain a superiority.

[Barath] What does this mean from the military point of view?

[Chervov] What can we do from a military point of view? As the treaty loses its validity, so also every limitation ceases. Both qualitatively and quantitatively we can develop our strategic forces, their every component. We do not want this. We do not wish to step up the arms race. But if we are forced to do so we can not avoid it. At the most important forum of the Warsaw Pact Organization our leaders expressed their will that the treaty remain in force. Everything depends on the other side. As the United States is forging ahead with armament, we are obliged to take countersteps.

[Barath] As we know, Soviet missiles can now deliver more nuclear warheads than previously.

[Chervov] That goes without saying. First and foremost, there could be a question of increasing the number of nuclear explosive charges, of the missile warheads that could be targeted separately, in the case of the land-based and sea-based missiles alike. We could respond first with this.

[Barath] U.S. right-wing circles would be very happy if they could force on the Soviet Union a new round of the arms race. Is there any alternative to this if the Reagan administration remains faithful to its political line and if Reagan remains U.S. President for another 2 years?

[Chervov] The Soviet Union, as well as the other member-states of the Warsaw Pact are struggling to stop the arms race. This is one of the most important of the vital questions facing mankind. Not only the Warsaw Pact countries, but the other forces struggling for peace are striving to put a stop to armament buildup. We are active in this in several directions at once. Our basic tool is discussion.

We take a stand on several forums at once, for example, in the defense of the SALT I Treaty, which limits antimissile weapons. And, basing ourselves on the SALT I Treaty, we wish also to deter the extension of the arms race into space. Recently, for instance, we proposed to the United States that we both undertake a commitment for the observation of the treaty for 15-20 years. This would give guarantees for the prevention of arming the cosmos. That is, in the event of Washington's accepting the proposal, though now the United States is capable of anything.

[Barath] The first reactions are not rejection.

[Chervov] Unfortunately, the U.S. Administration has given no official response. The leader of the Geneva negotiating delegation said: Yes, this is a positive proposal, it is constructive, but officially this means nothing. So, for the time being, again we are obliged to wait. In connection with all this, one legitimate question arises: Does rejection by the United States mean that the Soviet initiative can have no results?

[Barath] Finally, what is the balance of the Soviet disarmament initiatives? Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy replies.

[Petrovskiy] I believe that it would not be correct to give an unequivocal reply. Even in spite of the negative stance of official Washington and its closest allies, these proposals assist the development of the strong coalition of common sense and the peace struggle, those forces that wish to resolve the issue of the day by taking into account the interests of all mankind. This approach unites the socialist countries with the international worker movement, many developing countries, and also with many healthy-minded citizens in capitalist countries. This coalition of common sense and peace is strengthened by our proposals, and this alliance can be the guarantee that in the end the healthy way of thinking will be victorious. It is worth quoting in this connection the words of Antonio Gramsci. He said that the human personality is marked by two characteristics: The pessimism of the mind and the optimism of the will. The activity of the aforementioned coalition can be a testimony that the optimism of the will can conquer the pessimism of the mind.

[Barath] I know it is very difficult to prophesy. All the same, what in your opinion is the most probable response NATO will give to the Budapest proposal?

[Petrovskiy] Of course it is difficult to prophesy. There is no response as yet. Still, I believe that many West European countries will favor a positive step. They will be inclined to carefully study the Budapest documents, the new Warsaw Pact initiatives. With regard to the United States, to be frank, I am doubtful about this.

[Barath] A very interesting process is underway here. This was most recently shown by the Bern consultation on human contacts. Many European countries are desirous of the strengthening, the renewal, of the Helsinki process. With regard to the United States, it consistently opposes this. Also, is the United States capable annihilating the will of the European countries precisely in connection with Europe?

[Petrovskiy] I think that the time has come when the policies of the West European countries will be more and more independent. Naturally, it is not a question of their violating NATO interests; it is not a question of our wishing to drive a wedge into NATO. Still, the West European countries must have their own voice. Europe is our common home, both for the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. It is a small and fragile house, so we must take care of its maintenance jointly.

[Barath] Academician Sagdeyev, please tell me, do you have contacts with U.S. experts? Soviet-Hungarian relations are very complicated of course, but it is being said that colleagues can still understand each other better than people working in different professions. I am convinced that Soviet experts read the articles of their American colleagues and vice versa, that the best experts know each other by their Christian name, and that there are many common issues, common interests. To sum up, I consider it impossible that no contact whatsoever should exist between you two, despite the complicated international relations.

[Sagdeyev] You are absolutely right. Naturally we all maintain links with our colleagues, with American ones as well. If we meet we discuss our most recent scientific achievements, and when it is not politically obstructed, we cooperate with each other with pleasure. This was the case during the Vega program, in which a whole series of American nuclear physicists worked with us: What is more, some even participated in the planning of some joint scientific applications. We very much regret -- just as much as our American colleagues do, I know very well -- that in recent years there has been no official agreement, on a government level, for space research, an agreement on the basis of which the linkage between the Apollo and the Soyuz spacecraft could take place at the time.

We are hoping that the international political atmosphere will improve and sooner or later a new space research agreement will be signed, and then our scientific relations will again be strengthened and deepened.

[Barath] Would it be perhaps precisely space research, cooperation between scientists, which could help to ease international tension? Why not, after all?

Petrovskiy spoke about the new Soviet proposal, which was first described by Mikhail Gorbachev at the Czepl Machine-Building Works in Budapest.

[Petrovskiy] The Soviet Union is now wishing to present a new proposal in the United Nations in the interest of peace in space. It is a detailed plan, broken down into steps for peaceful research of space. We proposed that in the next 15 years we should create jointly the organizational conditions and technical foundations of our ability to carry out large-scale international enterprises in space, to build international space stations, and to prepare joint Mars research. In the interests of this we recommend the convening of an international conference to begin in the nineties, and suggest the establishment of an international space organization.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: MBFR STALLED BY WEST'S 'OVERBLOWN' DEMANDS

PM161601 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 19, 19 May 86 pp 7-9

[N. Oskarov article: "Is There a Way Out of the Deadlock?"]

[Text] The Vienna talks have lasted more than 12 years but have not yielded any substantial results. Will progress be made at the next round? There are possibilities for that, but let us not anticipate events. Let us look back at the results of the last two rounds.

At the end of last year the West, after a long period of silence, finally replied to the socialist countries' February 14, 1985, proposal on initial cuts in the ground forces and armaments of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. in central Europe with a subsequent non-increase in the level of troops and armaments of the sides in the area. Our partners came up with a document in which the NATO countries also favoured an initial cut in Soviet and American troops, although smaller in scale and not involving armaments. They also agreed to freeze troop levels, but not armaments.

The Warsaw Treaty countries gave its due to the reply of the Western participants because it indicated a certain shift. True, the shift applies to only some aspects of the problem, namely the outline of the initial agreement and the framework for further negotiations. However, the United States and its NATO allies have not departed from their unconstructive stand on the cardinal issues of the negotiations.

For example, the Western representatives maintain that the NATO countries have dropped their demand for prior agreement on numerical data on the troops of the sides. If one takes an unbiased look at the Western reply one can see that the "numbers barrier" has merely been replaced by an unjustified demand for a head-count of servicemen.

But perhaps the West has changed its attitude to the logical and justified proposal of the socialist countries to cut and subsequently freeze armaments along with troops? Alas, on that matter too the reply of the U.S. and its NATO allies is a categorical "no".

The same unconstructive policy is to be found in Western proposals on a reduced strength of troops subject to cuts. On control and verification, the NATO countries have toughened their stand.

So the "innovatory" Western proposals, much publicized as a "concession" to the Warsaw Treaty, turn out, upon closer scrutiny, to be merely a restatement and in some cases a toughening of the position they had stubbornly maintained throughout the previous round.

Needless to say, achieving a mutually acceptable agreement in Vienna is no easy matter, and of this the Warsaw Treaty states are well aware. While critically assessing the latest Western proposals, they do not want to start polemics at the negotiations, but seek to put them on a realistic basis. As at all other disarmament negotiations, there are some issues in Vienna on which there are profound divergences, but there is also some common ground, some aspects on which the positions are showing signs of drawing closer. That is why it is very important to take advantage of the existing elements of mutual understanding to advance further. For this political will is needed. The West has been found to be lacking it.

As for the Warsaw Treaty countries, they have repeatedly demonstrated their desire to reach agreement in Vienna. In particular, this was clearly stressed by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement on January 15, shortly before the start of a new round of the Vienna negotiations. The concrete proposals it set out on verification -- one of the key problems in the negotiations -- gave an additional and essential impulse to the Vienna forum.

The constructive line of the socialist states was further reaffirmed in their February 20, 1986 draft agreement on initial reductions by the Soviet Union and the U.S. of land forces and armaments with a subsequent non-increase in the level of armed forces and armaments of the sides in central Europe and measures related thereto. Compared with the earlier proposals, it contains some new elements prompted by the search for mutually acceptable compromise on the most acute problems, as well as on important aspects of the talks where there are serious divergences. The proposal takes into account the early signs of mutual understanding and some provisions in the Western stand. The next logical step to be taken was to start drawing up a future agreement, which was what the socialist countries proposed.

However, the new draft and the proposal to pass on to drawing up the text of an agreement met with a sharply negative reaction from the Western side.

The West asserts that the draft presented by the socialist countries fails to take account of the "far-reaching" Western initiatives. This contention does not hold water. Thus, to meet the West the Warsaw Treaty states have agreed to a reduced volume of initial cuts in Soviet and U.S. troops. They have agreed to extend the partial agreement from 3 to 4 years, accepted the procedure of initial troop cuts proposed by the West, agreed to the creation of permanent checkpoints at the entrance to and exit from the area of cuts; provided for the possibility of on-the-spot verification if the request is justified; and taken into account the NATO countries' position on the consultative mechanism. If that is not flexibility and readiness for compromise solutions, what is? In spite of this the NATO countries hastened to reject the Warsaw Treaty states' proposals. Why?

The main reason is the justified refusal of the socialist states to accept the full set of measures for control and verification proposed by the U.S. and the NATO countries without qualification. The Western participants in the negotiations see this as "intransigence" on the part of the Eastern side. Meanwhile, the public in the West is being told that the U.S.S.R. and its allies are against effective verification in general.

The Warsaw Treaty countries believe that an agreement in Vienna would undoubtedly require measures of verification. Verification is necessary to ensure the confidence of the two sides that the agreed cuts have indeed been implemented, that the frozen levels of troops and armaments are not increased and no change in the balance of forces is taking place. A reliable response to all these objectives is provided by the package of control measures contained in the socialist countries' proposal of February 20. The package includes national technical means, permanent, verification points, prior notification of troop movements, call-up of reserves and military exercises. On-the-spot verification on justified request is also envisaged.

These are sensible measures. But our partners insist on the exchange of information on the structure of troops down to battalion and barracks levels and on conducting 30 inspections a year. Moreover, NATO representatives would like to extend the measures of verification unilaterally beyond the agreed areas of reductions to include the western military districts of the Soviet Union.

Against the background of the agreement on partial initial cuts of Soviet and American troops, which are very modest in scale, the overblown and complicated verification system proposed by the West looks odd, to say the least. What, for example, is behind the demand for highly detailed information on troops? Such information could only serve purposes that have nothing to do with the objectives of the proposed agreement. The same is true of the West's demand for 30 on-the-spot checks a year. This again is prompted by the wish to have a head-count of servicemen. Finally, there is no justification for the attempts of the NATO countries to have verification measures cover territories situated thousands of kilometres away from the area of reductions which is strictly delineated in the mandate of the Vienna negotiations.

Nor should one exclude from view the fact that the Warsaw Treaty countries are offered such measures at a time when the deployment of American medium-range missiles continues in Western Europe, and NATO countries are stepping up their military preparations there, openly putting the emphasis on offensive weapons systems. No wonder the verification measures proposed by the West can only arouse the suspicions of the other side.

The Warsaw Treaty states are in favour of verification that is commensurate with the character and substance of the agreement, with the practical requirements of checking the observance of the obligations and with the real military-political situation. The West, on the other hand, in regarding verification as an absolute divorced from agreement; is trying to substitute it for real measures to bring down the level of military confrontation, i.e., to emasculate the possible agreement of its content. While formally accepting the idea and pattern of an interim agreement put forward by the Warsaw Treaty states, the NATO allies would like to minimize real measures to bring down the level of military confrontation in central Europe.

Freezing and reducing troops and armaments in the hottest spots of the planet -- and Europe is one of them -- is one of the chief measures aimed at halting the arms race and promoting disarmament, and ensuring peace and security. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty states have always supported scaling down the level of military confrontation, and they believe that in conditions of peaceful coexistence this level can and must be lowered. This is the purpose of the peace initiatives set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's January 15 statement. This is the purpose of the new Soviet proposals on the reduction of conventional armaments and troops in Europe advanced by Gorbachev in his speech to the Eleventh Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in Berlin. Their implementation would make it possible to untie the knot of problems that has been tightening in Vienna for many years. Today reaching an agreement at the Vienna forum is more urgent than ever.

It would be an important factor in improving the military-political situation in Europe and could go some of the way towards implementing the corresponding Soviet proposals concerning the whole of Europe.

The socialist countries have tabled a renewed draft agreement at the Vienna negotiations. The draft provides a realistic basis for advance and breaking years of deadlock. Therefore, the West should constructively reappraise its stand at the Vienna talks.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

21 July 1986

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS REPORTS SOVIET CSCE COMMITTEE MEETING

LD231946 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 23 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 23 TASS -- The Soviet public urges all who treasure the destinies of Europe to vigorous joint or parallel actions to safeguard life and civilisation. This is said in an address to all peace forces of the continent that was adopted today in Moscow by a plenary meeting of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. The meeting's participants discussed the committee's tasks in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the new Soviet peace initiatives.

Delivering a report, Lev Tolkunov, the committee's chairman and chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, pointed to the exceptional importance of the all-embracing programme of ensuring universal security, advanced by the CPSU congress. Its implementation has become the cardinal and long-term direction of the foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state, of the entire Soviet public.

45 years after the treacherous attack of fascist Germany on the USSR, the aggressive forces of imperialism and revanchism now conduct an anti-Soviet campaign of slander with the aim of revising the post-war arrangement in Europe, of recarving territorial frontiers that have shaped after the Second World War, Tolkunov said.

The Warsaw Treaty countries have proposed measures whose implementation opens a practical opportunity for arresting the present dangerous course of events, for stopping the development of unfavourable tendencies in Europe, in the entire system of international relations and changing this development for the better. While the USSR and its allies set the example of honesty and sincere interest in the improvement of the European and world political climate, the ruling circles of the USA and NATO virtually ignore the Soviet Union's constructive proposals. The United States refusal to observe the obligations under the SALT-2 treaty, the U.S. decision to continue nuclear testing, to conduct the preparation for star wars, deserve to be condemned, Lev Tolkunov said.

Having heard a report by Yuriy Kashlev, the head of the Soviet delegation at the European Conference on Human Contacts that was recently held in Bern, the participants in the meeting expressed indignation about the fact that contrary to the universal striving, the United States frustrated the adoption of important agreed upon recommendations on humanitarian issues, showing flagrant disregard for the interests of Europeans and for the implementation of the Helsinki accords.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS CITES BULGARIAN DELEGATE'S SPEECH ON MBFR TALKS

LD121308 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Vienna, 12 Jun (TASS)--Ambassador Ye Savov, the chief delegate of the Bulgarian People's Republic, said in his speech at today's plenary meeting at the talks on the Mutual Reductions of the Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe that the lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation to the point of its complete removal as the central task of the efforts to strengthen international security should also be accompanied by progress in the solution of the problem of conventional arms reductions. This approach of the Warsaw Treaty countries is graphically manifest in the decisions of the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty organizations which just took place in Budapest. The socialist countries are standing for drastic cuts in conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

They proposed a detailed program with a concrete timetable for reductions in the conventional armed forces and armaments. Regrettably, Ambassador Savov said, the NATO member countries aren't yet displaying any desire to reduce or at least to revise reduction-wise any of their military programs. They are going ahead with war preparations. It is also clear to everyone what grave consequences to international security and to trust between the sides can ensue from the unilateral denunciation of major international-legal documents, which restrict the growth of the more formidable types of weapons.

The Bulgarian delegate rejected the attempts of the West to sow mistrust towards the policy of the Warsaw Treaty countries and their position at the Vienna talks. From the point of view of the socialist countries, the Bulgarian delegate stressed, trust must be built and strengthened with real actions in the field of real disarmament. The west, however, is creating the impression that mutual trust is guaranteed not by reductions in the Armed Forces and armaments, I.E., material measures to lower the level of armed confrontation, but by the introduction of some arbitrary control measures divorced from disarmament.

The Bulgarian delegate furthermore demonstrated in his statement that stronger trust between the sides was actually contravened by such Western positions as unwillingness to reduce or limit armaments, the desire to shape up the commitment on a freeze so as to put the socialist countries at a disadvantage, the unjustified and unrealistic demand of a head count, and others.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is convinced, Ambassador Savov said in conclusion, that positive results in Vienna could contribute to the process of reductions in the conventional armed forces and armaments on a European scale.

Czechoslovakia's delegate, Ambassador Ludek Handl, forcefully demonstrated in his statement that, contrary to the allegations of the western negotiators, there was rough parity of the armed forces in Europe, including Central Europe. NATO he said, continues to escalate its military potential in Europe which is at odds with the goals of the Vienna talks. Ambassador Handl called upon the Western participants in the talks to take real steps towards reductions in the armed forces and armaments in Europe.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET-FINNISH CONSULTATIONS ON CDE, CSCE QUESTIONS

TASS Report

PM181321 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Consultations at the Finnish Foreign Affairs Ministry"]

[Text] Helsinki, 17 Jun -- On 17-18 June Soviet-Finnish consultations were held in Helsinki, during which questions pertaining to the continuation and development of the all-European process were discussed including the prospects for the conclusion of the work of the first stage of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Security Measures and Disarmament in Europe and preparations for the Vienna meeting of representatives of the CSCE participant states.

The Finnish side's attention was also drawn to the proposals of the Warsaw Pact states for a reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

The consultations were attended by L.I. Mendelevich, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium; V.M. Sobolev, Soviet ambassador to Finland and Yu.S. Deryabin, deputy chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry section; and on the Finnish side by K. Tornudd, under secretary of state at the Finnish Foreign Ministry; S. Pietinen, head of the Finnish Foreign Ministry political department, and J. Pekuri, ambassador at large.

The Soviet representatives were received by P. Vayrynen, Finnish foreign minister.

Finnish Report

PM231425 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 19 Jun 86 p 10

[Unattributed report: "Arms Are Reaching a Critical Level"]

[Text] The arms buildup is now approaching the critical level beyond which human civilization's survival becomes questionable. In order that this level is not exceeded there must now be rapid progress on disarmament, Soviet Foreign Ministry Foreign Policy Planning Administration Chief Lev Mendelevich said at a press conference in Helsinki Wednesday [18 June]. Mendelevich gave an account of the Soviet Union's latest disarmament proposals and outlined the view the Soviet Union takes of the military situation in the world. In the past Mendelevich has visited Finland to discuss questions relating

to CSCE. Mendelevich stressed that the Soviet Union will not lay down preconditions for a new summit between President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev but said that such a meeting should lead to concrete results.

According to Mendelevich the critical level has not yet been exceeded, but it is close. If this level is exceeded, it could become impossible to maintain an overview of developments. The main reason why Mendelevich thinks we are approaching the critical level is to be found in the endeavors to create new weapons systems.

During his 3-day visit to Finland Mendelevich discussed with Finnish Foreign Ministry Political Department Chief Seppo Pietinen the CSCE process, the expert meetings subsequent to the Madrid meeting, and the current Stockholm conference. They also discussed the follow-up meeting which begins in Vienna in the fall. The foreign Ministry announced that the talks were part of the traditional CSCE consultations between Finland and the Soviet Union.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

IZVESTIYA REPORTS ON CSCE DISARMAMENT FORUM IN BRUSSELS

PM131151 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by V. Antonov: "Condemnation of the Policy of Force"]

[Text] Brussels--The subject "European Security and the Latest Proposals on the Disarmament Problem" was the center of attention at the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation session held over the course of two days in the Belgian capital.

Delegations of the public from 21 European countries and representatives of 11 international organizations participated in its work. The Soviet delegation at the session was headed by M.F. Nenashev, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade.

The statement passed unanimously by the session participants notes that the European public condemns the aggressive policy of force and demands a revival of political dialogue, which must be followed by concrete steps aimed at stopping the arms race on earth and preventing one in space, as well as at reviving detente.

In their opinion, such real steps to resolve many problems in the interest of peace and security could be: immediate U.S. joining of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, ridding Europe of medium-range missiles by 1990, forming nuclear-free zones and zones free of chemical weapons on the European continent, renouncing the militarization of outer space, totally eliminating by the end of the century all arsenals of nuclear, chemical, and other types of mass destruction weapons, and considerably reducing conventional arms and armed forces with a simultaneous reduction in tactical nuclear weapons throughout European territory--from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The representatives of the public expressed hopes of a successful conclusion to and the achievement of tangible results by the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Security Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1438

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

JAPAN: ENVOY TO GENEVA TALKS CALLS FOR TEST BAN ORGAN

OW171336 Tokyo KYODO in English 1025 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 17 Jun (KYODO)--Japanese Ambassador Ryukichi Imai, deploring a 2-year interruption in work on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, Tuesday called for stepped up efforts to create an organization to promote such a ban. In a speech before a conference on disarmament here, he also proposed "a substantive discussion" on the subject, and scored the lack of progress in the establishment of an ad-hoc committee.

"We cannot but express our great concern about the fact that our work on a comprehensive test ban itself has been interrupted for more than 2 years because of our inability to find a consensus solution," said Imai, Japan's chief delegate to the disarmament meeting which opened here on 10 June. "Moreover the solution is not yet in sight," he added.

The Japanese envoy emphasized the importance of efforts to set up "a subsidiary organ to deal with a nuclear test ban."

"It is our strong hope," Imai told the meeting, "that a substantive discussion in the plenary session on various issues of interest to the delegations will start during this very period allotted to a nuclear test ban." Japanese officials said the Geneva meeting will last about 3 months, during which delegates will discuss the creation of an ad-hoc committee on a nuclear test ban and other key issues.

/9604
CSO: 5260/101

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BRIEFS

GORBACHEV, KADAR SPEECHES PUBLISHED--Moscow, 19 Jun (TASS)--A booklet, entitled "The Visit by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, to the Hungarian People's Republic" has been put out by the "Politizdat" publishers. The publication includes speeches by Mikhail Gorbachev and Janos Kadar, the general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, at a meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the collective of the Csepel Machine Tool Factory, other documents and materials. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1843 GMT 19 Jun 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1438

RELATED ISSUES

ACADEMICIANS VIEW ADVANTAGES OF DISARMAMENT

PM241549 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 24, 22-29 Jun 86 p 5

[Feature comprising articles by USSR Academicians Arbatov, Segdeyev, Gvishiani, and Bulgaria's Baliyevskiy: "War and Peace as Seen by Scientists"]

[Text] Dispel the Nuclear Myths

Academician Georgiy Arbatov. What are the top priorities in today's world? I would put it this way: the need for a new mode of thinking, an appreciation of the fact that to rely on old traditions and approaches to the problems of war and peace, and to ensure international security on the old notions about the role of the state and the forces of arms, is tantamount to death. This is the surest way to collective suicide. A new mentality and a new politics based on it are indispensable to survival.

The disaster in Chernobyl, which so stirred both Soviet and international public opinion, demonstrated this with renewed force. Different interpretations have been given to the Chernobyl events: There were some in the West who even tried to use them as an argument in favour of the arms race. They said: look, the Soviet Union did not provide us with "complete" information on the atomic power plant disaster. This means that it cannot be trusted, which in turn means that it is equally dangerous to negotiate with it and conclude agreements on arms limitations. Consequently, the arms race must continue without any restrictions. This is a perverted interpretation which can only bring nuclear catastrophe nearer.

What are the lessons of Chernobyl?

The first lesson is a dramatic reminder that the destructive forces created by people are such that the question about the threats to civilization is now posed in a totally new light. There have been plenty of "alarm bells" - both nuclear and non-nuclear - even before Chernobyl, including the Bhopal tragedy which claimed the lives of 2,500 people and ruined the health of another 200,000. The world has come face to face with "acid rain", and the pollution of the seas and oceans has become a grave threat. This is not to mention the main danger - the growing threat of humankind's destruction from conventional and nuclear weapons, fire, radiation and "nuclear winter".

The rapidly mounting technological vulnerability of humankind calls for a comprehensive restructuring of the entire system of international political and economic relations. And radical changes in political thinking.

The second lesson is that nuclear weapons cannot be used without the user getting hurt.

The third lesson is that sometimes even the most perfect, reliable and thoroughly tested technology can go wrong. Our scientists still cannot determine the causes of the accident. Many signs point to it being the result of an exceptional, highly improbable concurrence of circumstances. Chernobyl is by far not the only case of the most advanced and verified technology going wrong. In the United States and Britain there have been quite a few accidents at atomic power plants. We could also mention the Challenger tragedy and the recent breakdowns of the American Titan and Delta rockets.

It is, of course, not easy to move towards a new mentality. Signs indicating that humanity has entered a fatal phase of its history by developing ever more powerful means of destruction appeared even before the advent of the nuclear age; however, even the nuclear realities were not grasped immediately. The conceptualization of these realities started here in the late 1950's and early 1960's. The transition onto a new plane of understanding has been completed only in recent years. In the USA this process has developed at a slower pace. It started in the 1970's, came to a halt in the early 1980's, and under Reagan attempts are being that a cardinal change has occurred in the military field with the advent of nuclear weapons.

This tendency towards negating the obvious first came to a head in the utterly irresponsible, light-minded attitude to the nuclear problem. A former US Government official, T.K. Jones, said about nuclear war: "Many will survive if there are enough spades." Others spoke frivolously about "limited nuclear war" in Europe, about "protracted nuclear war", about "prevalence at all levels of conflict", etc. Later, when both American and world opinion responded to this with indignation and horror, the administration's mentality passed on to another stage -- that of attempts to find refuge from the new realities in technology, in "wonder weapons". This gave birth to the star wars programme. This aspect of the current US policy is fraught with immense danger to the whole of humankind.

The danger is not so much in the sense that these strategists are deliberately planning nuclear war (although there are such people and the idea of finding a miraculous way to win a nuclear war possesses their imagination in the same way as in the past alchemists were obsessed by the idea of producing gold out of mercury). But an even greater threat stems from the fact that today Washington doesn't want to stir a finger to set up reliable safeguards against an outbreak of a nuclear conflict. A perverted conclusion is drawn even from the fact that nuclear war is suicide: if so, no one will risk this war and therefore everything is permissible. A new phenomenon has sprung up: a challenging attitude to other nations, abuse of force, and scoffing at world public opinion. Take, for example, the US stand on the question of nuclear testing. In a nutshell, it is that if Washington needs to continue testing, it will do so no matter what others may say...

The pressing task today is to develop and promote a new way of thinking. There is a need to dispel the nuclear mythology, and to show the fundamental irrationality of the entire existing nuclear strategy.

"Instability of McNamara" and Others Academician Roald Sagdeyev. There hasn't been a question in the history of the arms race, it seems, which has not been subjected to such a detailed and comprehensive analysis as the Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI, which is being advocated by the American Administration. What are the conclusions arrived at by Soviet and foreign scientists?

The star wars programme brings us to the line beyond which the survival of human civilization may become impossible.

The introduction of a new, space dimension into the present system of nuclear confrontation has threatened to destabilize the entire situation. Robert McNamara, former US secretary of defense, pointed to the interconnection between the development of defensive and offensive armaments. This applied to the Soviet-American ABM Treaty, but it is equally true of the SDI programme. The point is that if one side begins to set up antimissile systems, the other side inevitably arrives at the conclusion that, as a result, it will lose the offensive potential to one extent or another. To what extent should it be built up to preserve the deterrent balance?

There is no precise answer to this question. However, in such cases scientists usually proceed from the "worst variant", which leads to an excessive buildup in the nuclear capability. The first side will respond by either reinforcing its defence system or bringing its offensive capability up to the level of the second, etc. The result is an accelerated arms race and strategic instability.

Instability can arise for other reasons as well. Specialists have estimated that several fragments of one per cent of the fire power provided by the SDI system with space-based elements will be enough to neutralize a similar system belonging to the other side. (This follows from the assumption that SDI is intended to destroy approximately a thousand enemy missiles. But to destroy the SDI system itself, highly sophisticated as it is, etc., it is enough to have roughly as much power as is needed to destroy one missile.) In this context the statements of SDI advocates to the effect that in the event of its development a "moral veto will be imposed" on an attack against the similar system of the other side, appear utterly groundless. Equally absurd are the assertions of the SDI authors that they are ready to share technology with the other side so that both systems should be launched into space in parallel.

There is a need to take into account the economic factor as well. In the camp of SDI advocates it is understood that the cost of implementing this programme is exceptionally high. There even exist the so-called "two Nietzsche criteria" on this score. First, according to Nietzsche, SDI will be rational only when the expenditures for its development - and this amounts to trillions of dollars - are smaller than the expenses of the other side to develop offensive means and take countermeasures, which are many times lower. Second, SDI must possess an absolute degree of survivability, that is, it must be invulnerable.

Both these criteria are practically unattainable. Why then is SDI still being pushed through in the United States? One of the possible answers, suggested by a Polish colleague, is this: A certain group in the West is prepared to pay an extortionate price to wipe out socialism.

Academician B. Raushenbakh convincingly demonstrated the exceptional danger for humankind stemming from the concept of automated wars built into the SDI idea. From his estimates it follows that the two supercomputers, which control the SDI of each of the sides and which function in an ideal way separately, may make mistakes when interacting with each other - mistakes that will spark an unsanctioned commencement of hostilities. Humankind must not entrust its destiny to computers, this is immoral!

What Will the Human Soul Turn Into?

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences President Atanas Baliyevski. I was once asked at UNESCO in Paris: Is it possible for people to destroy all life on earth? I replied: No, it's impossible. Because nature is something great and powerful. In the event of nuclear war, rats and cockroaches will survive. But the conditions for the existence of the human race and its further development may well be destroyed. And then humankind will find its dismal end...

But let's assume that there will be no nuclear war. What developments will there be? We are holding the devil by its tail, thinking that this will go on indefinitely. But this is a very dangerous delusion. Tensions remain in the world, pressure is still being brought to bear on people's souls, the arms race continues, which may bring human civilization to a horrible end.

Look, for instance, how people are propagandizing war. They keep saying all the time: war, missiles, war, missiles...All this is undermining the pillars of humankind.

People are being deprived of an outlook for the future, of the possibility to dream about it, and the interest in doing anything for the future's sake. They think only of the present.

We are seeing many negative phenomena in the world. For instance, terrorism -- individual, organized, state. This is explained by many reasons. One of them is that these acts are committed by people whose future has been destroyed.

For centuries and millennia people have observed the moral norms without which society's existence is impossible. After all, human society is not a herd of animals. People are homo sapiens. And in the main they think in terms of being good and kind. But what kind feelings are awakened in people in our days?

Several years ago I watched on TV how American soldiers were being trained. It was nightmarish. Maybe they are not bad guys at all in themselves, but they were taught to "kill a Russian". To kill a Russian -- what for? -- what has this Russian done to you, Mr. American? But this is a method of training -- that kind of training which poisons and ruins the souls of many generations.

We almost fail to notice this process. But this, after all, is turning into a habit. If we go on living this way, in a generation's time people's souls will be so corrupted even without nuclear catastrophe that humankind will be a zoological species. Ethics, morality -- everything may be destroyed.

Models of the Future

Academician Dzhermen Gvishiani. Specialists from the USSR State Planning Committee and the Academy of Sciences have carried out research based on computer experiments with a nine-region system of models. In this computer-developed and realized system the world was represented by such regions as the USSR, the PRC, the other socialist countries, the USA, Japan, the EEC member-countries, the OPEC member-countries, and other developing countries. The experiments included assessments of the results of two scenarios -- inertial development (where 5 to 6 percent of the gross world product is spent on confrontation purposes) and accelerated socio-economic development (where the military spending's share in the gross world product in 1986-2000 is lowered by 11 per cent annually, making it possible to reduce this share fivefold in 15 years).

What have these studies indicated? In the event of inertial development, global problems are bound to exacerbate. Even if there is not a nuclear conflict, the aggravation of these problems leads to grave negative consequences for both developed and developing countries. What follows from this?

Inasmuch as nearly a half of the scientific-technical potential of the developed countries works on military technologies, scientific and technological progress does not manage to compensate for the economic depletion of natural resources. Moreover, the economic efficiency of new technologies and technical means does not prove equal to helping resolve many global problems. Hence the low growth rates of labour productivity; a lowering in the pace of economic development, and an aggravation of social antagonisms. The lack of resources needed to solve ecological problems leads to the environment reaching a critical state. The quality of life worsens accordingly.

Although on the inertial way the developing nations have rates of economic growth which are from 1.5 to 2.5 percent higher on the average than those in developed countries, even their problems remain unresolved.

The gap in the level of economic development between developed and developing countries is not narrowing; it becomes impossible to solve the food problem even despite the looming slowdown in the demographic growth. The financial indebtedness of the less developed nations is not diminishing, and the exploitation of their manpower and natural resources by developed capitalist countries is being intensified.

A totally different picture is revealed when examining the scenario of accelerated development in conditions of disarmament. Thus, arms reduction may be instrumental in rendering considerable assistance to the developing nations in the shape of specially adapted technologies and technical means, as well as the material resources contributing to an increase in the rate of production accumulation. Assuming that the economic efficiency of the new technologies will gradually increase up to 2000 by roughly 70 per cent and the rate of production accumulation by 20 per cent, then - in comparison with the inertial development scenario - the developing nations' rates of economic growth will increase by 50 per cent by 2000, the per capita gross domestic product by 20 per cent, and their share in world production will grow to 12 per cent. Moreover, there will be a reduction in the economic gap between developed and developing countries, and the possibility will arise for an effective solution of the food problem.

At the same time, the developed countries, especially the USSR and the USA, will improve their economic performance.

These research studies cogently demonstrate that disarmament is instrumental in solving the global problems and ensuring humankind's further advance along the path of scientific, technological and social progress.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1457

END