

198222

JPRS-TAC-86-046

12 JUNE 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

19990422 089

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release

Distribution Unlimited

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

9
96
A05

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.

12 JUNE 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Moscow: White House 'Railroads' SDI Through Congress (Nikolay Borin; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 21 May 86)	1
Moscow on U.S. Plans To 'Upset' ABM Treaty for SDI (Vladimir Kazakov; Moscow in English to North America, 22 May 86)	2
Soviet Paper Hits U.S. 'Manipulation' of ABM Treaty (A. Mozgovoy; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 22 May 86)	3
TASS: Weinberger Hopes for Austrian Participation in SDI (Moscow TASS, 20, 21 May 86)	5
Weinberger in Austria	5
Austrian Protests	5
TASS: Skepticism About SDI Growing Among Americans (Moscow TASS, 29 May 86)	6
Soviet Reportage on West European Opinions on SDI (Moscow TASS, 27, 28 May 86)	8
French Leaders Split	8
Raimond Interested	9
Mitterrand Opposed	9
Spain's Serra Voices 'Doubts'	9
Soviet Government Issues Statement to Israel on SDI (Moscow PRAVDA, 25 May 86; Moscow TASS International Service, 24 May 86)	11
Interests of International Security	11
IZVESTIYA Condemns Ties	12

Briefs	
Nonsupport of SDI	13
U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
Karpov Interviewed on Progress of Fifth Round (V. Karpov Interview; Moscow Domestic Service, 24 May 86) .	14
TASS Reports on Meetings of Fifth Round (Moscow TASS, various dates)	16
Round Opens 8 May	16
INF Group 22 May	16
Strategic Group 21 May	16
INF Group 29 May	16
USSR Foreign Ministry Press Conference on U.S., Soviet Stance (Moscow PRAVDA, 18 May 86)	17
Moscow Program Discusses Gorbachev Proposal, ABM, SALT Treaties (Pavel Kuznetsov, et al.; Moscow in English to North America, 25 May 86)	20
SALT/START ISSUES	
USSR Paper Alleges U.S. Plans To 'Torpedo' SALT II (Edgar Cheporov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 17 May 86)	23
USSR Foreign Ministry Press Conference on U.S. SALT II Policy (Moscow Television Service, 23 May 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 May 86)	25
Moscow TV Broadcast	25
PRAVDA Report	30
Soviet Comments on U.S. Dismantling of Two Poseidon Submarines (Moscow TASS International Service, 28 May 86; Moscow Television Service, 29 May 86)	34
Decision 'Forced'	34
'Hesitation and Delay', by Viktor Konnov	34
Briefs	
U.S. Sub Mission	36
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
TASS Commentaries on 15 May Soviet Proposal (Moscow TASS, 16, 20 May 86)	37
'New Opportunity'	37
U.S. Response Hit	38

Soviet Delegation Hits Kampelman for Revealing 15 May Proposal (Moscow TASS International Service, 16 May 86)	40
--	----

Soviet Ambassador to France on Nuclear Issues (Paris LE MONDE, 10 Apr 86)	41
--	----

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: NATO Bodies Consider Siting U.S. Binary Arms in Europe (Various sources, various dates)	42
--	----

'Behind Public's Back'	42
------------------------	----

U.S. Claims 'Crisis', by A. Yevgenyev	42
---------------------------------------	----

West European Opposition Cited, by Georgiy Zubkov	43
---	----

NATO Military Planning Committee	45
----------------------------------	----

NATO Military Committee, by Albert Balebanov	45
--	----

FRG's Woerner Comments	46
------------------------	----

Meetings End	46
--------------	----

'Creeping Chemical Rearmament'	47
--------------------------------	----

NATO Council Meeting, by Viktor Ivanov	48
--	----

'Deep Disagreements' Emerge	49
-----------------------------	----

Chemical Weapons Depot in Maryland 'Serious Hazard' (Moscow TASS, 8 May 86)	50
--	----

Briefs

Mexico on U.S. Experiments	51
----------------------------	----

Bacteriological Weapons Conference	51
------------------------------------	----

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Soviet Journal Urges NATO To Accept Warsaw Pact MBFR Proposals (K. Borisov; Moscow MEZDHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 5, May 86).	52
--	----

TASS Reports on CDE Conference Held in Stockholm (Moscow TASS, 10, 23 May 86)	58
--	----

Military Exercises Discussed	58
------------------------------	----

Grivenskiy Attacks West	58
-------------------------	----

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow Hits Reagan Response to Gorbachev on Test Ban (Boris Kalyagin; Moscow Television Service, 25 May 86) ...	60
--	----

Moscow Hits Weinberger Comment on Nordic NFZ (Moscow International Service, 26 May 86)	62
---	----

Soviet Late May Comments on Latest U.S. Test (Various sources, various dates)	63
--	----

U.S. 'Contempt' for World Cited, by Valentin Zorin	63
--	----

U.S. Ignores Public Demand, by Ivan Ablamov	64
---	----

Test 'Political Hypocrisy', by Igor Charikov	65
'Contradicts' Geneva Talks	66
'Shaken World Opinion', by Nikolay Bragin	67
'Open Challenge' to World, by Valentin Zorin	68
TASS Assails U.S. Nuclear Tests, Deployments in Micronesia (Moscow TASS, 29 May 86)	70
Soviet Paper Reported To Cite Sakharov on Test Ban (Peter Bartels; Hamburg BILD, 30 May 86)	72

RELATED ISSUES

Moscow Contrasts Soviet, U.S. Approaches to Verification (Vladimir Bogachev; Moscow World Service, 25 May 86)	74
Moscow Talk Show on Test Ban, SALT II, Eureka (Vladimir Pasko, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 23 May 86)	76
Moscow 'Observers Roundtable': Test Ban, CW Arms, CDE (Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 15 May 86)	80
TASS Blames U.S. for French Refusal To Host UN Meeting (Moscow TASS, 29 May 86)	85
TASS: Conclusions of Pentagon Nuclear Winter Report 'Peculiar' (Moscow TASS, 15 May 86)	86
AFP: USSR Agrees To 'Tighter Supervision' by IAEA (Paris AFP, 23 May 86)	87
USSR's Dobrynin Writes on Arms Control (Anatoliy Dobrynin; Prague RUDE PRAVO, 22 May 86)	88
Brazil's Sodre Continued Negotiations on Disarmament (Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO, 20 May 86)	90

/7310

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW: WHITE HOUSE 'RAILROADS' SDI THROUGH CONGRESS

LD221018 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 21 May 86

[Nikolay Borin commentary]

[Text] The United States Administration has resorted to outright blackmail to railroad through Congress its Strategic Defense Initiative, commonly known as the star wars project. A report to Congress says that if it fails to release the money to build weapons systems under that program the White House have to drop the Soviet-American ABM Treaty. Congress was told that after abrogating the treaty the White House would immediately start testing and deploying space weapons. Nikolay Borin comments:

The message to Congress failed to mention the position of American allies on the issue although Washington, when it received their consent to participating in the scheme, promised them that it would comply with the ABM Treaty. The Thatcher government then saw the promises as a guarantee that Britain would be involved only in research for the SDI. Anyway, this is what it told the alarmed public at home and in other West European NATO countries. President Reagan however, interviewed recently by the Baltimore SUN, remarked that he was longing to have space weapons and that he would agree to their partial deployment even before the work had been completed. The United States Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle has said that the first components of space weapons are going to be sited in space in the 10 years to come.

By the way, American military experts at a recent news conference on the SDI in Washington repeatedly called for regarding the star wars as a common project. There was much talk about the need for greater unity of the NATO members on political and military questions that have arisen or can arise as the SDI is implemented. Meanwhile, the recent attempts to make inroads into the Soviet-American SALT II treaty and the ABM Treaty showed the real worth of the White House's pronouncements. London and Bonn late last month hailed the statement of the United States special envoy Paul Nitze, who said that the President was going to abide by the restrictions under the SALT II treaty. The United States then was also urged to comply with the ABM Treaty, which curtails an arms race in space. However, less than a month after that both treaties came under fire from the administration and even became a matter of arguing between the President and Congress.

I have an impression that as soon as the question of the SDI is raised, the brainfathers [as heard] of the program -- I mean arms manufacturers, the military and politicians -- forget everything, even the allies. One of the leaders of the star wars project, George Hess, has said the United States needs a Rommel in space. This is an extremely tactless historical parallel. Rommel, as you may know, was one of Hitler's generals who fought against British troops in Africa during World War II. The comparison he has made is crystal clear -- that Washington does not care a bit about its partners' attitude to its dangerous war games in space.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ON U.S. PLANS TO 'UPSET' ABM TREATY FOR SDI

LD230504 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 22 May 86

[Vladimir Kazakov commentary]

[Text] Congress has been told that if it does not support the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative the administration will have to violate this major treaty. But what if Congress fully supports the SDI program and appropriates the funds requested? Then the ABM Treaty will be broken all the same. To justify this, the so-called limited interpretation of its articles is used. But the treaty is concrete. Article 1 of the treaty bans the deployment of the national ABM system. But this is the principal aim of work under the SDI program. Article 5 bans the development, testing and deployment of this system or its space-based components. But SDI implies moving weapons into space. In defiance of Article 6, phased-array radars are being installed in Greenland and Britain. A station using the elements of a radar tested against missiles has been mounted on the Aleutian Islands in violation of the treaty. MIRV warheads for antimissiles are being developed.

How can this square with the assurances of the administration that the United States would like to see nuclear weapons scrapped and arms limited and curtailed? American experts themselves note that the 1972 ABM Treaty is a major arms race deterrent. Their talk about striving for disarmament and stability seems to be empty talk. Facts show the wish to upset the ABM Treaty is just a link in the chain of actions carried out by the administration to whip up the arms race and secure arms supremacy. The Pentagon now feels the treaty limitations are too fettering.

Space-arms systems conflict with the ABM Treaty. A new generation of nuclear offensive systems cannot be fitted into the framework of SALT II. When the United States equips its B-52 bombers with long-range cruise missiles it will exceed the permissible ceilings of the SALT II treaty by the end of the year. That's why Washington has already told the allies it may upset some of the treaty articles. And for the same reason the Reagan administration is offering Congress the absurd alternative: severing the ABM Treaty either at once or gradually. Experience shows nothing good can come out of an arms race escalation. In the past, retaliatory measures always ensured, and the world kept growing more explosive.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET PAPER HITS U.S. 'MANIPULATION' OF ABM TREATY

PM270740 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 May 86 First Edition p 3

[A. Mozgovoy "Commentary": "Treaty Under Threat"]

[Text] The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has published a collection of materials containing an unequivocal threat that, if Congress cuts appropriations for President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), the White House will "review its commitment" to stick to the terms of the ABM Treaty of indefinite duration and will resort to a "broader interpretation" of the agreement.

It is not a new idea, in fact. Only last year the U.S. Administration launched a perfidious attack on the ABM Treaty to give the military-industrial complex a clear run at implementing the "star wars" program. New York lawyer (F. Kansberg), who specializes in combating the mafia and pornography, was instructed to sabotage this very important agreement. U.S. success in this sphere is unconvincing. But this fact did not bother the organizers of the subversive act--U.S. Under Secretary of Defense F. Ikle and Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle. They have deliberately confused pornography with politics on the banks of the Potomac. (Kansberg) was given his money, and without further ado he did his dirty work. He wrote a "study." It came up with the absurd idea that the ABM Treaty authorizes the development [razrabotka] and testing of space strike complexes.

Senior figures in the Washington Administration eagerly latched on to (Kansberg)'s conclusions. But the "broad" interpretation of the treaty caused a wave of protest in the United States. Some eminent U.S. international lawyers opposed it. "The unilateral rejection of the agreed interpretation of the treaty in order to aid the implementation of programs for the creation [sozdaniye] of new weapons undermines the rule of law on which the international system is based," a letter signed by former secretaries E. Richardson, (Sh. Khafstedler), and C. Vance and Dean of the Harvard University Law School E. Griswold points out. Ambassador G. Smith, who headed the U.S. delegation at the talks to elaborate the ABM Treaty, said that the new interpretation would make this very important document a "dead letter." The Republican Administration backpedaled. The "broad" interpretation was replaced by a "narrow" one which, incidentally, is also a revision of the treaty, but less so.

To all appearances, Washington is now launching a new campaign in favor of the "broad" interpretation of the agreement. This time it is putting forward the argument that a "new approach" will save considerable amounts of money. Apparently, strict observance of the treaty is wasteful in that it "bars the way to certain major tests of ABM technology." Strange logic, to say the least! How can a reduction in appropriations for brand-new space armaments result in overexpenditure?

Of course, it is not a matter of a prudent attitude toward the federal budget, but of something else. "Senior Pentagon representatives are trying to use the economic arguments in order to break with a treaty to which they are totally opposed," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. This is the reason for Washington's current gymnastics over "savings"! Through the full implementation of SDI U.S. militarist circles are hoping to acquire military superiority over the USSR. But they cannot count on it. Our country will find a sufficiently swift, effective, and less expensive reply. Once the United States, possessing substantial advantages in terms of numbers of nuclear munitions and delivery means, still entertained the hope that with the acquisition of a new type of "wonder" weapon it would be able to dictate to the world. In conditions of strategic parity such designs are sheer illusion. Moreover, anyone who tries to make a sprint in the arms race may end up the loser in the end.

The Soviet Union is a consistent opponent of military rivalry. It is proposing that concrete steps be taken in disarmament. "If the arms race spreads to new areas, if the ABM and SALT-II treaties are undermined," M.S. Gorbachev said during his meeting with Spanish Prime Minister F. Gonzalez, "the degree of distrust will increase in a geometric progression, undermining the stability of international relations even further." Washington's manipulation of the ABM Treaty may have the most disastrous consequences for the security of all countries, including the United States itself.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: WEINBERGER HOPES FOR AUSTRIAN PARTICIPATION IN SDI

Weinberger in Austria

LD201938 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 20 May 86

[Text] Vienna May 20 TASS -- The U.S. Secretary of defense, Caspar Weinberger, who is making a tour of a number of West European countries, has arrived in Austria, a first post-war visit by the head of the U.S. Defense Department to this country.

According to local observers, Washington's emissary is going to discuss in Vienna the problem of Austria's contribution to the defense of the West. Even the interview, given by Weinberger to the newspaper "DIE PRESSE" [words indistinct] bears proof of the undisguised pressure put by Washington on neutral Austria in this question. That the Austrian Armed Forces are demonstrating convincing selfdefense capability is a positive contribution to the NATO deterrence and defense, he said. Weinberger in actual fact supported attempts by certain forces in Austria which seek to remove a clause from the State Treaty which bans Austria's possession of missiles. Caspar Weinberger expressed the "hope" that Austrian firms would show interest in orders related to the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

Austrian Protests

LD212213 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Vienna May 21 TASS -- The U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger today completed his official visit to Austria. In Vienna he had negotiations with Federal Chancellor of Austria Fred Sinowatz, Foreign and Defence Ministers Leopold Gratz and Helmut Kruenes.

The visit of the U.S. defence secretary was met with numerous protests of Austrian progressive organisations against the policy of the American Administration. In a joint statement they demanded that the United States should stop the star wars preparations and renunciate nuclear tests.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: SKEPTICISM ABOUT SDI GROWING AMONG AMERICANS

LD291904 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 29 May (TASS)--TASS News Analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Scepticism about "star wars" program described by the White House as the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), is growing among Americans, also in the U.S. Congress.

From the time SDI originated, the idea of the militarisation of outer space was not supported by most Americans, and now many of those who at first had fallen for the administration's propaganda come to doubt the expediency of the so-called "space shield" and express the justifiable concern that the "star wars" programme might be a spur to an uncontrolled nuclear and space arms race.

One of the reasons behind such attitudes on Capitol Hill is the growing opposition to the "star wars" programme by American scientists and technicians who are convinced that this programme has an extremely destabilising and provocative nature, said representative of the Federation of Scientists Kathleen Hancock.

56 American laureates of the Nobel Prize, 700 members of the U.S. Academy of Sciences declared against SDI. 46 senators, the other day, voiced their negative attitude to the implementation of the "star wars" plans.

People declare against SDI for various reasons, but the main one is the conviction that the implementation of SDI will undoubtedly lessen international security. For the very idea of "star wars" rests on the belief that a nuclear catastrophe is possible, that one side can deal a strike by nuclear weapons at nuclear weapon systems of the other side. In this case, in expert opinion, the globe will be swathed in lethal radiation within hours.

Certain persons in the West, speculating on the bitter experience of Chernobyl, whip up a "wave of indignation" against nuclear power stations, call in question the expediency of atomic power engineering altogether. Meanwhile they regard it quite possible to tolerate and even justify the build up of the nuclear potential of the United States and its allies in NATO.

One would look in vain for logic in such an approach to the problem of ensuring man's security. The Soviet Union holds a clear cut stand in this matter. In contrast to SDI, it advances a comprehensive programme of security of all sides, all peoples: It suggests that the globe be rid of all types of nuclear and chemical weapons by the beginning of the next century. But disregarding Soviet proposals, they in Washington continue nuclear testing in Nevada, speed up the implementation of "star wars" programme. They, apparently, still fail to realise that life brought mankind to a threshold where, just as a combat engineer defusing mines, it can make a mistake only once and that mistake will be fatal.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1391

12 June 1986

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET REPORTAGE ON WEST EUROPEAN OPINIONS ON SDI

French Leaders Split

LD281759 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 28 May 86

[Text] Paris May 28 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reports:

What is official France's attitude to American plans of militarisation of outer space?

A few months ago the answer could be only one -- negative. Both the president of the country and the then government repeatedly declared against the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative" and rightfully stressed that it inevitably leads to a new twist in the arms spiral, to spreading the arms race to outer space and precarious disruption of the existing military equilibrium.

Such an unequivocal answer cannot be given today. Statements which were made in the past few days by top leaders of the country testify to differences that appeared between the new right-wing majority government and the socialist president, and to the shaping of dangerous changes in that question.

Speaking to journalists at the French Diplomatic Press Association, Prime Minister Jacques Chirac openly backed American "star wars" plans, declaring that the government treats these plans "very positively" and will not tolerate France's staying away from SDI explorations. Foreign Minister Jean Bernard Raimond spoke in the same vein in the course of the debate in the Senate.

These pronouncements which testify to the obvious heightening of right-wing and pro-American tendencies in the new cabinet's foreign policy were not left unanswered. President Francois Mitterrand, speaking to cadets of the Academy of Land Forces in Coetquidan (Morbihan department) has said that, as before, he is against France's being drawn into SDI. French defences have long been based on nuclear deterrent strategy which ought to be independent. Nobody has the right to decide France's future for it, he said.

Our country shall not allow to be drawn into a conflict contrary to its wish. It is true to its allied obligations but it does not intend to draw itself to a greater extent, as it befits an independent country, into mechanisms "within the framework of which it will not be able to freely and fully participate in taking decisions." In this case the president did not mention the star wars programme, but, as is noted by political observers, the meaning of his words is absolutely clear.

The French public express concern over the intention of the right-wing government to tie the country to American star war plans. The peace champions are mobilizing their forces all over the country. On the initiative of the influential anti-war organisation, "the call of 100," they decided to hold a national demonstration in the capital on June 15, this year. It will be keynoted by the slogans of struggle against the arms race, primarily nuclear, against militarisation of outer space.

Raimond Interested

LD280951 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 28 May 86

[Text] Paris May 28 TASS -- Jean Bernard Raimond, French minister of foreign affairs, speaking in the Senate during a debate on foreign policy matters, has stated that France cannot stand aloof from the technological development which Reagan's 'Strategic Defence Initiative' (SDI) is supposed to bring about. Thus, he again confirmed the stand of Prime Minister Jacques Chirac who had stated recently the 'positive attitude' of the government of rightist majority to the U.S. "star wars" programme. The French foreign minister insisted on its being important for Paris to continue consultations with the United States and West European partners about SDI. It is noted here that President Francois Mitterrand of France comes out against the country's participation in the U.S. space militarization programme.

Mitterrand Opposed

LD272230 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Paris, 28 May (TASS)--President Francois Mitterrand of France has declared once again against France's participation in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative." Our country does not wish to be drawn into a conflict contrary to our will, he said in his speech to students of the Land Forces School in Coetquidan, Morbihan Department.

Mitterrand reiterated France's commitment to its obligations and alliances and noted that its participation in engagement depended exclusively on the country itself. At the same time, he declared for preserving the present nuclear deterrence strategy which, he said, ensures France's independence.

In his recent speech the Prime Minister of France Jacques Chirac is known to have supported the outer space militarization plans of the U.S. Administration.

Spain's Serra Voices 'Doubts'

LD282256 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 28 May 86

[Text] Madrid May 28 TASS -- Spanish Defence Minister Narciso Serra has voiced serious doubts as to "expediency" of the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative. Judging by the experience of other countries, participating in the SDI, he said, speaking at sessions of the fund for exploration of questions of peace and international relations, the Star Wars programme can hardly be "a positive element" in conducting a trans-Atlantic dialogue. The minister expressed anxiety that realisation of the programme might entail escalation of the arms race.

The Government of Spain has not yet officially determined its stand on Spain's possible participation in SDI projects. The inter-ministerial commission has elaborated a special report on the issue, which is now being studied.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET GOVERNMENT ISSUES STATEMENT TO ISRAEL ON SDI

Interests of International Security

PM271058 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Contrary to the Interests of International Security -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The Soviet Union has issued a statement to the Israeli Government regarding the signing in Washington on 6 May 1986 of the agreement on Israel's joining in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The statement stresses that the Israeli Government cannot but know that that program is designed to spread the weapons race into outer space and turn space into a zone of military rivalries and confrontation. The plans to create a qualitatively new class of strike weapons and deploy them in outer space is a component part of the global strategy of the United States, which is striving to upset the prevailing military-strategic equilibrium and to elevate the arms race to a qualitatively new level.

It is obvious that if outer space is packed with weapons it will be a serious blow to mankind's hopes for creating an all-embracing international security system and delivering the world from nuclear weapons before the end of this century. Instead, mankind will be faced with a disastrous threat, about which the Soviet Union has warned more than once.

Complicity in the implementation of the U.S. plans for the militarization of outer space runs counter, as the Soviet Union is convinced, to the aspirations of all people, including the Israeli people.

By making its "contribution" to turning near-earth space into an arena of confrontation, the Israeli leadership thus contributes to an aggravation of general tension in the world and consequently in the Middle East. There is no doubt that along with a growth of tensions prospects for the attainment of a just Middle East settlement in the interests of all states and people involved will become even more remote.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed its clear evaluation of the SDI program as that fraught with an enormous threat to mankind, as directed against a turn for the better in international affairs. Those who join in its implementation should realize the measure of their responsibility.

The Soviet side, the statement says, hopes that the Israeli Government will draw proper conclusions in favor of preventing the spreading of the arms race into outer space and strengthening universal security.

The statement to the Israeli Government was turned over through the Foreign Ministry of Finland, which represents the USSR's interests in Israel.

IZVESTIYA Condemns Ties

LD242115 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1629 GMT 24 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 24 May (TASS) -- Tel Aviv's decision to participate in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative should be viewed as a new substantive factor in the military-political situation in the Middle East, which lends even greater acuteness to the unregulated crisis and after a fashion extends its regional boundaries, 'IZVESTIYA' writes today. Israel's involvement in the strategic programs of the United States, the newspaper comments, whips up the arms race in this region for which the selfsame Israel was one of the sources.

The new military partnership with the United States evidently rouses the aggression of the Israeli military. It is no coincidence that precisely after announcing its participation in SDI, Israel sharply intensified the campaign of threats and blackmail with respect to Syria to the approving accompaniment of Washington and London.

However, no references to the regional situation can hide the important fact that Tel Aviv's involvement in the implementation of the "star wars" program goes far beyond the boundaries of the realities of the Middle East. It means that Israel is becoming a participant in the global plans of the U.S. Administration and its nearest NATO partners, 'IZVESTIYA' stresses.

The decision of the Tel Aviv government to become a participant in SDI logically flows from the spirit and the imperatives of the American-Israeli strategic alliance. In other words, Washington believes that the time has come for Israel to pay for American aid. The United States, encouraging Israel's regional ambitions, is clearly interested in bringing Israel into the orbit of a global anti-Soviet strategy. However, the newspaper writes, for the Israeli leaders to blindly follow the imperious course of Washington will neither strengthen Israel's security nor will it bring political dividends. Through their decision, the Israeli leaders are deepening the abyss of enmity and confrontation dividing it from its Arab neighbors, and are complicating its international positions.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

NONSUPPORT OF SDI--Luxembourg, 26 May (TASS)--Serious disapproval of the "star wars" program, strenuously carried on by the U.S. Administration, in the Western world has made itself feel new today at the spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly, which has closed here. Some 200 parliamentarians from 16 NATO countries which took part in it refused to support in the final resolution the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative." Following a vote by the overwhelming majority, a declaration of support for the "star wars" program was dropped from the text of the resolution. Most members of the delegation of U.S. Congress to the session also joined opposition to the declaration of support. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 26 May 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1391

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

KARPOV INTERVIEWED ON PROGRESS OF FIFTH ROUND

LD241328 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 24 May 86

[Interview with V. Karpov, head of the USSR delegation at the Geneva arms negotiations on nuclear and space weapons, by Radio Moscow correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev, in Switzerland; date not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Dmitriyev] Viktor Pavlovich, what can be said about the state of negotiations now that 2 weeks have passed since the latest round -- the fifth round -- opened?

[Karpov] Two weeks is, of course, not a great deal of time to advance negotiations to the point where they would require a different assessment. Nevertheless, the fifth round was preceded by four rounds -- practically a year of negotiations -- and they have revealed sufficiently fully both the differences between the sides and the possibilities which in our view can be made use of for these negotiations to achieve mutually acceptable solutions, to form the basis of major solutions -- solutions that could indeed strengthen the security of both the United States and the USSR, and contribute to strengthening international security by achieving the program of nuclear disarmament advanced by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January. Stage one of that program constitutes the substance of the negotiations between the USSR and the United States on offensive strategic weapons.

[Dmitriyev] The U.S. side continues to insist that it will not give up its Strategic Defensive Initiative program.

[Karpov] Yes, and so far our U.S. partners have not been able to explain to us how implementing the SDI program, as it is called in the United States, could correspond to a solution to the problem of preventing an arms race in space.

This point is one of the agreed general aims of the negotiations. In this plane indeed there is no progress and presumably there can be none if the U.S. side continues to insist on carrying out its star wars program. A serious, fundamental amendment to the U.S. position is required here.

[Dmitriyev] Speakes, the White House representative, declared a few days ago that possibilities exist for achieving an accord on medium-range missiles in Europe in the immediate future.

[Karpov] If it was possible to reach agreement on eliminating Soviet and U.S. missiles in Europe, which forms the essence of the Soviet position -- that is how it has already been formulated in the nuclear disarmament program advanced by the USSR -- it would be a major step in the cause of strengthening European security and, of course, it would have a major effect on universal security. If White House representative Speakes has in mind the proposal that the USSR recently submitted at the negotiations in the form of a draft agreement on eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, one hopes that this is an expression of a serious attitude by the White House toward the submitted Soviet draft. However, I would not like to draw final conclusions now. Time will show how much progress can be made here in the work of agreeing on specific formulations of an agreement. The Soviet side is ready for such work. Things will depend on the U.S. side.

[Dmitriyev] I would like to clarify whether the U.S. position corresponds to the accords reached in the joint statement adopted at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

[Karpov] I think that in essence the United States is going for a reexamination of what was agreed to at the summit by the USSR and U.S. representatives.

[Dmitriyev] A reexamination in which direction?

[Karpov] Naturally, a reexamination in a worsening direction. That is to say, for example, if we have an accord on the necessity of preventing an arms race in space, the U.S. side is attempting to present its SDI program as a program to prevent an arms race in space, which, as the saying goes, just does not hold water. If we are talking about preventing the arms race on earth, which is a sensible objective, the United States in its position in essence does not want to adopt the sort of measures that would indeed end the arms race on earth. They want to leave loopholes, channels for continuing the race in directions which are to their advantage. Calculations to achieve one-sided military advantages over the USSR have never been justified and never will. We will take the appropriate measures to guarantee our security. But that would not be our choice. Our choice is a precise accord between the two countries on preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1393

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS ON MEETINGS OF FIFTH ROUND

Round Opens 8 May

Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 8 May 86

[Text] Geneva, 8 May (TASS)--The scheduled 5th round of talks between the USSR and the U.S. on nuclear and space arms opened here today.

The Soviet delegation is led by Viktor Karpov, and the American by Max Kampelman.

INF Group 22 May

LD221112 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Geneva, 22 May (TASS)--The group on medium-range nuclear armaments held its meeting here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Group 21 May

LD211130 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Geneva, 31 May (TASS)--The group on strategic arms held a meeting here today in the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons.

INF Group 29 May

LD291134 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Geneva, 29 May (TASS)--The group on medium-range nuclear weapons today met at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons here. The group on space weapons also met today.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1393

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS CONFERENCE ON U.S., SOVIET STANCE.

PM201110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and Foreign Journalists on questions concerning nuclear and space weapons talks was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 16 May. It was attended by A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, and Colonel General N.F. Chervov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

A statement at the opening of the press conference said that of late the U.S. Administration has again been spreading fabrications about the USSR's position at the talks on nuclear and space weapons. Official U.S. spokesmen, including the President himself, claim that the U.S. side has made new and far-reaching proposals at the Geneva talks, but Moscow is still failing to reply to them.

Proceeding from the urgent task of releasing mankind from the nuclear threat, the Soviet Union has put forward in the last few months alone an integrated program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons by the year 2000. It has put forward new proposals on destroying chemical weapons and on considerably reducing all components of ground forces and tactical aircraft in Europe. In the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev presented the innovative and creative Basic Principles of an All-Embracing International Security System. More than 9 months ago the Soviet leadership, displaying state wisdom and a high sense of responsibility, announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and, as M.S. Gorbachev said on 14 May, it has decided to extend it to 6 August this year.

What has the United States done in this time? It has done a great deal, not in the sphere of limiting and reducing arms, but in the sphere of building up all types of arms and in the elaboration of concepts and doctrines to justify the militarization of space and strong-arm aggressive foreign policy methods. The U.S. reluctance to do anything real to curb the arms race was laid bare on the question of halting nuclear weapon tests. As for the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments, in the previous four rounds the U.S. side came up with nothing new compared with what it had said earlier, which it knew to be unacceptable. Therefore, the U.S. figures' claim that the United States submitted something new at the talks on 1 November 1985 and 24 February 1986 does not square with the facts.

Equally far from the truth are the U.S. Administration's claims that the aforesaid U.S. proposals have been left unanswered by the Soviet Union.

First, the Soviet side's principled reply consists in the abovementioned far-reaching, large-scale, and well considered proposals. Second, the Soviet side carefully analyzed the proposals submitted by the United States on 1 November 1985 and during the talks with Secretary of State G. Shultz in November 1985, and at the actual talks an official evaluation was made of the proposals and it was demonstrated in detail why they are unacceptable.

In particular, it was stressed that the U.S. proposals sidestep the main issue in the current strategic situation -- how to prevent an arms race in space, because without a ban on space-strike armaments, strategic nuclear arms limitations, not to mention deep cuts, would be meaningless.

As for the U.S. side's thoughts on strategic offensive armaments, what it in fact has in mind is a buildup of strategic arsenals, although it is supposedly talking about a 50-percent cut.

Instead of the total level mentioned by the U.S. side of 6,000 nuclear charges on strategic delivery vehicles, a level which both sides are supposed to reach, the United States would in fact increase its number of nuclear charges to 15,000, by, for example, omitting the counting some of the nuclear charges on heavy bombers and failing to include long-range sea-based cruise missiles in the cuts.

In connection with the "intermediate agreement" on medium-range missiles contained in the U.S. side's 1 November 1985 proposals, we stated clearly that, under the proposed formula, the United States, in particular, would be able to sharply increase, by more than 100 percent, the number of nuclear charges on its medium-range missiles in Europe, whereas the number of Soviet medium-range missiles would be reduced. Washington's 24 February proposals contained nothing constructive either. In reply to the Soviet proposal on the total elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the U.S. side reiterated its notorious "zero option," which results in one-sided advantages for the United States and NATO.

Thus, the U.S. line at the talks on nuclear and space armaments is not geared to accords, in fact, it undermines the possibility of reaching any. Basically, the U.S. side has done its best to kill the impetus that was imparted to the talks on nuclear and space armaments by the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

If Washington really wanted to help the USSR's efforts to lead the nuclear and space armaments talk out of the impasse, it could do this by switching to a businesslike and constructive discussion of questions at the fifth round of the talks, which started recently.

Question: Could you clarify the USSR's approach to resolving the question of medium-range missiles in Asia?

Answer: Our approach to medium-range missiles in Asia is laid down in the program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons -- at the second stage these missiles would be eliminated in the eastern part of the country. In that region our medium-range missiles are opposed by corresponding U.S. medium-range weapons. The USSR is prepared to resolve the question of its medium-range missiles in Asia. But at the same time it is necessary to decide the question of what to do with the U.S. medium-range weapons in the Far East.

Question: In recent days Americans have been talking a great deal about a possible change in the U.S. approach to the SALT II treaty. What can you say about this?

Answer: The Soviet side's view is that observance of the principles of the treaty, which creates barriers to the quantitative growth and qualitative improvement of the most powerful armaments -- strategic arms -- would continue to be of considerable importance for maintaining the strategic balance and ensuring favorable conditions for the elaboration of new accords on limiting and reducing nuclear armaments.

Our position on the SALT II treaty will also depend, of course, on how things stand with regard to preventing the arms race from spreading to space and U.S. observance of the ABM Treaty. The first test of future U.S. intentions with regard to SALT II should come when the next U.S. "Ohio"-class submarine begins sea trials. Unless the United States takes appropriate steps it will exceed the treaty's armaments limit of 1,200 units on ICBM's and MIRVed submarine-launched ballistic missiles. To observe the limit, it will have to dismantle the appropriate number of existing armaments.

The second test of the U.S. side's intentions will obviously come toward the end of the year, when, by equipping bombers with long-range cruise missiles, the United States will reach the treaty ceiling of 1,320 units for MIRVed ballistic missiles and heavy bombers with cruise missiles.

Washington is now saying that whereas in the first case the United States may still observe the limit, in the second case it will not. At the same time it is intended to launch a propaganda campaign accusing the USSR of alleged "noncompliance" with SALT II. The purpose is to find a pretext for relieving the United States of the restrictions that were agreed by the sides under the treaty.

Thus it is a matter of an intention to grossly violate the treaty and "wriggle" out of it by getting rid of provisions as they become obstacles to new U.S. military programs. If this happened, the United States would bear full responsibility for the consequences. The USSR would draw its own conclusions and take steps to protect its own security and the security of its allies and prevent the balance established by the treaty from being upset.

Question: The U.S. President says that he has instructed the U.S. delegation at the talks on nuclear and space armaments to "act flexibly." How do you view this statement and what instructions have been given to the Soviet delegation?

Answer: The word "flexibility" seems to be all the rage with the current administration. Before each of the previous four rounds the U.S. President maintained that he was instructing his delegation to behave "flexibly." But as the talks themselves have shown, either the U.S. delegation did not carry out its President's instructions, or the concept of "flexibility" has been given a new meaning. For why, round after round, has the United States maintained an ossified, paralyzed stance?

As for the soviet delegation, as is done before each round, it has been given creatively worked out instructions.

If the U.S. side behaves responsibly, seriously, and really flexibly, the talks will immediately be specific and fruitful.

Some other questions posed by journalists were also answered.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1393

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW PROGRAM DISCUSSES GORBACHEV PROPOSAL, ABM, SALT TREATIES

LD261733 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 25 May 86

["Top Priority" discussion program hosted by Pavel Kuznetsov with Prof. Radomir Bogdanov and Prof. Sergey Plekhanov, both from the USSR Institute for United States of America and Canada Studies -- live or recorded]

[Excerpts] Hello, I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on today's edition of "Top Priority." Our usual panel are Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov, of the Moscow-based Institute for USA and Canada Studies. And the topic for today is the Soviet plan for nuclear disarmament by the end of this century, which was advanced on 15th January by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. We all remember the tremendous response the Soviet proposal has generated. Interest in it has not subsided even now, although much has been done by the critics of the three-stage plan to kind of neutralize the effects of this proposal, its impact on world opinion. You know, the terrible misfortune at Chernobyl was used to give a blow to arms control, although that accident had dramatized our common vulnerability to the sinister force of the atom when it gets out of control.

Anyway, at Radio Moscow we still keep receiving many letters concerning the Soviet plan and the overwhelming majority of these letters are very, very positive. However, we do receive some letters which I will describe -- which I would describe as kind of negative or responses containing fairly strong reservations. Approximately, out of 10 or 15 letters, positive letters, 1 is negative and they fall into what I believe are three basic categories. I suggest that we discuss these categories one by one. Well, I'd like to begin with the people who are -- who sound the most aggressive. They accuse us of almost every mortal sin and they say that as long as we are different, socially, politically, no disarmament is possible. What is your opinion to such an approach in Soviet-American relations, Dr. Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] You know, I quite understand our American listeners over there, with their doubts, with their, you know, worries. They would be surprised, our American listeners, if they will find out at this end as many people, like them, also putting the same question: Are we really able to have any normal, decent relations with the Americans? I agree that mistrust, mistakes, some very unfortunate developments in Soviet-American relations, are really building a kind of a mountain of mistrust which is very unhelpful in building, you know, real base for cooperative Soviet-American relations. And if we concentrate on how to avoid that, then it's one thing. If we concentrate our efforts on how to build another mountain of this mistrust, it's another thing. What we suggest to the United States, what we suggest to the whole world, that's our belief how we should deal with this ominous common danger. [sentence as heard] If somebody else has other

suggestions of a positive kind we are open to discuss it, we are open to integrate it into our plan. But the problem is that so far what we hear from the administration people, you see -- we hear only no without any constructive proposals, you know, any constructive proposal. They take our plan stage by stage and criticize it without contributing into, maybe, what to change, to correct, what else to suggest, and things like that.

[Kuznetsov] What I had in mind when I described the people of this category was that they go by a very simple, simplistic rather, formula: Now you support national liberation movements, we don't; let's have no business with the Soviet Union because, for example, it supports Nicaragua or stands by Libya.

Now, I haven't heard a single Soviet official say that since the White House is on the side of South Africa, of the regime of apartheid, which kills hundreds and hundreds and thousands of people, let's have no business with America.

[Plakhanov] That's right. Well, there is an English saying: Cutting one's nose to spite one's face; and this is what, I think, this viewpoint boils down to. There are many differences that we have with the United States but we have overriding common interests and the major area of common interest is survival. Either we die together or we survive together, and we can survive only by means of limiting, reducing nuclear weapons and eliminating them altogether in the final analysis before they eliminate us. But the problem of trust, I think, is very important, very important. When our listeners in the United States raise this problem, I think they should do a little soul-searching and ask themselves where do they get information about the Soviet Union? The way the American media has monopolized control over the minds of the American people is astounding. No other country is that isolated from alternative sources of information about the world as Americans are. And, well, there are examples of good media work but I'm afraid that for each example of objective reporting about the Soviet Union, one can find dozens of examples of blatant untruths, distortions, and so on. But the glaring example is coverage of the Chernobyl accident. I saw the other day the front page of the New York DAILY NEWS from early May and there in bold type, you know in huge letters, there is: 15,000 Dead in Mass Graves. Yes, there is an anti-Soviet bias in the way news from the Soviet Union is reported by the American media.

[Bogdanov] But, but -- I'm sorry for interrupting you -- not only anti-Soviet bias, there is a lack of simple human logic.

[Kuznetsov] Let's go back at this point to the Soviet disarmament plan, and I'd like to describe in a nutshell the kind of people that I put in the second category. Well, by and large they agree that we would be better off with the nukes, but they say that the Soviet plan is pie in the sky, it's utopia, and -- as one listener put it -- we'd much rather have disarmament happen today than in 15 years, because with time more problems will develop. And he went on to say about what you've touched upon already, he mentioned mistrust between governments, and it is the major stumbling block, so he suggested instead of governments the whole issue of disarmament should be put in the hands of the working man, rank and file people.

[Bogdanov] I cannot believe that mistrust in that [as heard] plays a very big role. But let me put it the other way round: You know, what is the new phenomena of today? Say, before the Second World War bad politics was a source of arms race, now it's vice versa. Arms race is a source of bad politics, you know. Arms race generates bad relations between the states; that's why we say that's the source of the danger. Let's deal with the arms race -- by the way, let me remind our listeners that disarmament,

arms control, is a reality. We have some very major achievements in our Soviet-American relations. ABM Treaty: that's the major thing we have achieved on which still the whole system of arms control is based. We have some other very important treaties. So if somebody is disillusioned -- I'm also not very much optimistic but still it is possible; I believe it is possible. What is really needed is peace, words we have more than enough.

[Kuznetsov] Let's go back to the final category of listeners who object to the Soviet disarmament proposal. It's a rather curious category of people. They say: Well, you over there in Moscow, in the Soviet Union, don't know whom are you dealing with. As long as we have this administration you will have no success with it. I tend to agree with these people in view of some latest reports concerning some major Soviet-American agreements.

It's the SALT II treaty, a tentative decision by the White House to break out of it at the end of the year when they add more long-range cruise missiles to their existing fleet of B-52 strategic bombers. Now the latest report last Monday, one of the top government officials, administration officials, suggested that if Congress does not support the SDI the United States will break out of the ABM Treaty, will reconsider its commitment to the ABM Treaty of 1972. Now take the decision to produce and deploy chemical weapons, the so-called binaries, and the refusal to join us in the nuclear test ban, the moratorium on nuclear tests.

[Bogdanov] My answer -- I don't know whether you will agree with me or not -- my answer to all your questions is that this administration wants to bring their America into the next century with a very, very far, high superiority, military superiority, over the Soviet Union and over the whole world. That's why they are doing all that. That's my answer to you, I don't know, what is your opinion?

[Plekhanov] Well, I agree that this is their purpose but that doesn't mean that they will be able to do it.

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, yes.

[Plekhanov] Everybody in this world faces a problem of intentions and real possibilities. Now, our position on disarmament is not based on a desire of doing something that will please the Reagan administration. Our position is based on our perception of what the world's reality is; it is based on what must be done by the world, by the Soviet Union, the United States, other nations in order to reduce the danger of nuclear war. And the fact that the Reagan administration has not responded positively to our proposals need not discourage us from continuing to advance and to develop our position on disarmament. (?In) the first place, Reagan administration is only a few hundred people and there are 5 billion people in the world. And so I think that there must be a lot of work done in persuading the people, the public opinion [words indistinct] explaining what we mean, explaining why it is necessary. We've got to be very very patient, very very patient, but very persistent: persistent in pursuing our principles, which we think are right, and if you're persuaded that you're right you will not drop your principles because somebody else decides [words indistinct]

[Kuznetsov] [Words indistinct] our strong belief is that arms control supercedes the social, political and whatever other differences that exist. This is problem no 1. I would not say arms, I would say disarmament. [Sentence indistinct].

/9738

CSO: 5200/1393

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR PAPER ALLEGES U.S. PLANS TO 'TORPEDO' SALT II

PM221522 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 May 86 First Edition p 3

[Edgar Cheporov article: "SALT II: Who Is Against. Why Washington Is Torpedoing the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States"]

[Text] As is known, the SALT II Treaty, signed at the time by U.S. President J. Carter, was not ratified by the American Congress. And now Washington intends to tear up altogether this most important document relating to nuclear arms control. President R. Reagan, TIME magazine reports, has sent a "confidential letter to the leaders of West European states" informing them of an "intention to violate the SALT II Treaty already this year," when the number of B-52 strategic bombers equipped with nuclear-tipped cruise missiles exceeds the limits established by the treaty.

So, we are talking about bombers. But quite recently it was stated that in connection with the start of sea trials of a new submarine equipped with Trident missiles the U.S. President has decided to dismantle all the Poseidon submarines. Why? So as not to violate the SALT II Treaty. "It is exceptionally difficult to continue the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms," THE WASHINGTON POST wrote in this connection, "and at the same time openly proclaim a policy of nonfulfillment of the conditions of existing agreements, even if they have not been ratified." This kind of interpretation of the presidential decision sounds completely logical--it is indeed exceptionally difficult to conduct one set of negotiations and disregard accords which have already been reached. Unfortunately this logic was immediately demolished. Here is U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's comment on the White House decision: it is not so much a question of the President's "commitment" to SALT II, it transpires, as of the excessive cost of modernizing the submarines. And soon the U.S. President himself was stating that if he orders the scrapping of all the Poseidon submarines he will do it exclusively "on economic grounds." Thus a phenomenon from the political sphere has been transferred to the category of mundane commerce. In addition it has been decided to accelerate work on creating the Midgetman mobile ballistic missile and also to begin a study of the question of creating a bigger missile--Mobileman--with multiple warheads.

It is clear that the decision to dismantle the Poseidon, the admission of a forthcoming attack on SALT II, and also the various interpretations of these steps reflect a varying approach to the fate of this agreement in American political circles. The SALT II Treaty, I will remind you, was concluded in the summer of 1979. And soon after the signing ceremony R. Reagan, who replaced J. Carter in the White House, began stating that the treaty was "fundamentally flawed," that there was no equality between the United States and the USSR, and that the Russians had gotten "way ahead" of the Americans in strategic arms.

But is it conceivable that the Soviet Union was able within the space of a year or two to achieve superiority, especially substantial superiority, in strategic means, whose development [sozdaniye] takes many, many years?! Or maybe some unexpected facts which had previously not been taken into account had been discovered? No, no new facts had emerged. The point at issue was something quite different. K. Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, says that if the United States had ratified the SALT II Treaty "a dangerous precedent would have been set for future negotiations... since the criteria stipulated under SALT II would be used and SALT II would thus become something like a supreme law of our country...." When the debate was going on this time the President received two diametrically opposed messages from American senators. One of them asserted that the policy of "the cause of peace symbolized by SALT II" has lost its relevance. The other spoke about the inadmissibility of abandoning the limits established by this treaty. Clear differences were also discernible in the administration itself.

The source of all these differences is the failure of the attempts by those who advocate consigning SALT II to the archives to prove "violations" of it by the Soviet Union. A formula was even dreamed up--the need for a "commensurate reaction" to these violations. But it proved impossible to find a convincing reason for a reaction--no such reason exists. When, for example, the U.S. defense secretary stated recently that the USSR has exceeded the SALT II ceiling for strategic launchers, the Joint Chiefs of Staff noted that equality has not been violated. "In all probability," THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote, "it was quite irresponsible of the administration to officially accuse the Soviet Union of violating the general quantitative limits established by SALT II at a time when current data published by the Joint Chiefs of Staff testify that the Russians are adhering totally conscientiously to the required limits." The USSR considers that accords are concluded to be observed and to be used as the foundation for reaching new and even broader agreements. The USSR will seek to achieve precisely this objective in the course of the fifth round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms which have begun in Geneva.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1394

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS CONFERENCE ON U.S. SALT II POLICY

Moscow TV Broadcast

LD232107 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 23 May 86

[Report by unidentified announcer on 23 May Moscow press conference on the question of nuclear arms limitation, opened by Vladimir Lomeyko, chief of the Foreign Ministry Press Department, with Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, deputy foreign minister, and Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, first deputy defense minister and chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces, passages within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] A press conference took place in Moscow today on the question of nuclear arms limitation. It was opened by Comrade Lomeyko, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Department. The journalists were addressed by Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister.

[Bessmertnykh] "According to statements by U.S. officials, the U.S. Government is now examining the question of its future attitude toward SALT II, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. It is reported that Washington is weighing various types of action: to formally observe the provisions of the treaty for a little while, officially discard the treaty, or crawl out of it by rejecting the existing limitations as they become an obstacle to the development of U.S. strategic programs."

The types of action are varied, but their essence is the same: one way or another, today or tomorrow, to fling wide open the gates to the strongest possible arms race.

"At the same time, the U.S. Administration is once again attempting to cast a shadow over the Soviet policy regarding this treaty. The aim blatantly being pursued is to create a pretext for the United States to violate the SALT II treaty in order to justify its gamble on a further strategic arms race. All this is being done despite the fact that from the moment the SALT II treaty was signed in June 1979 the Soviet Union has built its policy in the strategic arms sphere in such a way as to ensure that the approximate parity established by that historic international legal act was not only preserved, but also strengthened. The Soviet side proceeds from the view that despite its formal expiration on 31 December 1985, the treaty remains a living and effective document embodying the results of many years of cooperation between the USSR and the United States in the seventies to end the nuclear missile arms race and strengthen strategic stability. The predominant importance of SALT II lies in the fact that, being based on the mutually recognized principle of equality and equal security, it places an obligation on the sides to observe both quantitative and substantial qualitative limitations on their strategic nuclear systems. [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1205 on 23 May carries a report on the press conference and adds the

following: "The treaty established not only an initial total level of 2,400 units, but also a reduction of it to 2,250 units if the treaty was ratified. Corresponding "ceilings" were provided for and are in operation for the main groups of strategic systems -- 1,320 units for ballistic multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles (MIRV's) and for heavy armed bombers; 1,200 units for ballistic missiles (not including bombers) with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles; no more than 820 units for ICBM's with MIRVs."]

Being a restraint on the arms race and an instrument for reducing the sides' strategic systems, the treaty has thus also worked to create a basis for consolidating the trend to further effective and substantial strategic arms reductions. Unfortunately the refusal of the U.S. Government to ratify the treaty has not permitted this trend to materialize. In the early eighties the treaty was opposed in the United States by forces that had no wish to accept the strategic parity proclaimed by the treaty -- forces striving for military superiority. The Soviet side advocates preserving everything positive that has been achieved to date in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. It proceeds from the point that observance on a reciprocal basis of the provisions of the SALT II treaty could continue to be of great importance for maintaining the strategic balance and ensuring favorable conditions for drawing up new accords on arms limitation and reduction. [TASS adds: "Of course, the USSR cannot fail to take into account here how matters will stand in relation to the prevention of an arms race in space and the observance by the United States of the ABM Treaty, which the United States is also now undermining. In other words, the Soviet Union will take into account the actions of the U.S. side from the point of view of their influence on an alteration in the strategic situation."]

"If the SALT II treaty is undermined, the United States will bear full responsibility for such a course of events. Under those conditions the Soviet Union will draw the appropriate conclusions and take measures for an effective guarantee of its own security and the security of its allies. The Government of the United States should take this into consideration."

[Announcer] One of the first questions was put to Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, USSR chief of General Staff and first deputy defense minister. What is the significance of the SALT II treaty for restraining the arms race?

[Akhromeyev] "The SALT II treaty, even today, in the form in which it operates, restricts the deployment of the sides' strategic offensive weapons."

Had it been ratified, a more considerable contribution would have been made to restricting the arms race. But I repeat that even today it limits the strategic arms race.

"In the next few days another Ohio-type submarine will undergo sea trials in the United States. If the United States is going to observe the SALT II treaty, it will have to dismantle the missiles either on two Poseidon-type submarines or a corresponding number of Minuteman-3 intercontinental missiles. This applies, these kind of restrictions apply not just to the United States of America; they also apply to the same extent to the Soviet Union. While the SALT II treaty was in effect, we have been reducing our strategic armaments and we treat this, well, the way one should when a treaty is signed. [Moscow TASS in English at 1359 GMT on 23 May carries a report on the press conference and adds the following: "Since the time the treaty was signed, the USSR scrapped 72 ICBM launchers and 21 heavy bombers."]

All in all, under the provisional agreement, SALT II and the SALT II treaty, the Soviet Union has dismantled 540 strategic delivery vehicles, the United States -- 168. So, the accords are working. We are in favor of them continuing to work but, of course, on condition that the United States observes them."

[Lomeyko] "Thank you."

[Lomeyko points to the audience] "Your question. Go ahead, please."

[A colonel in Soviet Army uniform in the audience] "Have there been violations of the SALT II treaty by the U.S. side? And if so, what were they?"

[Akromeyev] "Yes, there are violations of the SALT II treaty by the U.S. side. Our government made detailed announcements about these in a memorandum in January 1984 and in a TASS statement of June 1985. Well, I can cite some examples. By deploying its Pershing-2 ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles in Western Europe, the United States thereby violates Article 12 of the treaty on noncircumvention of it. Pershing-2 missiles and long-range cruise missiles are strategic weapons in relation to the Soviet Union. In essence, the United States is creating, by circumvention of the existing strategic balance established by the SLAT II treaty, additional strategic potential."

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1545 GMT on 23 May carries a report on the press conference and adds the following:] "The U.S. Administration has recently been declaring more and more often that the SALT II treaty is not subject to monitoring [kontrol]. At the press conference Comrade Akhromeyev was asked to expound the Soviet side's opinion on this issue:

It is now very fashionable -- pardon me for such an unofficial expression -- in the United States to talk about the impossibility of monitoring the fulfillment of the requirements of the SALT II treaty. When this treaty was signed, however, the previous administration of President Carter asserted quite the opposite. It is our conviction that the SALT II treaty is reliably being verified by the national technical facilities of the sides, and, in addition to this, by the requirements that have been incorporated in the treaty. Every land-based missile in out in the open, both in our country and in the United States; submarines in their bases are not concealed either -- both we and United States keep a check on them; strategic bombers at airfields are not concealed either. As far as tests are concerned, they are reliably verified. The United States started to talk about the treaty not being verified when it was decided not to ratify it: in 1980 and 1981. They are now actively talking about this only because, evidently, they are raising an axe over the treaty in order to terminate its validity."

[TASS English adds: "In connection with allegations in the U.S. that the USSR developed and was developing the second new type of ICBM, Marshal Akhromeyev said, "The Soviet Union is testing only one new type of ICBM -- RS-22. This is allowed by the SALT-2 treaty."

"Talking about the testing in the USSR of the second new type of ICBM, the U.S. means the RS-12M missile, a modernization of our old ICBM RS-12.

"This version is based on the misinterpretation of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty related to the composition of elements included into the so-called throw-weight of the missile.

"They do not include into the weight of the old missile RS-12 the weight of some of its elements, while unlawfully including into the throw-weight of the modernized ICBM RS-12M the weight of the equipment used during tests only.

"The aim is clear. The U.S. has developed one new type of ICBM (MX). At present, contrary to the treaty, it is developing the second new type of ICBM (Midgetman) and is seeking to find justification for this. Such is the underlying cause of the groundless accusation levelled by the U.S. against the USSR."

On President Reagan's remarks that the SALT-2 treaty was "unverifiable", Marshall Akhromeyev said that in elaborating the treaty, its content was determined in a way that would make it controlled by the sides' national technical means.

Additional measures were worked out when necessary.

The claims that the treaty was unverifiable were used in the past to thwart its ratification, and were being used at present to renounce it.

Asked about possible consequences of the U.S. refusal to comply with the SALT-2 treaty, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, said:

"If the U.S. renounces the treaty, the restrictions containing the arms race in all directions will be lifted and the strategic potentials of the sides will grow."

Asked about the differences, if any, in the approaches to the problems of limiting and reducing strategic armaments between the present and previous American Administrations, Bessmertnykh said:

"We have the experience of talks on limiting nuclear armament with the U.S. under the administrations of Kennedy, Nixon, Carter.

"We achieved certain treaties and agreements. The main principle that was placed at the foundation of the talks was the principle of equality and equal security.

"The sides realized that the talks were conducted by the nations equal in strength. This made it possible to conclude the SALT-1 and SALT-2 treaties, and the agreement on the prevention of nuclear war.

"The Reagan administration is undertaking an attempt to depart from the fundamental principle which makes accords possible. That principle is equal security and equality. The present administration's actions have complicated talks in all areas, including strategic, space and other nuclear armaments."]

[Man from the floor in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation] "It is now written in the West that the Soviet side has submitted a draft agreement on intermediate-range missiles at the Geneva negotiations. What can you say about the substance of the draft?"

[Bessmertnykh] "The following situation has arisen. Hardly had the Soviet delegation laid on the negotiating table in Geneva the new draft agreement when on the same day, or the next day, it was made public by the U.S. side and then in a distorted form.

"After that, a number of official U.S. representatives commented on this draft of ours, again in a false light. Evidently this gives me grounds, given that the negotiations are confidential, to set out briefly certain points relating to the contents of this draft.

"Yes, the Soviet Union has indeed taken a constructive new step at the Geneva talks, geared to breaking the deadlock in the negotiations, which have come to a standstill, including the sphere associated with medium-range missiles in Europe. The central provision of this draft is that an obligation should be made by the two sides, that is, the Soviet Union and the United States, to eliminate their medium-range missiles, both ballistic and cruise. Moreover, these missiles would be dismantled or destroyed together with their launchers.

"Measures are envisaged to ensure the viability of this agreement, if it is concluded: In particular, measures on the noncircumvention of the agreement and the nontransfer of both medium-range and strategic nuclear systems to other countries. Moreover, the Soviet Union has proposed that this obligation should naturally be reciprocal. Of course, the U.S. nuclear allies in NATO should not build up their relevant armaments."

[Moscow Domestic adds: "The following question was also asked at the press conference. What consequences could there be from a U.S. refusal to observe the treaty? Comrade Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, replied:

The SALT II treaty, even given its present status, nevertheless represents a considerable obstacle to the numerical buildup, the quantitative buildup of strategic armaments, and to their qualitative improvement. The question that arises is, what will happen if the United States renounces the treaty? As I have said, this is one of the possible options that the U.S. Administration will follow now: that is, a direct official renunciation. This will mean that, in effect, the restraints holding back the arms race in all its directions will be removed, and there will be an increase in the strategic potentials of the two sides, and one can even imagine the arms race in this sphere will begin to assume unpredictable parameters. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said recently, if SALT II and the ABM treaty are undermined, mistrust between countries will intensify in a geometric progression. This will thus have an effect not just on relations between the USSR and United States, but also on the overall international situation."]

[Announcer] Question: The Soviet Union has again extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. Will this not prejudice the defense of the Soviet Union?

[Akhromeyev] "True enough, if one side tests and perfects its nuclear weapons and the other side does not, it is no doubt no great secret that the side carrying out tests derives definite advantages from this, and perhaps no small advantages at that. But the other side, which has opted for a unilateral ban on nuclear tests, gains, it seems to me, given the situation the world is in today, a great political advantage.

The fact that the Soviet Union gains this advantage not only, so to speak, as an advantage, but also that it is accommodating the peoples of the world and that it is striving to solve this problem for the interests of all peoples and not just, so to speak, for the sake of its own Soviet people -- I think this policy which the leadership of our party and the Soviet Government are pursuing is perfectly correct."

[Announcer] The participants in the press conference also replied to other questions from journalists.

[Video shows Bessmertnykh, Lomeyko, and Akhromeyev seated on rostrum on front of a large wall chart in tabular form, the writing and figures on which are indistinct. At the foot of this chart is a note in Russian and in English, shown in close-up when the camera focuses on the speakers: "Note: as of 23.5.86 the USSR and the United States have 2504 and 2210 delivery vehicles respectively: The United States has more warheads but on the whole there is an approximate parity in these weapons and systems."]

PRAVDA Report

PM261641 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs"]

[Text] A press conference on nuclear arms limitation issues was held for Soviet and foreign journalists on 23 May at the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Taking part in it were Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister.

A statement read at the opening of the press conference pointed out that, according to statements by U.S. officials, the U.S. Government is currently considering revising its attitude toward the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II). Washington, it is reported, is weighing different options: to continue formal observance of the treaty's provisions for a little while yet, to withdraw from the treaty officially, or to "creep" out of it by renouncing the existing limitations as they become an impediment to the development [razveriyvaniye] of U.S. strategic programs. Different options, but amounting to the same thing: one way or another, today or tomorrow, to throw the doors wide open to a race for the most powerful armaments.

In the meantime, the U.S. Administration is again endeavoring to cast a shadow on Soviet policy toward this treaty. The aim is patently obvious: to create a pretext both for U.S. violations of SALT II and for justifying its gamble on a further strategic arms race.

The Soviet side proceeds from the premise that, despite its formal expiration on 31 December 1985, the treaty remains a living and effective document that embodies the results of the many years of USSR-U.S. cooperation in the seventies on halting the nuclear missile arms race and strengthening strategic stability. Of course, the treaty can retain this status for as long as the U.S. side refrains from actions that undermine the basic provisions of this treaty -- which has not been ratified through the fault of the United States.

The predominant significance of SALT II lies in the fact that, founded as it is on the mutually acknowledged principle of equality and identical security, it binds the sides to observe both quantitative and substantial qualitative limitations on the sides' strategic nuclear means. It established not only an initial total level of 2,400 units but also the reduction of this level to 2,250 in the event of the treaty's ratification. Corresponding "ceilings" were stipulated and are in force for the basic groups of strategic systems: 1,320 units for MIRVed ballistic missiles and for heavy bombers with their armament; 1,200 units for MIRVed ballistic missiles (excluding bombers); not more than 820 units for MIRVed ICBMs.

The Soviet side advocates the retention of everything positive hitherto achieved in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. It proceeds from the premise that the observance on a mutual basis of the provisions of SALT II would continue to be of no little importance for the maintenance of the strategic balance and for ensuring favorable conditions for the elaboration of new accords on arms limitation and reduction.

Naturally, we cannot fail to take into account here also the future situation regarding preventing an arms race in space, and U.S. observance of the ABM Treaty -- which the United States is now also undermining. In other words, we will take into consideration the actions of the American side from the viewpoint of their influence on a change in the strategic situation.

If the SALT II Treaty is undermined, then the United States will bear full responsibility for such a course of events.

In these circumstances the Soviet Union will draw the necessary conclusions and adopt measures for the effective assurance of its own security and that of its allies.

The U.S. Government must be aware of this.

Answers were given to journalists' questions.

Question: Previous U.S. Administrations have stated that the SALT II treaty meets the interests of the United States. Why then has it still not been ratified?

Answer: The SALT II treaty undoubtedly meets the security interests both of the Soviet Union and the United States. Assessing the significance of the SALT II treaty, President J. Carter emphasized in his time that "This treaty is the most important step of all those ever made in the context of establishing control over nuclear armaments." The rejection [otkloneniye] of SALT II, Carter observed, would be "a serious blow to peace and the security of the United States." However, during the debate in the United States over the treaty's ratification those circles opposing detente and advocating the buildup of military power and the achievement of military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union prevailed.

As we know, the treaty consolidated the strategic parity between the USSR and the United States. The U.S. refusal to ratify the SALT II treaty untied the hands of these circles. Graphic confirmation of this is the "General Strategic Program" proclaimed 2 October 1981, whose implementation has now reached the stage whereby Washington has been forced to choose: either a further arms buildup or SALT II.

Question: Does the SALT II treaty have any significance at all for curbing the arms race if it has not been ratified and is not being implemented by the sides in full measure?

Answer: Even in the form in which it is in force today the SALT II treaty limits the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the sides' strategic offensive forces.

At the end of last year, in connection with the commissioning of the seventh "Ohio" class missile submarine, the United States dismantled one "Poseidon" submarine. An eighth "Ohio" class vessel is shortly to begin sea trials. In order to observe the established level of MIRVed missiles the United States will have to dismantle two "Poseidon" submarines.

The Soviet Union has also been cutting its armaments. We regard this as normal. Since the treaty was signed the USSR has dismantled 72 ICBM launch installations and 21 heavy bombers, and overall, in line with the SALT I Interim Agreement and the SALT II Treaty, the USSR has dismantled 540 strategic delivery vehicles while the United States has dismantled 168 units.

Question: Have there been violations of the SALT II treaty by the U.S. side, and what have they consisted of?

Answer: Yes, there are violations. They were dealt with in detail, in particular, in the 27 January 1984 Memorandum, the 12 June 1985 TASS Statement, and in the Soviet-U.S. Standing Consultative Commission.

For example, by deploying in Western Europe its Pershing-2 ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles the United States is acting in contravention of Article XII of the treaty, which prohibits the circumvention of its provisions in any way. In terms of reaching our territory these missiles are, with regard to the Soviet Union, a strategic weapon whose capabilities are not inferior to those of an ICBM or submarine-launched ballistic missile.

Question: People in the United States claim that the USSR has created [sozdayut] and is deploying [razvertyvayet] a second new type of ICBM. What is the substance of these claims?

Answer: The Soviet Union has tested [ispytal] only one new type of ICBM -- the RS-22. This is permitted under the SALT II treaty.

In talking about the testing of a second new type of ICBM in the USSR the United States has in mind the RS-12M missile, which is a modernized version [modernizatsiya] of our old RS-12 ICBM. This story is being constructed on a distorted interpretation of the SALT II treaty provisions concerning the composition of the elements included in the so-called "throw-weight" of a missile. These people do not include in the weight of the old RS-12 missile the weight of some of its elements, while on the other hand, in the throw-weight of the modernized RS-12M ICBM, they illegally include all the equipment used only during tests. The aim is clear. The United States has created [sozdali] one new type of ICBM (MX). Now it is creating [sozdayut], in contravention of the treaty, a second new type of ICBM (Midgetman) and it is trying to find a justification for this.

Question: What might be the consequences of a U.S. refusal to observe the SALT II treaty?

Answer: If the United States renounces the treaty, this will remove the limiting devices that for several years now have ensured the maintenance of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States. The growth in the sides' strategic potentials in both the quantitative and qualitative respects will be practically unpredictable.

The development of armaments has already rendered the task of their limitation and reduction extraordinarily difficult. If the last remaining limits are eliminated, this task will become many times more complex. Who knows if we will then succeed in achieving an effective agreement curbing the strategic arms race.

Question: Where do you see any differences -- if there are any -- between the approaches to the problems of strategic arms limitation and reduction on the part of the current and previous U.S. Administrations?

Answer: There are differences, and not inconsiderable ones. We have experience with nuclear arms limitation negotiations with the United States under the Nixon, Ford, Carter, and incumbent administrations. We had our differences with the earlier administrations, but there was also the mutual desire to find solutions. The main element that formed the foundation of the negotiations was the principle of equality and identical security. The sides realized that the negotiations were being conducted by states that were approximately equal in terms of strength [po silam] and of issues constituting their fundamental interests. The SALT II treaty was a balanced accounting of the interests of both sides.

The Reagan administration has nullified this foundation. It has abandoned the principle of equality and identical security. Its negotiating line is to compel the USSR to accept its terms and thereby to attain military superiority, to start an arms race in space and continue the arms race on earth. During the 6 years the present administration has been in office nothing has been achieved in questions of arms reduction -- while much has been destroyed.

Question: The Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium. The United States is continuing its nuclear weapon tests. Will this not harm the security of the USSR?

Answer: Indeed, if one side is testing and improving [sovershenstvovat] its nuclear weapons while the other refrains from doing so, then clearly the side that is testing is seeking to obtain definite advantages from this.

But there is yet another important aspect. The side that has introduced a unilateral ban on nuclear tests in the current world situation acquires a great moral and political advantage. The General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces also proceeds from this premise. Yet in order to prevent the dismantling of the military equilibrium in particular, there will be further improvement in the combat training of the Soviet Armed Forces and further enhancement of their capability to reliably ensure the motherland's security.

Question: Reports have appeared concerning the Soviet side's submission at the Geneva talks of a draft agreement on medium-range missiles. Could you explain the substance of this proposal?

Answer: The Soviet delegation had barely placed a draft agreement on the negotiating table when the U.S. side made it public, and moreover gave it a distorted interpretation.

The Soviet Union has indeed undertaken a new constructive step in order to break the deadlock at the talks.

The central provision of the draft is a commitment by the USSR and the United States to eliminate their medium-range missile in Europe -- ballistic and cruise. Measures are envisaged to prevent the circumvention of a future agreement -- in particular the non-transfer of medium-range and strategic missiles to other countries. Moreover, the Soviet side has expressed the readiness to make such a commitment reciprocal. Naturally, the U.S. nuclear allies in NATO would not build up their own corresponding armaments. A broad range of verification [kontrol] measures, up to and including on-site inspection, is provided for.

The draft submitted by the Soviet side represents a serious document. It constitutes a good departure point for Europe's complete liberation from nuclear weapons and provides a powerful stimulus for the galvanization of the talks as a whole.

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET COMMENTS ON U.S. DISMANTLING OF TWO POSEIDON SUBMARINES

Decision 'Forced'

LD280909 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0810 GMT 28 May 86

[Text] Washington, 28 May (TASS) -- President Reagan has announced his decision to dismantle two obsolete Poseidon nuclear submarines in connection with the forthcoming start of trials for the new Nevada submarine (of the Ohio type), equipped with 24 launch units for Trident I ICBMs. This means that for the time being the United States formally remains within the framework of the limit allowed by the Soviet-American SALT II treaty of 1,200 units for ICBMs and ballistic missiles on submarines, equipped with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles.

As observers point out, the White House decision was forced on it. It was made under powerful pressure from American and international public opinion which demand that existing Soviet-American accords on arms control not be undermined; the world must not slip toward a thermonuclear catastrophe. Proof of how widespread such feelings are is the fact that all the U.S. allies support observation of the SALT II treaty. According to an opinion poll, over 75 percent of Americans support strengthening the arms control mechanism. Fifty-two senators have demanded that the U.S. President observe the provisions of the SALT II treaty. A similar letter was also sent to the White House by over half (221) of the members of the House of Representatives. The U.S. State Department also recommended that the SALT II treaty not be undermined.

Announcing the dismantling of the old submarines, the White House at the same time clearly made it understood that in future it will not consider itself bound to the provisions of the SALT II treaty, and retained for itself the "right" to go beyond the limits established by the treaty when carrying out the program to arm B-52 bombers with cruise missiles.

'Hesitation and Delay'

OW291301 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 29 May 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Viktor Konnov commentary]

[Text] Washington. The White House official spokesman has said that the U.S. attitude toward SALT II will be determined primarily by U.S. Armed Forces requirements and not by treaty articles. Our commentary:

Hello, comrades. The concrete reason for the given statement was the commissioning of the latest U.S. Ohio-class submarine, carrying 24 Trident missiles. With its launching, the total number of U.S. missile-launching pads will exceed the limit of 1,200 units established by SALT II.

It was clear from the very beginning that, in order not to exceed this number, the United States had to dismantle the launching units in two obsolete Poseidon submarines.

A decision on submarine dismantling was adopted after long hesitation and delay. It is tempting for the U.S. Administration to present the given step as an act of goodwill, proof of observance of SALT II. But that would have imposed certain obligations on the United States, and required further observance of the treaty provisions, and this apparently did not tally with the administration's plans. For a long time, there had been talk in Washington about getting out of SALT II and existing restrictions. For this reason, the White House official spokesman said that the decision on submarine dismantling has been made in the interest of economy, and in particular because the nuclear engines of these submarines have served their time, and it would be very uneconomical to modernize or replace them. The United States has, so to speak, told the world: We do what we wish and consider only our own strategic and economic arguments, and those concerning compliance with signed agreements is a secondary matter. Pacta sum servanda -- treaties must be observed -- says an old Latin saying, otherwise what is the point of signing them.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1394

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

U.S. SUB MISSION--Washington, 24 May (TASS)--The Pentagon reported on Friday that three U.S. nuclear power submarines joined and surfaced in the geographical point of the North Pole on 6 May. The short statement issued by the Pentagon only says that the aim of the mission of the submarines was to collect scientific information and test the combat readiness of the submarine force in conditions of the Arctic without logistic support from the bases. Richard Gross, a UPI correspondent, quoted unnamed spokesmen for the U.S. Navy as saying that the report on the operation was aimed at declaring in public a strengthening of the presence of U.S. strike submarines in the Arctic. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0851 GMT 24 May 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1394

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS COMMENTARIES ON 15 MAY SOVIET PROPOSAL

'New Opportunity'

LD161924 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 16, TASS--By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

At the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva, the Soviet Union has taken another step which opens a new opportunity to set the beginning to nuclear arms reduction. As the White House spokesmen already reported, on May 15 the Soviet Union tabled a new draft treaty on medium-range missiles in Europe. This question, just as the problem of complete ending of nuclear explosions can be resolved shortly, provided, certainly, that the other side shows the same constructiveness and confirms its peaceable statements by deeds.

What is the essence of the Soviet stand on medium-range missiles in Europe and in what lies its constructiveness? The USSR proposed to eliminate on a reciprocal basis the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone, both ballistic and cruise missiles. Meeting the United States and wishes of statesmen of NATO countries, the USSR, for one thing, no longer links the solution of this question to strategic arms and non-militarisation of space. Second, it excluded the forces of Great Britain and France from the European balance of nuclear forces under consideration. Third, it has taken into consideration European's concern over operational-tactical nuclear arms of an enhanced range that had been deployed by the Soviet Union in answer to the United States' deployment of new medium-range missiles in Europe.

The only thing required of Great Britain and France is that they not build up their armaments of this kind if the agreement with the USA is reached. All matters related to this problem could become the subject of a direct exchange of opinions with the afore-mentioned countries. The United States, on its part, must assume the pledge not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries.

On the negotiating table in Geneva is now a concrete document which sets out in the context of law the obligations of the sides for the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone and for the removal of Soviet operational-tactical missiles of an enhanced range from those districts where they were deployed after the beginning of the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe.

The responsible approach to this document will, undoubtedly, indicate a measure of political responsibility of the other party to the negotiations--the United States of America. And the USA resorts to this day to various subterfuges, tries artifiically to link this matter with problems of the military balance in Asia, refuses to assume the commitment not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries. The stand of two other NATO countries-- Great Britain and France--is not marked by constructiveness and enthusiasm either. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, for instance, not only comes out categorically against a ban on quantitative build-up of Britain's nuclear-missile potential but also declares that she cannot imagine a world without nuclear arms.

The time has come to start joint efforts to make the common European home secure, so that all its peoples feel safe in their own national homes. It is high time to give an impetus to the advance along the road of ridding Europe and the whole world of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet draft treaty on medium-range missiles in Europe is a good basis for making such a start.

U.S. Response Hit

LD201848 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 20 May 86

[Text] Moscow, May 20, TASS Military News Analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

In response to the Soviet compromise proposal to eliminate American and Soviet medium-range missiles in the Eurorpean zone on condition of a United States pledge not to provide its allies in Europe with additional strategic and medium-range missiles the United States administration suggested a worsened variant of the odious "zero option."

When stating its readiness to "eliminate a whole class of medium-range missiles" the United States actually proposes to liquidate all the Soviet missiles of this class. At the same time the fulfilment of the American plan provides for the preservation of American nuclear missiles on board United States naval ships in the Far East, in South Korea, in Japan and also in the Philippines, Diego Garcia Island, and at other United States bases in Asia.

More than that, Washington reserves the right to continue building up its nuclear missiles in these regions. It is well known that in the Far East alone the United States has deployed thousands of nuclear warheads, including medium-range missiles. According to the American plan these powerful nuclear forces of the United States should not be opposed by a single Soviet medium-range missile.

More than that, even the elimination of the United States medium-range missile in Western Europe under the American plan is to have a purely symbolical character. When its "comprehensive plan" is to be implemented Washington insists on the right not to liquidate its missiles in Western Europe but to hand them over to Britain and France!

In accordance with Washington's proposal the nuclear forces of the American allies in Europe are not subject to any limitations as well.

In an interview to the Austrian newspaper DIE PRESSE the head of the Pentagon Caspar Weinberger stated on Monday that the United States had "thoroughly studied" the Soviet proposals on medium-range missiles and arrived at the conclusion that "they are based on intent to tip the balance of forces in favour of the Soviet Union." As to the American proposals, which provide for a United States monopoly on medium-range missiles in Asia and a monopoly of NATO countries on such arms in Europe, they, to quote Weinberger, are "fair and balanced."

For 5 years now Washington is trying to assure the world public that the only reliable road to disarmament lies supposedly through the uncontrolled increase of NATO's nuclear arsenals. The administration in Washington says that it is possible to stop nuclear tests only if these tests are intensively conducted by the United States. Now, as though mocking the common sense of people, Weinberger in his interview to the newspaper DIE PRESSE describes the American proposals on the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union as a "comprehensive programme in the field of arms control."

The dishonest rhetoric of the head of the Pentagon reflects Washington's dishonest policy in the field of arms limitation and reduction.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1373

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET DELEGATION HITS KAMPELMAN FOR REVEALING 15 MAY PROPOSAL

LD161501 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 16 May 86

["Statement [Soobschcheniye] From the USSR Delegation"--TASS headline]

[Text] Geneva, 16 May (TASS)--In Berne on 15 May, M. Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation, made a statement in which he reported publicly on a draft agreement on intermediate-range missiles in Europe submitted by the USSR delegation at a plenary session held that day. Moreover, M. Kampelman expressed rash and unobjective assessments of the Soviet draft. The Soviet side, guided by the principle of confidentiality that is in effect at the talks, did not report having submitted the draft. The USSR delegation deems it necessary to draw attention to the one-sided and distorted qualification of the Soviet proposal expressed by the head of the U.S. delegation.

The submitting by the Soviet Union of the draft agreement, which has been drawn up in strict juridical form, is a major event at the talks, testifying to the aspiration of the Soviet side to make into fact the decisions of principle made in connection with the talks on nuclear and space weapons at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva in November 1985.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1373

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET AMBASSADOR TO FRANCE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

PM141403 Paris LE MONDE in French 10 Apr 86 p 3

[Unattributed report: "USSR Is Not at Present Calling for End to French Nuclear Tests"]

[Excerpts] The USSR is in no way asking for an end to French nuclear tests and is not now conducting any direct negotiations on this with France, Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR ambassador to France said Tuesday, 8 April.

Addressing the Diplomatic Press Association, Mr Vorontsov stressed that the Soviet Union's main priority in foreign policy was to reach an agreement with the United States on halting the arms race, starting with a complete end to American and Soviet nuclear tests in the immediate future. "We want practical measures" in this sphere, he added, citing the English expression "we won't take 'no' for an answer."

The ambassador added that there was no question of Moscow negotiating with the Americans on the question of French nuclear weapons. "If necessary, we know whom to contact," he stressed, adding that the USSR would start "talks with France at the appropriate time" on this subject.

/8918

CSO: 5200/1373

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: NATO BODIES CONSIDER SITING U.S. BINARY ARMS IN EUROPE

'Behind Public's Back'

LD041653 Moscow TASS in English 1208 GMT 4 May 86

[Text] Brussels, 4 May (TASS)--The United States is stepping up preparations for deploying a new generation of chemical weapons in Europe. According to the Brussels-based bulletin NATO REPORT the Reagan Administration will try already this month to secure behind the world public's back its NATO allies' approval for the program of producing and deploying American binary munitions in Western Europe. The bulletin's report confirms the hypocrisy of official Washington which uses pronouncements on a "sincere strivings" toward disarmament to cover up its policy of building up its mass annihilation weapons armory.

U.S. Claims 'Crisis'

PM201456 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 May 86 Second Edition p 3

[A. Yevgenyev article under the rubric "The Facts Expose": "The 'Chemicalization' of Europe"]

[Text] The words "chemical weapons" are again appearing on the pages of the West European press. The point is that the question concerning the deployment of U.S. binary ammunition on the European Continent will be resolved in the last 10 days of May at a series of conferences of the North Atlantic bloc's leading organs.

It is well known that the U.S. Congress, appropriating funds for the production of this new-generation chemical weapon, demanded that the administration secure the allies' consent to its deployment on their soil. And the Pentagon's fixers went overboard to obtain it. The Seoul regime declared in April its readiness to accept binary ammunition. And now Washington has undertaken the conditioning of its NATO partners.

In an attempt to deceive public opinion in West European countries, people from the Pentagon promise that binary weapons will apparently be shipped there only in the event of a "crisis situation." And they did actually find some people who fell for this artless bait. Take just the FRG leaders for example. Playing the role of Pentagon propagandists, they are trying to convince their country's people that the Americans are even prepared to liquidate the enormous stockpiles of toxic substances already present on FRG territory, and that Washington would supposedly need separate permission from Bonn to deploy binary ammunition.

Such claims, however, are clearly aimed at simpletons. For a long time now the transatlantic strategists have been considering Europe as a potential location for the use of toxic substances. Britain's well-informed newspaper THE TIMES points out in this connection that "chemical weapons will, without any doubt, be used by the United States in a European rather than an intercontinental war." Furthermore, the Pentagon's plans to establish five new U.S. chemical weapons arsenals on West German territory are well known. A statement made by the "Green" party organization in Baden-Wuerttemberg to expose this project points out that the United States intends to deploy binary ammunition in the Karlsruhe and Hermersheim areas, starting in 1987.

Exercises to work out the use of chemical weapons under field conditions have been held over a long period of time both at American and at NATO testing grounds in Western Europe. Furthermore, the question of conducting combat operations with the use of chemical weapons was assigned a central position in numerous maneuvers by U.S. forces in Europe, like the "Reforger-15" (1983), for example. NATO has been in the process of organizationally shaping chemical services units and subunits since 1978. And the Pentagon long ago made its calculations regarding the quantities of chemical ammunition required to conduct combat operations on the European Continent with the use of toxic substances.

Moreover, statements by U.S. General Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, testify that his staff has already drawn up a detailed plan for the deployment of binary weapons. The danger contained in the Atlanticists' schemes is perfectly obvious. After all, the quantity of toxic substances already deployed in Western Europe today is capable of destroying the continent's population many times over.

The world public resolutely condemns the Pentagon's monstrous plans for the "chemicalization" of Western Europe, and emphasizes that these plans enhance the military danger and run counter to the peoples' desire to put an end to the race in all types of mass destruction weapons.

Our country has put forward a precise plan for the liquidation of this barbaric weapons even before the end of the century. Proposals in this connection are contained in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. On 22 April the USSR put forward proposals making it possible to eliminate the existing differences at the talks.

As for Washington, instead of seeking agreement on the question of banning chemical weapons, it is preparing to deploy binary chemical weapons in other continents, and primarily in Europe. The U.S. politicians are eager to ban chemical weapons only in words. As we can see, in reality they are ready to turn whole countries and continents into gas chambers.

West European Opposition Cited

LD211821 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 21 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] A series of spring sessions of NATO's top military bodies began at NATO Headquarters near Brussels today. These conferences will go on for 2 days. What main questions do NATO generals and leading officials intend to examine? There are, perhaps, three such questions: The conventional arms buildup, the plans for production and deployment in Western Europe of new U.S. binary chemical weapons, and the examination of the so-called European SDI.

It is absolutely clear from the agenda for the current round of NATO conferences that Washington and its NATO allies persists in continuing their course aimed at military superiority, remaining deaf to the sensible, concrete, and peace-loving Soviet initiatives. After all, it was only a month ago that the Soviet leadership put forward a new initiative that pertains precisely to conventional arms and provides for a considerable reduction of all components of land forces and tactical air forces of the European states and also of the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces deployed in Europe. The entire territory of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals, can become the zone for this type of reduction.

The people of the West European countries are alarmed at NATO's plans to deploy the latest generation of chemical weapons on the continent: binary warheads with paralyzing nerve gas.

Plans of this kind have already been approved at a recent special session of NATO Planning Group.

Disagreement with the new, dangerous designs has been voiced at the session itself as well as after it: official Netherlands, Danish, Norwegian, and Greek representatives spoke against these plans. Debates have just ended in the Danish parliament. A resolution has been passed there that calls on the government to announce the country's negative attitude toward the U.S. plans to modernize chemical weapons during the sessions of top NATO bodies that began in Brussels today. The parliament has also made it incumbent on the government to bring this position to the notice of the U.S. Congress.

During the debates, one of the MP's cited the following fact: The quantity of the allegedly obsolete poisonous substances brought from the United States and currently sited in Europe is enough to wipe out all mankind 5,000 times over.

At the present time the Pentagon already stores 1 in 10 of its chemical warheads in European depots. U.S. experts attempt to assert that binary weapons are safe during production, transportation, and storage and, they say, it is only when two parts are combined -- that is why these weapons are called binary -- that they are activated.

But what concern is it for the inhabitants of Europe where the Pentagon intends to manufacture these new, sinister weapons, or how they will be transported? They will be stored in Western Europe and the intention is to use them there.

It is no accident that the Pentagon strategists chart all their chemical attacks on the maps of Europe. Our country understands that the United States is clearly playing a dishonest game, reckoning on deflecting counterstrikes from its territory and allowing its allies' territory and population to fall prey to them. It is known that the USSR is in favor of the quickest possible and most complete liquidation of chemical weapons as well as of the industrial base needed to manufacture them. In this area, too, new Soviet proposals have recently been put forward.

As for the European defense initiative, it is being contemplated as a back-up for the star wars plans that are being pushed through, full steam ahead, in the United States.

West European countries approach this problem in various ways, both as far as the idea itself and its implementation are concerned. Here, for example is what the BULLETIN NOUVELLE ATLANTIQUE, close to NATO circles, imagines for this defense initiative. It said that what is proposed is to create arms designed to hit missiles from planes with the use of arms and hardware that are already being developed now within the framework of the star wars plans and, in particular, laser and electromagnetic arms. It is thought that the U.S. Patriot antiaircraft missile complex, which is already part of NATO armory, can form the basis of this program, naturally having undergone modernization.

NATO Military Planning Committee

LD221056 Moscow TASS in English 1005 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Brussels May 22 TASS -- The NATO Military Planning Committee opened a meeting at the North Atlantic bloc's headquarters today. The top issue on the agenda is a U.S. plan, being imposed on its allies, to produce binary weapons for subsequent deployment in Western Europe. Denmark, Norway, Greece and Holland object to the plan.

U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger held a series of bilateral talks, including with the defense ministers of countries opposed to the U.S. plan, after arriving here on the eve of the session. Local commentators believe that the prime aim of those contacts was to crush the allies' resistance to the Pentagon's efforts to put the arms race into still higher gear.

Other issues on the agenda include a program for boosting the arsenals of "conventional" arms and the "EuroSDI", a supplement to the U.S. "star wars" project.

NATO Military Committee

LD221402 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1549 GMT 21 May 86

[By TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Brussels, 21 May (TASS) -- The NATO Military Committee, which today is holding a session at the level of chiefs of General Staffs of member-countries of the North Atlantic alliance, has spoken out for a further intensive buildup of the bloc's conventional weapons. General Cornelius de Jager, chairman of the committee, stated this in NATO headquarters.

Speaking at a press conference, the general reported that NATO's highest military body today recommended to ministers of defense of alliance countries that they support U.S. plans for the mass production of binary weapons intended for deployment [razmeshcheniye] in Western Europe. The committee adopted these recommendations under the pretext of... NATO "lagging behind" the Warsaw Pact in the area of chemical weapons. However, the general was not able to quote any facts or figures to corroborate his unsubstantiated assertions.

C. de Jager reported that the participants in the session apportioned significant attention to various aspects of the implementation of the U.S. "star wars" program and its West European supplement -- the so-called "European defense initiative." The general stated that both projects are "component parts of the Western defense strategy." The chairman of the NATO Military Committee once again resorted to the myth fabricated within the walls of NATO about the so-called "Soviet military threat," in order to justify NATO plans for further whipping up the arms race.

The statements made today at the NATO headquarters by its highest military leader show that the leaders of the bloc still apply the same old and unrealistic measures to the most important problems before mankind--the problems of war and peace--and that they still have not renounced the ideas of "deterrent," [ustrasheniya] "containment," [sderzhivaniya] and striving to attain military superiority over the Warsaw Pact.

FRG's Woerner Comments

LD222132 Moscow TASS in English 1644 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Brussels May 22 TASS -- The participants in the meeting of the NATO Military Planning Committee taking place here approved the U.S. plans to produce new binary chemical weapons intended to be stockpiled in Western Europe, West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner announced here. This approval is one of the conditions set by U.S. Congress for the financing of the production of these deadly munitions. The defence minister admitted that though none of the participants had objected to the decision, delegates from a number of countries had reaffirmed their critical attitude to the American programme of the serial production of binary bombs and shells. Insiders report that the Dutch, Danish and Norwegian delegates said that the adoption of the American plan by the session did not mean that their countries supported it.

Meetings End

LD221541 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1212 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Brussels, 22 May (TASS) -- One-day sessions of the NATO Eurogroup defense ministers and the NATO Military Committee at the level of chiefs of staff of the NATO member-countries have been held here. Yielding to open pressure from Washington, the defense ministers of 12 West European countries declared their intention to make a "European contribution" to making the alliance "as solid as possible," meaning, in particular, accumulation of weapons arsenals. The United States, Canada, France, and Iceland do not take part in the work of the Eurogroup. As General Cornelius de Jager, chairman of the NATO Military Committee, stated at the press conference, the committee recommended to defense ministers of the alliance countries that they support U.S. plans for mass production of binary missiles, intended for siting in Western Europe. The committee adopted these recommendations under the pretext of NATO "lagging behind" the Warsaw Pact in the field of chemical weapons. However, the general failed to cite any facts to substantiate his unfounded allegations.

As is known, the British Government has already given its consent for siting the new U.S. chemical weapons on its territory to be kept in case of a "crisis situation." Observers note, however, that there is no consensus concerning these plans among the West European partners in the alliance. Denmark, Norway, Greece, and the Netherlands refuse to approve them. Considering the scale of the antiwar movement in Western Europe, participants in the Eurogroup session had to make general pronouncements favoring an improvement in East-West relations and continuation of arms control talks. But not a word was spoken about any concrete ways of achieving that end. Moreover, the decisions and recommendations adopted at the session of the Military Committee bear witness directly to the opposite -- the striving for expanding militarist preparations. In the words of Gen de Jager, the committee spoke in favor of a further intensive buildup of conventional weapons. Considerable attention was paid by the participants of the session to various aspects of implementation of the U.S. "star wars" program and its West European extension -- the so-called "European defense initiative" [Passage indistinct].

LD211850 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 21 May 86

["Chemical Threat Must Be Removed" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- TASS Military Analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Having come against serious opposition to its plans immediately to deploy new chemical weapons in the territories of U.S. allies, the U.S. Administration has decided to use the tactic of the "creeping chemical rearmament" of Western Europe.

White House envoys in Brussels have begun to assure their West European colleagues that the USA no longer insists on the deployment of new binary weapons in West Germany, Britain or other NATO countries. Everything the United States needs, the Washington officials say, is the NATO countries' agreement of principle to the shipping of such chemical agents to their territories "in a crisis situation." The United States needs this consent, according to them, to ensure progress at the talks on a total chemical weapons ban.

There can be no doubt that Washington will not stop halfway in the fulfilment of its program for turning Western Europe into a huge depot of nerve gas. Following the consent of the West European NATO members to the development of binary munitions, Washington will demand their consent to the deployment of new chemical weapons in their territories.

The persistence with which the U.S. Administration is pressing new binary munitions on Western Europe can be explained by the fact that the Pentagon thinks chemical weapons to fit ideally the American concept of waging war as far away as possible from the U.S. shores. The Pentagon strategists are nurturing the illusion that chemical warfare can be only in Europe or Asia or that there will be no retaliation against American territory if the USA unleashes a war of aggression with the use of chemical agents.

It is symptomatic that Washington has launched another campaign to promote a chemical arms buildup at a time when the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have put forward new, far-reaching initiatives aimed at the eventual exclusion of chemical agents from the life of mankind.

The Soviet Union's concrete and realistic proposals for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century have thrown Washington into confusion. The U.S. Administration is obviously seeking to bind its European allies and to secure their automatic support for any armed venture, global, regional, nuclear, chemical or conventional.

The eradication of chemical weapons is an absolutely essential factor of ensuring the security of all the countries and peoples of the world.

A total and universal ban on chemical weapons can become an important, truly historic step towards the normalization of international relations, a turning point from confrontation to cooperation among countries with different socio-economic systems.

Preconditions for solving this problem on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security have been created by the latest peace proposals of the USSR and other socialist countries. Now it is time for Washington to act.

NATO Council Meeting

LD292135 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 29 May 86

[Viktor Ivanov commentary on the NATO Council's regular session, being held in Halifax, Canada]

[Text] There is the usual set of military issues and also the issue of what is termed international terrorism on the session's agenda. The general atmosphere at the session differs little from that of the previous meetings. As before, it is marked by Washington's desire to get its West European partners to join its plans. The American Administration seeks in particular to enlist their unconditional support for its military programs and it expects them to increase their own share in military preparations. In this context the Halifax meeting is nothing but a continuation of a series of NATO meetings held at various levels in the past few days.

The discussion last week of the production by the United States of most modern chemical weapons known as binary weapons was the touchstone that was expected to expose the measure of the allies' loyalty to what is known as the Atlantic solidarity partnership. Though the United States succeeded in winning the formal approval of its plans, it was evident that the allies were questioning more and more the sensibility of the decisions imposed on them by their senior partner. Six countries made their reservations in one form or another or voiced openly their disapproval of binary weapons.

The issue of chemical weapons is revealing because it illustrates the American Administration's general negative stand on the problem of arms limitation and control. Washington blocks the progress of talks concerning the prohibition of space weapons and production of medium-range nuclear and strategic systems. Moreover, it is preparing the ground for scrapping such existing agreements as SALT II and the ABM treaties.

The United States as it seems is not only stepping up its huge military program but is also seeking the opportunity to act freely as far as the unimpeded use of the arsenals built up by it is concerned. The bombardment by American planes of civilian installations in Libya under the pretext of combating international terrorism shows where this policy may lead to. As before, Washington is trying to justify this policy by the existence of a mythical Soviet threat, but it fails to explain why no response has been made so far to the comprehensive Soviet program aimed at eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction before this century is out. No word has been spoken about the total lack of peace initiatives on the part of the United States and the existence of numerous militaristic programs.

The criticism of this disparity in the policy of the two countries develops into active public opposition in the NATO countries. The public is getting increasingly apprehensive of the aggravation of the military threat. Sentiments of this kind not only take the form of massive manifestations but of the call on political leaders to take practical steps to remove the danger. Not to take these calls into account means to risk one's political career, especially in the countries where regular elections are in the offing.

So, one more participant is invisibly present at the Halifax meeting. This is the public opinion of the West European countries, the United States and Canada. It presents the partners in NATO with an alternative -- either to continue following in the wake of the confrontation policy pursued by Washington or to adopt a more realistic course.

'Deep Disagreements' Emerge

LD300711 Moscow TASS in English 0701 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, May 30 TASS -- TASS Special Correspondent Artyom Melikyan reports:

Deep disagreements have emerged at a special session of the NATO Council at a foreign minister level. It has been learnt here that counterpiece to the debates, held behind closed doors, turned out to be not only issues of the entire complex of East-West relations but also the differences which have become clearly pronounced in NATO lately.

They are related, above all, to the U.S. programme for the production of binary chemical munitions, a new generation of chemical weapons, and the so-called fight against terrorism. The positions of the United States and the rest of the NATO member countries were far apart on a number of problems pertaining, primarily, to strategic arms control.

It is indicated here that U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz found himself in isolation when he encountered disagreement on the part of the United States' partners with the White House's decision to torpedo such an important for containing the nuclear arms race mechanism as the SALT-2 treaty. [sentence as received]

It is observed in informed circles in this connection that the situation where the U.S. side found itself in isolation is explained by the apprehension of U.S. partners that this step by Washington will create a highly alarming situation in the world, as Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek put it.

It has been learnt that Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Denmark and other NATO countries also stated that they held a special position. It is noteworthy that disagreements on this issue appear to be so serious that they slipped beyond the bounds of closed meetings. For instance, Canadian Foreign Minister Charles Joseph Clark described Washington's plan with respect to the SALT-2 treaty as a development which provoked heightened concern.

It follows from the briefings held upon the completion of the May 29 closed meetings that the attempts to muster its partners' unreserved support for the programme to produce binary weapons and Washington's methods to "combat international terrorism" were not crowned with success.

In view of the NATO council session, a mass rally and a torch-carrying march were staged in Halifax to protest the "star wars" programme.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1390

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEPOT IN MARYLAND 'SERIOUS HAZARD'

LD091408 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 8 May 86

[Text] Washington, 8 May (TASS)---TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy reports:

The Maryland authorities now consider bringing a lawsuit against the Pentagon for glaring disregard of safety norms. The biggest depot of chemical weapons of the U.S. Army is situated in the Maryland State close to Aberdeen. Several months ago people of the city started pondering on the question of whether or not the contamination of fish in the picturesque Chesapeake Bay and toxic pollution of the soil near the bay could be traced to that arsenal. They invited representatives of the local Environmental Protection Agency. Their visit to the Army facility set the beginning to a large-scale investigation and caused a veritable scandal.

It was established that large stockpiles of Chemical weapons are kept at the depot which has been existing for 45 years now. And they are kept in such a state as to pose a serious hazard to the health of local people, to wild life and vegetation. It was established that large-scale poisoning of fish in the Chesapeake Bay is connected with the leakage of 800 liters of sulphuric acid from the depot. There were several explosions of chemical ammunition. Nerve gas leaked into the atmosphere in 1983. At least 40 times, personnel of the depot staged illegal burials of highly toxic chemicals. Officials of the local Environmental Protection Agency pointed out that such actions pose long-term potential hazard to the health of over 40 thousand people residing in the area of the chemical weapons depot.

According to the WASHINGTON POST, huge stockpiles of chemical weapons are kept at 12 arsenals, similar to the one in Aberdeen. They are situated on the territory of nine states. Despite serious hazards presented by those seats of contamination to the population of nearby districts, the administration intends to replenish them with ever new types of ammunition in the framework of its program of the "United States chemical rearming."

/9738

CSO: 5200/1390

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

MEXICO ON U.S. EXPERIMENTS--Mexico City, 25 May (TASS)--The United States, developing new and new types of chemical and bacteriological weapons, uses Latin Americans as human guinea-pigs, stated Manuel Cervin Massieu, a prominent Mexican biologist, professor at the National Autonomous University of Mexico. Washington strategists, testing chemical subatances and bacteria in Latin America, he said in an interview with EXCELSIOR newspaper, check on Latin American peoples the results of barbarous research which is being conducted in the United States. Mexico, the scientist emphasized, has come to feel the influence of the criminal experiments. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0617 GMT 25 May 86 LD] /9738

BACTERIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONFERENCE--Geneva, 2 May (TASS)--The second conference to review the operation of the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and their destruction will be held in Geneva on September 8-26 this year. This decision was taken by the committee in charge of preparations for the conference. As Soviet representatives emphasized, the convention made it possible for the first time in history to remove an entire category of mass annihilation weapons from the arsenals of states. The Soviet Union attaches great significance to that important multilateral agreement and proposes a complex of specific measures designed to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons, prevent the militarization of outer space, and limit the race in conventional arms. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 2 May 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1390

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET JOURNAL URGES NATO TO ACCEPT WARSAW PACT MBFR PROPOSALS

AU291211 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 5, May 1986 (Signed to Press 22 Apr 86) pp 118-123

[Article by K. Borisov: "For Progress at the Talks in Vienna"]

[Text] The 27th CPSU Congress particularly stressed that the struggle against the nuclear peril, the arms race, and for the preservation of universal peace in the future will be a main direction of the party's activities in the world arena.

Having thoroughly considered the prevailing situation, the CPSU advanced an integral program for the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century -- a program that is historic in its scale and significance. This program points out a reliable, direct, and short path to removing the nuclear threat and freeing the world from nuclear weapons. In proposing to remove weapons of mass destruction -- nuclear and chemical -- from states' arsenals and not to permit the appearance of space weapons, the Soviet Union believes that along with this process measures must be implemented to limit and reduce conventional armaments and armed forces.

The 15 January 1986 statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee sets the goal of setting in motion the entire existing system of talks and ensuring the highest efficiency in the disarmament mechanism. The achievement of an accord at the Vienna talks could lay the basis for movement toward reducing conventional armaments and armed forces. The talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe have continued in Vienna for 13 years now and the 39th round begins on 15 May.

As is known, 19 states are taking part in the talks: the USSR, the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania from the Warsaw Pact and the United States, Britain, the FRG, Canada, Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Denmark, and Norway from NATO. The Vienna talks did not begin from scratch. The subject of the talks was defined at the preparatory consultations preceding them: the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments and the measures connected with them in central Europe (these measures began to be called "associated"). The boundaries of the region for reductions, which comprise the territories of the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, as well as the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, were clearly delineated. It was decided that the troops and armaments of these countries and also of other states having armed forces in central Europe -- the USSR, the United States, Britain, and Canada -- would be subject to reduction. All these 11 states

have the right to take part in adopting decisions and are therefore called direct participants in the talks. As distinguished from them, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Denmark, and Norway, which are not reducing their troops, have a "special status" at the talks, in other words, a consultative one. The principle of not damaging the security of any of the sides was fixed as a basic principle of future accords. During the talks themselves a mutual understanding was reached concerning their end goal -- the establishment in central Europe of equal collective levels of the numerical strength of Warsaw Pact and NATO armed forces of 900,000 men each, including 700,000 men in the ground forces.

Thus, from the very beginning of the Vienna talks their mechanism was adjusted and basic parameters were clearly defined. All this presented the opportunity, given political will and a constructive approach by both sides, to relatively quickly achieve concrete results and begin a practical reduction in the level of military confrontation in the middle of the European Continent, where large masses of troops and armaments are concentrated. Unfortunately, this did not happen. Through the fault of the Western countries the Vienna talks have been and still are at a prolonged standstill.

The socialist countries have proceeded and proceed from the premise that an approximate balance in the correlation of military forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact has developed and exists in the middle of Europe. To maintain the prevailing balance of forces of the opposing armed groups at a lower level of troops and armaments, at the very beginning of the talks they proposed implementation of an equal percentage reduction by each direct participant of their armed forces and armaments in the region (by about 17 percent). The Warsaw Pact countries have subsequently time and again updated their proposals and have introduced elements in them that take into account certain precepts of the NATO countries' position.

The NATO countries have adhered to and continue to adhere to a different approach. They state that the main goal of the talks must be the removal of supposedly existing "disproportions" in ground forces and the basic types of conventional armaments in the region of the reductions favoring the Warsaw Pact. On this basis, the NATO countries demand "asymmetrical," that is, significantly greater, troop reductions for socialist states than for NATO.

Assertions of the socialist countries' superiority in conventional weapons do not correspond to reality. The NATO bloc exceeds the Warsaw Pact in the total numerical strength of personnel, in the number of combat-ready divisions, and in antitank weapons; the sides have about equal quantities of artillery and armored equipment. NATO has superiority in fighter-bombers, for which the Warsaw Pact compensates by a slightly greater number of air defense fighter-interceptors. On the whole there is an approximate balance in conventional weapons. Western sources also confirm this. For instance, "The Military Balance 1984-1985," the annual publication of the London Institute for Strategic Studies, states: "As before, our conclusion is that the general balance in conventional armaments and armed forces is such that it makes general military aggression an extremely risky enterprise." (Footnote 1) ("The Military Balance 1984-1985," London, 1984, p 151)

For a number of years a "numerical discussion" has been under way, imposed by the Western countries, on the numerical strength of the sides' armed forces in the reduction area, during which twice, in 1976 and 1980, data on the sides' troops was exchanged. As of 1 January 1980, the NATO states had 991,000 men in central Europe,

including French troops on FRG territory, among the 792,500 in the ground forces. The total numerical strength of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries as of 1 August 1980 (after the unilateral withdrawal by the USSR of 20,000 troops from GDR territory) was 979,000 men, among them 796,700 in the ground forces.

Progress in Vienna is also hampered by the unwillingness of NATO countries to extend reduction and limitation to armaments, which also contradicts the mandate of the talks, whose subject was defined at one time as a "mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments."

Yet another obstacle on the path to a mutually acceptable accord in Vienna is the NATO countries' artificially inflated demands, which are known to be unacceptable to Warsaw Pact countries, for verification [kontrol] of the fulfillment of a proposed agreement, which in no way correspond to the scope and nature of steps toward a real reduction in the level of military confrontation.

With the aim of breaking the deadlock of the talks, the socialist countries in February 1983 proposed a new approach for achieving an agreement, according to which each side would reduce as many troops as required to achieve agreed equal collective levels of the numerical strength of armed forces -- 900,000 men for each alliance, including 700,000 in ground forces for each alliance. This approach would mean an end to the fruitless "numerical discussion" and would permit a focus of efforts on the main thing -- achieving an end result of reduction.

However, this approach was also rejected at the time by the Western participants, who in their reply proposals in April 1984 essentially repeated all their former unconstructive stances without any substantial changes.

Seeking to achieve practical progress at the talks, the socialist countries on 14 February 1985 introduced a proposal regarding an initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of troops and armaments in central Europe and no subsequent increase in the level of the sides' armed forces and armaments in this region.

This proposal concretely envisaged a reduction within 1 year of USSR and U.S. troops together with their authorized armaments and combat equipment by 20,000 and 13,000 men, respectively with no subsequent increase or, as they say, a freeze for 2 years on the levels of troops and armaments in central Europe for all member-states of the agreement both on a collective and national basis. The proposal also contained necessary verification [kontrol] measures for the fulfillment by the sides of the agreement obligations that were adequate for these obligations.

In advancing their 14 February proposal, the Warsaw Pact countries proceeded from the premise that in the deadlock conditions that the Vienna talks were in -- and through no fault of their own -- achieving and implementing at least a limited, interim agreement in Vienna would be an expedient and useful first practical step on the path to reducing the level of military confrontation in the middle of Europe. The logic of such a step is that a reduction in the level of military confrontation cannot be begun without first of all stopping the buildup of armed forces and armaments.

Only after 10 months, in December 1985, did the NATO countries advance ideas in response. Their representatives also favored an initial reduction in Soviet and American troops, but in smaller quantities and without armaments. They also stated their agreement to begin a freeze on the level of troops, although also without extending this obligation to armaments.

One can positively assess the very fact of a response by the Western participants to the proposal by the socialist countries and consider that this exchange of signals and development of political dialogue correspond to the accords of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. One can also positively assess the fact that the West has taken a step toward the February proposal by the socialist countries, at least a step toward the outline of the initial agreement proposed by them and a framework for further talks. Moreover, it should be noted that if the NATO countries have now after all decided to abandon "numerical discussion," they have thereby made a concession to common sense, not to the socialist countries.

But together with certain constructive precepts, the Western proposal contains a number of dubious elements that do not meet the requirements of reality and the principle of no damage to the security of any of the sides. The main shortcoming of the NATO countries' proposal is that it nullifies efforts for a real reduction in the level of military confrontation in the middle of Europe, replacing them with deliberately overstated verification [kontrol] measures. This circumstance must give rise to the question: With what aim is this being done? After all, verification [kontrol] must be commensurate with the agreement obligations and facilitate their fulfillment by the sides, and not be a source of distrust and suspicion.

An important impetus for invigorating all disarmament talks was the proposal to free the world of nuclear weapons and other aspects of arms limitation and disarmament contained in the 15 January 1986 statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

One circumstance of a fundamental nature should be immediately pointed out. Assertions that implementation of a program of nuclear disarmament would lead to an intensification of the threat to use conventional weapons, where socialist countries supposedly possess superiority, are the pseudoarguments of those who in practice do not want an improvement in the situation and are looking for excuses to hamper the cause of disarmament. The Soviet Union has been and remains a firm supporter of maintaining balance at the lowest level possible, including the sphere of conventional armaments and armed forces. Therefore, the Soviet proposals of 15 January envisage that together with measures to eliminate nuclear weapons, steps must be taken to reduce conventional armed forces.

The Vienna forum could lay the basis for the process of reducing conventional armaments and troops and make it a constant element of European security. A first accord in Vienna would also beneficially affect other efforts to reduce the level of military confrontation in Europe and would promote an improvement in the international climate on a wider scale. The Soviet Union and its allies do not want to lose time for nothing at talks that have already been at a standstill for an intolerably long time. And if there is an opportunity to accelerate the talks and genuinely push them forward, the socialist countries for their part will do everything necessary to achieve a positive result.

Guided by these thoughts, the GDR, the Polish People's Republic, the USSR, and the CSSR have instructed their delegates in Vienna to jointly advance a detailed draft "agreement on initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of ground forces and armaments with no subsequent increase in the levels of the armed forces and armaments by the sides and related measures in central Europe." This draft was introduced in Vienna on 20 February 1985 on behalf of the socialist countries that are direct participants in the talks by ambassador (A. Wilandt), head of the GDR delegation.

The basic provisions of the draft agreement are as follows:

-- Over a period of 1 year from the moment the agreement goes into effect, the USSR and the United States will withdraw from central Europe to the boundaries of their national territories 11,500 and 6,500 ground forces servicemen, respectively together with their authorized armaments and combat equipment. An exchange of lists of the troop units being reduced and withdrawn will be carried out beforehand, before the signing of the agreement.

-- All 11 direct participants in the talks will pledge after the completion of the reduction of Soviet and American troops not to increase for 3 years the personnel and armaments of their ground and air forces in central Europe.

-- With the beginning of the operation of the nonincrease obligation, an exchange will be carried out of annually updated numerical data on the armed forces of NATO and Warsaw Pact countries remaining in the area of reduction.

-- For the period of the reduction of USSR and U.S. troops and the subsequent operation of the obligation not to increase (freeze), three to four constantly operating control posts will be established on the Western and Eastern sides of the reduction area. All ground forces formations, units, and subunits of the participants in the agreement will arrive or depart through these posts. The posts will be manned by representatives of both sides.

-- Preliminary mutual notification is envisaged of such military activities by the sides as troop movements, a callup of reservists, or military exercises with the participation of 20,000 men or more.

-- Together with the use of national technical means of verification [kontrol] so as to ensure fulfillment of the agreement, the possibility of conducting on-site inspections [proverka] upon a valid request is not excluded.

-- The creation of a consultative commission for an operational examination of questions connected with the fulfillment of the agreement is also envisaged.

Preserving all the fundamental precepts of the socialist countries' proposal of 14 February 1985, the new draft in many respects develops, defines them more precisely, and supplements them. It takes into account all the elements of the Western participants' position that seem acceptable and proposes compromise solutions for a number of important aspects on which there is no agreement between the sides.

Thus, important steps have been taken by socialist countries toward valid and sensible verification [kontrol] of the fulfillment of the agreement. M. S. Gorbachev stressed in the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress: "I would like to focus attention on the problems of verification [kontrol], to which we attach particular significance. We have frequently declared: The Soviet Union is open to verification [kontrol]. We have an interest in it, no less than others. Comprehensive and very rigorous inspection [proverka] is, perhaps, one of the most important elements in the process of disarmament. The essence of the matter, as we see it, is as follows: Disarmament without verification [kontrol] is impossible, but verification [kontrol] without disarmament is also meaningless."

The new draft agreement in many respects takes into account the previous ideas of the socialist countries; however, it is under no circumstances a question of it simply repeating former precepts. A number of them acquire a new quality in light of the nature of a partial agreement, and others represent quite a new positional element. During the formulation of verification [kontrol] measures the socialist countries have this time also proceeded from the goals of reliably ensuring the fulfillment by the sides of obligations for an initial reduction and no subsequent increase in armed forces and armaments in central Europe adapted to the substance and nature of the proposed agreement. At the same time, other realities of the contemporary situation in which one now has to live and work and which still remains complicated and tense were soberly taken into account.

All this reaffirms the socialist countries' desire to seek sensible mutually acceptable solutions on verification [kontrol]. However, this should not be a one-way street. The West must find its position -- whether it will continue to occupy a hopeless position on the principle of "all or nothing" in questions of verification [kontrol], or whether it intends to turn to realistic solutions.

An important impetus for solving the problems of improving the situation on the European Continent on the whole was the new Soviet initiative advanced by M.S. Gorbachev on 18 April this year at the 11th SED Congress, which proposed an agreement on significantly reducing all components of ground forces and the tactical aviation of European states, as well as the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces deployed in Europe. The troop formations and units being reduced would be subject to disbandment and their armaments -- to either being destroyed or stored on national territories. According to the Soviet side, the territory of the whole of Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- must become the geographic zone of reduction. Operational-tactical nuclear armaments would be reduced at the same time as conventional armaments.

The new Soviet proposal poses the question of proper and reliable verification [kontrol] at all phases of this process. The USSR considers that this can be a question both of national technical means and international monitoring [proverka] forums, including on-site inspections [inspektsiya] if necessary.

It is obvious that the Soviet initiative of 18 April this year is a subject for serious talks. Its implementation would allow not only the untying of the knot that for more than 12 years has been tightened at the talks in Vienna, but would also lead to a strengthening of confidence between European states.

At the Vienna talks it is necessary to solve very complicated problems before a positive result is achieved. Nonetheless, for the first time in many years there is a real chance to overcome the lingering standstill in Vienna. Both the 20 February 1986 draft agreement introduced by the socialist countries and the new Soviet initiative of 18 April this year create a practical basis for joint efforts by the sides to draw up a mutually acceptable accord. This will of course be difficult work. However, the complexities can undoubtedly be overcome given appropriate political will. The Warsaw Pact member-states are again demonstrating this will in practice. Their interest in success is obvious. Their proposals to the Western partners to shift to concrete work in formulating a text of an agreement is evidence of this.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", "Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn". 1986.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1385

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS REPORTS ON CDE CONFERENCE HELD IN STOCKHOLM

Military Exercises Discussed

LD101056 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 10 May 86

[Text] Stockholm May 9 TASS -- The discussion of the proposals of socialist as well as neutral and non-aligned countries on measures to limit military exercises is going on at the Stockholm Conference on Security- and Confidence-Building and on Disarmament in Europe. In recent years military exercises have assumed such a scope that it becomes difficult to distinguish them from preparation for the deployment of armed forces for combat operations.

Today the Soviet delegation in its speech at the conference pointed out the importance of taking restrictive measures to overcome distrust and to lower military confrontation in Europe, and urged the participants in the conference to begin to coordinate the text of an appropriate agreement. It was shown that the USA and its closest NATO allies were in every way evading a solution to this urgent problem and seeking to retain freedom of action for a step-up of military preparations.

Grivenskiy Attacks West

LD231100 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Stockholm May 23 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports:

The regular session of the Conference on Security- and Confidence-Building Measures, and on Disarmament in Europe ended here today. Summing up its results, Oleg Grivenskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, noted that from the point of view of urgent tasks of the European policy it is important to complete the first stage of this conference with positive results. The opportunities for this do exist and they are perfectly real given mutual aspiration to reach an accord. This, however, is what the United States and some Western countries lack.

Under all kind of far-fetched pretexts they impede the work to hammer out mutually acceptable accords, draw back from the quest for ways to come to grips with unresolved problems, which are proposed by socialist, neutral and non-aligned countries.

The success or lack of success at the Stockholm Conference is in the present-day situation a touchstone of the readiness to work not in words but in deed for scaling down the military threat on our continent. This is necessary both by its own self and for a new all-European meeting in Vienna, so as it could make a decision to pass over to the second stage of the conference devoted to disarmament in Europe. Thus, a new impetus would be given to developing the Helsinki process in all of its aspects.

The next session of the conference will begin its work on June 10.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1385

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW HITS REAGAN RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV ON TEST BAN

LD251822 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 May 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpt] When Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in his speech on Soviet television, stated that the USSR Government had made the decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, in the White House they pretended that they had not even noticed this important step. Clearly, the U.S. Administration could not find a convincing argument to justify its reluctance to stop the nuclear arms race.

This week, the United States actually replied to the latest Soviet initiative on extending the term of the moratorium on nuclear explosions, and it did so in an habitual and challenging form -- it detonated another nuclear device.

From time to time officials in Washington recall that there exists agreement on holding another Soviet-U.S. summit meeting this year, and that the whole matter allegedly rests with Moscow. But these are mere words. In actual fact the U.S. Administration's behavior is such as if it set itself the task of torpedoing Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States. For example, one cannot assess in any other way the shameful anti-Soviet campaign started in the United States in conjunction with the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

Previously the United States had tried to camouflage its refusal to stop nuclear explosions with various excuses. They referred to difficulties with verification: When we stated that any verification, including on-site inspection, would not be any problem for us, they started talking about their lagging behind; they said the USSR had already carried out a series of explosions and does not usually start new tests before spring. Well, spring, one can say, has passed, and we have not tested nuclear weapons for 9 and 1/2 months, and we are prepared to wait even until 6 August. You would think that even far-fetched arguments had been removed, but figures in the U.S. Administration are saying more and more often that to stop tests would have a negative effect on the reliability of U.S. nuclear arsenals. What, then, is the value of the White House's assurances of its desire to strive for a radical reduction in, or even the total elimination of, these arsenals?

Some U.S. observers believed that in the existing situation -- when the accident at Chernobyl demonstrated yet again what an abyss will open in the event of nuclear war, when scores of public, including U.S. organizations urged the U.S. Administration to follow the example of the Soviet Union and refrain, at least for some time, from

scheduled explosions -- Washington again displayed contempt of U.S. public opinion and of the viewpoint of the international community. The U.S. Administration ignored the constructive approach of the USSR on the matter.

Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed his consent in principle to holding a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. He noted at the same time that two simple things are required for such a meeting -- the readiness to make it yield tangible, practical results at least on one or two issues of continuing concern for the world, and a fitting political atmosphere.

However, it does not look as though the White House is striving to improve the climate in Soviet-U.S. relations. As to the search for agreements on disarmament problems, Washington is so acting in a diametrically opposite direction and is threatening to cancel the agreements signed earlier.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1392

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW HITS WEINBERGER COMMENT ON NORDIC NFZ

LD282029 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1430 GMT 26 May 86

[Text] U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger claimed at a press conference in Copenhagen that the establishment of a nuclear weapons-free zone in northern Europe is the same as calling on the Soviet Union to start an attack. It is extremely dangerous to turn one's back on danger, he said. Our observer writes in this connection:

All kinds of stories about the Soviet threat are as old as the world itself. But regarding the real danger, there we absolutely agree with the secretary of defense. One must not turn one's back on danger. But it is necessary to estimate in the right way what is really threatening, what is danger. The majority of the people on the earth realize that nations are threatened with a nuclear disaster, and therefore we have to welcome every step taken in the direction of eliminating nuclear weapons.

The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe is one such step, and therefore abandoning the idea of forming such a zone would be tantamount to turning one's back on danger. This is what Secretary of Defense Weinberger calls for. But no wonder, for the advocates of nuclear weapons have really turned their backs on the threat. They are moving backward and enjoying the past, in other words, how before the beginning of the nuclear era all problems could be solved with armed force. Thinking of the past, they see wars that did not threaten the United States in any way. The towns of other countries, not of the United States, were in ruins.

But when we turn forward, the picture changes. Nuclear weapons can lead to a destabilization of an already explosive situation. What will happen if a nuclear war breaks out, even in a situation favorable to the United States, when it is the first to direct a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union, asks American scientist Isaac Asimov, who continues: What will be the consequences of the explosions of hundreds of nuclear bombs? Will not the strike that destroys the Soviet Union destroy all of Western Europe after a few days and then gradually the rest of the world?

To avoid the disaster, decisive action is needed to eliminate the military nuclear threat. The Soviet Union has presented a concrete program for the elimination of nuclear weapons. It supports the establishment of nuclear-free zones, also in the northern Europe. As we know, the idea of establishing a nuclear-free zone is gaining extensive support there. Therefore, the secretary of defense is again trying to direct public opinion elsewhere and to force upon it the idea of a fabricated threat and not of the real danger. He is trying to make public opinion turn its back on the most important issue of our time, the problem of nuclear disarmament.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1392

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET LATE MAY COMMENTS ON LATEST U.S. TEST

U.S. 'Contempt' For World Cited

LD222322 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 22 May 86

[Report by Political Observer Valentin Zorin on the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] World public opinion has reacted with indignation to the report of a new test explosion at the U.S. nuclear site in Nevada. We go now to Political Observer for Soviet television Valentin Zorin:

Hello, comrades. The world waited with particularly alert attention the reaction of official Washington to the important new step taken by the Soviet Union in extending its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 6 August. Having for the first time actually encountered the terrible power of nuclear energy out of control, millions of people, wherever they live, have become very clearly aware of the monstrous threat lurking in the nuclear arsenals of the modern world.

They have formed a high opinion of the wise and truly humane position of the Soviet Union. For a week after the speech in which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev announced the extension of the Soviet moratorium, the leaders of the Washington administration seemed incapable of opening their mouths; they relegated the task of expressing a negative attitude toward our country's move to officials of third-rate importance. Well, it is not difficult to guess the reasons for this unwanted taciturnity on the part of Washington's high-ranking politicians: They quite simply have no arguments to justify to public opinion in the United States and around the world their obstinate unwillingness to seize the opportunity they have been given of taking a real step towards stopping the nuclear arms race.

And now, instead of a constructive answer to the peace-loving Soviet initiative, the latest in the series of nuclear explosions -- the 11th since we introduced our moratorium -- has rent the air at the testing site in Nevada. In this way, Washington is demonstrating its open contempt for the world community, its refusal to make a sober appraisal of the realities of today's world and its inability to think on the level of those harsh realities and in accordance with their demands. Nor can one fail to mention that the continuing nuclear tests in Nevada demonstrate the malicious intent and cynicism of the organizers of the anti-Soviet pandemonium over the accident at Chernobyl. It is not human safety that motivates the Washington politicians, but the unworthy desire to score points in a dirty political game.

But those who think they can go on acting in defiance of the laws of morality and common sense are mistaken. Washington is going to have to pay a large political price for its attempts to carry on without taking this into account. Even those leaders of the West European countries who are accustomed to following in the wake of their senior partner across the Atlantic have now been forced to dissociate themselves from the test in one way or another.

An indication of the growing mood within the United States is the bill, prepared by a group of influential congressmen, to stop financing the production of nuclear warheads as long as the Soviet Union refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions. Realities exist which Washington, sooner or later, will have to reckon with. The last word has not yet been spoken.

U.S. Ignores Public Demand

LD221400 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 22 May 86

[TASS commentator Ivan Ablamov]

[Text] Moscow May 22 TASS -- The world has been outraged by yet another nuclear blast at the testing range in Nevada. Ostentatiously ignoring public demands in its own country and abroad for an end to the nuclear arms race which poses a deadly threat to mankind, Washington presses on with its nuclear testing program.

The world can see clearly once again that the USSR and the United States have opposite approaches to international affairs. Proceeding from the conviction that the nuclear age requires a new political mentality and a new policy, the Soviet Union maintains consistent efforts to bring about disarmament and prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

The urgent and important nature of Soviet peace initiatives for completely eliminating nuclear weapons, stopping nuclear blasts and creating a comprehensive system of international security has become especially clear these days.

The Soviet Government has decided to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till August 6, the 41st anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy. The USSR has called on the United States to hold an urgent summit meeting to come to terms on the prohibition of nuclear tests.

This noble step by the USSR has been hailed as an act of statesmanship dictated by concern for bridling the nuclear arms race.

Nagasaki Mayor Hitoshi Motoshima has said the Soviet proposal for holding the Soviet-U.S. summit to ban nuclear testing meets the aspirations of the Japanese.

Public opinion polls in the United States have showed that most Americans support an end to such tests as a concrete and easy first step to completely halting the nuclear arms buildup.

But in Washington they have disregarded these worldwide calls for weighing with utmost responsibility the measure of danger threatening mankind and for demonstrating in practice their concern for human life and public health, and continued following a different path, the path of escalating military preparations. Nuclear armories and nuclear testing, however, harbor the threat of a catastrophe.

12 June 1986

This explains the angry worldwide reaction to the latest nuclear test in the United States.

Huge stockpiles of nuclear arms have been accumulated in the world and many Americans are asking whether nuclear weapons are justified at all, U.S. physiologist George Wald, a Noble Prize holder, has said.

He added that the administration was responding to the right step by Moscow with a series of nuclear tests needed to further the "star wars" program.

The hard truth of the times, the Indian newspaper daily has said, is that socialism upholds peace, while imperialism wants the arms race.

Washington's provocative actions corroborate this obvious truth.

Test 'Political Hypocrisy'

LD222022 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 May 86

[Igor Charikov commentary]

[Text] The latest U.S. nuclear explosion conducted at the test site in Nevada aroused worldwide protests. Authorities in the Japanese towns of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which has suffered from U.S. atomic bombings, categorically demanded that the White House immediately end all nuclear tests. Here is our commentator Igor Charikov:

The U.S. capital is trying to create the impression that nothing extraordinary has happened. A representative of the Department of Energy, which officially conducts the tests in Nevada, informed journalists only about the technical facts of the explosion that took place. True, he revealed that the explosion was connected with weapons, but refused to answer the questions that followed immediately. Even without further explanation, yesterday's explosion in Nevada confirms that the U.S. Administration, ignoring world and domestic public opinion, continues to implement a program for the creation of new types of nuclear weapons aimed at inflicting a first strike from space.

According to the appraisal of specialists, this program will this year alone require 15 nuclear explosions. Each explosion of this kind, including those conducted underground, is not without ecological consequences. Improving and accumulating nuclear arsenals, the U.S. ruling circles at the same time make speeches about the need to get rid of nuclear weapons. These very words were uttered as recently as yesterday by the U.S. President himself, but against the background of Washington's practical deeds these speeches are seen to be false and thoroughly hypocritical, for every day and every hour the material preparations for a nuclear war are being conducted in the United States. This political hypocrisy and double standard is eloquently described in an announcement by the well-known hardline supporter, Richard Perle, who said that he sees no practical nor acceptable alternative to nuclear tests, if nuclear weapons are the cornerstone of the West's defense strategy.

However, practically the whole world, with the exception of Perle and a few others like him, sees an alternative in the Soviet initiative for a moratorium on all types of nuclear tests. Pronouncements in support of the idea of a Soviet moratorium and appeals to the U.S. Administration to subscribe to it can be heard every day. As is known, the Soviet Union has adopted a decision to extend the moratorium announced earlier to 6 August. This was adopted despite Washington's stubborn refusal to speak seriously about nuclear disarmament. The latest test in Nevada is yet another politically irresponsible challenge to common sense, an act contradicting the new political thinking required in our time.

'Contradicts' Geneva Talks

LD221922 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 22 May (TASS)--TASS political news analyst Igor Orlov writes:

Another nuclear explosion in Nevada conducted by the U.S. shows clearly the essence of the U.S. Administration's policy. The explosion was staged against the clearly expressed will of the world public which urges the United States to join in the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing, the moratorium that has been extended. Trying to camouflage the aggressive essence and militarist trend of its policy Washington resorts to various propaganda tricks, tries to place the blame at the wrong door. This was seen again during a meeting of State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb with reporters.

Answering the question as to why the United States does not take steps to reciprocate the well-known Soviet initiatives advanced since the Geneva meeting, Kalb alleged that there are on the negotiating table U.S. proposals awaiting the USSR's answer.

Kalb noted that the United States, allegedly, advanced considerations about making progress in the questions of nuclear tests. But he "forgot" to specify that instead of a complete ban on such tests Washington would like to achieve the opposite results--to conduct talks on their regulations, that is on giving sanction to nuclear tests. Instead of discussing the question of a ban on space strike arms, the United States is prepared to propose a "dialogue" on interrelationship between strategic and defensive arms, that is to carry the matters to the working out of "rules" for conducting the race of such armaments.

The attitude to the Soviet initiative for the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe is indicative of Washington's obstructionist stand. The United States is now cynically boycotting solutions of that question, making references to the stands of Britain and France, demanding the weakening of the Soviet Union's defences on the eastern borders, while preserving the U.S. Armed Forces in that region. And this happens not only at the Geneva talks but also at other talks. Each time the Soviet Union takes a step to meet the U.S. stand, the U.S. steps back.

12 June 1986

The juggling of words cannot conceal the obvious fact that Washington's actions after the Geneva meeting contradict the arrangements reached, attest to the strengthening of an anti-Geneva syndrom there and this is confirmed anew by the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada.

'Shaken World Opinion'

PM231332 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 86 First Edition p 5

[Nikolay Bragin "Observer's Opinion" under general heading: "Contraty to Common Sense"]

[Text] The latest nuclear explosion at the Nevada test site has literally shaken world public opinion by its defiant and provocative nature. It was, after all, conducted only a week after mankind's hopes that a real step would at long last be taken toward curbing the nuclear arms race had been rekindled.

Millions of people all over the world enthusiastically welcomed the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 6 August and the new call to the United States to follow this example. Many politicians and public figures described the USSR's initiative as an act of the greatest state wisdom meeting the interests of peoples all over the world.

The demand that the United States back the moratorium idea and halt its nuclear explosions started to intensify everywhere. People with different political beliefs in the United States itself persistently called on the incumbent White House administration to heed the voice of common sense, abandon its wild ambitions to attain nuclear superiority, face up to the truth, the realistically assess the catastrophic consequences which may result from a continuation of the nuclear arms race.

But Washington again remained deaf to the demands of the U.S. and international public. The latest explosion in Nevada--the 11th since the Soviet Union announced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests in 1985--cannot be perceived as anything but a crude challenge to mankind's most cherished aspirations.

So far, the arguments of common sense have had no effect on it. Nor have the lessons of Chernobyl. This does not mean, however, that it can conduct itself in the world according to the principle "I do as I like." The peoples and the peace-loving states will no doubt draw their conclusions from the U.S. militarists' defiant behavior and will redouble their efforts in the struggle for peace.

It is obvious that the reliance on the continuation of the nuclear arms race on Earth and the deployment of strike weapons in space remains unchanged in the policy of the incumbent U.S. Administration.

Disregarding the opinion of the peoples, who demand that an end be put to nuclear insanity, Washington is driving itself into still greater moral and political isolation in the international arena. The aggressive nature of its foreign policy course is obvious. And this truth cannot be covered up by any American big talk about "commitment to the cause of peace." The people judge policies and politicians by their deeds and not by their words.

'Open Challenge' to World

LD250215 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 24 May 86

["Moscow Viewpoint" by Valentin Zorin--read by announcer]

[Text] The nuclear explosion at the Nevada proving ground on Wednesday was not only identified by seismological stations in various parts of the world but also sparked off a stormy political reaction because it runs counter to the interests and aspirations of millions of people around the world. The latest explosion in Nevada is seen by the world community as an open challenge.

These days the world is living under the impression of the tragedy at Chernobyl, where people had to face such a formidable power as nuclear energy that has got out of control. Washington tried to use the Chernobyl accident to score political points and to fan anti-Soviet hysteria. However, the masterminds of the propaganda campaign have failed to hide the main thing. Millions of people around the world saw clearly the menace hanging over humanity--the menace created by the continuing race in nuclear arms. The relatively small radioactive cloud that appeared over Chernobyl paled into insignificance when compared with what can follow the explosion of even a small part of the nuclear charges stockpiled in the world.

The Soviet Union, in a bid to promote disarmament, took still another step that has met with approval from everybody in his right mind. Although the Soviet Union has for more than 9 months complied with a self-imposed ban on nuclear explosions, the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has announced that the unilateral Soviet moratorium has been prolonged to the 7th of August. That was not an easy decision to make, especially at a time when the Pentagon went ahead with its tests. The Soviet Union nevertheless did take that step, thereby supporting with practical steps its goodwill and readiness to take real actions to rid humanity of the threat of nuclear self-annihilation.

However, Washington has again refused to accept the hand extended to it. The order to go ahead with nuclear tests in Nevada is evidence that the United States leaders put the profits of a handful of military-industrial companies before the vital interests of people, including the Americans themselves.

Incidentally, underground nuclear explosions in Nevada are far from being as safe as the Americans, Canadians and people in other countries are told. During the underground explosion on the 10th of April, a number of important systems failed and as a result radioactive gas, Xenon, reached the surface. And still later, when radioactive tunnels were ventilated on the 22d and 27th of April, which was announced by the Energy Department, products of radioactive decay produced by the explosion escaped into the atmosphere. The Canadian TRIBUNE believes that an increased radiation level in Canada could be partly caused by that incident in Nevada. Experts have been claiming that radioactive gases were discharged into the atmosphere after other nuclear explosions in Nevada also. The continuation of nuclear explosions in Nevada at a time when the Soviet Union does not conduct such tests shows the actual worth of peace pronouncements by the United States leaders.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1392

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS ASSAILS U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS, DEPLOYMENTS IN MICRONESIA

LD292105 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 29 May 86

["USA Gives Legitimacy to Annexation of Micronesia" -- TASS identifier]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS -- TASS News Analyst Vasily Kharkov writes:

The resolution imposed on the U.N. Trusteeship Council by the USA with British and French support on Wednesday is designed to give legitimacy to the U.S. annexation of the Pacific islands known as Micronesia. The nearly 40 years of the American government of those islands, stretching in a huge semicircle over almost 4,000 kilometers, have seen Washington's diktat and imposition on the trust territory of political, economic and social conditions which have amounted to the actual seizure of the islands by the United States. When the USA was granted by the U.N. Security Council its mandate to govern the territory in 1947, it pledged to guide itself by the interests of the local population, to facilitate progress and to help the trust territory to advance towards self-government and independence.

That pledge was grossly violated and the U.S. exploited its status of trustee first and foremost to promote its own military and strategic goals.

The Pentagon continues to view Micronesia as a strategically sensitive chain of American military bases, bringing many parts of Asia and the Pacific within the range of U.S. nuclear missiles. That is why the Pacific islands have become a militarist staging area, which the U.S. uses every now and then to flex its muscles in that vast region.

The USA has a major base on Atoll Kwajalein in the Marshall Islands, for instance, and tests on it intercontinental ballistic missiles and components of the "star wars" weapons. More than one billion dollars has been invested in the base and it keeps growing.

Two more atolls in the northern group of the Marshall Islands, Bikini and Eniwetok, were used over the years to test American atomic and hydrogen bombs. They remain contaminated with radiation. Bikini is still uninhabitable and its people remain exiles. The 18 million dollars a year that Washington pays in compensation to the population of the islands who sustained damage from nuclear explosions amounts to a pitiful attempt to avoid responsibility for the criminal action.

Disregarding the will of the population of Belau, who unanimously called for the non-nuclear status of that small island territory, the USA is planning to establish there a base for nuclear-armed Trident submarines. The USA has virtually bought its "military presence" by promising a dollar sop to Belau.

Now that the south Pacific has already been proclaimed a non-nuclear zone by the states in the region and that the anti-war and anti-nuke movement is growing all over Asia and the Pacific, Washington's annexationist ambitions towards Micronesia and its use as a staging area by the Pentagon constitute a challenge to the will of the peoples. The USA has grossly violated the U.N. Charter and the declaration on the granting of independence to the colonial countries and peoples and abused its mandate of trustee for neo-colonialist purposes. Any revision of the status of Micronesia is the exclusive prerogative of the Security Council. That is why the attempts of the USA and its Western allies to manipulate the Trusteeship Council for the purpose are groundless. The future of the Pacific Islands must not be subordinated to the Pentagon's nuclear missiles ambitions.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1392

12 June 1986

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET PAPER REPORTED TO CITE SAKHAROV ON TEST BAN

DW300835 Hamburg BILD in German 30 May 86 p 4

["Exclusive" BILD report by Peter Bartels: "Sakharov on Chernobyl: It Was Terrible"]

[Text] "It was terrible what happened (in Chernobyl), a tragedy like that of Challenger..."

This was said by Andrey Sakharov, the famous Soviet nuclear physicist, by phone to his wife Yelena Bonner in the United States. The Soviets recorded the talk with microphones and hidden cameras.

The new video cassette BILD received yesterday from Moscow, was recorded 14 days ago in Gorki, Sakharov's place of exile. The Kremlin had him interviewed for the first time by a (Soviet) reporter -- on a side street in Gorki.

Reporter: "I am from GORKOVSKIY RABOCHIY (GORKI WORKER)."

Sakharov unbelieving: "The GORKOVSKIY RABOCHIY?"

Reporter; "Excuse me please, but this is the first time I have had an opportunity to speak to Academician Sakharov. Can you satisfy my professional curiosity? Everybody speaks of Chernobyl at the moment. An accident..."

Sakharov: "A terrible accident."

Reporter: "The papers write about a radiation of 10-15 milliroentgen per hour. Is that much?"

Sakharov: "No, it is only little. You see, those who died received a much higher dose. They got several hundred roentgen."

Reporter: "I also deal with ecological issues for our newspaper. I believe that the accident will have some effect on nature."

Sakharov: "It could have some effects..."

Here the video cassette sound suddenly becomes indistinct. It becomes intelligible again when Sakharov says: "However, you know, it was not nature that tried to put the fire out, they were firefighters."

Reporter: "Yes, I understand what you mean. Will we have to deal with consequences?"

Sakharov: "No, nothing serious. Not for the people outside the power plant zone."

Reporter: "Nevertheless, we must continue our fight to achieve renunciation of nuclear weapons."

Sakharov: "Total renunciation. Naturally, yes, naturally. It is a terrible threat to mankind."

Reporter: "We have announced a moratorium (voluntary nuclear test halt) until 6 August. However, the Americans have not responded."

Sakharov: "They believe that without nuclear weapons they will be unable to resist the Soviets. As long as tensions exist, we will be unable to achieve agreement."

/9738

CSO: 5200/1392

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW CONTRASTS SOVIET, U.S. APPROACHES TO VERIFICATION

LD251934 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 25 May 86

[Commentary by TASS Observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Ever since disarmament talks began 40 years ago there has been an ongoing dispute over the problem of verification. There could have been no dispute had it not been constantly fueled by the opponents of disarmament. Whenever the United States and other Western nations accepted certain arms limitation measures, verification problems were resolved. But whenever the international situation became aggravated through the fault of imperialist circles, and prospects for agreement on arms limitation declined, there immediately appeared so-called verification problems.

After it assumed power in 1980, the Reagan administration in effect adopted a policy of renouncing disarmament agreements reached with the Soviet Union on an equal footing. In its report for the fiscal year 1981, the Pentagon pointed out that the United States needed only such agreements with the Soviet Union that would direct military competition to areas where the United States will get a clear advantage. That is the basis of a policy aimed at securing military superiority over the Soviet Union. All that stood in the way of that policy was rejected and alleged verification problems were used as an excuse.

The United States, for instance, used this tactic to stall progress toward an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. Back in 1958, a conference of experts of eight nations, including the USSR and the United States, came to the conclusion that a total nuclear test ban lends itself to reliable verification with the help of national means. The United States said that national means were not enough. At the trilateral talks between the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain, held between 1977 and 1980 with a view to reaching agreement on banning nuclear tests, the United States kept on toughening its stand on verification. Having dragged its feet at the talks, the United States went on to break them off.

In order to remove all the so-called difficulties in resolving that problem the Soviet Union said that it is prepared to accept the most stringent verification measures, including on-site inspection. The Soviet Union accepted the move of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden whereby they offered their help in verifying a bilateral Soviet-American nuclear test ban. After that the United States had to make a clean breast of it and acknowledge that the sticking point is not at all verification.

The United States needs more nuclear tests to upgrade its nuclear weapons and develop attack space weapons. The American Administration proposed to the Soviet Union that they should exchange observers of nuclear tests and compare notes about how best to upgrade nuclear weapons. And perhaps one day, Washington said, the two sides will reach an agreement on halting nuclear tests. Accepting that proposal would be tantamount to substituting legalizing nuclear weapons upgrading for verifying a nuclear test ban.

The Soviet stand boils down to the following: Disarmament is possible without verification. But verification without disarmament makes no sense. In advancing its proposals for arms limitation and disarmament the Soviet Union has always closely linked verification with arms limitation and scrapping process. The Soviet Union extended that approach to verifying the implementation of the program for the total abolition of nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass extermination by the year 2000, which it advanced on 15 January.

The process of eliminating weapons could be verified by both national means and on-site inspection. The Soviet Union is prepared to reach agreement on any supplementary verification measures. The Soviet Union is interested in reliable verification of compliance with disarmament agreements no less than the United States. This country favors effective verification in all avenues of arms control to ensure that agreements reached are complied with. The Soviet Union is prepared to limit or ban any type of weapons on a reciprocal basis, given reliable verification. This is stated in the updated version of the program of the Soviet Communist Party adopted at the recent 27th congress.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1386

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW ON TEST BAN, SALT II, EUREKA

LD240921 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 23 May 86

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Vladimir Pasko, commentator for All-Union Radio, with Vitaliy Yakovlevich Chukseyev, chief editor of foreign information for TASS; Anatoliy Doronin, correspondent for East Africa; Vlacheslav Vladimirovich Sychev, general secretary of CEMA; Sergey Pravdin, correspondent in Ulaanbaatar; Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, not further identified; Pavel Kasparov, correspondent in Paris]

[Excerpts]

[Pasko] Hello, comrades! We are continuing to receive letters connected with the accident at the Chernobyl AES. Many are asking if they can help in some way to eliminate the consequences of the accident. I cannot reply individually to all letters, but I can cover the main point: For those who want to send donations to the victims aid fund, I can tell you that checks should be made out to the Moscow account of the Executive Committee for the Association of Red Cross and Red Crescent societies.

Its number is 700-624. Or they can be sent directly to Kiev, Account No 904.

The accident has deeply concerned people, and, let me add, not only Soviet people. This is shown by the letters being received by the radio from foreign listeners expressing sincere sympathy with us. No less emotion has been aroused by the dirty attempts of the West to make use of what has happened for its own political ends. What sort of politicians are they, writes, for instance, Comrade Sazonov of Engels, who can only see in the accident an excuse to evade our proposals on nuclear disarmament, when, in fact it is a graphic illustration of how urgently necessary they are! This was in effect confirmed by the U.S. specialists who are in our country at this time. The same feelings were expressed in a letter from Artem Ivanovich Boedyeko of Gorkiy, who asks if there are forces in the United States capable of standing against the course of the present administration, and in a letter from Comrade Malenchikov of Borovich. Borovich asks what measures are being taken by the Soviet Union to maintain a military balance in a situation in which the United States does not want to agree on the total destruction of nuclear weapons. Petr Grigoryevich Zhukovskiy, from Vladivostok, asks: Why does the United States refuse to take into account the opinions of the governments and public of other countries?

Taking part in our program today is Vitaliy Yakovlevich Chukseyev, chief editor of foreign information for TASS. I will let him speak.

[Chukseyev] You must have already heard, comrades, that on 21 May the United States conducted another nuclear weapons test. Again the earth trembled at the Nevada test site where the U.S. military is busy developing ever more up-to-date and efficient means of mass annihilation. Since the Soviet Union announced its moratorium on nuclear testing on 6 August last year, the Pentagon has carried out 11 such tests. The other day I happened to see a set of photographs of the test site in Nevada, which was distributed by ASSOCIATED PRESS. At first glance it looks like the lifeless surface of the Moon: Huge craters are scattered over the desert landscape shown in the photographs. These wounds, inflicted in Nevada by underground nuclear explosions, serve as a graphic illustration of the policy of the arms race being pursued by the United States. In this connection one cannot help but ask if Washington understands the dangerous brink the world has come to. Does the Reagan administration realize in full measure its responsibility for the fate of millions of people? Unfortunately, one can only give a negative reply to this question. Furthermore, it is glaringly apparent what a challenging position the White House is taking in giving the order to press the button at the Nevada test site only a week after the Soviet Union's latest decision to unilaterally prolong its moratorium until 6 August this year and its appeal to the United States to follow this example. This is by no means a new position.

The well-known NEW YORK TIMES observer Tom Wicker recently wrote an article containing a short chronological account of this matter.

He recalls the following, which I quote: The Soviet leader proposed the proclamation of a moratorium on 6 August 1985, the 40th anniversary of the day on which the United States dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, and the Soviet Union observed this moratorium. President Reagan rejected such a moratorium. At the beginning of 1986 Moscow extended the moratorium until 31 March. Reagan rejected it again.

The Soviet leader proposed once again extending the period of validity of the moratorium, and the U.S. President rejected this proposal too. None of the reasons cited in this connection by the U.S. leader sounds convincing.

The creation of new and more lethal nuclear weapons, according to the observer, contradicts Reagan's own dictums that nuclear war cannot be won and that it should never be waged. And indeed, in its negative reaction to our country's appeal, as before, the administration has not taken the trouble to search for serious arguments. Attempts were also made, in the face of obvious facts, to present the Soviet moratorium as a propaganda maneuver.

Here is how Rajiv Gandhi, the Indian prime minister, spoke out in connection with such absurd accusations: A few claim that the Soviet Union is doing all this for the sake of propaganda. Yes, we would also like to receive such propaganda from other countries. Unfortunately, so far we are not seeing a positive reaction to our proposal on the part of other states possessing nuclear weapons. However, regarding the essence of the extension of the period of the Soviet Union's renunciation of nuclear tests, the Indian leader stated:

We wholeheartedly welcome this decision by the Soviet Union. This step demonstrates that the USSR's attitude toward nuclear disarmament is a very serious one. The next meeting of six countries from five continents on problems of nuclear disarmament will take place on 6 August, and its participants, Gandhi said, hope that such constructive proposals will come from other nuclear powers too.

These assessments reflect the sentiments of the international community and U.S. public that our country's decision evoked. In many reactions, it was noted that the U.S. refusal to join the moratorium on nuclear tests is a deviation from the joint statement at the Geneva summit meeting last autumn in which the leaders of the two great powers stress the importance of preventing any war between them -- nuclear or conventional.

[Pasko] The attempts by the Washington administration to undermine the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitations Treaty signed in June 1979, serve as another link in the same dangerous policy aimed at achieving military superiority. A number of listeners have asked us to go into greater detail as to what is now taking place in the United States concerning this treaty.

[Chukseyev] The fact of the matter is that at the end of May sea trials will start of the eighth U.S. nuclear submarine of the Trident class, which carries 24 missiles. This means that the United States will exceed the ceiling of 1,200 multiple-warhead nuclear missiles laid down by this treaty. The start of the sea trials of the new submarine will require the White House to make a decision on the dismantling of two existing submarines of the Poseidon class if the United States wants to remain within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. agreement. Such a step is being earnestly resisted by the hawks among the U.S. leadership who wish to use the situation that has come about to move ahead militarily. It is reported that Reagan will make his final decision taking into account the results of consultations with the West European allies.

In this connection, even British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe, who usually supports the U.S. foreign policy line, stated: Nonobservance of the agreement would provoke a considerably greater loss of trust in the U.S. Administration than the raid on Libya. And Bettino Craxi, the chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers, as the ITALIA agency reports, expressed in a letter to Reagan his anxiety in connection with the U.S. position and called on him to keep the treaty in force. Craxi pointed to the risk to which the world will be subjected if what remains of the spirit of the Geneva meeting is somehow or other undermined by a new, more hardline U.S. attitude.

From sources in the administration, information is emerging that Reagan is inclining toward extending the period of validity of the SALT II treaty, something internal political considerations are also compelling him into doing. Recently, more than half of the members of Congress sent him a letter in which they spoke out against undermining the limitations on offensive arms. They stressed that this would, in the first place, damage the security of the United States.

However, taking into account the zigzag nature and unpredictability of the foreign policy actions of the White House, it is better to wait with the forecasts. Even if the period of the treaty's validity is extended at the end of May, the treaty will, as before, remain under threat. As the informed paper THE WASHINGTON POST reported in this connection: The limits set by this agreement could be exceeded this summer when the U.S. Air Force will arm a sufficient number of bombers with cruise missiles. Such are a few events connected with the questions being asked by the listeners of this broadcast.

In the conduct of the U.S. Administration, there are many such things that are incompatible with political morals, worsen the international atmosphere, intensify tension in Soviet-U.S. relations, and testify to the striving to continue the line toward military superiority and continuing in the arms race.

[Pasko] Our mailbag contains a large number of letters asking about progress in the fulfillment of the decisions of the economic summit conference of the CEMA member-countries and the extraordinary 41st CEMA session.

What has been and is being done in this area? How are things going? These questions have been sent in by, among others, Tolchev, Abdikeyev, and Aldzhigidov from Moscow; Ulitovskiy from Kishinev; and a number of other comrades. Here to answer your questions is Vyacheslav Vladimirovich Sychev, CEMA secretary.

[Sychev] Almost 2 years have passed since the June 1984 summit-level economic conference in Moscow of the CEMA member-countries. It was a conference that defined the strategy of cooperation of the CEMA member-countries for a long period of time. It is natural that since the economic conference the activities of all bodies of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and CEMA's entire work, have been geared to the fulfillment of the conference's decisions. First and foremost, of course, it must be said that in fulfillment of the decisions of the economic conference, an integrated program for the CEMA member-countries' scientific and technical progress up to the year 2000 was drawn up within a fairly tight deadline and adopted by the 41st extraordinary CEMA session in December of last year. It is a most important program document of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

The integrated program is aimed at tackling the main task set by the 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the other fraternal parties -- the task of accelerating the social and economic development of our countries. The 6 months since the adoption of the integrated program for scientific and technical progress has been full of strenuous work to implement the important tasks formulated in the program.

[Pasko] Comrade Zhilkin from the village of Sredniy Raskhovets in Kursk Oblast asks how the comprehensive program for scientific-technical progress of the CEMA member-countries differs from the West European Eureka in that the first is a military program whose results will show up in the civilian sphere, while the second is a civilian one whose results will show up in the military sphere.

The French Federation of Scientific-Technical Workers has stated that the implementation of this project means Europe's entry into the process of the militarization of space.

The comprehensive program for the scientific-technical progress of the CEMA member-countries up to the year 2000 has nothing in common with Eureka.

In adopting it the socialist countries especially noted that they are pursuing humane, peace-loving aims. They resolutely advocate the prevention of the arms race in space and its cessation on earth as well as disarmament and the widest international cooperation for the sake of an exclusively peaceful use of the revolutionary advances in science, equipment, and technology.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1386

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW 'OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE': TEST BAN, CW ARMS, CDE

LD251817 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 15 May 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD' Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, deputy editor in chief of MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHOUNARODNYE OTHNOSHENIYA; and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, Central Television and All-Union Radio Political Observer]

[Excerpts] [Zholkver] Hello, comrades. At the center of attention of international observers last week was the visit to our country by the head of the Spanish Government. As you know, at its regular meeting the CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted that the constructive nature of the talks, meaning the talks between the Soviet leadership and the Spanish Prime Minister Gonzalez, provide the opportunity for the continued broadening of mutual understanding and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Spain in the interests of the peoples of the two countries and the strengthening of peace, trust and security in Europe and beyond.

I think that overall the Soviet-Spanish talks in Moscow went beyond the framework of just bilateral relations. Indeed, during the Soviet-Spanish talks, and particularly during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with Felipe Gonzalez, note was made of one of the most important features of the world today: the rapid growth of the mutual links and mutual dependence between the countries of our planet. There are a whole number of vitally important questions that are posed for all countries by our nuclear and space age. Chief among them is the ending of the arms race and elimination of the threat of nuclear war. What is needed to solve these problems is new thinking and new approaches in world politics. Our country vividly demonstrates both. We propose embarking on the steps that are easiest to take -- the liquidation of medium-range missiles in Europe and the ending of nuclear tests -- but what at the same time do we see in the West?

[Lebedev] Yes, there is now a colossal difference in this approach to the world situation, and there are in general fundamental differences in the degree of responsibility for what is happening.

As far as our country is concerned -- and you have already mentioned this, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, but I will simply recall -- there has been a very broad response and positive discussion throughout the world on our new pledge, which was adopted unilaterally, for a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests which the Soviet Union is unilaterally extending until 6 August -- in other words, the anniversary of the day that the Americans subjected Hiroshima to nuclear bombing.

Of course our country is right to expect at least some sort of good-will gesture from the other side. So far the reply is unambiguous: In Nevada there has been another nuclear weapon test designed, by all appearances, for the star wars program. Since we unilaterally announced the moratorium last year, 11 explosions have been carried out in Nevada. Currently the United States and its allies are trying to conceal this stance of theirs by making unseemly use of speculation about the tragedy that happened at the Chernobyl AES. The speculative nature of this stance becomes particularly striking when at the same time moralizing phrases are pronounced to the effect that Washington is concerned for the safety of its own citizens, the citizens of other countries, and so on.

However, this tragedy has led many seriously minded politicians to recognize one very important truth of our age -- namely the need for new political thinking and the new approaches that our leader is calling for. That understanding was shown in particular in something that was said by Egon Bahr, one of the leaders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] in the FRG. He said: The conflagration in Chernobyl showed vividly what many people did not want to see -- that Europe has a home, and its inhabitant share both its security and its dangers. That very important conclusion is, of course, significant and symptomatic, but at the same time, unfortunately, far from everyone thinks in the same way as the SPD leader.

But what about the nuclear tests in Nevada? Is that not a threat to other peoples? And what about the preparations for star wars? Is that not a threat to other peoples? And is not the NATO decision on chemical weapons a threat to all peoples? -- in particular to the European peoples, because it was especially about the manufacture of binary weapons designed to be deployed in Western Europe. On 1 October the conveyor belt of chemical death will be started up in the United States, and...

[Lebedev, interrupting] Incidentally, Rudolf Georgiyevich, excuse me, but I would like to ask you a question. Can one really seriously believe the statements resounding across the ocean, in the United States, that for 17 years that conveyor belt has not produced anything, that no chemical weapons have been produced at all, that the production of allegedly...

[Kolchanov, interrupting] Of course a very great deal of them have been produced, and this is shown, among other things, by the numerous leaks of chemical substances, both in the United States and in Europe itself. Now a new program is being put forward, one that will cost many billions of dollars and will bear a correspondingly great danger.

[Zholkver] Yes, there are the old chemical weapons, so to speak, and the new ones. I have read in the West German press a number of reports that the U.S. chemical weapon depots in the FRG now contain enough chemical charges to annihilate the entire population of Europe. It is interesting how the NATO leadership and the Pentagon are now playing on the mood of the Europeans who are demanding the liquidation of chemical weapons. They are promising the Europeans that they will remove these old weapons that have gone rusty in a number of cases, thus leading to leaks, and that the new chemical weapons will be brought into Western Europe from the United States only in a crisis.

[Kolchanov] But who, Aleksandr Vladimirovich -- and a question for you, too [referring to Lebedev] -- who determines this crisis?

[Zholkver] And who creates it? The analogy is quite obvious, and people in Western Europe itself have started speaking about it. As everyone knows, the raids by the U.S. Air Force on Libya were carried out from NATO bases in Britain. The U.S. aircraft carriers from which the raids on Libya were carried out used NATO ports in Italy as a base. In this case the Americans acted without asking the agreement of their NATO allies, and now very many people are emphasizing that the Americans themselves will create a fresh crisis, and on this basis bring new, additional chemical weapons into Western Europe. This greatly worries many people there.

[Kolchanov] A crisis can be created, or it can simply be proclaimed, and the chemical weapons can be brought in on this basis. But incidentally, what exactly is the attitude of the European states toward chemical weapons? It is not the same everywhere, is it?

[Zholkver] Indeed, an unusual situation has developed. At the latest NATO sessions almost half of the U.S. allies, or more accurately, 6 out of 13, spoke out against the plans for chemical modernization. It is true that after that, Perle, assistant to the U.S. defense secretary, bluntly said: We do not intend to grant to any country the right to veto U.S. programs for binary weapons.

[Lebedev] Yes, at the moment discussion of banning chemical weapons and the attitudes toward this problem once again demonstrate the same two approaches to key problems in world politics.

Moreover, what is important in my view is that the division does not simply set apart, so to speak, world socialism, the socialist community, and NATO countries. No, this division goes deeper than a differentiation. We see that a realistic approach, a responsible approach, is also being demonstrated by a number of political forces in the West. In particular, the recent meeting in Prague of representatives of the CPCZ, of the GDR's SED and the FRG's SPD, also became evidence of this. There was discussion at this meeting of a very interesting joint initiative of these political forces to create a zone in Europe free of chemical weapons. The SPD, as we all know, is one of the most influential political forces in Western Europe.

As far as the Soviet Union and its allies are concerned, then, our position is clear. Recently at the Geneva disarmament conference Soviet representatives again put forward constructive proposals that could lead to a very rapid conclusion of a convention on banning chemical weapons and liquidating their stocks; monitoring measures do not create any kind of difficulty here -- despite what the Americans try to affirm -- because we are ready to accept very effective measures of monitoring and inspection, including on-site inspection.

[Kolchanov] In my view this is another fact that proves that Europe can and should do a great deal. It should, because it ought to remember its history. It is there that both World Wars I and II began. It can do a great deal -- this is also proved by its historical experience. It suffices to remember the Helsinki accords, the Final Act, and subsequent events. Political contacts between European states have become more intensive. Scientific, technological, and economic ties have become even wider and deeper, and cultural and sports ties. Europe has become closer. Europe has become nearer. Europe can do a great deal.

[Zholkver] Yes. This very fact is confirmed by the example of one of the latest sessions of the West European Parliament in Strasbourg. For the very first time the question of all-European cooperation in the sphere of security was considered there. The West European Parliament came out for holding consultations with the Soviet Union on this question and came out in favor of considering, in this West European community, the proposal by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on banning chemical weapons.

[Kolchanov] Of course there are many paths toward strengthening European peace and security, and in my view one of the important ones is the successful completion of talks in Vienna and Stockholm. I will touch on the Vienna talks for a moment. I have had many opportunities to be in the Vienna Hofburg Palace, and at various times to be an eyewitness at these talks. You know that they have already started calling these sections or sessions of these talks "rounds", hinting both at the hardening...

[Zholkver, interrupting] You mean the talks on reducing armed forces and weapons in central Europe?

[Kolchanov] Yes, quite right, Aleksandr Vladimirovich. And you know, nonetheless, despite the tough position of the West and the constant resistance of socialist countries, the Soviet Union is constantly looking for ways to overcome these obstacles in order to reach a positive result. I will recall the socialist countries' draft that we introduced on 20 February. This is a draft agreement on the initial reduction of ground troops and weapons by the Soviet Union and the United States, with a subsequent non-increase of the levels of armed forces and weapons by the sides, and related measures in central Europe.

Insofar as Western countries are not ready for a major reduction in ground troops, we propose that the troops of the USSR and the United States be reduced by 11,500 and 6,500 people respectively; moreover, what is very important, not by pulling out individual soldiers or officers from the various subunits or auxiliary services, but by cutting whole military units, along with their weapons and combat equipment. After the completion of this action, all the participants in the agreement should take on the obligation not to increase during the next 3 or 4 years the levels of armed forces and weapons in central Europe. It is a concrete and realistic step that would make it possible to shift matters from a standstill.

[Zholkver] Of course such reductions would be very important from the point of view of creating that trust in Europe that is so essential and that is being discussed primarily at another important all-European meeting -- the Stockholm conference. Last week the latest session of that conference ended. As yet there are not any major positive results, although here too, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries put forward concrete proposals both on concluding a treaty on the nonuse of force and on measures to strengthen mutual military trust. But under various kinds of pretexts, far-fetched pretexts, the West is holding up the working out of mutually acceptable accords, although the success of Stockholm would be a touchstone for the readiness, not in words but in deeds, to strive for a reduction of the danger of war on our continent. This is doubly important since, as you know, Rudolf Georgiyevich, other talks are due in Vienna this autumn, along with the talks on reducing conventional weapons; this is to be a new all-European meeting, after Helsinki.

[Kolchanov] Yes, by 19 September participants in the Stockholm conference should complete their work on the final document. Following this, evolving out of the Stockholm conference, the conference in Vienna should take place.

[Zholkver] Questions will also be discussed there about disarmament in Europe, since at the moment in Stockholm, the discussion is mainly about measures of trust.

[Kolchanov] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries have a concrete program of peace for Europe. The USSR is proposing that agreement be reached on a significant reduction of all components of ground troops and tactical aviation of the European states and also corresponding forces of the United States and Canada that are deployed in Europe. Moreover, the military formations and units being reduced would be subject to disbandment while their weapons would be destroyed or stored on national territories. The geographic zone of reduction should obviously become the territory of the whole of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. At the same time as conventional weapons, operational-tactical nuclear weapons would also be reduced. This is a businesslike, concrete, and constructive approach to solving European problems.

[Zholkver] Across the ocean attitudes toward the development of events in Europe vary. In this respect an article by Kissinger, former U.S. secretary of state and a well-known U.S. politician, published recently in the British OBSERVER newspaper, is very interesting. He admits pretty frankly here that in the United States they are worried by the almost unanimous nonapproval -- in Western Europe, including even Britain -- of U.S. policy, in particular its latest Libyan aspect. He notes that Thatcher was almost isolated in Britain. And Kissinger writes about a new source of tension in NATO, noting, it is true, that these conflicts between the United States and Western Europe have their roots in events of at least 30 years ago. What are we talking about here? Kissinger recalls that NATO was formed in a period when the United States had superiority, first and foremost in nuclear weapons, and when it persistently intimidated West Europeans with the Soviet threat.

Well, times are changing now. Fear of a Soviet invasion has diminished somewhat, Kissinger admits; approximate parity with the Soviet Union has replaced the U.S. nuclear supremacy; and now, he complains, Europe believes it has the right to dissociate itself from U.S. actions. And he comes to the following conclusion: In dissociating itself now from the United States, Europe is thereby challenging the concept of U.S. global interests.

[Kolchanov] I do not think it will be at all difficult to predict how the United States will behave in this situation. It will try even more vigorous arm-twisting tactics than before.

[Zholkver] How diverse and full of anxieties and problems is our modern world, then! The main thing, however, is the fact that mankind is confronted by a harsh choice. What is involved is the preservation of life itself on earth.

In these conditions, the Soviet Union is struggling for the sole sensible historic prospect, rejecting war as a means of resolving ideological and political disputes and putting forward a specific program for all mankind of strengthening peace, banning nuclear weapons and creating an all-embracing system of collective security.

Thank you, comrades, for taking part in this conversation.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1386

RELATED ISSUES

TASS BLAMES U.S. FOR FRENCH REFUSAL TO HOST UN MEETING

LD292153 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] New York, May 29 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov reports:

The permanent mission of France at the United Nations organization has informed the U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar of the refusal of the French Government to host in Paris this year an international conference on the interconnection of disarmament and development.

On the decision of the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly, the conference in which all the major military powers were to take part was to be held in the French capital from July 15 to August 2. France explained its refusal by the fact that "the stands of the participating countries continue to be apart."

As is known, the main reason for it is the stand of the United States which has been boycotting from the very beginning preparations for the important forum in Paris, making it clear that the U.S.A. opposes any actions of the international community that run counter to U.S. aggressive militaristic preparations and plans of stepping up the nuclear arms race.

The French Government suggests that the international conference on the interconnection of disarmament and development be postponed till 1987. However, the work of the preparatory commission of the conference showed that most U.N. member countries insisted on the holding of the conference at a fixed time.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1386

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: CONCLUSIONS OF PENTAGON NUCLEAR WINTER REPORT 'PECULIAR'

LD150926 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 15 May 86

[Text] Washington May 15 TASS — TASS correspondent Nikolay Orekhov reports:

After lengthy delays the Pentagon has at long last sent to Congress a report on the so-called nuclear winter, which was requested from it back last year.

The problem of "nuclear winter" -- a complex of thermonuclear war's catastrophic consequences for the climate of the entire globe of ours -- has been in the focus of attention of many U.S. scientists for several years now. Their studies show that smoke and dust lofted into the atmosphere by explosions of nuclear warheads can block out the sun's light, triggering a steep decline in the temperatures on the entire earth surface and the death of all life forms. The theory of the "nuclear winter" has become one of the arguments of the U.S. peace campaigners in favour of freezing and eventually eliminating nuclear arsenals stockpiles on the globe, and scaling down perilous tensions in inter-state relations.

The Pentagon experts, who were forced to attend the problem of "nuclear winter" on Congress' demand, have primarily expressed a multitude of reservations concerning this theory but, nevertheless, have not dared to declare it erroneous. Moreover, half of the Pentagon report is devoted to the "political consequences" of this theory where, for that matter, the authors of the study directly proceed from the assumption that the danger of a "nuclear winter" is quite real.

The conclusions drawn by the authors of the report are, however, rather peculiar: Instead of calling for progress in the field of nuclear disarmament, they suggest ... going on with building up U.S. "deterrence forces" under the programme for "modernizing" the Armed Forces, set in motion by President Reagan. They also advocate continued work to develop the "star wars" weapons. The report refers to the Geneva talks but in so doing it repeats old, threadbare proposals of the U.S. side, designed to secure by the United States unilateral advantages in the field of strategic armaments.

It is not fortuitous that many congressmen, on whose demand the Pentagon report was compiled, remained unsatisfied with this "study". One of the lawmakers told AP that it was incomplete and did not provide an answer to many questions raised.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1386

RELATED ISSUES

AFP: USSR AGREES TO 'TIGHTER SUPERVISION' BY IAEA

AU231202 Paris AFP in English 1201 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (AFP)--The Soviet Union has told visiting Spanish officials that it is ready to allow to tighter supervision of its nuclear power plants by the U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Spanish diplomatic sources said here Friday.

The increased IAEA supervision would concern the design, construction and operation of nuclear power plants, the sources said, adding that Soviet officials has said that they would also be willing to give the U.N. agency information in case of accident.

The Soviet statements reportedly were made during this week's visit here by Spanish premier Felipe Gonzalez, the first Western head of government to visit the Soviet Union since the Chernobyl nuclear disaster on April 26.

Soviet authorities came under sharp international criticism for not having provided timely information about the Chernobyl accident to the Soviet people, foreign countries and the IAEA.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1386`

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S DOBRYNIN WRITES ON ARMS CONTROL

AU231337 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 22 May 86 p 6

[Article by Anatoliy Dobrynin, CPSU Central Committee secretary: "Disarmament and Progress; the USSR's Peace Initiatives and the Developing Countries"]

[Excerpts] In the present epoch there is no other sensible road than that of halting the nuclear arms race and of preserving and consolidating peace. The ideal of socialism is a world without arms and violence, a world in which every nation freely chooses its path of development and its way of life.

Mankind is faced with a number of complicated and difficult tasks. But there is also the highest task, namely to avert a nuclear war. Sometimes the impression is created that certain representatives of developing countries underrate this primary task, under pressure of really complicated internal problems. If one fails to avert a nuclear war, then what is the use of all the efforts in the fight for national independence and the social progress of the peoples? A halt to the arms race would enable the whole world to release immense resources, which could also be utilized in the interests of developing countries. The fight against the threat of a nuclear war is also a fight for the development of countries and peoples who have liberated themselves.

One can recall that, under conditions when attention to nuclear issues was sharper, the Soviet Government -- after weighing the circumstances connected with the security of its own people and of all mankind -- adopted the decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests up to 6 August 1986, that means up to the date when the first atomic bomb was dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima 41 years ago, causing hundreds of thousands of people to perish in consequence. It was the Soviet Union that submitted the proposals on a total liquidation of nuclear and chemical weapons; on the renunciation of the creation of further means of mass destruction -- above all in space; and on the dissolution of military blocs and limitation of military budgets.

The Soviet program for consolidating peace and creating a system of international security organically contains initiatives that are aimed at achieving a political settlement of conflicts in various parts of the globe.

We attach great importance in our foreign policy to consolidating security in Asia and the Pacific area. The Soviet Government has proposed an extensive package of measures that should lead to a constructive dialogue between the states in the Asian-Pacific area and to a joint search for paths for resolving the controversial issues among them and for achieving mutually advantageous cooperation. The joint effort of all states in this broad area could in the future enable the convening of an all-Asian forum that would aid the elaboration of a reliable mechanism for all-Asian security and the establishment of zones free of nuclear and chemical arms in this area. We also suggest preparations for a conference of Pacific states on issues of security and cooperation. The Soviet Union welcomes the efforts of governments and of the peace-loving public of states in the southern part of the Pacific to create a nuclear-free zone.

We are devoting considerable effort to normalizing the situation in the Mediterranean, which has recently become dangerously complicated due to the activities of American Armed Forces. In the interest of transforming this area into a zone of stable peace and cooperation, the USSR has proposed the withdrawal of USSR and U.S. fleets from the Mediterranean. At the same time, our country has submitted a proposal to convene a representative conference, similar to an all-European conference, that would make it possible to study the entire complex of issues for consolidating peace in the area, including measures of trust that have already asserted themselves in world practice.

From the viewpoint of principles, goals, and contents, this cooperation represents a new brand of international economic relations, which stands in opposition to the system of exploitation of these countries by supranational companies and which consolidates the positions of young states in the fight against neocolonialism. This cooperation is multifaceted, it encompasses various spheres, and it helps the young states to build an independent economy and to promote their culture, as well as to prudently train their own cadres. The number of developing countries with which the USSR cooperates on the basis of interstate treaties has increased from 18 in 1960 to 70 in 1986. More than 2,100 industrial enterprises, electric power plants, and agricultural and other facilities have been built in the developing countries in cooperation with our country. Currently the construction of more than 1,200 plants is either under way or being prepared. We are firmly convinced that the principle of "arms instead of progress," foisted on countries by militarism, must be replaced by the principle "through disarmament to progress." It is particularly toward this end that the Soviet Union's proposals on limiting military budgets and on transferring a part of the released means to aid the developing countries are oriented.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1386

12 June 1986

RELATED ISSUES

BRAZIL'S SODRE CONTINUED NEGOTIATIONS ON DISARMAMENT

PY230137 Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO in Portuguese 20 May 86 p 5

[Text] Brasilia--Speaking at a luncheon given at Itamaraty to bid farewell to Soviet Ambassador Vladimir Chernyshev, Foreign Minister Abreu Sodre stated: "Brazil participates in initiatives for a broad discussion on the international economic system, opening a dialogue for the promotion of new forms of cooperation, in defense of our interest, and against protectionist measures. We also want to warn our partners about the seriousness of the current economic-financial situation."

Sodre said that the Brazilian Foreign Ministry has studied specific matters related to the foreign debt, employing diplomatic channels to show the need for new methods of dealing with the issue, taking into account all aspects, including the social and economic aspects.

Besides the priority attention paid to the urgent need for a new international economic order, Brazil condemns the arms race and supports the negotiations that may lead to nuclear disarmament. Sodre stated: "We feel that the United States and the Soviet Union have special responsibilities within the disarmament process which must progress through the effective preparation of bilateral and multilateral negotiations, especially at the UN Conference on Disarmament."

/6662

CSO: 5200/2014

END