

259098

JPRS-TAC-86-057

18 JULY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 110

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

3
110
A06

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

18 JULY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet Paper Publishes Articles on Pros, Cons of SDI (Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No 15, 9 Apr 86).....	1
Editorial Introduction	1
Choice Before Mankind, by Paolo Stoppa	1
Why Edward Teller Wants Star Wars	2
Why Carl Sagan Does Not Want Star Wars	4
Physicists Agree With Sagan, by Fedor Burlatskiy	7
TASS Military Writer Assails Italian Statements on SDI (Moscow TASS, 25 Jun 86).....	9
TASS: California Firms Predominate Among SDI Contractors (Yuriy Kornilov; Moscow TASS International Service, 26 Jun 86).....	11
Soviet Countermeasures Against SDI Outlined (Vasiliy Morozov; Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA, 24 Jun 86).....	12
Soviet Regional Journal Assails Japanese Decision (Valentin Sapronov; Kiev POD ZNAMENEM LENINIZMA, No 4, Feb 86).....	15
French Defense Minister Advocates SDI Participation (Paris LE MONDE, 19 Jun 86).....	20

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Moscow, U.S. Attempts To Extract Soviet Concessions (Moscow Domestic Service, 29 Jun 86).....	21
Moscow Talk Show Views Internal U.S. Political Debates (Moscow Television Service, 28 Jun 86).....	25
Soviet Delegation Statement on Progress (Moscow TASS International Service, 26 Jun 86).....	39
TASS Commentary on End of Fifth Round (Moscow TASS, 26 Jun 86).....	41
PRAVDA Editorial on Arms Curb Initiatives (Moscow PRAVDA, 28 Jun 86).....	43
FRG's Kohl Comments on Possible Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Helmut Kohl Interview; Stuttgart Sueddeutscher Rundfunk Network, 2 Jun 86).....	46
FRG's Genscher on Reagan Speech, Upcoming Moscow Talks (Hans-Dietrich Genscher Interview; Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG, 22 Jun 86).....	48
FRG Defense Minister Assesses Gorbachev Proposal (Hamburg DPA, 14 Jun 86).....	49
FRG Adviser Teltschik Views New Soviet Proposals (Horst Teltschik Interview; Mainz ZDF Television Network, 22 Jun 86).....	50
FRG Officials Comment on Soviet 'Zero Solution' (Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 14 Jun 86; Hamburg DPA, 17 Jun 86).....	52
Genscher's Remarks	52
CDU/CSU's Dregger Comments	53
FRG Paper on Reagan's 'Personal' Letter to Gorbachev (Editorial; Munich SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG, 16/17 Jun 86).....	54

SALT/START ISSUES

French Paper Weighs Reagan SALT II Decision (Michel Tatu; Paris LE MONDE, 19 Jun 86).....	55
FRG Officials Comment on SALT II Agreement (Hamburg DPA, 21, 22 Jun 86).....	57
Todenhoefer on USSR Compliance	57
Genscher Sees Improvements	57

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Soviet Article Considers French Nuclear Policy
 (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 25 Jun 86)..... 59

Canada: Clark, Arms Control Center on Cruise Testing
 (Jeff Sallot; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 3, 12 Jun 86).... 62

Clark in Commons 62
 Position of Center, Activists 62

Briefs
 TASS on Pershing II Tests 64

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRAVDA on UK Response to 18 April Gorbachev Initiative
 (A. Maslennikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 30 Apr 86)..... 65

USSR: Petrovskiy, Chervov Press Conference on Pact Proposals
 (Moscow Television Service, 1 Jul 86; Moscow TASS,
 1 Jul 86)..... 70

Broadcast on TV 70
 Petrovskiy on Numerical Reductions 73
 Arms Balance Seen 73
 Agreement at MBFR Urged 73
 U.S. Arms Sales Hit 74

Soviet Army Paper Commentary on Warsaw Pact Proposals
 (V. Makarevskiy; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 24 Jun 86)..... 75

TASS Reports Speeches at MBFR on Warsaw Pact Appeal
 (Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Jun 86; Moscow TASS, 26 Jun 86)..... 78

Hungarian Delegate 78
 Polish Delegate 78

French Paper Views Gorbachev Proposal
 (Editorial; Paris LE MONDE, 13 Jun 86)..... 80

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow Views Shultz' Differences With ASEAN Over NFZ
 (Various sources, various dates)..... 82

Economic, Military Issues 82
 Relations Seen Strained 83
 'U.S. Bid Rebuffed' 83

USSR's Gan Views U.S. Public Support for Test Ban (Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Jun 86).....	85
USSR: U.S., UK Carry Out Nuclear Test in Nevada (Moscow TASS, 25 Jun 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Jun 86).....	89
TASS Report	89
PRAVDA Comments	89

RELATED ISSUES

Gorbachev Sends Reply to Japan's Nakasone (Moscow TASS, 1 Jul 86).....	91
CPSU Central Committee Secretary Biryukova on Arms Issues (Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 21 May 86).....	93
Soviet Military Political Chief Interviewed on WWII Lessons (Aleksy Lizichev Interview; Moscow Domestic Service, 20 Jun 86).....	96
USSR's Chazov Interviewed at Hiroshima Symposium (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 13 Jun 86).....	99
USSR: U.S.-European Differences on Arms Issues Belittled (Aleksandr Bovin, et al. Interview; Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT, 26 Jun 86).....	100
Doctors Call for Immediate Nuclear-Test Moratorium (Tokyo KYODO, 14 Jun 86).....	104

/6539

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET PAPER PUBLISHES ARTICLES ON PROS, CONS OF SDI

Editorial Introduction

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15, 9 Apr 86 p 14

[Text] What responsibility does the American SDI program bear for mankind? The scientists C. Sagan and E. Teller (United States), the Italian journalist P. Stoppa participate in a discussion (we are reprinting this material in a condensed version from the Italian weekly EUROPEO) and from LITERATURNAYA GAZETA analyst Professor F. Burlatskiy.

Choice Before Mankind

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15, 9 Apr 86 p 14

[Article by EUROPEO analyst Paolo Stoppa]

[Text] President Reagan stated that if the SDI research program would result in rendering nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete," then why are the Russians so much against it as they have again energetically emphasized in Geneva?

The Russians are afraid not of the "peace shield" itself. They are afraid that it might destroy the existing strategical balance.

Is an SDI program possible? It is possible but not in the short run. Why? The neutralization of a nuclear strike is extremely difficult. The whole operation must be conducted in less than 30 minutes; that is the period of time between missile launch and the separation of warheads aimed at specific targets. The defense must detect, intercept and destroy thousands of targets moving at high speed.

In order to be most effective, the Americans are now developing [razrabotka] a so-called "layered defense"; that is, they propose to operate in separate layers in space as well as from ground bases. The first layer (a space weapon) must destroy the main missile wave, making the task easier for the defensive systems in the second layer (which are also space weapons) and then the third (mixed weapons) and the fourth (ground weapons) so as to create [sozdaniye] a "virtually" impenetrable defensive network. The different

layers correspond to different phases of the ballistic trajectory and different weapon systems are used in each layer.

The simplest method of intercept is by missiles launched from the surface. But this is the least effective method since there is a very high percentage of errors and misses. In the past America has denigrated the ability to create a "terminal" defense system. Today the situation has changed. Radars for control and rendering targets harmless have been developed which are capable of managing the conduct of the battle. But the "deep stream" of the future strategic defense will be a space system capable of destroying enemy missiles with their valuable warheads in the boost phase, immediately after the boost phase and during ballistic flight along their trajectories.

The main task before the American scientists is the creation [sozdaniye] of a weapons system capable of accomplishing on a large scale the operations which until this time have only been accomplished in laboratory conditions.

Why Edward Teller Wants Star Wars

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15, 9 Apr 86 p 14

[Article by Edward Teller, "father" of the H-bomb and consultant at Livermore Laboratory]

[Text] Defensive possibilities must be considered on their economic as well as their technical merits. A defense is useless if it can be overwhelmed at a lesser cost by mere duplication of attack instruments. It will also be ineffectual if the defense itself can be destroyed at less cost than its replacement. If, on the other hand, 80 percent of the attacking rockets can be destroyed for a fraction of the cost required for the attack, the defense would be sufficiently effective to induce all parties to emphasize defense, not offense.

The requirement of lesser cost seems to rule out even predeployed unmanned battle stations in space. Such stations would be very expensive to deploy and comparatively easy to destroy--the very opposite of an effective defense. Nevertheless, observation stations in space--or surveillance satellites--must be maintained, even at considerable expense, because they play an important role in all stages of defense. The entire system would cost a great amount, but early warning is crucial to the whole defensive plan.

In discussing boost-phase interception, I want first to emphasize that I am not talking about the destruction of rockets in their silos; the advantage of destroying attack missiles while they are accelerating is twofold. The missiles are most vulnerable at this time, and several re-entry weapons carried by the main rocket are destroyed as a unit by a single hit.

One possible method of interception, whether in the boost phase or some later portion of the offensive missile's flight, is the high intensity laser beam, which can be directed in a very precise manner. The lasers could be located on the ground, and, when the signal of an attack was received, appropriate mirrors could be deployed to redirect the beams toward their targets.

Directed energy weapons using focused beams of electrons, positive ions, or atoms could also be employed effectively in the boost and other phases of defense. However, lasers, and in particular, x-ray lasers, are one long step ahead of these other methods. An x-ray laser would have to operate outside the atmosphere and would use a nuclear explosive to provide its power. This beam cannot be redirected by mirrors. Here the whole laser-producing mechanism would have to be popped up in a very short time.

The idea of terminal defense, so hotly discussed in the years before the ABM treaty, has new appeal, in part because of improved methods of detecting and tracking incoming missiles. Not only are better and cheaper radar stations available, but new tracking devices also exist. For example, low energy lasers--effective only for detection--have been developed and could be mass-produced at relatively low cost.

After a missile is observed, it must be destroyed, either by an inert projectile, sometimes called a kinetic kill vehicle (KKV), or by a nuclear explosive. KKV's require either extreme accuracy or great numbers. This makes them expensive to use in the upper atmosphere. A further severe problem is that attack missiles can be fused to explode with full force on first contact. This could result in a megaton explosion (equivalent to a million tons of TNT). Such an explosion would introduce enough disturbance in the atmosphere to make detection and tracking of additional missiles difficult or impossible.

Using a small defensive nuclear missile, with an explosive power approximately equivalent to 100 tons of TNT, to destroy an incoming attack missile has several advantages. Only a nuclear device would reliably prevent a full-scale explosion of the incoming bomb. Also, a small explosive need not be aimed with as great accuracy as KKV's, a particularly important advantage if the attacking missile is equipped to take evasive action.

There is another reason that small nuclear explosives may be advantageous in terminal defense. It is possible that attack missiles will carry biological agents rather than nuclear warheads. A small nuclear explosive would vaporize the missile's contents and destroy the biological agents.

There is, however, one field where the United States has a natural advantage. Computers. These computers can play an extremely important role in a defense against missiles that could number in the thousands. In this situation, battle management becomes extremely difficult. The obvious solution is to make full use of advanced computers. Of course, in a problem of such complexity, there will be difficulties. For example, an attack, a first attack, could well be accompanied by nuclear explosions that occur in mid-course or just after re-entry. Such explosions may interfere with the functioning of the computers. However, modern super-computers can be structured at widely separated locations neutralizing interference.

In the long run, defense must be established against any form of attack, particularly against cruise missiles, which can carry nuclear explosives. The toughest part of defending against cruise missiles is receiving adequate

warning of their approach. This necessitates early detection. The approach of big airplanes can be detected by over-the-horizon radar at distances of more than 1600 kilometers. The same method may be applied to cruise missiles. The difficulties are somewhat greater, but they are understood.

Joint operations by airplanes and remotely directed tanks present a special danger. Modern airplanes and tanks are incredibly expensive, in great part because of the requirements of the human occupants. Microelectronic equipment would greatly reduce the size and cost of planes and tanks and greatly expand the range of their missions.

Such planes would be most effective if not programmed but guided on the basis of data obtained by the sensors in the unmanned aircraft. Developments of this sort exemplify how an inexpensive defense might prevail over an expensive attack.

A nuclear countermeasure to a tank attack could be provided by the neutron bomb. This commonly misrepresented weapon has a power equivalent to 100 to 200 tons of TNT, almost 1,000 times less than the tactical nuclear weapons it would replace, but most important, the damages from heat during a neutron bomb are not significant. Detonated a few hundred feet above ground, it produces intense radiation within a radius of about half a mile. Beyond that distance, it has practically no effects. The damage would probably be much less than what would occur from the alternative defense, a massive conventional artillery barrage.

Conclusion. Without a good defensive system, a billion people might die in a large-scale war. No single program, no set of planned defenses, can give us the assurance that we so much want. The best hope the immediate future offers is to convert the current balance of terror to one where there is less terror and more balance. We must create a situation which will make it possible for us to secure time in which to create a lack of parity now.

The task of building peace on the basis of understanding and cooperation will probably have to be left to our children and grandchildren. Defensive weapons can do no more than give the coming generations the opportunity for coexistence and cooperation.

Why Carl Sagan Does Not Want Star Wars

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15, 9 Apr 86 p 14

[Article by Carl Sagan, American astrophysicist and popularizer of science]

[Text] There are some 20,000 strategic nuclear weapons in the American and Soviet arsenals (We here ignore the more than 30,000 so-called tactical nuclear weapons.) waiting to be delivered to their targets. The fatalities of a major exchange between the United States and the USSR have been variously estimated as ranging from a few million to two billion people. When intermediate time-scale radioactivity, toxic smogs from the burning of cities and nuclear winter are thrown in, it becomes clear that we are a hair's breadth from ultimate catastrophe.

As was clearly recognized by General Bradley, there are only two approaches to the nuclear arms race: increasing reliance on gadgets to save you from your adversary's gadgets, or getting rid of the nuclear arsenals. The U.S. President proposed the former.

Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), in essence, is a multi-tiered defense involving lasers, particle beam weapons, and kinetic energy kill vehicles. Now what could be wrong with this? Consider some of the difficulties:

Even scientists and engineers who support SDI doubt that a system much more than 50 percent effective can be deployed in the next few decades. But to be generous, let's imagine a system that is 90 percent effective. The Soviets would fire 10,000 warheads at the United States and only 10 percent would get through. But 10 percent of 10,000 is 1,000 and 1,000 warheads are enough to destroy the United States. Even a system that was 99 percent impermeable would provide inadequate protection. And if SDI cannot protect the bulk of the American population, what is its purpose?

Suppose the USSR wishes to inflict a certain level of damage on the United States and believes that the United States will be able to deploy a strategic defense that is 50 percent impermeable. A natural response would be to double the Soviet arsenal of strategic weapons. Increasing the Soviet offensive arsenal involves existing technology and not much in the way of development costs. Soviet offensive response to SDI is likely to be cheaper (and more reliable) than the defensive shield. The burden of proof is on those who claim otherwise.

SDI, even if it were perfect, would work only against missiles fired on high ballistic trajectories. Even if the United States were able to develop an impenetrable shield, it would still be fatally vulnerable to nuclear weapons delivered by bombers and by ground-hugging cruise missiles.

The Soviets, with many firsts in space technology, are unlikely to sit on their hands while the United States spends decades developing SDI. There are many options open to the Soviets that would make the task of the defender much more difficult.

It is clear that no human being would be able to control such a strategic defense; the offensive forces have simply become too big. Instead, the job would be handed over to what is called a battle management computer. No computer with the necessary capabilities exists, and none will for at least several computer generations.

From experience with the civilian space program, we know that, despite the best efforts of the best people, serious programming errors occur. Often they aren't caught until they cause some launch failure, or a malfunctioning satellite drifts off into space. Eventually, after several trials, the errors tend to be caught and corrected. But there is no opportunity for trial and error with Star Wars. One chance is all we will ever get.

An impermeable American shield would represent the strategic disarmament of the Soviet Union. If Soviet missiles could indeed be rendered "impotent and obsolete," and if the USSR had no comparable defensive system, then the United States could, by threat of obliteration, work its will on the Soviet Union.

That the nuclear arsenals have not become still more bloated is in part the result of a few painfully negotiated treaties between the Soviet Union and the United States, including the Partial Test Ban Treaty (1963), the Outer Space Treaty (1967), the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968), the ABM Treaty, and SALT I AND II (the last still unratified by the United States).

Many of the treaties are valued the world over--the Partial Test Ban Treaty, for example, is esteemed because not a single United States or USSR nuclear weapon has been exploded in the atmosphere or in space since it was signed. But as currently conceived, Star Wars would, in one way or another, violate every one of these treaties.

Strategic defense is not so much a thing as a process. Once started, there is no natural termination point. Instead, it will lead to an open-ended set of actions and reactions in both offensive and defensive technologies. For this reason, among others, it is difficult to put a price tag on SDI. Some knowledgeable analysts think it would be more than a trillion dollars. A trillion dollars is a great deal of money. It is, for example, more than half the national debt, about which the administration and the Congress profess some concern.

The trillion dollars to be spent on Star Wars must come from somewhere. It will be taken from social services, education, support for family farms, rebuilding and opportunities for the disadvantaged. A trillion dollars on Star Wars will make it much more difficult to implement needed improvements in conventional defenses so we can lessen our reliance on nuclear weapons.

Once the Outer Space Treaty is breached and nuclear weapons are emplaced in space, there are incentives for storing them at greater and greater distances from the earth; then they represent a second strike capability that is hard to eliminate without giving advance notice. Nuclear missiles on the moon, for example, could not be destroyed from the earth in less than the three-day earth/moon transit time--unless of course gadgets to destroy them were already in place on the moon. "Logic" of this sort may lead over many years to the conversion of the solar system into a vast arena for nuclear confrontation.

Conclusion. Strategic defense cannot protect the United States in a nuclear war, can be overwhelmed and outfoxed, flagrantly violates treaties America has solemnly ratified, is ruinously expensive, jeopardizes space exploration and increases the chances of nuclear war. The only alternative for the United States and the USSR is to act in what is clearly their mutual interest: to negotiate both a moratorium on the development [razvitiye] and deployment of new nuclear weapons systems and to make bilateral and verifiable reductions in the present nuclear arsenals. Because the arsenals are so bloated, deep cuts can be made without compromising strategic deterrence. This is a task that

does not require, as Star Wars does, a whole series of technological breakthroughs; it requires only political will.

Physicists Agree With Sagan

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15, 9 Apr 86 p 14

[Article by Fedor Burlatskiy, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political commentator]

[Text] Little can be added to the unimpeachable analysis given by Carl Sagan to the technical aspects of "Star Wars." Recent interviews with most important physicists in the United States showed that an overwhelming majority hold the same position. They are convinced that the creation [sozdaniye] of a reliable defensive shield against nuclear armed missiles is impossible. The "U.S. Union of Concerned Scientists" holds the same point of view, not to mention the unanimous opinion of Soviet scientists.

But we will carefully examine Edward Teller's position. We can easily see that this is not his "fruitful debut idea": he was randomly turning up, as in solitaire, one different technical solution to the problem after another without being able to leave one of them out. In another interview he confirmed that apparently there were six competing ideas on how to shoot down enemy missiles.

From this there is no indication of the elusiveness of the task to create [sozdaniye] space weapons. I will risk making the paradoxical judgement that the less successful the United States is in solving the problem of a defensive shield the more active it will be creating [sozdaniye] space weapons of the most varied types, surely including those which Teller imagines--"laser," "terminal," "kinetic," and all the others. It is difficult to even imagine how people will feel 20 to 30 years from now if they have hundreds of satellites armed with such weapons over their heads.

And a few more words about the moral aspects of the problem. Why is Teller so zealous, so active and so categorical? What does he gain from the SDI program along with the generals and enthusiastic politicians? The same thing he gained when he insisted on the creation [sozdaniye] of the hydrogen bomb, leading to the sacrifice of his supervisor and friend Robert Julius [sic] Oppenheimer to his ambition. I remember at the time that the famous congressional investigation commission into the Oppenheimer "affair" which blamed him for a deliberate slow down in the project to create [sozdaniye] the hydrogen bomb, Teller was the only scientist who directly suggested that he be eliminated from this work.

Now Teller is seeking allocations for the new military program. And this time the "merchant of nuclear death" (as he is called in the United States) is requesting for this idea a very great amount--a trillion dollars. Part of this golden stream must end up in Teller's Livermore laboratory.

It is not without interest to note that the arguments which Teller uses now outwardly are directly opposed to those by which he was guided when he was agitating for the hydrogen bomb. Then, he reported that the USSR had

outstripped the United States in creating [sozdaniye] the H-bomb. Now he urgently calls for the use of the U.S. technological superiority, primarily in the area of computers. Any reasons, any means are good in terms of this goal--race, race, race, up to the creation [sozdaniye] of the most fantastic space systems which will entrust the fate of man to its operation. Isn't one who calls himself the greatest of living physicists in the world mad?

But no, Teller is simply a businessman; he sells that for which the most will be paid--according to that bitter sentence: war eats science. Well who in the United States would give a trillion dollars, let's say, to a program to research Halley's Comet? Or for a flight to Mars? Or for aiding the hungry--here on our planet?

Leonardo da Vinci, 5 centuries ago hid his invention--the idea of a submarine, fearing that it would be used for warfare. We found out about this idea from his diaries. He gave an account of it in his secret writing. Edward Teller haunted the threshold of the White House, selling his unripe but tempting idea of "Star Wars" to the nuclear adventurists. What a gigantic moral precipice divides modern American scientists from the titans of the Renaissance!

Just the same as the American physicists who created the first atomic bomb share in the blame for the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Teller and his colleagues bear the burden of responsibility for, maybe, the most tragic decision in all of the history of science--the creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons which increase monstrously the risk for the self-annihilation of mankind.

CONCLUSION. In our memory, to a lesser degree, there were two other times when the chance to prevent or stop the nuclear arms race was missed. The first time was in 1946 when the United States, having a monopoly on the nuclear weapon, turned down the suggestion to completely ban its production and use. The second time, in 1963, after the Caribbean crisis and the realization of how close a nuclear catastrophe was and that there was a sufficient accumulation of nuclear missile potential for mutual deterrence. The death of John Kennedy and the change in the American policy that followed him interrupted the process of limiting the arms race which had begun then.

Now mankind has a new and unique chance, since this is about the penetration of weapons into a new--cosmic sphere. This is not all but also there is the qualitative modernization of all existing types of weapons. The uniqueness of this chance is that one side--the Soviet Union--is absolutely serious about averting a new round of the arms race and a gradual, complete elimination of nuclear weapons. While the other side is not ready for this and continues nuclear testing and sabotaging the arms limitation process. All the more important is the honest, scientific examination of this matter of the illusory and illogical hopes of strengthening security by the methods of a nuclear and space race. It is no accident that public opinion in the Western countries is drawn to this wise position. It is not evening, there is still time to make an impact on decision makers and to avert the nuclear night for all of mankind.

12747

CSO: 5200/1380

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS MILITARY WRITER ASSAILS ITALIAN STATEMENTS ON SDI

LD251812 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS - By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev.

Speaking in the Senate of the Italian Parliament, Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti said that Italy's participation in research under the U.S. SDI program, allegedly, will not lead to the responsibility of Italian politicians for the strategic consequences of the initiative. This assertion clearly cannot be regarded as a responsible one. It is the same as saying: Yes, we carry petrol for arsonists, but we are not responsible for the fires they start.

This brings to mind the fact that former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said in a recent debate: The problem is that politicians have no idea of possibilities of technology. It would be surprising, however, for a person involved in important decision-making to be unaware nowadays of what the militarization of outer space can entail. The Italian leadership, just as the Governments of Britain and the FRG that assumed the role of participants in the "star wars" program can hardly fail to realize that its aim is to disrupt the existing military-strategic balance and to achieve military superiority over the USSR. They surely realize that SDI will cause a new spiral of the arms race -- space, nuclear and conventional arms race, with unpredictable consequences. And this will surely affect Western Europe. It will be unable to keep aside. Washington will demand it to "share the burden".

The West European governments that get involved in the "star wars" program assume a heavy responsibility for the destabilization of the strategic situation, for the creation of strategic chaos, for the heightening of uncertainty and fear, for the increase of the risk of nuclear catastrophe. Led by the senior partner, the United States, they are destroying the foundation of the process of arms limitation and reduction, above all the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile system, bury the hopes of the peoples to achieve positive results at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms, dash the prospects for the revival of detente and preclude the possibility of ridding the world of nuclear arms. They thus seriously test West European security.

The creation of large-scale anti-missile defence system will strengthen the positions of those in Washington who dream of all sort of "limited" wars in Europe and will correspondingly increase the likelihood of such wars being unleashed.

As to the reasoning about some kind of "advantage" stemming from West European countries' participation in SDI it disintegrates when coming up against reality. It is said, for instance, that the chance of participating in "scientific and technological cooperation" should not be left slip, that SDI, allegedly, will have a "beneficial effect" on the development of civilian branches of science and technology. But the very idea that new methods of destruction should be developed for progress in technology is an absurdity. And, as peace campaigners in the FRG aptly put it, SDI is about as useful in non-military spheres, as a tank in harvesting.

Nothing can come out of plans to get access to U.S. technology, either. The "big brother" counting on West European scientific and technical potential, has no intention of sharing its secrets with its allies. Former FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt warned that any possible U.S. Administration in the nineties and later will be hiding its technological trump cards and will not hand them over to Europeans of its own free will. Moreover, as the "British experience" showed, West European firms that are to be involved in the implementation of "star wars" program will be vetted and their research will be classified. Those firms will be faced with the prospects of being surpassed by U.S. competitors and of becoming heavily dependent on the Pentagon. The newspaper "WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE" laments that the Americans intend to prohibit their partners to use even those results of research that are not related to SDI.

Thus, the participation of West European countries in SDI will lead to the increase of their dependence on the "senior partner" in the military sphere, and consequences, in the sphere of foreign policy. The possibilities for their upholding their specific interests in the international scene will automatically lessen.

The hopes of West European monopolies to get a large slice from the "star pie" worth many billions of dollars will not come true either. Thus, British firms, that hoped to secure orders to a sum of 1,500 million dollars received orders worth only 15.5 million dollars, while FRG firms, according to the information of "DER SPIEGEL" magazine, can count at the most on only 100 million marks in the next six years, while their annual spending on research is 31 billion marks. Thus, as the British "GUARDIAN" put it, West European participants get a tiny piglet out of the multi-billion-dollar litter of the American sow.

It is high time for the governments of such West European countries, as Britain, FRG and Italy to realize that the historic chance of Europe is not in heaping up more arms stockpiles, but in peaceful cooperation among European countries, in the reduction and limitation of nuclear and conventional armaments, in armed forces reduction. The proposals of socialist countries create every conditions for this chance to become reality.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1448

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: CALIFORNIA FIRMS PREDOMINATE AMONG SDI CONTRACTORS

LD262235 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1047 GMT 26 Jun 86

[By TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 26 Jun (TASS) -- The U.S. press has published a list of military-industrial concerns emerging as main contractors in the implementation of R. Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative."

In analyzing this list, one cannot but notice that a particularly significant place is taken in it by powerful California military-industrial concerns ("Rockwell" and "Lockheed", "McDonnell-Douglas" and "Hughes"). This is not by chance. Although California is only one of 50 states in the country, more than 8,500 companies and firms are included in the list of main Pentagon contractors are concentrated here. Over 40 percent of weapons comprising the U.S. nuclear arsenal are produced in this state. Almost half of the Pentagon's orders connected with preparation for "star wars" fell to the lot of Californian military concerns.

Present-day California, this veritable "forge of weaponry," is also at the same time a kind of "forge of policy": it is no secret that the U.S. President, the secretary of state, the defense secretary, and many other top representatives of the Republican administration, began their political careers in California, in the jungles of California business. Having risen to the Washington political Olympus they of course have not forgotten those who, with enormous "financial contributions," paved their way to power. It is characteristic that during the period 1979-84 the volume of military contracts concluded by the Pentagon with the country's military-industrial corporations grew 2.2 times. Moreover the California "arms barons" receive particularly high profits.

And that's how it is in reality. The powerful military-industrial complex created in the United States, that alliance of the bomb and the dollar, the dollar and organs of power -- that is who stands behind those circles in Washington who, forming the main directions of U.S. foreign policy, are continuing to make a stake on force, on nuclear blackmail...

/8309
CSO: 5200/1448

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COUNTERMEASURES AGAINST SDI OUTLINED

AU251716 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 24 Jun 86 p 4

[Article "Especially for NARODNA ARMIYA" by APN military observer Vasilii Morozov: "The Countermeasures Against SDI"--capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] TODAY THE QUESTION OF THE SOVIET COUNTERMEASURES AGAINST THE AMERICAN "STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE" (SDI) IS NO LONGER HYPOTHETICAL, BUT REAL. THE U.S ADMINISTRATION'S PERSISTENT RELUCTANCE TO FOLLOW THE USSR'S EXAMPLE AND DECLARE A MORATORIUM ON NUCLEAR TESTS IS LINKED WITH THE PENTAGON'S NUMEROUS MILITARY PROGRAMS, "THE MOST PROMISING OF WHICH IS THE 'STAR WARS' PROGRAM." THE SERIES OF TESTS IN NEVADA IS DIRECTLY LINKED WITH THE COMPLETION OF THE DEVELOPMENT WORK [razrabotki] ON THE X-RAY LASER WHICH IN ESSENCE MEANS THE BEGINNING OF THE PRACTICAL REALIZATION OF SDI. ALL THIS DETERMINES THE USSR'S COUNTERREACTION AND THE NATURE OF THE SOVIET COUNTERMEASURES TO THE AMERICAN SDI.

As many scientists and military specialists in the USSR and Western countries, including the well-known Soviet Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, the Soviet Union refuses to develop its own "SDI" and resolutely insists on the banning of space-strike weapons not from "fear" of the new U.S. technologies (allegedly "unattainable" for the Soviet Union!) The lessons of recent history provide convincing evidence that the USSR, acting on the principle of "action -- counteraction," has always kept pace by its countermeasures with all the various military provocations of the United States.

The USSR has means of response that are cheaper, more reliable, and faster in the possibilities of use. These in the final account can nullify the value of the Pentagon's "space shield" and obliterate Washington's stake in the "magic power" of SDI. If these means come into operation, they will turn into "useless rubbish" not the Soviet (as the strategists of the Pentagon wish), but the numerous expensive component elements of the U.S. antimissile defense system deployment in outer space.

What sort of countermeasures can these be? The chief point is that they will preserve the USSR's ability to make a counterstrike against the aggressor, whatever type of nuclear attack is made against the USSR.

One of the possible countermeasures is the further development [razvitie] of Soviet nuclear weapons with the aim of preserving their capacity for making an adequate counterstrike. Here we may refer to the research done by a group of Soviet experts led by Academician Roald Sagdeyev. They have reached the following conclusion. The deploy-

ment by the United States of a large-scale antimissile system, as well as of its individual combat subsystems, will be a direct contravention of the 1972 antimissile defense treaty. In such a case the Soviet Union may consider itself released both from Article 12 of this treaty and from SALT II that not ratified by the United States, which limits the number of ICBM's and the building of additional launching installations for them.

Accordingly, the people in the Pentagon cannot help but know that in such a case the appearance on the Soviet side of greater capabilities for the mass use of its own ICBM's in a counterstrike will create a number of additional difficulties for the the functioning of the detection system of the American space-based antimissile defense, and will lead to a sharp reduction in the efficiency of the systems for interception and for aiming the space-strike weapons against the defined targets for attack. All this in the final account will increase the "penetration" capacity of the Soviet ICBM's and will reduce the reliability of the U.S. "space shield," behind which the creators of SDI hope to hide from the inevitable retribution following their nuclear first strike against the USSR.

The Soviet scientists have assessed the situation and reached the following conclusion: A similar result can be achieved through increasing the number of warheads carried by the ballistic missiles. This measure can compensate to a considerable extent for the losses of missiles for a counterstrike in the active sector of their path during their flight, since it will hamper interception in the following sectors.

A countermeasure that is simple and effective from the economic viewpoint may be the deployment of "dummy missiles" with simplified control systems and carrying no warheads. The carrying out of combat launching of ICBM's with the aim of "exhausting" the space antimissile defense by means of pre-activating it in response to a predetermined counterstrike sequence can serve as such a measure. It is not difficult to guess that all this will lead to a great expenditure of energy reserves in the space echelons of the antimissile defense, to the draining of x-ray lasers and electromagnetic guns, and to other premature losses in the firepower of the antimissile defense system.

There are, of course, many other no less effective countermeasures for responding to the "invulnerable" SDI (according to the Pentagon's declarations). For example, a method of preserving the USSR's fighting capacity for an adequate counterstrike might be the possible increase of the potential of the weapons existing today against which no appropriate measures of interception have yet been suggested. Such offensive weapons may include the ballistic missiles carried in submarines, which are launched on low trajectories (their flight is within the stratosphere, where the effectiveness of the antimissile defense system is sharply reduced), as well as variously based cruise missiles. None of the types of space weapons developed in the United States is capable of reliably detecting and intercepting small low-flying missiles.

IN CONCLUSION, WE MUST STRESS THAT REAGAN'S SDI WILL NOT FULFILL THE ROLE ALLOTTED TO IT IN THE PENTAGON'S STRATEGIC PLANS. IN THE SOVIET UNION, WHERE PEOPLE WELL REMEMBER 1941 AND ITS LESSONS, THERE IS TODAY A COMPLETE SYSTEM OF EFFECTIVE, ACCESSIBLE, AND CHEAPER MEANS AND METHODS FOR PRESERVING THE FIGHTING CAPACITY OF ITS ARMED FORCES AND FOR INFLECTING A POWERFUL COUNTERSTRIKE AGAINST THE ATTACKING SIDE, WITH ALL THE CONSEQUENCES ARISING THEREFROM. IN THE UNITED STATES THEY MUST REALIZE THAT SOVIET PEOPLE WANT TO LIVE IN SECURITY NO LESS THAN THE AMERICANS, AND THE ATTEMPTS TO INTENSIFY THE U.S. THREAT AGAINST THE USSR WILL INEVITABLY REBOUND LIKE A BOOMERANG.

[Within the body of the text, enclosed in a box, is the following quotation "from the speech of Mikhail Gorbachev in the town of Tolyatti":] The United States commenced its "star wars" program at full speed. If the United States, in contradiction to common sense, persists in this course, we will find a convincing answer which need not at all be in outer space. We are very well aware of the capabilities of modern science and of our own capabilities. There is nothing the United States can do that we cannot. But we are against such a choice. We are against the absurd American logic and against armament. For us the banning of space-strike weapons is not a problem of fear of falling behind, but one of responsibility. The arms race will not exhaust us. They will not defeat us from outer space, and the technology will not outstrip us. Nothing good will come out of these attempts.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1448

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET REGIONAL JOURNAL ASSAILS JAPANESE DECISION

Kiev POD ZNAMENEM LENINIZMA in Russian No 4, Feb 86 pp 87-89

[Article by Valentin Saprnov, under the rubric "International Life": "The 'Yamato' Goes into Orbit: What Japan Is Seeking in the Pentagon's Space Ventures"]

[Excerpts] They found it on the bottom of the East China Sea, at a depth of 340 meters. "Undoubtedly, this is the 'Yamato'!", reported the commentator, his voice trembling with excitement, when the stern of the gigantic ship was shown on screens all across Japan. On the rusty metal one could still see distinctly at a glance the emblem of the emperor--the chrysanthemum.

An uninformed reader might ask why there is so much ado about this pile of old scrap metal. A representative of the organizing committee for the search for the battleship explained it all very frankly at a press conference: "We want to raise from the bottom, not merely the ship, but the spirit of Old Japan, whose time for rebirth has come." To the great disappointment of all the extremists and revanchists, the monster of the Imperial Navy appeared to be broken into three parts and its extraction to the surface remains questionable. As far as the notorious "spirit of Yamato" which it embodies goes, there have been no traces of it here. Ultrachauvinism and the insane ideas about the superiority of the "race of Yamato" over all other peoples are again being raised on high. Their proponents also demand corresponding heights for the nation's military might, including as high as space itself.

The Japanese Government intends to implement a program for armaments accumulation, which is supposed to go into effect in the 1986 fiscal year. This was announced in the parliament's Chamber of Counsellors by Prime Minister Y. Nakasone, having thus refused the opposition demand that he abandon the 5-year program, which provides for military purchases amounting to 18.4 trillion yen.

And the paths to a much faster achievement of the desired goal have been perceived in joining Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) or, in more understandable language, the "Star Wars" Program.

Even the White House passionately craves this. Is there a more important ally in its mad venture than Japan? Without the highly heat-resistant ceramics produced in its enterprises, not one of the multiple-use "Shuttle" craft would have returned to the ground. Other materials can not withstand the overheating

that occurs during entry into the dense layers of the atmosphere. Also needed by the Pentagon are the lasers, the optical fibers and the heat-beam-to-target missile guidance systems, developed [razrabotannyye] by the Japanese, as well as other electronics achievements, including the as-yet-not-created [sozdan-nyye] fifth generation computers. In other words, everything which is capable of making "Star Wars" a reality sooner.

This is why various agents and whole delegations of Pentagon experts have become frequent visitors to the Japanese Islands from across the ocean. They carry with them lists of goods for the American space-based ABM systems and for communications with spy and killer satellites in the EHF band.

At the end of March, 1985, Caspar Weinberger, the US secretary of defense, sent an official invitation to the Japanese Government for the purpose of drawing Japan into Reagan's "Star Wars" Program. As if it were an ultimatum, there was even a period indicated for reflection--60 days.

And Tokyo kept completely within this period. On 28 May 85, Shintaro Abe, the nation's minister of foreign affairs, speaking to a meeting of the Government Council for Maintenance of Overall Security, declared that the Japanese Government had decided to take a "cautious position" with respect to participation in the SDI.

Ignorant Japanese closed their eyes tightly in expectation of thunder and lightning from the other side of the Pacific Ocean. But nothing of the sort followed. Apparently, such an answer suited everyone in Washington. And why not? Indeed, even in January, 1985, at a meeting with President Reagan, Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone spoke with approval about the American plans for the militarization of space and the creation [sozdaniye] on this basis of an ABM system.

Then Nakasone set to work on the Japanese Parliament's deputies and in June of the same year gave permission to private Japanese companies to participate in the development [razrabotka] of the American space weapons. "The Cabinet of Ministers will not hinder them," it was declared in a statement on this matter by the Japanese minister of foreign affairs, which was published by the newspaper "TOKYO SHIMBUN."

Briefly, Washington will receive the new technical inventions for its own armored starships. And there is nothing secret about it, rather it is being done on a solid contract basis. Indeed, since November, 1983, Japan has been tied to the United States by an agreement on collaboration in the field of military technology. For this reason the matter of official agreement on participation in "Star Wars" is considered to be secondary in Tokyo. Especially since such an agreement would cause unfavorable repercussions around the world and in the Japanese Islands themselves and these would be mere hindrances to the matter.

Japanese-American mutual military and space collaboration is already in full swing. The University of Osaka is helping the American center in Los Alamos to do research on laser beams. Work is also being conducted on the creation [sozdaniye] of a particle-beam weapon, essentially a stream of protons, elec-

trons or neutrons being used. The main component here is a magnetic unit from the Japanese firm, "Hitachi Magnetics." Representatives from both nations are jointly studying neutron streams and laser beams in the widely reknown Lawrence Laboratories in Livermore, California.

On 27 Apr 85, in Tokyo, there was a ceremonial signing of a protocol regarding scientific and technical collaboration between Japan and the US for 1985-1986, according to which Japan will take part in the creation [sozdaniye] of an American orbital station. Specifically, they will take on the development [razrabotka] and creation [sozdaniye] of one of the modules. In the budget for this year, 1.4 billion yen have already been allocated, and in all the Japanese taxpayer is faced with paying out 200 to 300 billion yen for these purposes.

Nakasone's government, it is true, hastened to declare that this work, as they put it, is in no way related to "Star Wars." But the Pentagon is not concealing the fact that it needs the station as a "Space Headquarters" and a repair and maintenance base for military satellites that have been placed into orbit. Indeed, the very realization of the project is being carried out under its guidance, states the newspaper "MAINICHI."

It is typical that nearly a year before the signing of the agreement mentioned, a number of leading Japanese concerns created [sozdavat'] their own "committees for planning a space base." Whereas previously Japan's big business had to overcome misgivings about sending their new inventions across the ocean--would this not undermine its position in the competitive struggle?--then, now, it seems, similar doubts have receded on the second plan. First, because the monopolists saw in the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" a faster path towards the creation [sozdaniye] of their own ultramodern weapons. Second, having begun with a transfer of technology, Japan's military-industrial complex is hoping to break the existing ban on the export of all kinds of armaments and military materiel.

For the time being the expansion of the Japanese monopolies has not yet entered upon this path. And if it does? As local economists have calculated, the breakdown of the barriers in the path of exports abroad of weapons would allow Japan in the very near future to supply the world market with nearly 60 percent of the combat vessels, 46 percent of the military means of conveyance, 40 percent of the military electronics and up to 30 percent of the aerospace industry products.

Collaboration on near-earth orbits between the Pentagon and Japan's Defense Agency (JDA) has begun. In the budget for the current fiscal year (which began on 1 Apr 86), 168 million yen have been allocated for equipping Japanese combat vessels with devices for receiving signals from the American "Fleetsat" military satellite. Via the space communication the Japanese Navy will receive information from the US on the strategic situation in the Far East. The Japanese communications satellite, "Sakura-2," has been placed at the disposal of the JDA.

And what is more, the militarists and several members of the nation's ruling Liberal Democratic Party are insisting on the creation [sozdaniye] of their own

reconnaissance satellites for gathering information on the USSR's Armed Forces. In carrying out similar military preparations associated with space, Tokyo is defying the resolution adopted by the nation's parliament in 1969 regarding the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

At the same time, it is necessary to note that previously many people in Japan supposed that "Star Wars," if not a utopian concept, was, it seemed, a matter of the very distant future. A number of the projects appear to be too technically complicated. But on 28 Jun 85, it became clear to the Japanese that this was not the case by far. As the newspaper "AKAHATA" reported, on the American airbase on Okinawa, the latest electronics equipment for re-equipping the F-15 fighter planes, making them over into satellite interceptors, has been delivered. The two-stage ASAT system anti-satellite missiles will be fitted on them and these can also be used for intercepting ballistic missile warheads. And there are 72 such aircraft in all on Okinawa.

Having scattered 140 of its own military bases and sites around the Land of the Rising Sun, as well as nearly 50,000 servicemen, Washington has converted Japan into one of its own strategic spring-boards, which is dangerous not only for Japan, but for all the nations of the region as well.

And it is no accident that today above the columns of demonstrators and at meetings of Japanese supporters of peace, alongside the banners stating "No to the Tomahawks!," stand ones with the slogan "No to 'Star Wars'!" The notorious American "initiative" is no less dangerous than the cruise missiles deployed near the shores and in the ports of Japan. "The SDI runs counter to our hopes for saving the earth from all means of mass destruction based on splitting the atom," declared S. Kawasaki, a professor of the University of Chiba, at an international symposium of scientists "For the Total Banning and Elimination of Nuclear Weapons." which took place in Tokyo at the end of July, 1985. Reagan's program, in his words, is a new "Manhattan Project" (in the course of which the atomic bomb was created [sozdan]--author's note), intended to enable the US to acquire the capability to deliver a nuclear first strike with impunity.

The playing up of Nakasone's cabinet to the orbital ventures was condemned by the communist deputy, Hiroshi Tachiki, speaking in the upper chamber of parliament. Such a position by the government, he reminded, directly contradicts the parliamentary resolution on the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes. The Japanese CP member of parliament demanded that a ban be imposed on any participation by Japanese corporations in the work on weapons for the SDI and on placing the corresponding technology at the Pentagon's disposal.

Japan is not a newcomer to space research. It became the fourth space power after the USSR, the US and France, when, on 11 Feb 70, the "Lambda-4S5" rocket placed the Japanese satellite, "Osumi," into a near-earth orbit. Since then quite a few devices have been launched, not just research satellites, but also meteorological and communications-relay satellites as well.

The first launch of the new generation of N-2 rockets is planned for 1992. It is capable of lifting an effective load weighing up to two metric tons. This is adequate for a manned space flight around the earth or for dispatching

lighterweight craft to Mars, Jupiter or Venus. Thus, Japan's scientists are facing good prospects for activities in the use of space for the good of humanity, including the Japanese people.

In the headquarters buildings of the nation's largest concerns they are also talking as if participation in the SDI will yield new inventions for this noble purpose. It is possible that peaceful space research will indeed get some kind of crumbs from the grand table. But many billions and even trillions [of yen], which will be absorbed by the space arms race, will be extorted from them for these crumbs. The Japanese military-industrial complex and as it turns out. the government do not begrudge such sums.

Of course, the launching into space of the restored battleship "Yamato" will take place only in the lunatic minds of the militarists. But the path to the transformation of Japan into a leading military power is not as long as it may seem. According to the information of foreign economists, Japan will be able to increase the output of weapons of death in very brief periods by a factor of 3 to 5 over current levels. According to Japanese sources, 12 to 15 months are sufficient for Japan to set up the production of missiles and nuclear weapons.

The horrors of the last war and of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are still fresh in the memories of many Japanese. According to information from a recent poll, conducted by the prime minister's office, 72 percent of the populace opposes increasing military expenditures.

But in Tokyo, evidently, they have forgotten the lessons of the past and have decided to count on educating the new generation, not burdened by the memory of the last war, in the spirit of militarism. Thus, in this year the nation's Ministry of Education has removed from school textbooks the last remnants of the truth about the marauding wars of the Japanese Empire. Now everything there will appear much simpler: Japan, supposedly, simply had to go to war in Asia and the Pacific Ocean. Even the specter of the battleship "Yamato" has been connected to the education of the little children in the "traditional spiritual values" (Prime Minister Nakasone's expression--author's note).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Radyanska Ukraina", "Pod znamenem leninizma", 1986.

12752

CSO: 1807/235

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER ADVOCATES SDI PARTICIPATION

PM230704 Paris LE MONDE in French 19 Jun 86 p 24

[Unattributed report: "Mr Giraud Discusses Plan for Europe To Build ABM Defense"]

[Excerpt] While attending the 40th anniversary of the creation of the National Office for Aerospace Studies and Research in Paris on Tuesday 17 June, Defense Minister Andre Giraud stated: "While maintaining its own ambitions in the deterrent sphere, France might, if this was felt necessary, envisage examining with its European allies a joint effort to protect themselves against any enemy counterforce capability." This is the first reference made by Mr Giraud since he has been defense minister to possible participation by France in what is known in the FRG as a "European Defense Initiative," in other words joint defense against enemy missiles.

After describing space as a new "decisive strategic stake for the future of modern defense," Mr Giraud added: "The space challenge already concerns observation, navigation, and telecommunications. Being aware of the major change now under way, France has equipped itself with its own means of anticipating development in these three spheres, without dissociating the space question from the vital maintenance of the efficacy and credibility of the nuclear tool."

Calling on Europe to "launch a process of thinking and research on the subject of space and defense," the French defense minister concluded: "Let us nonetheless bear in mind that ABM defense cannot replace nuclear deterrence. It would only be a means of complementing and strengthening it. It strikes me as very significant that the U.S. SDI (the establishment of a space shield against missiles) is no longer presented in Washington as the end of nuclear deterrence."

/6091

CSO: 5200/2710

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW: U.S. ATTEMPTS TO EXTRACT SOVIET CONCESSIONS

LD291824 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 29 Jun 86

["International Observers Round Table" program with Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, TASS political observer; Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, member of the editorial board of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA; and Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator]

[Excerpts] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! Today is the opening day of the 10th PZPR Congress. This is indubitably an important event in the lives of Polish Communists and all the working people of the Republic. Among the numerous foreign guests invited to take part in the congress is a CPSU delegation headed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The delegates will discuss the party's activity in the socioeconomic and foreign policy spheres in the period since the last congress, and will discuss and approve the draft new party program. The draft was published long before the congress started and was discussed widely in party organization, labor collectives in factories and state farms, military units, and higher educational establishments. The discussion showed that the working people of Poland express their support for the party's political course. They put forward a number of specific proposals and critical remarks which aimed to promote the solution of the country's social and economic problems.

[Grigoryev] I would like to add to what you have said, esteemed colleagues, that the supreme forum of Polish Communists marks the completion of a whole series of such Congresses of the fraternal parties in the socialist community countries. Those congresses began at the end of last year and continued this year. All of them have shown, despite a certain difference of problems facing communists in the fraternal countries, the unity of their approach to unsolved problems of economic and social development in their countries, and the unity of their assessment of the international situation and their approach to it.

A clear expression was given to this unity of communists of the fraternal countries by the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee which took place on 10-11 June of this year. At this conference, a collective analysis was made by the top leaders of the allied countries of the current international situation, the reasons for the tension in it, and ways of overcoming that tension. As the documents of the Budapest conference said, the chief reason for the tension in the current situation is the dangerous foreign policy course and the imperial globalist ambitions of the U.S. Administration, which has no wish to act in the spirit of the Geneva accords. At this difficult time the fraternal countries stressed that they consider it their duty

to continue persistently the quest for possibilities of limiting arms, the quest for ways to improve the international situation and for constructive cooperation between states with different social systems. It was stressed that this line of principle had been affirmed by the decisions of the congresses of the ruling parties in the fraternal countries. The conference, as we all know, supported the program that our country put forward for the complete liquidation of weapons of mass annihilation and the concrete steps to end nuclear tests that were taken by our country. At the same time, the Budapest conference made another important contribution to the struggle to end the arms race by adopting a large-scale program for reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe.

[Charikov] As you know, comrades, last week the latest round in the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons ended. On the eve of the completion of that round, the USSR put forward to the U.S. a realistic compromise solution of a partial nature. It was done on the eve of the completion of the round in order to give the U.S. side time before the resumption of the talks in September to discuss and evaluate the Soviet proposals and to give a reply. Those proposals, as I said, are of a partial nature, inasmuch as the Soviet Union is proposing that agreement be reached not to abandon the ABM Treaty at least for a period of 15 years; and, in order to strengthen the application of the treaty, that it be agreed where the boundary lines run between work that is permitted and work that is prohibited by its terms. It is also proposed that agreement be reached on limiting various types of arms to equal levels, including heavy bombers and submarines carrying medium-range cruise missiles.

The very fact that these new proposals have been tabled by the Soviet Union has already been assessed by the world press as a highly constructive event at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. One Japanese newspaper writes that the ball is now in the U.S. court; in other words it is now yet again up to the United States, to Washington to reply.

The newspaper also stresses that since the talks started in Geneva, the opinion has been expressed in the United States that SDI should be used as a means of bargaining with the Soviet Union on questions of strategic missile reduction. It is thought, MAINICHI writes, that the U.S. -Soviet talks in Geneva depend chiefly on the United States. What this obviously means is that in the United States itself, there is no complete unanimity of opinion on the question of SDI and the expediency of getting involved in it, of getting involved in this condition which, as is becoming more and more obvious, is acting as a brake in Geneva.

[Tsoppi] I would like to add to what you said, Igor Pavlovich, that we have tabled another extremely important thing at the Geneva talks: the draft agreement on the question of medium-range missiles in Europe, which is of extremely great importance for our continent and for the preservation of peace as a whole. In that document we express our agreement that if there were a zero-to-zero ratio in this type of weaponry between the United States and the Soviet Union -- in other words if all the Soviet and U. S. missiles were completely withdrawn from Europe -- the British and French nuclear missiles could remain in the European zone in the number that there are now, to date, at the date our proposal was tabled. At the same time, we stated that we ourselves would not increase the number of our medium-range missiles in Asia, also an extremely important point.

I think that the kind of situation has now developed -- after this new, concrete, and constructive step -- where there is the chance that when they resume, the Geneva talks will, after all, achieve some progress. Indeed, much depends on the eventual U.S. decision on whether or not to move ahead along the path of limiting and ending the arms race. I would like to remind you of the following very weighty phrase spoken by Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev: If the U.S. side on this occasion too ignores our initiative it will become obvious that the present U.S. Administration is playing an unworthy game over a very serious issue, one on which mankind's future depends. In addition, we have just been talking about the SDI and space issues. The participants in the Socialist International congress have stressed that space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

[Grigoryev] Yes, well, such statements about it now being up to the U.S. side to respond, yet again, for the n'th time, such statements and assessments are being heard in great number from all sides. One could quote them endlessly: political and public figures, newspapers, and mass organizations are all saying that it is up to the United States to reply. Recently, indeed, we heard this reply: U. S. President Reagan recently spoke in Glassboro, giving in his speech, on the whole, an overall assessment, so to speak, of the Soviet proposals. He was unable to deny that they are of a constructive nature. In general, in the view of the world's political observers, the President's speech was fairly conciliatory, of a conciliatory nature. Well, the President did indeed say that the Soviet proposals are constructive and that they would be studied. True, he was once again unable to refrain from charging the Soviet Union with expansionism, etc., but this was obviously just a gesture toward fashion...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] and tradition.

[Grigoryev]...and tradition. But it is interesting simply to approach the speech with an attempt to analyze it: The words were, on the whole, encouraging; as yet there have been no actions to follow, on the part of the U.S. Administration, no kind of specific actions in response.

[Tsoppi] While that which preceded the speech testifies to quite the opposite.

[Grigoryev] Unfortunately, not only what preceded it but what succeeded it as well.

[Tsoppi] And what succeeded it as well...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] I would like to recall that the United States, on this occasion together with its trusty ally Great Britain, carried out another nuclear explosion in Nevada, camouflaging it, for no apparent reason, under the name Darwin. I cannot imagine what connection the great scientist had with this. So that as far as the reaction of, in the first place, the White House, to the Soviet peace-loving program is concerned, as yet, unfortunately, apart from...

[Tsoppi, interrupting]... apart from a change in key.

[Grigoriyev]...apart from a change in key, as yet, nothing specific has followed. Moreover, there also have been regrettable testimonies like this latest nuclear explosion.

[Charikov] But you know, in regard to these disparities in U.S. behavior, on the one hand...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] And declarations...

[Charikov] Yes, and declarations: On the one hand, this conciliatory tone in the Glassboro speech, and on the other, the latest challenge to the world public with the explosion in Nevada. One can perhaps find certain explanations for this behavior; one can detect a certain logic in it. The motives by which President Reagan was guided in delivering or preparing his Glassboro speech could be twofold. The mood in Congress over the past few weeks has been of a clearly anti-Pentagon orientation, all this is obvious. And the President desperately needs to prevent any reductions in the defense budget. So why not, asks the author of a WASHINGTON POST article, why not win the votes of some legislators who have spoken in a more reasonable tone over to his side? This is very characteristic of U.S. politics, because as soon as electors' votes -- legislators' votes -- are required on the eve either of elections -- and Congressional elections are coming up in autumn of this year -- or for a debate on the latest military budget, the tone changes instantaneously. It either becomes excessively harsh or, as we can see at the moment, in some way even tractable and, I would say, more conciliatory. So, one could perceive the following sort of explanation: It has been done exclusively for political purposes, and it was aimed more at the domestic audience.

The second explanation given by the author of that same article in the WASHINGTON POST is more serious. He believes that Reagan is reasoning in the following way: By playing a tough game, he has allegedly driven the Russians into a corner and can now do business with them because his tough line has forced the Soviet Union to make concessions. This is totally untrue. The Soviet Union is making no concessions of a fundamental nature and, incidentally, these partial proposals do not in any way, in any way at all, contradict the proposals we previously submitted for a complete ban on space strike weapons and 50 percent reduction of all offensive weapons capable of reaching each other's territory. That is, these fundamental proposals of ours remain on the agenda, they have not been struck off...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] It is simply that another very important step has been taken to go halfway to meet...

[Charikov, interrupting] Absolutely right, and this step, this constructive...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Compromise.

[Charikov] Yes, this call for a compromise, is evidently being wrongly seen in Washington as a sign of our weakness, a dangerous delusion.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW TALK SHOW VIEWS INTERNAL U.S. POLITICAL DEBATES

OW280823 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0557 GMT 28 Jun 86

["Studio 9" program presented by Prof Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, Political Observer of Soviet Television and Radio; with Prof Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; and Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.]

[Text] Hello comrades, we are meeting with you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center in order to talk about current world political problems. Our guests today are: Prof Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the institute of the United States of America and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences.

Our discussion is taking place at mid-year 1986. The second half of the year is now beginning. Time is going very fast, and 6 months is a fairly long period in politics. If we now remember the situation existing in the international arena 6 months ago, at the beginning of this year, and compare this situation with the current one, we find a fairly substantial difference. Six months ago there were certain hopes and very positive trends in the development of events in the international arena were visible. A few months have passed and the hopes have faded somewhat, the positive trends are less visible, and I think it would be correct if we began our discussion with an attempt to answer the question -- What is the matter? Why have things moved so fast in the international process during the period, Vadim Valentinovich?

[Zagladin] I do not know whether it is correct to say that the situation has worsened during this time. I have some doubt, because actually the objective situation did change. On the whole, the objective situation has not changed greatly compared with the beginning of the year. There has been a change in people's mood, impressions, and feelings. Here, we actually see the dynamics you have mentioned Valentin Sergeyevich because ...

[Zorin, interrupting] Let us say that I have expressed subjective perceptions.

[Zagladin] The subjective ones have really changed, there is not doubt about that. Speaking objectively about the situation, it was complicated, it was tense and it still is. The impressions have changed because there were more hopes then, hopes produced by Geneva, and now they are somewhat less, but they have not disappeared altogether because, if at the end of last and the beginning of this year, Geneva produced hope,

now the source of hope is the initiative of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The submission process of this initiative is continuing and producing new hope, but of a different kind from that in the past. In order to give a more substantial comparison, it is necessary to review what has actually happened in the last 6 months, very briefly of course.

Geneva produced hope, and we all remember that, despite the fact that no concrete decisions were adopted there, the general platform jointly developed was certainly positive, because both sides admitted that it was not possible to wage a nuclear war, that there would be no victors, that it was necessary to move along the road of reduction of armaments, stopping the arms race on land and preventing it in space. Some positive things have been said by each side or even together that has produced hope. Concerning us, the Soviet Union and its leadership, it perfectly understood that the very best general statements would remain empty words if they were not supported by concrete actions, concrete ideas and proposals.

This was very well understood by our leadership, which started with the considerations and thoughts we call new thinking, and were then comprehensively and fully outlined at the congress. It understood one thing, that political will was needed, that it was necessary to really show that we see a danger and want to eliminate that danger, that we want to do what we talked about in Geneva. From this springs a series of proposals. The series is long, and was mentioned by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev at the recent session of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I will not enumerate them all, but I will say that, if our proposals were adopted by the beginning of the 1990's, the world would look very different from what it does today. First of all, there would be by then a substantial reduction in strategic nuclear arms, subject to agreements, decision by both sides as to the extent, 40 or 50 percent, more or less, yet substantial in any case. Second, intermediate range nuclear missiles would have disappeared in Europe. Third, chemical weapons would have been banned and eliminated; fourth, there would have been a reduction in conventional armaments, as well as nuclear tactical-operational weapons, in the European Continent from the Atlantic to the Urals. That would have been a very different picture of the world.

When we or others talk about our proposals, all this is enumerated and that is all. I want to say that the picture of our ideas would not be complete at all if we did not also mention proposals of a different kind; we do not just want to put a stop to the arms race, we wish to move the course of events onto a different road and move the world into a new state, some new world system, a system that could be characterized by cooperation. During this period, in addition to the disarmament proposals, our country has submitted major proposals on international cooperation, which deal with problems concerning humanity, the whole world, and offer solutions advantageous to all.

That includes the proposal on cooperation in space that has been designated star peace [yuzézdnyy mir], contrasting with star wars, as well as various other proposals on cooperation in the field of world power engineering, beginning with ensuring the safety of nuclear power engineering, the creation of new reactors through joint efforts, and ending with proposals concerning a power reactor based on the principle of nuclear synthesis [yadernyy sintezis]; then there are the proposals dealing with contributions to the development of liberated countries and overcoming injustices existing in this sphere, and so forth. In other words, we have two baskets of proposals, some of which are aimed at reducing tension and disarmament, others that are aimed at the development of peaceful and mutually advantageous cooperation between people. The synthesis of our ideas is the program for a comprehensive security system, which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

characterized as a new approach to this problem. Truly, it is a new approach because, for the first time in history, a state offers proposals aimed, not just at preventing war or lowering the level of military danger, but also offering to create a system of guarantees that would not only cancel or remove the present danger, but would prevent its resurgence. Such are our proposals. Yet, our far-reaching proposals have not met a positive response. It cannot be said that they have not met a response, because large circles and many states support these ideas, but there has not yet been a positive response from our main partners, and Washington first of all. Moreover, some things have simply been rejected. We offered to ban nuclear tests on a mutually agreed basis, and we ourselves have not conducted any for almost a year. The Americans have rejected this. They now say that they want to abandon observance of the temporary agreement and the treaty on limiting strategic armaments. Still, there is no willingness for direct talks on the nonmilitarization of space. In other words, in many spheres not only is there no response but there is refusal. This is actually what has primarily aroused a doubt about the spirit of Geneva, and some mistrust of this spirit, questions about its need, and secondly it has produced some kind of skepticism about prospects. This mood does exist, and on a fairly large scale. Why it all happened is an entirely different problem.

[Zorin] Let us try to discuss nevertheless ...

[Zagladin, interrupting] Let us discuss it in a collective manner ...

[Zorin] Let us do that, I beg you, Vitality Vladimirovich.

[Zhurkin] It seems to me that the identity of those who are guilty of these tendencies is well-known. It was named at the June Central Committee Plenum, mentioning the U.S. military-political elite, which begins to post an evergrowing threat to the United States itself, and probably not only to the United States but also to its allies.

Indeed, during the last few months, why has the U.S. tried to aggravate the situation and not taken constructive steps? I think that there is a complex of causes, including the plain inertia of the neglected militarist course. This inertia has an effect. Certainly, there is not just the inertia, you cannot attribute everything to that. I think that, when we talk about political causes, the main thing is that the elite became afraid of the challenge thrown out by the Soviet Union, which offered to use new thinking in the international situation. The new thinking, the new approach, has been specified in a long series of exclusively large-scale initiatives and proposals. Frankly, I do not remember a 6-month period in the postwar era when such a large and massive program of peace initiatives was offered. The first reaction, and it may not be the first reaction, is that of a tortoise hiding in its shell, the armor of military preparations, of no compromise, of toughness. Apparently, there are also economic reasons. The idea of trying to wear down the Soviet Union economically in the arms race is not new among American Administrations, yet it seems to be the favorite child of the Reagan administration, its fondest dream.

By the way, it was the first administration to concretize this plan in official documents, national security directives on the main strategic trends of U.S. activities, about 3 years ago, first in Directive 32 and then in Directive 75. Though secret, the contents of these directives somehow leaked to the press, and Directive 75 says that it is necessary to get rid of the Soviet Union economically.

Now, when the 27th congress proposed a program for the USSR's social and economic development, it must have raised concern in the United States. It should not be forgotten that this toughening is an attempt to somehow augment or even promote this attitude built on efforts to reduce relations between the two countries to the arms race and political confrontation to some kind of collision, in hopes of hurting the Soviet Union economically.

And finally there is a third side. In recent years in the United States, due to a number of circumstances, including the fact that the crisis ended in 1982 and the economy has been developing more or less normally for 4 years -- although it is true that the economic growth this year will be around 2.5-3 percent which is nevertheless normal for the United States and is a revival, naturally and not a crisis -- and the allies have fallen behind somewhat, I mean the West European NATO allies, all of this has apparently created a feeling of some kind of excessive power and increased opportunities in the U.S. military-political elite. This has pushed it to take steps that many in Western Europe and in the United States itself have characterized by comparing the actions of the administration with those of a passionate gambler.

[Zagladin] With a passion for power.

[Zhurkin] Yes. You know one U.S. senator even compared it to a cardplayer on a ship, not simply in a casino, but on a ship somewhere on the Mississippi who attempts in an hour or 2 or 3 to beat his compatriots quickly and disappear from the ship.

Of course this is a dangerous trend, a dangerous trend in the contemporary nuclear world that is oversaturated with arms; and the danger of this trend has been noted not only by us. Recently we received the latest issue of STRATEGIC SURVEY published by the Institute of Strategic Studies in London. This is considered a major publication in the West.

As a matter of fact, the institute is saturated and oversaturated with Americans so this survey is not prepared by liberals but by fairly rigid people in the military and political sense.

You will excuse me, the quotation may be somewhat long, but it is interesting. It says here that President Reagan is apparently prepared to sacrifice the prospects for a relaxation of tensions in Soviet-U.S. relations for the sake of pursuing the dream of a stronger America that is less inhibited in the international arena. The author of this survey concludes: But his constant muscle flexing and tactics of confrontation contain a risk that his famous luck will run out and that the United States may be drawn into a whirlpool of serious military crisis, either through its own actions or those of its allies. Undoubtedly the President has increased the stakes, but whether this passionate game of his leads to success remains a very big question.

It seems to me that the fact the administration is presently trying to forge ahead in a series of issues, not only in the central direction, not only in Soviet-U.S. relations but also in relations with its allies, this, in the contemporary situation is fraught with great difficulties in the future. I would again like to return to the idea expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the plenum about the military-political elite. This military-political elite is digging in and threatening the serious, extensive, and large-scale interests of the United States as a great power.

[Zorin] A simply unusual situation for the political history of the United States has taken shape. Generally it was always considered that the threat was external. Often this threat to the United States was in fact external. In recent years the myth about a Soviet threat was increased. Now more and more facts indicate that the real threat to the United States is not external but internal. This is precisely what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was talking about in his plenum speech when he stressed: It is becoming increasingly clear that the genuine threat to the security of the United States does not originate from external forces. This threat, and it is a considerable one, is posed by the country's military-political elite and its adventurist behavior in the international arena.

This apparently is the key to the answer to many questions, Vadim Valentinovich.

[Zagladin] I think it is necessary to continue this line of thought. I agree fully with what was said. I think first that this situation in the United States is a particularly vivid example of what is happening in the capitalist world in general; it is the apex. But these processes are occurring in other countries as well. Possibly not as fast or as vividly, or as obviously, as in the United States.

Secondly, as far as the United States is concerned, what is this elite? Lenin once said that the fundamental question for Marxists is to study the relationship between property and power. Now, both sides of the issue are involved here. The relationship of property, being private capital property, changes insofar as new forms of state-monopoly capital are in action, and transnational capital has appeared; enormous concentrations of wealth, besides, in most diverse forms. This requires further study but, as far as power is concerned, well into the 19th century it was said that a state is a committee for running the country on behalf of the bourgeoisie. Later, Marxism amplified this wording to read that it was a committee running things on behalf of the top bourgeoisie.

Now, it has become a weapon in the hands of this elite, a weapon in the hands of a peculiar oligarchy which has arisen in America, primarily on the basis of a conjunction of the military-industrial complex and the military elite associated with it; the bureaucratic elite associated with it or the elite in the state apparatus; the administrative elite associated with it, including certain people involved in science or in the organization of science, including some of the judicial authorities.

This is an elite that lives by its own interests and aims and does not care about anything else, particularly for the interests of its own country.

Besides, you were quite right when you said that its actions contradict the interests of the United States. This is true. Another thing should be noted. Never before has so much been said about these national interests. This whole elite is saying that it is the main defender of the national interests. In actual fact this is a group that ought to be turned over to the Commission on Anti-American Activities, insofar as it undermines the economy of the United States. The colossal debt the United States has accumulated is its doing. It undermines the security of the United States insofar as its military programs do not strengthen or bolster this security; on the contrary, they create increasing dangers for it.

[Zhurkin, interjecting] It compromises the political positions.

[Zagladin] Quite right, the political positions. It is the primary cause of developing anti-Americanism. Finally, a climate is being created in the country that the Americans are criticizing as they see the internal political, moral, and other dangers. So, it really is a dark force.

As far as what motivates it, I agree with what Vitaliy Vladimirovich said, but I would add this, rather I would schematize it this way. First, the source of all these actions is the interests of military business and the logic we have discussed, the inertia I mean. Second, they are economic interests, not only regarding the Soviet Union, that is really the next point, but it is the desire to create a potential capable of defending the interests of this elite, the economic interests. After all, nearly a third of the U.S. national income is generated by various ways of plundering the developing countries and the liberated countries. It is, of course, a very important matter to preserve this third for those who receive and live by these means.

If the developing countries follow a genuinely independent and politically self-reliant course, these means will be lost. In order to preserve them, force is needed. Grenada, Libya, the Middle East, and so forth are needed. In other words, neoglobalism is needed, and force and military power are needed for neoglobalism. Now, it is quite true that the allies can be kept under control in this way.

Now my latest American interlocutors -- there have been many of them, most diverse people from conservatives to liberals -- told me what this oligarchy has learned from the example of detente. One of the lessons learned was as follows: During the years of detente, the allies felt themselves somewhat more tranquil, more free. They began pursuing their own policies, mending their contacts with the East, defending some of their own interests. This is completely inadmissible to this elite. Now, how do you keep them in hand? One of the methods is participation in military programs. But participation in SDI presumes a freeze on contracts with the East, or limitation of political independence.

Now, what Vitaliy Vladimirovich said about attempts to pressure us, to force us to arm ourselves to death -- there is a German expression [word indistinct] -- that is what they want to achieve. So there are reasons for emasculating the Geneva spirit. But I think that every one of these reasons has its limits and gives rise to various problems. There is another side that is difficult to discuss now, but it must be kept in mind that every direction these actions take gives rise to problems, very difficult and serious ones.

[Zorin] I would like you to continue discussion of this topic, Vadim Valentinovich, in the following sphere.

You have already raised the thought that these past 6 months have not only been linked to negative manifestations, but a series of important and positive things have retained their vitality.

[Zagladin] Yes.

[Zorin] I would like to dwell on this aspect a little.

[Zagladin] Well, I could turn the problem over somewhat ...

[Zorin, interrupting] But how ...

[Zagladin] In the same aspect. I recently received a letter from a Rostov viewer. It is interesting, full of goodwill, shows great understanding of the situation, but toward the end of the letter the viewer asks the following question: Considering what happened during the last 6 months, was there any need to go to Geneva? Why go when a paper without any confirmation is produced? I will be glad to reply. That is not just a piece of paper, it is a serious document, at least that is our attitude. The confirmation of the document are our initiatives that have been supported by huge political forces in the world. I am not talking about socialist countries. The Warsaw Pact countries have confirmed their full support for the Budapest initiatives and, in their turn, have offered new ideas. During his visit to Europe, Hu Yaobang also supported these ideas and wished success for their promotion. That shows the existence of the Chinese point of view. Then the underdeveloped countries, the nonaligned countries, the Delhi Six -- they all actually support them. That means that it has not failed.

On the other hand, the changes in public opinion observed after Geneva have not disappeared. The U.S. line of pressure, sabotage of the Geneva spirit, arouses different reactions. It also arouses pessimism. We have already mentioned that. It also arouses something else -- a desire to act in order to somehow oppose, stop this sabotage. These actions are becoming fairly tangible. I think this is how things are, and this will not fail to eventually have an effect on U.S. leadership. Vitaliy Vladimirovich has quoted from the LONDON REVIEW, I think it contains an interesting thought, all the more so because its authors' inclinations are far from liberal, so to speak. I would disagree with them in one respect. They said the President has decided ... the President has, so to speak ... I do not know but I have the impression that the President may have his own ideas, and that possibly he is fairly sincere in some of his ideas. Lately, two or more times I think he spoke about the need for a turn for the better, that the Soviet proposals are a serious matter. I think that here, to some extent, he expressed his own point of view. A different matter is that he has that elite and other people around him. He himself may be somewhat inconsistent, but I think that if this ...

[Zhurkin, interrupting] And he himself is bound to that elite ...

[Zagladin] And he himself is bound to it, of course. Although bound, he still has his own nuances of thinking. Of course, his latest statements may be evaluated in different ways. But I think there is some influence of the positive atmosphere that developed after Geneva and still exists. It is difficult to get away from this positive aspect.

[Zorin] I think it is necessary to emphasize that the unprecedented composite, as you said, of the most important proposals, the peaceful proposals of the Soviet Union, are having real political effect despite productive bourgeois propaganda and the myth about the Soviet military threat shared by a fairly large number of people in the world. Today the influence of this myth is far from being what it was let us say 6 months ago before our initiatives. That is also a positive factor that has come to light.

[Zhurkin] Of course. Indeed, Valentin Sergeyevich, we often and correctly say that the world is not limited to the United States, but this formula can probably be applied to the United States itself -- the United States is not limited to the military-political elite. In the U.S. ruling class there are groups, groups in favor of constructive development of relations. I am not talking about wide sections of the public that put pressure on Congress, the same Congress that puts pressure on the administration, there is no doubt that all of this background is functioning and it can be said very accurately that the activity of all these is obvious and growing under the influence of Soviet peace initiatives. Is there any need to talk about it? Dozens of polls are taken and I will simply show the

viewers the one published in TIME magazine. [Video shows results of poll.] This is the percentage of people in favor of agreement with the Soviet Union, and this percentage is constantly growing; and here is the percentage of people who are for nuclear rearmament of the United States. They amount to 10-12 percent. That represents one-eighth to one-tenth.

Concerning Congress. Of course, Congress does not operate in a simple manner. Yet on the eve of Geneva, affected by economic factors -- because there was a need to somehow manage the huge budget deficit -- just the same, on the eve of Geneva, Congress adopted a decision that led to U.S. military allocations this year approximately equivalent to 1985 allocations in real prices with adjustments for inflation. The struggle for the 1987 budget has now begun, and Congress is striving to make the 1987 military allocations equal to the allocations of 1985 and 1986.

There is no doubt that the growth is large and the Pentagon has grown quite fat, the expenditures are huge, yet persistent efforts are being made to break the ascending curve of Reagan's military expenditures, sometimes unsuccessfully and other times successfully. While speaking about the effect of our peaceful initiatives, we must see that effect in all its complexity and diversity.

[Zorin interrupting] And not always in a straight line...

[Zhurkin] And not always in a straight line, of course, and not always for a short time. That is a job for the future, not for months and not even years, but for a long time. It is a job, not only during the period of the Reagan administration, but also for the post-Reagan period in 1989. That means the Soviet Union is now actually laying the foundations for the long-term, and offers to solve the most important world problems and -- what is more important than the problem of war and peace? -- offers our alternative for solving these problems. The Soviet Union offers its road, which is finding ever-growing support, for solving the question of the main rights of man, man's right to life and humanity's right to existence.

[Zorin] Well, while analyzing the situation, we focussed our attention on Soviet-U.S. relations and problems of these relations, but these do not exhaust the situation in the present day world, and this...

[Zagladin interrupting] The world is not limited to the United States, as we have said.

[Zorin] Yes, the world is not limited to the United States, and the relations are not bigger as U.S. and other Western politologists say, there is not just two points of force, the world is diverse, and the situation in various regions, various points of the globe, exercise a very serious influence on the general world situation, and in particular a very great influence on the situation in Europe, and that was very evident in the last 6 months. So, I would like you, Vadim Valentinovich, to comment on this complex problem.

[Zagladin] Alright. While speaking about Europe, we have to say that the continent is passing through a complicated period of history. The first reason is the great and serious military threat that is now the main problem on the continent. Europe, as a whole, is not leading a simple life now, according to all indicators. In the last decades, or slightly less, there was a considerable change in direction in the internal political sphere in Europe. At the beginning of the 1970's, liberal and social-democratic trends prevailed, then came the conservative trend. The movement of conservative

forces in Europe has led to conservatives ruling on their own in 10 countries, in coalitions in 6, and only 5 countries having social-democratic governments, with more or less leftist or center-left trends. [as heard] Most of Europe is in the conservative forces' hands. This has had an effect on the political, economic, and military situation in Europe. It was expressed in the sphere of foreign policy by a slide toward the United States, support for its plans, support for SDI, support for the program to create new chemical weapons, stronger cooperation, or rather interaction in this case, in more frequent summit meetings, which have become a regular institution of the European and other leading capitalist countries, in other regions of the world and, first of all, the United States, and so forth. That is one element.

But, in the latest period, covering 18 months to 2 years, the picture begins to change somewhat; change in the sense that, in some countries, the leftist forces, the social-democrats, communists, the greens, and others have begun to become more active, the conservatives are beginning to lose in some places, first of all in the FRG and Great Britain. The latest partial elections indicate a clear loss of position by conservatives. But the main thing, of course, is the internal political changes reflecting, to a considerable extent, the foreign policy processes. The fact that conservative parties and governments have caused great economic damage to wide masses, their rigid policies and austere economy conducted along different lines, but all at the expense of the working masses, and for the sake of solving big capital problems, have played their role. In the field of foreign policy, some deep issues are emerging.

I am engaged with Europe a lot and have meetings and make visits -- I have already been to several countries this year. Now, what if I try to generalize, what is obvious, what is the general mood seen or felt in European circles? Now, I do not mean leftist circles, simply middle of the road ones.

First, there is the fear of war, a fear of the consequences of American programs, and a fear of an intensification of the military danger if these programs continue. Everybody, even the conservatives, talk about this, in different ways maybe, but everybody is talking about this. Possibly even more is being said now -- particularly during the past 6 months we are talking about -- about displeasure over U.S. policy. They put it this way: We are being ignored, and although it would seem that we are allies, the Americans act as if they can do with us as they please.

I was in Italy when the Libyan crisis erupted, and the Italians, including representatives of the ruling coalition, said that, well, what does this mean? They are shooting and bombs are falling on Libya, but in fact they are falling on us, the Europeans, because we said we are against these bombs. But they drop them anyway, and in many cases the American advisers, who supposedly visited the Europeans for consultations on the Libyan events, did not even tell them that at the moment when the consultations were being held, the aircraft were already taking off. This caused terrible indignation.

Now practically all European governments oppose to some extent, the rejection of SALT, and they voice this. Nevertheless, such statements have been made. What else can be heard everywhere? Dissatisfaction with U.S. economic policy. Now, there is of course dissatisfaction on the part of large European corporations, which are being pressured intensively, and the Americans may even have been somewhat hasty in considering them too weak. They are not all that weak. But that is another matter.

I am talking about dissatisfaction among broad circles, primarily political ones.

What are they dissatisfied with? Well, for example, there are some 300 bills before the U.S. Congress concerning trade or economic discrimination against the Europeans. Limitations on European exports to the United States and, on the other hand, expansion of U.S. exports to Europe. Of course the Europeans are responding with their own measures. The European Economic Community, which we often call the Common Market, is adopting its own measures aimed at limiting U.S. exports to Europe, and so forth. There are very large problems here.

Finally, there is another topic that is being raised by prominent representatives of the intelligentsia. This is a protest against the Americanization of European culture. A second conclusion is that Europe must be more concerned about itself. It has its own interests in the security, economic, and cultural spheres and it must be more concerned with this. Various plans, and an intensification of integratory processes in the economy, in politics, and in military affairs, stem from this.

Further, there is discussion that Europe must display its worth more in the foreign policy sphere in deciding major world issues. Already we see different shades here, on Central America, southern Africa, and the Middle East. European positions do not coincide in all areas with American ones, and they differ in Europe too, but in general there is a desire to have their own European position. There is also increasing interest in general European issues, which means in particular the problem of cooperation with the East.

Now, from this point of view, great interest is being shown in our proposals, particularly to the Budapest session of the Political Consultative Committee. Before our meeting, I took a look at and systematized the responses. I did not find one negative response.

[Zorin] To Budapest.

[Zagladin] To Budapest. Not one, of course, there are various degrees of approval. There is simply warm support, there is interest, and there is expressed interest, and so forth, but there is not one...

[Zhurkin, interrupting] They are seeking clarification, asking for clarification of some things.

[Zagladin] Yes, they are asking for clarification.

[Zhurkin] For example, Vadim Valentinovich, the Europeans regularly ask: Why is nothing being said about this or that weapons system; About tanks or artillery, say? But this is obvious.

[Zagladin] Yes, it is a point for negotiation.

[Zhurkin] Besides, it has been pointed out that a reduction of conventional arms has been proposed, and that means discussion will include reduction in the number of tanks [words indistinct] main strike force of land forces, missile units, and artillery, and so forth. This is obvious.

[Zagladin, interrupting] Sub units and formations. Of course. They ask another question, if we are to talk about what is being discussed. They say that, for instance, you propose equal reductions, but you have an advantage it seems, superiority. Well, there is no superiority, but there could be some imbalance one way or the other in some systems. But this too is a topic for negotiation now. But, in principle, there is enormous interest in these proposals.

Here scale could be stressed. If it were implemented and arms and armed forces decreased, liquidated, or removed by 25 percent, people in Europe would immediately breathe a sigh of relief. Secondly, there is scope in the approach. In other words, we are not limiting ourselves or reducing the matter to one kind of weapon. We are including everything. Besides, we are not simply saying that these are weapons of conventional armed forces. In actual fact, we also have in mind tactical [operativno-takticheskoye] nuclear arms of relatively minor effective range, up to 1,000 kilometers.

Therefore we can say that we are proposing an acceleration of the movement along the three-stage schedule that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed in the 15 January proposal. It was envisaged for the next stage but now we are prepared to begin with this.

Further, this is a proposal that is obviously addressed to those countries with which we want to have equal security. We are not placing anybody into some privileged or, on the contrary, under restricted conditions.

[Zhurkin] Besides, Vadim Valentinovich, it seems to me to be worth noting to what degree the numerous proposals originating in the East have been taken into consideration...

[Zagladin interrupting] Quite right.

[Zhurkin] And not just those of the public, not just from the forces coming out for a constructive development, but those of governments as well, particularly conservative governments -- their proposal concerning ways to somehow blunt the possibility, say of a rapid and sudden outbreak of military activities.

[Zagladin] Quite right.

[Zhurkin] There is their proposal that the nature of the doctrines of the sides be discussed in a balanced way, and a series of other proposals. It seems to me that this aspect is also important. What was expressed over a period of the past 5 or 10 years...

[Zagladin interrupting] Undoubtedly. I would go even further, because not only the proposals of governments, but the considerations that were expressed by the NATO Council, the European part of that council, were taken into account, to quite a broad extent. As a matter of fact, speaking in parentheses, this proposal of ours was also handed to a representative of the deputy secretary general of NATO. Insofar as it is a Warsaw Pact proposal it is quite natural that it was also handed to our partner, if I can put it that way, in Western Europe.

In short, it is truly a unique initiative and it is quite understandable that it could evoke such an interest. Now again it is a matter for a practical beginning. We are fully prepared for this and will see how it goes.

[Zorin] I would like to draw attention to the fact that the reaction abroad to this proposal from Budapest is not unambiguous. Various pronouncements have been made. In connection with this I would like to ask you, my colleagues, the following question: A completely peculiar and characteristic feature of recent times -- of the very recent past -- is the surprising ambiguity, to put it mildly, or more directly the contradictions in Washington's reaction to many important proposals. This is evidenced by the series of statements we hear often contradicting one another coming from the mouths of administration leaders. Now it is very difficult to understand where the genuine position of Washington lies. Vitaliy Vladimirovich, how can you explain this disarray that we see in Washington's political circles?

[Zhurkin] Valentin Sergeyevich, I would like to say first of all that there is ambiguity and there is also conformity. If we take the administration's affairs, then there we see complete and 100 percent conformity.

[Zorin] Yes, but I have its statement in mind.

[Zhurkin] In words and in statements there is ambiguity and contradictions, in general, in the statements of leaders of any large state. This too is politically significant in a way. It seems to me that there are a number of reasons behind this. First of all there is undoubtedly a struggle being waged in the U.S. leadership. The leadership is right-wing-conservative but nevertheless the right-wing-conservative leadership is not monolithic. I think it is incorrect to view it as monolithic.

[Zorin interrupting] Nixon was also a right-wing-conservative.

[Zhurkin] Nixon was a right-wing-conservative but objective conditions forced him to go to Moscow to sign the SALT-I Treaty.

There are ultra-right-wing officials who do not want any agreements and there are right-wing-conservative who carry on old conservative traditions and would like to introduce some element of agreement -- some element of organization, if you will -- to Soviet-U.S. relations, some sort of order. This struggle cannot fail to influence the President's position or the administration's course.

[Zorin] I would like to draw attention to another aspect or nuance of the situation. There is no doubt that a struggle is underway between the most frantic officials such as Weinberger, Perle, Casey...

[Zhurkin, interrupting] [Name indistinct]

[Zorin] Yes. There are more sober-minded officials. This is how it is and each group promotes its own idea. Now Vadim Valentinovich expressed his opinion about Reagan's position. I would like to draw attention to the following peculiarity of the President's position. Presently the second presidential term is approaching its midway point -- there is no third term, the President is not elected for a third term according to the Constitution. This circumstance in U.S. political traditions gives rise to some peculiar processes. The President's influence gradually falls as the expiration of his term approaches.

Officials in the administration, party members, and congressmen, and many of those whose positions are linked with support of the President begin to look less towards the President and more towards who the next administration leader will be, when to bet on, and whom to follow.

Presently this process is beginning but after the November elections when Reagan's presidential term nears its end, this process will intensify and the President's influence will gradually decline. This will result in the fact that various political groups in Washington will acquire increased pressure if not strength, more ambitions, and will exert more pressure on the President and promote their own opinions and assessments. This will lead to certain contradictions and an intensification of the struggle between the groups and ambiguity in Washington's political reactions.

[Zagladin] In connection with this, the military-industrial [as heard] elite apparently is already thinking about the future and the President is no longer its future.

[Zorin] This is a very important nuance, I think, although it seems to me that the most important thing in reply to this question was noted by Vitaliy Vladimirovich. It is the fact that a struggle...

[Zagladin, interrupting] A struggle, yes, quite right.

[Zorin] An internal struggle is underway...

[Zagladin, interrupting] There is no doubt that a struggle is being waged within the administration, this has been proven. But I think we should not overlook the midterm elections that are very important. This struggle too has great influence because the Democrats are becoming more active and many Republicans who want to be reelected are forced to take into consideration in their pre-electoral actions both the American and European moods. In this connection the position of the Europeans -- I am on my favorite topic -- may have considerably more weight than in other circumstances.

[Zorin] Yes. I would like, in conclusion, to refer to some of our viewers' letters that have something in common with the letter you quoted Vadim Valentinovich. There actually are such letters: The Soviet Union is offering one initiative after another, serious initiative and every time negative responses are heard in Washington in connection with these proposals. Some of the letter writers ask the question: Is there any point under the current conditions to continue the dialogue with the United States, if all our initiatives find no support, is there any sense in that?

[Zagladin] I would reply as follows: Do we have any other option? And we do have another option. The situation is very serious because now it is still possible to sign some kind of agreements; it is possible to negotiate about something. But if the next qualitative round in the arms race begins, it will be difficult to sign agreements. The parity will then lose its significance and on the contrary it will become a destabilizing rather than a stabilizing, element.

In addition to the seriousness of the danger we must also consider the time factor. We must not procrastinate and this is constantly reiterated by our leadership and that is correct. We must act quickly in order to solve problems while they can still be solved. It is now still possible to solve them. For this reason it is necessary to move forward and offer these solutions.

By the way many people, and in the United States first of all, would have liked us to be less energetic and would like to move us to some other position, a positive of confrontation, a position of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, spike against spike or something like that. Some of the provocative actions of the Libyan type may have been planned for that purpose, that we shall break loose so to speak. But we shall not break loose. It was reiterated at the June Central Committee Plenum that we shall consistently conduct our line, our policy.

We have said that the world is not bipolar. This is true and certainly in the political sense, and yet some kind of bipolarity is emerging now. But not along the USSR-U.S. line, along another line. Now practically this question of the future, of the right to life which Vitaliy Vladimirovich spoke about, this question is in the focus of wide public attention, as well as statesmen, ordinary people, businessmen and some part of the military.

It is a common topic now. Around this topic is formed the bipolarity of the world. On one side there is, like in the schematics published in time, a shrinking group of those who are in favor of this course, for continuing the policy of force, for intensifying the arms race and on the other side a growing mass of those who are against this policy.

This does not mean that they are for or against us, as the question is often asked. No they are not for us. In their largest part and even in their majority they are not supporters of socialism. They are people standing on the other side of the social barricade; they are people who have entirely different views from us. Yet we are united over one issue, because it is necessary to preserve peace, it is necessary to preserve life and develop peaceful cooperation. In this aspect the world is really gradually becoming bipolar.

Now the situation in the world arena is such that the degree of social responsibility of the governments, states, political leaders cannot be measured by national yardsticks, whether they defend well or poorly the national interests. You may defend the national interests well, but if you do not take into consideration these general human problems -- problems which concern one and all -- you cannot consider yourself to be a responsible politician.

In essence there is a kind of competition going on to see who will manage to lay the road for the survival of humanity, who will manage not only to point out that road but to show how to march along it as well and take real steps in that direction. Our initiatives show how to take these steps. We show the way and we show how to march along it. Our unilateral actions, which we have taken several times, show the huge political will of our people, our state and party leadership. I think that socialism will certainly succeed in this competition because this is really the system which today, now, shows that it is capable and worthy of being called the representative of the policy, a promoter of the policy meeting the interests of all humanity.

[Zorin] Well we have exhausted our time on the air. All I have left is to thank you for participation in the discussion, and thank our viewers for their attention. Until our next meeting here in our Studio 9, thank you.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET DELEGATION STATEMENT ON PROGRESS

LD262315 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2225 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 27 Jun (TASS) -- The USSR delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons has issued a statement that says:

On 26 June, Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, made a statement for the press in which he summed up the results of the recently completed fifth round of talks. The evaluations he expressed do not correspond to the actual state of affairs at the talks, and, therefore present it in a distorted form.

The fact is that for the whole round there were no changes in the position of the U.S. delegation to facilitate the achievement of mutually acceptable accords on questions of preventing an arms race in space and halting it on earth. The U.S. side simply did not contribute any kind of positive proposals. It continued to block progress at the talks, adhered to its former unconstructive positions, which cannot serve as the basis for an agreement, and evaded a businesslike review of the proposals of the Soviet side. In particular, this concerns the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons, on which the United States continues up to the present to adhere to its position of 5 years standing, which long ago became obsolete.

In all three groups at the talks the USSR delegation has undertaken new and serious steps aimed at achieving very rapid progress. In the group on space weapons, in the group on strategic weapons and in the group on medium-range nuclear weapons, the Soviet delegation put forward proposals that were detailed, balanced and took account of the interests of both sides and that could form a good basis for solving, in the very near future, the problem of ending the arms race in all spheres and of radical reduction of nuclear weapons.

Thus, on the questions of strategic offensive weapons, the Soviet side fully keeps on the negotiating table its proposal for 50 percent reductions in the corresponding nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States. We give preference to such a radical solution and we are ready to try to reach an agreement on it immediately, now.

However, at this round of the talks the U.S. side has continued stubbornly to stand on its old proposals of 1 November, last year, which only announce the aim of 50 percent reductions but which in fact envisage a sharp increase, by several thousand units, in the number of nuclear charges the United States has at its disposal at the present time.

Taking this into account and in the interests of getting out of the impasse that has been created by the actions of the United States, the Soviet side, during the past round, put forward an intermediate option for reducing strategic offensive armaments providing for somewhat less than the 50 percent formula, but nevertheless for equivalent deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the sides. Such reductions could be implemented provided an accord is reached on not quitting the ABM Treaty for a minimum of 15 years. We regard it as a step toward implementing reductions of 50 percent in the corresponding nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States.

Major proposals were submitted by the Soviet side on issues also relating to verification. We are in favor of a strict and adequate verification of the fulfillment of the undertaken commitments, if necessary right up to on-site inspection. Indeed it has become clear that the U.S. side is only talking of verification.

In practice it has been in every way avoiding an objective examination of this issue too.

We are forced to note with regret that all the efforts made by the Soviet delegation to move the negotiations out of their present deadlock have not yet received support from the U.S. delegation, and all the responsibility for the absence of positive results at the negotiations on nuclear and space armaments lies fully with the U.S. side.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS COMMENTARY ON END OF FIFTH ROUND

LD261948 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo reports:

The fifth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms that lasted for some 50 days, ended here today.

The Soviet Union, firmly adhering to the line of practical quest for mutually acceptable agreements in Geneva announced during the fifth round the new concrete initiatives on all the three directions of the talks, that is, on problems of space, strategic and medium-range nuclear arms.

Thus, both at the talks and outside their framework, the Soviet Union was doing everything to create the atmosphere favouring the achievement of appropriate agreements. The Soviet Union, specifically, extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till August 6 of this year and again proposed the USA to join it. The Warsaw Treaty member-states made a joint initiative for a large-scale reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, the initiative which considerably supplements and shores up the Soviet programme of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. All these steps clearly show the Soviet Union's striving for arrangements aimed at the lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation, at the consolidation of stability and peace.

It would seem the U.S. side should give a positive answer to these constructive and far-reaching Soviet initiatives. But again, this has not happened. During the fifth round, the U.S. side has not advanced anything positive and concrete that could help bring closer the stands and set the beginning to the process of achieving arrangements, specifically, on separate aspects of preventing an arms race in space, of the reduction of strategic arms, as well as on the question of medium-range nuclear arms.

Particular acuteness at the past round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms was assumed by questions of verification, to which the Soviet Union attaches special importance. For without verification which leads to the confidence that the obligations assumed are strictly observed, arms limitation and reduction and disarmament are unthinkable.

Summing up the results of the fifth round, one should emphasise the fact that the Soviet Union has made important, far-reaching fundamental proposals which have not been answered by the United States. All this indicates the need for a revision of the present approach of the U.S. Administration to the Geneva talks, since overcoming the impasse now fully depends on Washington.

It is noted in the diplomatic and public circles here that during the intermission the U.S. side will, possibly, realise the need for a fresh approach to the Geneva talks so as at last to open the way for the achievement of appropriate arrangements.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ON ARMS CURB INITIATIVES

PM010816 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Our Peace Initiatives"]

[Text] The Soviet Union, together with the fraternal socialist community countries, is waging a struggle on a broad front to improve the complex and tense international situation, terminate the arms race, and save mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe that hangs over it.

Within a brief period of time our country has submitted proposals that are exceptionally important in terms of their significance. The USSR has put forward a specific plan for the total elimination of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons by the end of the 20th century and for the prevention of the creation [sozdaniye] of space-strike weapons (SDI). Introducing a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union called on the United States to follow its example and thus clear the way toward the conclusion of an agreement imposing a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. We are in favor of the elimination of USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and the speediest banning and destruction of chemical weapons. All this must be implemented under strict international control [kontrol]. Desiring to help bring about a positive development at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, our country has proposed an interim alternative approach toward nuclear arms reduction: To reach accord on not abandoning [nevykhod] the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years, with work in the SDI sphere being limited to laboratory research, in other words to the threshold that has virtually been reached by the United States. Moreover, strategic offensive weapons are to be limited at equal levels, while the question of medium-range weapons capable of reaching the other side's territory is to be resolved separately. The Soviet Union is doing everything possible to ensure that mankind enters the 21st century under conditions of "star peace" rather than "star wars," which is the aim of the most aggressive U.S. circles.

It is recognized by wide circles of the world public that the Soviet proposals for the strengthening of peace are striking in terms of their scope and realism, innovative presentation of the issues, boldness of political thinking, and willingness to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

The program adopted by the Soviet Union and its allies for a large-scale reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals is a new contribution in the struggle to terminate the arms race.

The problem of war and peace remains the most important of all the problems facing mankind today. The way to its solution lies through disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons, through international cooperation that is advantageous for all. Our country advocates the preservation and deepening of political dialogue, constructive cooperation between states, and the expansion of mutually advantageous trade and economic ties. The idea of pooling all countries' efforts for the peaceful exploration of space put forward by the Soviet Union is encountering growing support.

The June conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee in Budapest confirmed the basic avenues of the fraternal countries' struggle for peace and a transition to real disarmament. They have now become the foreign policy platform of all socialist community countries. The CPSU Central Committee June (1986) Plenum approved our delegation's activity at the conference and confirmed the party's foreign policy course set by the 27th congress and aimed at strengthening universal peace and averting the threat of nuclear war.

The plenum expressed confidence that the fraternal socialist countries' friendship and cohesion and the further development of their interaction with all peace-loving states and broad public forces will lead to the further buildup of socialism's peace offensive. It will also build the establishment of international cooperation for the purpose of reaching mutually acceptable accords in the arms limitation sphere and for the sake of the development and progress of all mankind.

But the U.S. Administration, pursuing an extremely dangerous course of "neoglobalism" and imperial ambitions, is evading the practical solution of problems and questions concerning peace. Furthermore, it is taking the path of abrogating previously achieved Soviet-U.S. accords and agreements. The recent U.S. Government statement about its intention not to observe in the future the strategic offensive arms limitations contained in SALT II constitutes a qualitatively new and highly dangerous step toward demolishing the entire existing arms limitation system [rezhim] and undermining the opportunity to conclude new agreements in this sphere in the future. The Washington "hawks" are also shaping up for the abrogation of the ABM Treaty. Evidence of the sinister nature of Washington's military-strategic plans is also provided by the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada and by the unprecedented volume of military expenditures, whose confirmation by Congress at a sum exceeding \$300 billion in fiscal 1987 is being sought by the White House.

There is not and there cannot be any justification for such a policy. It places in jeopardy peace and security all over the world. This is the opinion of millions of people in all continents. Washington's reckless playing with fire in the international arena is also causing growing concern among the U.S. allies, who are unwilling to risk their security for the sake of the senior partner's imperial ambitions. The peoples in the world are responding to the challenge by U.S. and NATO militarist forces, which are spinning the flywheel of the nuclear and other arms race, by stepping up their actions in support of the peace proposals by the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. Members of mass antiwar organizations and realistically minded politicians and public figures in the West perceive them as offering a realistic way to improve the international situation, create an all-embracing security system, and save mankind from the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. This historic opportunity must not be missed.

The people demand that 1986, designated as the International Year of Peace by the United Nations, be marked by specific steps in the cause of strengthening peace, eliminating the threat of nuclear war, consolidating universal security, and establishing international cooperation.

Soviet people welcomed with great enthusiasm the Appeal to the Soviet Union's Working People adopted at the CPSU Central Committee plenum on the launching of a nationwide socialist competition for the successful fulfillment of 12th 5-Year Plan targets. Declaring their willingness to respond to the party's call with selfless labor and to translate the bold plans and intentions into the energy of practical deeds, the Soviet people are aware that every success scored by our country along the path mapped by the 27th congress represents a new step toward strengthening the positions of socialism and the cause of peace on earth.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1454

U.S-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S KOHL COMMENTS ON POSSIBLE REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

DW231345 Stuttgart Sueddeutscher Rundfunk Network in German 1050 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Interview with Chancellor Helmut Kohl by correspondent Reissenberger on the "Das Suedfunk Interview" program; date and place not given--recorded]

[Excerpt] [Reissenberger] Mr Chancellor, how do you view the chances of a meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, and what are the chances of the Geneva arms control talks?

[Kohl] Well, you know about the recent statements by President Ronald Reegan in which he once more declared his preparedness to meet General Secretary Gorbachev this year. The reliable information I obtained from the U.S. Administration shows that this is not some propaganda statement but that this intention is backed by the will of the U.S. President and the U.S. Government. It is reasonable and it is being supported by all European colleagues and myself in the framework of NATO and in the framework of the EC.

I have very carefully observed and analyzed what has been said and done — not openly — at the Warsaw Pact summit meeting some days ago in Budapest. It indicates, and I am also convinced of it, that despite all the propaganda noise the Soviet Union is interested in a talk between Gorbachev and Reagan. It will be necessary now that the foreign ministers — not in a public flood of words, but in discrete diplomatic talks — will explore the conditions. I believe that as a whole, if I may say so, chances have not decreased but increased. I expect such a meeting. It is the prerequisite for the substance of talks and for some real progress in disarmament talks, because the representatives in Vienna or Geneva can discuss many things; if the respective chiefs have not indicated clear guidelines nothing will be achieved. I stick with my basically slightly optimistic opinion: We will make some headway.

[Reissenberger] Yet it seems that Gorbachev avoids contacts with Bonn. Or is more going on through diplomatic channels in the dialogue with Moscow, more than is told to the people?

[Kohl] I fail to see that the Soviet Union avoids contacts. We have regular visitors coming from Moscow, and we had a number of talks before the first constituent meeting of the new Central Committee after the CPSU congress.

You know that we assume that Foreign Minister Genscher will go to Moscow in the very near future; I do not want to give an exact date, but probably in July. Certain treaty projects will be discussed there. You can see from all this that no new ice age has come, but that relations continue in what I call reasonable dimensions. We are interested in these talks, the Soviet Union knows our clear positions with regard to basic problems of international policy, involving relations between the Soviet Union and us. The Soviet Union is our most important and most powerful partner in central and Eastern Europe. It would be a foolish policy not to handle these relations carefully, however, not at any price but in mutual adherence to valid treaties — reason must prevail.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2712

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S GENSCHER ON REAGAN SPEECH, UPCOMING MOSCOW TALKS

DW221802 Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG in German 22 Jun 86 p 8

[Interview with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher; interviewer's name, date and place not given]

[Text] BAMS: Have the chances of real disarmament between the East and West improved following Reagan's speech?

Genscher: President Reagan gave an encouraging speech. It proves that despite all Cassandra cries the NATO foreign ministers' meeting in Halifax gave a clear signal for disarmament, cooperation, and detente. When the Europeans speak with one voice they are listened to in Washington. The U.S. readiness to take the Soviet disarmament proposals seriously and test them at the negotiation table is expression of a sincere desire for understanding.

BAMS: Do you believe that the next Reagan-Gorbachev summit will produce a result that is important for disarmament?

Genscher: Yes, if both sides in the meantime negotiate seriously and intensively--something Washington and Moscow obviously want to do. The world is at a crossroads between a new arms race which would be bound to lead to disaster, and real disarmament. The FRG, the citizens of which make the largest contribution within NATO to our common security, is the prime mover for detente, cooperation, and disarmament. We thereby also meet our German and European responsibility for peace.

BAMS: You are going to Moscow by the end of July....

Genscher: The German-Soviet relations are of crucial importance for East-West relations. Therefore, the Soviet Government invited me, and therefore I accepted the invitation. The Soviet leadership knows just as we know that the improvement of German-Soviet relations is not only an advantage for our two states but for all of Europe.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2712

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG DEFENSE MINISTER ASSESSES GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

LD141140 Hamburg DPA in German 0957 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text][Dateline indistinct]— At a meeting held by the Evangelical Academy in Loccum today, Defense Minister Manfred Woerner expressed the Federal Republic's "paramount interest" in arms control and disarmament in view of the new proposals made by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. "We are determined to take the Soviet Union at its word," he said at the international gathering, which is largely devoted to the subject of space armaments. The Federal Republic is ready to subject itself to any control. Following Gorbachev's proposals one would now have to see "what is propaganda and what is really readiness for disarmament."

Referring to the Soviet (?position) at the disarmament negotiations in Geneva and in Vienna, the minister spoke of "appropriate skepticism." The Soviet negotiators have so far refused on-the-spot inspections. However, Gorbachev's proposals contain "a whole series of significant [word indistinct] aspects. (?there would now be an attempt to sound them out at the negotiating table). Particularly interesting are some aspects of the proposals concerning the conventional field, such as conventional arms control, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

On the subject of a defense system in space, the minister expressed the expectation that such systems would be developed on both sides, in East and West. He expressed the hope that both superpowers would "find cooperative solutions in accord with the ABM Treaty." It is important to lay down conjointly the relationship between offensive and defensive systems. The optimum that could be (?achieved) in Geneva as regards strategic stability "would be if both superpowers agreed a new strategic mix, a new strategic relationship envisaging fewer offensive and more defensive weapons. That would be a [word indistinct], which would make a nuclear war even more improbable," the minister said.

Woerner went on to say that political responsibility requires the sounding out of the chances for a defensive system, as is now being researched. "It is not only because the Soviet Union has begun this that the Federal Republic is of the opinion that such research is legitimate, that it is politically necessary, and that it is in the well-understood security interest of the entire alliance. It would be a good thing to be able to set a picture of a secure defense capability with nonnuclear weapons against a picture of definite capacity for destruction with nuclear weapons."

The meeting in Loccum, which ends tomorrow, is also being attended by U.S. ambassador Henry Cooper, member of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva negotiations, and Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation in Geneva.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2712

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG ADVISER TELTSCHIK VIEWS NEW SOVIET PROPOSALS

DW222145 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1710 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Interview with Chancellor Kohl's foreign political adviser Horst Teltschik by moderator Peter Hopen, on the "Bonner Perspektiven" program--live]

[Text] [Hopen] Mr Teltschik, 2 days ago the U.S. President assessed the new Soviet arms limitation proposals positively. He talked about a possible turning point. Is that tactics, does he thus intend to prevent attacks, or is there really more behind it?

[Teltschik] Mr Hopen, I think, President Reagan's statement is very encouraging, because it indicates that there is a chance now to achieve a reduction of systems in the field of strategic armament instead of only discussing an upper limit — as has been the case within the framework of SALT II. That is our goal to reduce armament and not to introduce upper limits.

[Hopen] Does that mean that in this sense the Soviet proposals can be approved?

[Teltschik] The Soviet proposals seem to be realistic, and that is apparently how the U.S. Administration sees it. That means, they offer a chance of the two world powers to agree on this important issue. For the first time — and that is a good experience — the two superpowers are willing to negotiate drastic reductions. As you know, General Secretary Gorbachev last fall, prior to the Geneva summit, submitted a proposal on a 50-percent reduction. That proposal was taken up by the U.S. administration and laid down in the joint communique issued by the two statesmen at the Geneva summit, and now the Soviet Union has made another step forward by saying that they would begin by reducing their arms 30 percent and make the next step later on, if the Americans are willing to observe the ABM Treaty, the treaty on the limitation of strategic systems, for a certain time. General Secretary Gorbachev spoke about 15 to 20 years.

[Hopen] Mr Teltschik, if it is true that the Soviets react that way to the American proposals one might call that a success of U.S. negotiation tactics.

[Teltschik] We must certainly note that on the one hand the U.S. tactics is successful insofar as the Soviet Union has taken considerable steps in the matter. But on the other hand it also indicates that the general secretary is a Soviet leader who reacts with great flexibility and who is ready to take serious steps. That means, U.S. tactics can only be successful as long as the Soviet side too, is willing to discuss proposals or to take the initiative.

[Hopen] Many Europeans and Americans feared that the U.S. President did not seriously want arms limitation. What do you think about that? Is that only a problem of two differing groups in the United States, while the President's decision is clear, or can we still expect a surprise?

[Teltschik] The U.S. Administration and President Reagan have put forth a lot of far-reaching reduction and disarmament proposals in the past years. Quite a few of those proposals were discussed, coordinated, agreed upon with the allied partners. The Federal Government, in particular, has remarkably contributed to the fact that the U.S. Administration further developed its proposals — for instance concerning the problem of INF or conventional disarmament. Therefore, we never doubted that President Reagan is willing to take disarmament steps. We also brought our influence to bear on the Soviet interlocutors trying to explain that the will really exists in Washington and that one should make use of it. I think, the fact that General Secretary Gorbachev has now laid new proposals on the table shows that he sees a chance. Both sides must use it now.

[Hopen] Thank you very much, Mr Teltschik.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2712

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG OFFICIALS COMMENT ON SOVIET 'ZERO SOLUTION'

Genscher's Remarks

LD142051 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1700 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] Federal Foreign Minister Genscher has welcomed the latest Soviet proposal for reducing nuclear medium-range missiles in Europe. Speaking on Saarland Radio today, Genscher emphasized especially that Moscow from now on no longer takes into account the British and French nuclear potential. The federal foreign minister said that the USSR's initiative is taking up western concepts and should be considered as part of the East-West dialogue.

Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva disarmament negotiations, said in Bonn yesterday that Moscow is prepared to support a zero solution for medium-range missiles in Europe and would no longer insist on taking into account the British and French nuclear weapons.

According to him, the USSR is to eliminate its 243 SS-20 missiles deployed in the European part of the country with a total of 729 warheads, provided the United States abandons its (108) Pershing-2 missiles and 464 cruise missiles. Once both sides have eliminated their missiles in Europe then the issue of the Soviet medium-range missiles deployed in the Asian region and the short-range missiles and conventional armaments could be solved on this basis.

CDU/CSU's Dregger Comments

LD171029 Hamburg DPA in German 0851 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 17 Jun (DPA) — CDU/CSU group chairman Alfred Dregger believes that the Soviet proposal to reduce the intercontinental nuclear carriers of the United States and Soviet Union by one-third during an interim stage ought to be considered. Dregger told the CDU/CSU group on Tuesday, regarding the latest proposals by Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and the negotiator at the Geneva disarmament negotiations, Viktor Karpov, that he also considers the fixing of the ABM Treaty for the period of the research phase as remarkable. It is noteworthy that the Soviet Union no longer raises fundamental objections to the U.S. SDI research. This changed attitude by Moscow was no doubt due to the fact that Moscow itself has been working on a missile defense system in space for years.

Dregger emphatically called, however, for a worldwide zero solution for medium-range missiles. One should resolutely resist the Soviet Union when she proposed the removal of these missiles for the European area only, as she had done 6 months ago. A zero solution restricted to Europe does not remove the threat from nuclear weapons, especially not from the Federal Republic, which is without nuclear arms.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2712

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG PAPER ON REAGAN'S 'PERSONAL' LETTER TO GORBACHEV

DW161235 Munich SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 16/17 Jun 86 p 4

[Editorial by "SCHR": "Summit in Clouds"]

[Text] President Reagan as well as party chief Gorbachev try at the moment to create the impression that the agreed second meeting will take place this year after all. The President who has been on the defensive lately because of Gorbachev's disarmament proposals, seems inclined to regain lost ground by pretending to wait impatiently for Moscow's acceptance of a date, and by stating that he has asked Gorbachev in a "personal" letter to make speedy preparations for the meeting. A chance of revival is even given to SALT II that was said to be dead.

Gorbachev on his part makes a second talk depending on "concrete results." However, it remains a puzzle how this will be achieved. The first meeting has not facilitated the Geneva arms control negotiations because understanding between the two was too vague to be turned into guidelines for negotiations. Gorbachev's various new proposals also have not achieved much rapprochement between both delegations. Although these papers always contain some elements worth considering, Moscow's negotiators do not seem prepared to discuss the significance of nuclear points.

There is ambiguity not only with regard to space weapons, where Moscow has recently shown some preparedness to make concessions, but also with a view to intermediate-range missiles. What Moscow's chief delegate Karpov stated now in Bonn — a zero solution in Europe without the integration of French and British nuclear potentials — is neither new nor helpful as long as the Soviets insist that Paris and London may only modernize but not increase their nuclear weapons. However, the British and the French do not want to give Moscow a veto right with regard to their national nuclear power.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2712

SALT/START ISSUES

FRENCH PAPER WEIGHS REAGAN SALT II DECISION

PM230701 Paris LE MONDE in French 19 Jun 86 pp 1, 4

[Article by Michel Tatu: "Death or Rebirth of SALT Agreements?"]

[Text] Is it dead or not? Apparently Mr Reagan does not like to use this word in connection with the SALT II treaty on strategic arms. But if it is not dead, it is not alive either.... These agreements "no longer exist," the White House said just recently. And if President Reagan respects them for a few more months, he almost feels the need to apologize for doing so: This situation, he said in his 27 May message, is purely "technical," and stems from economic considerations and not from respect for a document which was "biased" from the start, which was not ratified because it was unratifiable, and which, even if ratified, would in any case already have expired and which, to cap it all, was "violated from the start" by the USSR.

Is this therefore the end not only of the treaty concluded between Brezhnev and Carter in 1979 but also, as many people in the U.S. Congress, the media, and in Europe maintain, the end of the whole arms negotiation process, the famous "arms control" which was central to Soviet-American relations for more than 15 years?

This may be so. It is true that President Reagan never liked the 1979 SALT II treaty, which he and his friends condemned very strongly during his 1980 election campaign. It is also true that he has made no secret of his feelings, especially in the past 2 years. While stating that he was abiding by the limits laid down by that document "for the time being," he issued an increasing number of warnings about Moscow's alleged violations: an initial report on this subject was sent to Congress in January 1984, and two further reports followed in 1985. And one of the main arguments put forth in his entourage today is precisely the lack of effect these reports have had — reports which, they say, the Soviets "did not even want to discuss." It was therefore necessary to bang on the table to be heard one day, and that day has come.

It is also true that the said violations and the polemics surrounding them demonstrate above all the treaty's imperfect nature. For instance, the main dispute relates to the Soviet SS-25 missile, described as "new" by Washington and as "a modernized old missile" by Moscow.

How can we know whether the characteristics of a device deviate from the established norms unless we observe its flight tests as closely as possible and pick up the information they relay? It is to this that the second U.S. grievance relates, and the United States accuses its partner of deliberately coding this information. However, the treaty is completely ambiguous on this point because, although it prohibits each side from "preventing verification" by the other side's "national technical means," it does not prohibit coding....

It remains to be seen whether the trees of technical details are intended to stop us seeing the wood. Even if we accept that the Soviets have distorted the letter and more especially the spirit of SALT, it is difficult to see the violations alleged by Washington as a justification for purely and simply abandoning what is after all the only existing framework for strategic relations between the two superpowers. As Mr McNamara said, it is rather like abandoning the penal code because crime has not disappeared....

This point is particularly valid because this code is still essentially respected: Since SALT II was signed, the Soviets have dismantled between 1,000 and 1,300 old missiles as they introduced new ones. Perhaps they would have done this in any case, although they are not accustomed to doing so (Footnote) (This was seen particularly in the Euromissile affair, because a large number of old Soviet SS-4 missiles deployed 25 years ago were kept for years and are still to be found alongside their SS-20 successors). But the result is nonetheless that they have conformed to the overall limits laid down by SALT II.

However, the strangest thing is that these general limits are already favorable to them and that Mr Reagan has no intention of abandoning them. The official pretext for possible U.S. abandonment of the SALT agreements is the deployment of cruise missiles on B-52 bombers. At a rate of 10 missiles per aircraft, 131 aircraft will be equipped in October or November. But as far as we know the Pentagon is not planning to go beyond a maximum of 200 units. And it is entitled to do this provided it dismantles other systems from any part of the contingent of MIRVed missiles: Minuteman-3 (ground-based) or submarine-launched missiles. Finding 60 or 70 "compensatory" launchers

out of a total of 1,200 is not a superhuman effort, given the general superfluity which is recognized by all. According to the latest White House statements this compensation has still not been ruled out.

In this connection, several hints given in the 27 May presidential statement attracted too little attention. While saying that he would no longer abide by the constraints of SALT II, Mr Reagan asserts that he "will continue to withdraw old forces" as new ones are deployed, that he is "not envisaging an appreciable numerical increase in U.S. offensive forces," and finally that he "will not deploy more strategic vehicles or warheads than the Soviet Union." Now, although the USSR has more strategic "launchers" than the United States (just over 2,500 as against 1,893), its arsenal still has slightly fewer warheads: 9,000 as against between 11,000 and 12,000. In these conditions it is even more difficult to see why Washington would need to permanently exceed the ceiling fixed for MIRVed missiles — the only one on which there is at present a dispute.

This is why the U.S. attitude seems to be a matter of presentation rather than content. If Mr Reagan had been more skilled in Soviet-style "agitprop," he would have highlighted the "positive" part of his speech, stating that he does not intend to have a single weapon more than his rival, that the latter must end its violations, and that he will be content to follow his lead. Moreover, this is more or less what Mr Gorbachev is replying today.

It is therefore probably going too far to talk, as some people are doing, of "an unlimited arms race." The Soviets, who do not have to worry about public opinion, could probably theoretically start a new wave of military production. But this is not what Mr Gorbachev has been saying for more than a year, and a spokesman from his embassy in Washington has just said that

Moscow's response will be "in proportion" to what Washington does. And this is even less than what Mr Reagan wishes or is able to do, caught up as he is in the obstacles put up by Congress, a large section of the media, and his European allies, all hostile to abandoning the SALT agreement: It is significant that even Mrs Thatcher is said to have raised the strongest objections on this subject.

It is therefore more accurate to see this latest incident in the way an American official close to the current Geneva talks described it to us: not so much a definitive abandonment of SALT as new and strong pressure on Moscow to force it to change its behavior, an attempt to force the conclusion of an agreement replacing the "bad" SALT treaty by something better but not abandoning what has been achieved.

It is probably no coincidence that the fateful date of withdrawing from SALT by putting into service the 131st B-52 equipped with cruise missiles will come shortly before the desired date for a new Soviet-American summit, in November or December. Nor is it a coincidence that Mr Gorbachev, not discouraged by his failures, has for some time been making new disarmament proposals, some of which are welcomed in Washington. This is particularly true of the one which would eliminate from the sphere of strategic talks the American bombers in Europe, in other words the "forward-based systems" which have poisoned the start of each "SALT process" for the past 15 years before fading away as if by magic with the signing of an agreement. Something will certainly emerge eventually from the current major maneuvers.

/6091

CSO: 5200/2709

SALT/START ISSUES

FRG OFFICIALS COMMENT ON SALT II AGREEMENT

Todenhoefer on USSR Compliance

LD211306 Hamburg DPA in German 0919 GMT 21 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 21 Jun (DPA) — According to Juergen Todenhoefer, the disarmament spokesman for the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, the U.S. Government has "overwhelming proof" of violation of SALT II by the Soviet Union. Todenhoefer and his party colleague Markus Berger, member of the Bundestag defense committee, said today after returning from 2 days of talks in Washington that the Soviet Union clearly massively violated their undertakings in the agreement. Nevertheless, the politicians said the CDU/CSU, for fundamental considerations, would still welcome the observance of the essential elements of the agreement until the conclusion of new nuclear disarmament agreements. However, the decision depended on the Soviet Union, which must remove its numerous violations, for example the stationing of 72 SS-25 intercontinental missiles. The Soviet Union has until November 1986 to do this, as the U.S. President expressly stated that constructive steps by the Soviet Union would be taken into account on U.S. decisions on nuclear arms in the fall.

Genscher Sees Improvements

LD221515 Hamburg DPA in German 1347 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Excerpts] Bonn 22 Jun (DPA) — The latest Soviet proposal for a 30-percent reduction in strategic weapon systems and the positive reaction from U.S. President Reagan have been (?described) today by the Bonn coalition and the SPD as a sign of serious movement in East-West negotiations. The chancellor's foreign policy adviser, Horst Teltschik, and the deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, Volker Ruehe, said that new ways could now be worked out in Geneva to reduce the number of nuclear weapons instead of only limiting them as in the case of SALT II. Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) sees the possibility of achieving far-reaching improvements in East-West relations [words indistinct].

Through the statement by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 and his speech in East Berlin, through the Budapest declaration of the Warsaw Pact and the latest proposals in Geneva, the Soviet Union had made clear steps in the direction of the Western negotiating positions, Genscher said at a Hesse FDP festival on the Hoherodskopf in Vogelsberg. This should now pay off at the negotiating table. The Federal Republic must be "the driving force" for improving relations between West and East. Together with France, the Federal Republic was a guarantor and forerunner of the unification of democratic Europe.

Speaking for the SPD Bundestag group, parliamentary business manager Carl Ewen welcomed Reagan's positive reaction to the new Soviet disarmament proposals. The SPD hoped they would be turned into concrete agreements at the Geneva negotiations. The U.S. Government, however, must stick to the SALT II agreement limiting strategic weapons. Only in this way could there be successful negotiations.

In a press statement, Ruehe welcomed the fact that the Soviet Union no longer raised any fundamental objection to U.S. research on space defense. As Moscow was now ready for negotiations on the fundamental question of where permitted research ends and banned development starts, clarity could also be achieved on the extent to which research on modern missile defense systems by both sides was permissible according to the existing East-West treaties.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2713

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET ARTICLE CONSIDERS FRENCH NUCLEAR POLICY

PM261138 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[E. Arsenyev article under the "Events and Opinions" rubric: "Atlanticists' 'Gunboat Patriotism'"]

[Text] The debate on questions of nuclear disarmament has become noticeably more intense in France recently. The increased interest in these problems is connected to a considerable extent with the Soviet plan for the reduction of nuclear armaments and the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world. Debates are going on in many areas: On attitudes to America's "star wars" plans, nuclear weapons and the neutron bomb, and plans for the creation of the so-called "joint defense" of Western Europe. Ultimately, the discussion centers on the role that France will assume in the complex present-day situation: Will it use its standing to avert the nuclear threat, or will it allow itself to be embroiled in a new round of the increasingly dangerous nuclear arms race and NATO's warlike adventures?

The right-wing parties, which won the recent parliamentary elections, are exerting an ever increasing influence on the shaping of French policy. The new government headed by J. Chirac is making considerable changes in the country's lifestyle having announced a broad program of denationalizing the industrial and banking sectors, returning to the antidemocratic majority voting system, and abolishing taxes on large fortunes.

French Prime Minister J. Chirac recently stated that the government intends to prepare an expanded military program that envisages the modernization of nuclear weapons, the construction of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, new generation nuclear-powered submarines, and other measures. This promises enormous profits for the military-industrial complex and new hardships for working people since the construction of a single aircraft carrier will cost Fr8 billion and a nuclear-powered submarine Fr3.5 billion. France is continuing underground nuclear tests: This year alone and despite the protests of the international public four nuclear explosions have been carried out at Mururoa Atoll in the Pacific. One-third of the military budget goes on the production and modernization of nuclear weapons.

Against this background the public is showing mounting concern that the shift of France toward Atlanticism may increase. Statements by some officials in favor of French involvement in SDI are causing particular alarm.

Many French people are aware that the European peoples are indeed living on top of a nuclear volcano and that the problems of peace and security in the nuclear age are inseparable, especially in Europe, because of its geographical density and concentration of armaments. The peace and disarmament movement in France is therefore enjoying development.

At the same time pro-Atlanticist circles, encouraged by the right-wing forces' victory in the parliamentary elections, have increased their activity in France. They are indeed vying with one another in their displays of "gunboat patriotism," seeking to increase military expenditure and bring about French involvement in SDI while supporting U.S. acts of adventurism in the Mediterranean and other regions of the world. Using the accident at the Chernobyl AES as a pretext, they launched a campaign of slander and disinformation, a campaign the democratic forces in the country have resolutely exposed as real "anti-Soviet radiation" poisoning Franco-Soviet relations. Moreover, France has again been the object of increased pressure from the United States and NATO.

Nevertheless, clearly Paris does realize that only an independent foreign policy, the development of all-around cooperation, and a realistic approach to international problems are capable of securing the country's national interests. Hence the statements by French leaders in favor of peace and detente, the continuation of all-European process on the basis of the Helsinki accords, and political dialogue with the Soviet Union. Most French people realize that there can be no genuinely independent French policy or lasting peace and security in Europe without good relations with our country.

Despite the constant attempts by Atlanticist circles to instill distrust and fear toward Soviet policy in French people, realistically minded figures and indeed most French people believe the "Soviet threat" to be a myth. "I personally do not believe that the Soviet Union has belligerent intentions toward us," President F. Mitterrand restated recently.

The Soviet proposals to radically reduce nuclear armaments, to completely eliminate nuclear weapons throughout the world, and to strengthen the international system for the safe development of nuclear energy have been received with great interest in France.

In view of France's special position and also its leaders' statements that Paris will be able to join in the process of nuclear disarmament only after substantial reductions of U.S. and USSR nuclear arsenals, the first phase of the Soviet proposals does not envisage any reduction of French or British nuclear weapons. Nor are they included on the overall balance sheet of nuclear forces in Europe.

The opponents of disarmament sometimes say that the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe does not suit them because the Soviet Union allegedly has an advantage in the conventional arms sphere. The Warsaw Pact countries' proposals for a substantial reduction in conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- demolishes that argument by the opponents of detente and disarmament. The Soviet side has expressed readiness to enter into direct discussion with Paris on nuclear problems to find a mutually acceptable solution. In short, the maximum possible has been done to ensure favorable preconditions for talks on reducing nuclear weapons and to take account of the European countries' national interests and security interests throughout the world.

After considering the realities of the nuclear age, many sensible French people are beginning to realize that it is time to rethink certain aspects of nuclear policy and bring it into line with the new conditions.

Thus, Professor Albert Jacquard of the Universities of Paris and Geneva considers that the scientific conclusions about the consequences of nuclear conflict force us to question many notions hitherto thought self-evident. He calls for a "reappraisal of values" to take place and for the whole range of problems involving nuclear weapons to be publicly discussed. In what circumstances could French people agree with a president's decision to "press the button," knowing that it may be a question of nothing less than collective suicide? A. Jacquard asks. Are there any goals that could justify the sacrifice of all humanity?

Such sober voices are not isolated in France. They show that in the depths of French society the "ice has started to break" and rethinking has begun.

French people are increasingly asking: Surely the time has come when it is necessary to ensure France's influence in the world and its national interests by helping to consolidate trust and cooperation and remove the nuclear threat rather than by means of deterrence? This question confronts those who shape the country's foreign policy with all its acuteness.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1449

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADA: CLARK, ARMS CONTROL CENTER ON CRUISE TESTING

Clark in Commons

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 3 Jun 86 p A4

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark dodged the New Democratic Party's request yesterday to end cruise missile testing as a way to press the United States to comply with the SALT II nuclear arms control agreement.

Instead, Mr. Clark said he still hopes the United States and the Soviet Union will comply with the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty's limits on the numbers of nuclear launchers.

NDP defence critic Derek

Blackburn asked whether Canada is not actually supporting the U.S. decision to exceed SALT II limits by allowing continued testing in Canada of cruise missiles.

Mr. Clark told the Commons that this is not the case because "the ultimate decision is yet to be made" about exceeding SALT II's limits.

President Ronald Reagan said last Tuesday that Washington would exceed the SALT II limits by the end of the year.

The United States will go beyond the SALT II limits when it deploys more than 130 nuclear-

armed cruise missiles on B-52 bombers.

Canada has allowed the U.S. Air Force to test the guidance systems of cruise missiles during winter flights in the Arctic. There are plans for a new series of tests next winter.

"Considering our role in the testing of the air-launched cruise missile, Canada has a particular responsibility for ensuring that this weapon is not used to violate SALT II," the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, an independent think tank, said in a statement.

Position of Center, Activists

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 12 Jun 86 p A7

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

THE FEDERAL Government has expressed strong concern about the likelihood that the United States will soon violate an important nuclear arms-control agreement, and the strength of the Government's convictions may be put to the test before the year is out.

The Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, an independent think-tank, other groups of peace activists and the New Democrats are calling on Ottawa to suspend

cruise-missile testing in the Arctic this winter if the United States violates the terms of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) of 1979.

President Ronald Reagan says the United States probably will exceed the SALT II limits on numbers of nuclear launchers before December. The United States says it is forced to do so because of alleged Soviet violations of arms-control agreements.

The United States will exceed the limits by

arming additional B-52 bombers with nuclear-tipped, air-launched cruise missiles (ALCMs).

This is the same type of missile that has been tested in flight in the Canadian North during the past two winters.

The U.S. Air Force needs to test the guidance system of cruise missiles over snow-covered tundra similar to the terrain of the Soviet Union. The United States does not have the geography to test the missiles itself. Arctic tests are scheduled again this winter.

The tests are conducted under the terms of an umbrella agreement signed by the Reagan Administration with the previous Liberal Government in 1983. The agreement runs until 1988 and can be renewed. Indeed, military experts in Ottawa expect that the United States will want to continue cruise-missile tests in Canada into the 1990s.

The Trudeau Cabinet was divided on cruise-missile testing when it considered the issue three years ago. Part of the political compromise was to link the approval to the so-called two-track strategy. The two tracks were to be deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe plus vigorous pursuit of arms-control agreements with the Soviets.

Although the text of the cruise-missile-testing agreement makes no direct mention of arms control, the Canadian communique issued at the time of the signing said such testing was linked intimately to Canada's policy on arms control and disarmament.

While the Conservatives may not feel obliged to embrace all the political statements and communiques of the Trudeau Government, the Tories in opposition seemed to be just as emphatic as the Liberals in making the connection between arms control and cruise-missile testing.

Flora MacDonald, Tory foreign affairs critic at the time, was the External Affairs minister in the short-lived Clark Government when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization took the

two-track decision in 1979. She told the House of Commons during the cruise-missile debate in 1983: "In regard to the cruise missile, it is quite clear that our first and most urgent obligation is to use all our influence in the pursuit of an arms-control agreement with the Soviet Union in Geneva. Anything else, including the testing of the guidance system of the cruise missile, is secondary to the central issue of arms control. We must not allow ourselves to be deflected from the goal of arms control and reduction."

She went on later to say that "the testing of the cruise missile is not a decision that can or should be taken in isolation. Instead, it must be placed, as I have argued, in the broader context of direction in arms control."

The Tories may be reminded again of Ms MacDonald's words as winter approaches and new cruise missiles are strapped to the wings of B-52s in violation of SALT II limits.

For the moment, the Government's official line is that Ottawa hopes Mr. Reagan's statement last month that the United States intends to exceed SALT II is not the final word on the fate of the treaty.

Ottawa is hoping the Soviets might make some face-saving gesture toward Washington to allow the United States to continue to comply. One of the problems facing Ottawa, however, is how to balance its response so the Soviets also feel a bit of pressure to clean up their own act. Ottawa feels the Soviets have a case to answer. Officials here believe there may be some validity in Washington's charges that Moscow has violated the SALT II agreement and the earlier Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Unfortunately for the federal Government, Canada does not have the same kind of direct leverage with Moscow as it does with the Americans in the cruise-testing program.

So the question will remain: do the Tories still believe cruise-missile testing "is secondary to the central issue of arms control?"

/9274

CSO: 5220/42

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

TASS ON PERSHING II TESTS--Washington, 25 Jun (TASS)--Three test launches of "Pershing-2" missiles with mock nuclear warheads have been staged in Cape Canaveral. According to the UPI news agency, all three missiles were launched to a determined area of the Atlantic Ocean with the aim to train the search for, the detection and the elimination of targets. The Pentagon has stated already 31 tests of "Pershing-2" missiles. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0917 GMT 25 Jun 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1449

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRAVDA ON UK RESPONSE TO 18 APRIL GORBACHEV INITIATIVE

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 86 p 4

[Article by A. Maslennikov, PRAVDA special correspondent, London, April:
"Don't Let an Historical Chance Escape: Disarmament and London's Position"]

[Text] First -- a few newspaper quotations. "The Soviet Union is making an effort to overcome the deadlock in the Vienna negotiations" -- this from the GUARDIAN. "The goal of the Soviet initiative is to lower the strained atmosphere in international relations"-- this from the TIMES. "The Soviet Union is continuing its peace offensive"-- this from the FINANCIAL TIMES. Thus are English newspaper writing about the new Soviet peace proposal that was put forward on 18 April in the speech of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary during the 11th SED Congress in Berlin.

It is necessary to mention that, generally speaking, such quotations objectively reflect the attitude with which the majority of the mass information media bodies and even simple people in England have greeted the new Soviet initiative on curtailing conventional arms in Europe. This initiative is a logical addition to and a component part of the program which was put forward by the Soviet Union to completely eliminate weapons of mass destruction before the end of the present century. It was expanded during the 27th CPSU Congress into a program for establishing a comprehensive international security system.

The new Soviet initiative -- and many observers point this out--has knocked the ground out from under the feet of those who were trying to avoid with the help of subterfuges and verbal maneuvers the adoption of the program that had been essentially put forward by the Soviet Union, those who were looking in it for some kind of "incompleteness", and those who declared that the implementation of the Soviet program would "simply convert Europe into a preserve for waging conventional wars." They were attempting to accuse the Soviet Union of allegedly "ignoring the simultaneous need to disarm in other areas by proposing a plan to eliminate nuclear weapons." The trumps of the authors of such dishonest statements -- and the leader of Great Britain's foreign policy departments is among them, as they point out here -- proved to be worthless.

The new Soviet proposal was heard at a time when the discussions about our program for creating a comprehensive international security system, which were being conducted in the countries of Western Europe including in the British Isles, had become even more profound. The attention of local commentators and political figures was concentrated more and more on those aspects which concerned ways to insure peace and security in Europe and to increase the role and responsibility of that continent's states in the struggle for disarmament and the normalization of the international situation in general.

No matter what pretexts were put forward in the west, the SUNDAY TIMES political commentators, G. Connolly and S. Milligan, wrote on the pages of the conservative newspaper: "The Soviet plan contained a number of remarkably sensible ideas, especially from Europe's point of view." Acherson, the political commentator for the OBSERVER newspaper, adds: "If Washington refuses to meet this proposal, the alarm of the Europeans over Reagan's policy will significantly increase."

Great Britain's Labor Party is giving the Soviet peace and disarmament program a positive rating. In a special statement, the party's National Executive Committee called upon the governments of England and other NATO countries to give a positive reply to the Soviet proposal and thereby "make a contribution to the solution of the most vitally important and pressing task facing all of us -- the securing of nuclear disarmament and the deliverance of Europe-- and subsequently the entire world -- from the threat of nuclear destruction."

D. Healey, the minister of foreign affairs in the Laborite "shadow cabinet", said in a conversation with a PRAVDA correspondent: "For me, as well as for British politics, there is a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that the Soviet proposals express special concern for the interests of the European countries. I heartily welcome the fact that the first phase of disarmament provides for the complete elimination of American and Soviet medium range missiles -- both ballistic and cruise -- in the European area."

The utterances of highly placed representatives of Great Britain's leading circles are also not wanting in calls to decrease the tension between the East and the West, to halt the arms race, and even to place limits on the stocks of weapons that have been accumulated by both sides.

Prime Minister M. Thatcher said during a visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to England in December 1984: "Both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries are interested in maintaining a balance of weapons if they want to feel secure. There is no sense in maintaining this balance at an ever higher level. The West is trying to lower it."

The British leader has now been given an opportunity to support her devotion to the curtailment of the arms race with deeds: to reply with real action to the peace program that was put forward by the Soviet Union on 15 January of this year. Well, what of that? Endless "consultations" with her senior ally across the ocean were begun. Finally, almost two months after the official handing over of the Soviet disarmament proposal to the English

government, Whitehall broke its prolonged silence. Alas, the Thatcher government essentially identified itself completely with the negative position which had been stated previously in Washington's reply.

When trying to justify somehow the refusal to accept the Soviet proposals and not having any convincing arguments for this, G. Howe, the minister of foreign affairs, in a wordy address to foreign correspondents accredited in London could not find anything better to do than to distort the content of the Soviet peace program. Speaking about the USSR as nothing more than a "potential aggressor" and despite the content of the 15 January statement, he then asserted that the Soviet Union allegedly "is ignoring the simultaneous need to disarm in other areas" by proposing the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century.

Mr. Howe "did not note" the fact that our country, as the 15 January statement had already pointed out quite definitely, was proposing that conventional weapons and armed forces become the subject of signed agreements along with the removal of weapons of mass destruction from the arsenals of states. They were already incapable in London of "noting" the new Soviet initiative that was put forward on 18 April -- namely the detailed plan to decrease significantly the military opposition in Europe with respect to conventional weapons.

Events, which -- like the beam from a searchlight -- snatch the very essence of the policy of this or that bourgeois state from the shadows of diplomatic strategems, are occurring in international life. Recently, the bandit attack on independent Libya, which was undertaken by Washington with the active complicity of London, was such an event. We are essentially talking in this case about an imperialist compact whose participants combined their efforts in an attempt to dictate their will on the peoples of young independent states and to follow a policy of "from a position of strength" with respect to these states.

The participants in the protest demonstrations against the anti-Libyan action, which were held recently in London and other British cities, said that this neo-globalist policy is a serious source of tension in the modern world and carries with it the threat of ever newer complications in different regions of the world, which threaten to plunge the planet into the vortex of a world-wide thermonuclear conflict.

The position of the British government regarding the question of halting nuclear tests is also being subjected to no less sharp criticism. The Thatcher government has formally not come out against the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban treaty. In fact, however, the approach itself to this problem is surrounded by such a quantity of ill-considered reservations -- primarily concerning monitoring and "the need to continue nuclear explosions in order to develop new types of weapons" -- that we are talking about actual opposition to solving the question of halting all nuclear testing. As if confirming this, M. Thatcher declared in an interview with a TIMES correspondent: "I cannot imagine the world without nuclear weapons."

Moreover, the British government -- as the FINANCIAL TIMES has just reported -- has approved the concept of producing binary chemical weapons in the United States. It is noteworthy that this decision was made on the eve of a meeting between representatives of the NATO member countries during which it was planned to impose the deployment of new generation American chemical weapons on Western Europe. The newspaper pointed out: "British agreement is an important step in this matter."

(F. Blekebi), the director of the Stockholm International Institute for Investigating the Problems of Peace, writes: "The position of the English government on a number of questions concerning control over weapons is disappointing to the highest degree."

It is evident, however, that the Soviet program for freeing the planet of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction, which has now been supplemented by proposals to decisively curtail conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe, cannot fail to exert an effect on the frame of mind of the British. (A. Benn), a well-known political figure and a member of the British labor party executive committee, said to me: "British public opinion is now undergoing serious changes with respect to questions concerning the halting of the arms race. We are now taking all of the recent USSR proposals in this area very seriously. The English know that the Soviet Union needs peace in order to solve the tasks that it has placed before itself. We ourselves, however, need peace no less than it since we would like to be free of the ever growing burden of the arms race."

In the opinion of my interviewee, the recent events which were connected with Libya, sharpened even more the understanding here of where the threat of war actually originates. He continued: "my countrymen see how ever newer aggressive actions are being undertaken by one party -- by Washington -- and how ideas and proposals, which are aimed at strengthening peace and moving the cause of disarmament forward, come from the other side -- from Moscow. When speaking about the new Soviet proposals concerning the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe, (A. Benn) called them positive ones to the highest degree. He said: "The Soviet Union is acting completely correctly in addressing them not only to the governments but also to the peoples of the European states. I hope that these proposals will receive such a high rating among the broad English circles. In the final analysis, this is very important since -- no matter how we regard this or that idea of the governments of the Western countries -- they cannot completely ignore the opinion of their own people."

In conclusion, here are the words of another Englishman.

Admiral Eberly, the director of the British Royal Institute for International Relations, said in a conversation with me: "I am firmly convinced that -- despite existing disagreements -- we should not halt the dialogue to thoroughly study each other's positions and to search for mutually acceptable solutions in the disarmament area. We cannot allow weapons to get out of control and their development to finally lead to a time when questions of war and peace

will be solved by computers. The solution of these questions must remain in the hands of politicians who are aware of their responsibility for the fate of their people."

It is impossible not to agree with this.

8802

CSO: 5200/1362

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: PETROVSKIY, CHERVOV PRESS CONFERENCE ON PACT PROPOSALS

Broadcast on TV

LD012348 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1938 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Announcer-read report on 1 July Moscow press conference given by Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy and Colonel General Chervov; all participants remarks are recorded; video shows participants seated at desks on a platform, identified by desk name plates; Yu. A. Gremitskikh is also identified and seen on the platform]

[Text] [Announcer] A press conference was held in Moscow today for Soviet and foreign journalists devoted to the comprehensive plan for reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe that was put forward in Budapest by the Warsaw Pact participant states. Taking part in the press conference were: Comrade Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister; and Colonel General Chervov, head of a department of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. Comrade Petrovskiy opened the press conference.

[Petrovskiy] Taking into account the exceptional importance of these proposals, we have decided to draw attention to them. What we are talking about is a program of movement along one more route on the map of the roads leading to a decrease of the danger of war. All wars from which Europe has suffered, including two world wars, were waged with armaments that were accepted as being conventional. At present, many of these armaments are approaching the means of mass annihilation regarding their destructive potential. In Europe a war involving their use would have ruinous consequences.

The recent accidents -- in our country in Chernobyl, and in the FRG in Hamm -- have also reminded us with all seriousness of such a factor as the presence of a dense network of peaceful nuclear installations whose damage, even by conventional weapons, could be the source of unprecedented danger.

And finally, the conventional armaments race, which swallows up a very substantial part of the military expenditures of states, imposes a heavy burden on the economies of virtually all countries.

In striving to get nuclear and chemical weapons eliminated in this country, the Soviet Union and its allies consider it necessary to back this up with considerable reductions in armed forces and conventional armaments. The essence of the program is a weighty reduction, tangible in real terms, on one-quarter, that is, 1 million men on both sides, of ground troops and tactical air forces together with the corresponding operation-tactical nuclear armaments. Such a reduction would apply to the forces of all European states, and also of the United States and Canada on the territory of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

An integral part of the program is a well devised system of confidence-building and verification [kontrol] measures, including international procedures, even on-site inspection. The program of reductions of armed forces and conventional armaments put forward by us is addressed to Europe, not only because the two major military groups are confronting each other, but also, by virtue of the accumulated experience of solving problems of all-European cooperation politically, because the continent has all possibilities to play the role of a building site of detente [novostroyka razridki] and to set a good example to the planet's other regions.

[Gremitskikh] Please, may I have your questions. TASS, Biryukov. TASS correspondent Biryukov asks: What measures of verification [proverka] are provided for the Warsaw Pact member countries proposals on the armed forces and conventional armaments of the sides that are being reduced and remain after the reduction in Europe?

[Chervov] The Warsaw Pact countries are proposing a very broad system of verification [kontrol] both of the reductions and of the troops remaining after the reduction. As for the process of reduction, here the countries of the Warsaw Pact are proposing any kind of verification [kontrol] measures, any, right up to on-site inspection [inspektsiya no mestakh]. Specifically, they are proposing: First to exchange [information on] [obmenyatsya] their troop strengths on the day of the talks, and also on the scale of troops subject to reduction, and on the troop strengths that are to remain after the reduction. In addition, it is proposed to create an international commission, an international commission of representatives of the Warsaw Pact, the NATO countries, and also of European states, that would have the right, or will be given powers -- this is to be decided at the talks -- to carry out on-site inspection of all the procedures of the reduction, of the elimination of weapons and combat equipment, and also of the stockpiling of weapons and equipment if such a question, or such a problem should arise at the talks and be solved.

According to our proposal, the troops being reduced must be withdrawn to their national territory, disbanded and demobilized, and their weapons and equipment liquidated. Some weapons, by agreement, and some equipment may be stockpiled or transferred to use for peaceful purposes. This process would be carried out under the observation of the international commission.

[Gremitskikh] A question addressed to Comrade Petrovskiy, asked by Egon (Traksler), correspondent for the newspaper UNSERE ZEIT: In the event of the start of fresh talks, will the former Soviet proposals put forward in Vienna remain in force? What is the fate of the Vienna talks?

[Petrovskiy] Before I reply to the essence of that question, I would like to draw attention to the fact that in their proposals the states participating in the Warsaw Pact are not restricting proposals on the place for discussion of matters of the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe only to a new, special forum. That is one of our proposals. The states of the Warsaw Pact are displaying, I would say, maximum flexibility on the question of the place for holding such discussions. Alongside the proposal of convening a special forum, comprising the European states, the United States, and Canada, they are also advocating that the Warsaw Pact proposals be examined at the second stage of the conference on confidence-building measures and security and disarmament in Europe. Nor are they against expanding the framework of the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and weapons in central Europe by including other European states in them, with the relevant alteration to the mandate of the talks. In a word, they see no impediment on the question of where to hold the talks. The main thing is to start these talks as soon as possible.

[Gremitskhikh] The Japanese newspaper ASAHI asks: What is the aim of the Warsaw Pact countries in submitting the proposal on the size of the initial reduction in troops in both alliances -- by 100-150,000 people on each side, and then by one-quarter. Why not by 30, 40 or 50 percent?

[Chervov] What is the aim of the countries of the Warsaw Pact in putting forward these specifically named figures -- 100-150,000 people; 25 percent; and why not 50 percent, and so on? They aim primarily to make the reduction a weighty one, making possible a considerable reduction in the level of military confrontation in Europe, and in the danger of war, and to reduce the threat of the danger of war in Europe. A reduction in the groups of the armed forces of the sides of more than 1 million people would, to a certain extent, resolve this task. When the proposal was put forward for a reduction of 100-150,000 men, the significance of this one-time reduction is in the fact that if it were implemented, the sides would have and they would show the political will to resolve these tasks, trust between the sides would be strengthened, and the sides could test out the proposed verification system.

The Warsaw Pact countries proceeded from the idea that these figures were realistic, that all the proposals that were contained in the appeal, all the figures that were given in the appeal, in our proposal, were well thought-out, carefully calculated, took account of the structure of the armed forces of the sides, and proceeded primarily from the aim of strengthening security in Europe.

[Gremitskikh] The Polish paper TRYBUNA ROBOTNICZA. Waldemar Wasilewski asks: Are there any UN recommendations about reductions in conventional weapons, and if so, how are they being implemented?

[Petrovskiy] I think that this is a very correct and timely question. Indeed, in putting forward radical proposals now for reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe, the socialist states are taking account of the proposals and the ideas that have been put forward at international forums. In particular the UN General Assembly, in its final document from the first special session on disarmament, which was by the way approved by consensus, that is it was approved even by the United States, adopted recommendations. I quote what is written there: Along with talks on nuclear disarmament measures, talks should be held on a balanced reduction of armed forces and armaments on the basis of the principle of not damaging the security of the sides. End quote.

The action program included in this same final document also contains an appeal for holding bilateral, regional and multilateral consultations and conferences with the participation of all the interested sides to discuss various aspects of disarmament in the sphere of conventional weapons. Unfortunately, and this must be stated, these important UN recommendations have not been implemented because of the opposition of the United States and other Western countries.

Time does not wait. Today what is needed is not words in favor of restricting weapons and not peace-loving assurances, but practical deeds.

The participants in the press conference replied to other questions from journalists.

Petrovskiy on Numerical Reductions

LD010811 Moscow TASS in English 0753 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- The essence of the proposals put forward at the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee held on June 10 through 11 consists in the tangible and really appreciable reduction of the ground forces and the tactical air force along with the corresponding nuclear armaments, Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, stated today.

He addressed a press conference here on the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member countries concerning the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

This reduction would cover the forces of all the European countries, as well as the U.S. and Canada, on the European territory stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals, V. Petrovskiy said. This could be implemented in the early 90's already, so that the process of the reduction of the armed forces and armaments of the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty member-states could be further continued in the future.

As the first step, it is proposed to hold one-time mutual reductions of the strength of the armed forces of the opposing groups by 100,000-150,000 from each side in the course of one-two years.

Arms Balance Seen

LD010952 Moscow TASS in English 0943 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- There exists an approximate military balance between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO in Europe in all main indicators of armed forces and conventional armaments, said Colonel-General Nikolay Chervov, the head of a department of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. He spoke at a news conference in Moscow today to the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty countries on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

When new negotiations begin, the Warsaw Treaty countries are prepared to table all the figures and propose such a verification system that will confirm the existence of the military balance. This is why the case in point is not an asymmetrical reduction, but an equivalent reduction, General Chervov emphasized.

Hence, there exists no objective reason for the figures debate if the other sides indeed wants to work toward an agreement, he said.

Agreement at MBFR Urged

LD011039 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- The Soviet Union declares in no uncertain terms for reaching agreement at the Vienna talks now, without delay, the more so because even at the beginning of this year, for the first time over all the 13 years of debates, the contours of possible agreements have taken shape, said Vladimir Petrovskiy, a deputy

minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., who spoke at a news conference at the Press Center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry in Moscow today.

Thanks to the constructive stand of socialist countries, the sides in Vienna managed among things to draw their positions closer on such important matters of substance, as the volume and procedure of the reduction of Soviet and American troops, an agreement on the subsequent non-increase of the level of armed forces and armaments of the sides in central Europe and also an agreement on certain verification measures.

In this situation, Vladimir Petrovskiy went on to say, the proposal of socialist countries on starting joint work to formulate the text of an agreement was natural and logical.

However, an improvement which made itself felt at the talks has not been consolidated so far, the deputy minister said.

The reason why it is so is the negative and unconstructive position of the Western parties to the talks on certain verification measures that have been bloated to deliberately unacceptable proportions. For example, NATO countries are trying to apply certain obligations to the Western military districts of the Soviet Union -- the attempt that contradicts the mandate of the Vienna talks, the Soviet representative emphasized.

Contrary to the coordinated tasks of the talks, the West does not agree to reduce and freeze armaments. Of course, it is difficult to work toward reaching agreement on such a basis, Vladimir Petrovskiy said.

U.S. Arms Sales Hit

LD011140 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- The reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe would affect in a most positive way the situation in other regions, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, head of a department of the USSR General Staff, has said answering a question of a correspondent of the newspaper "AL-ITTIHAD" of the United Arab Emirates. General Chervov spoke at a press conference today dealing with the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member-states on the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

In the present-day world security is a universal category, he said. It would be imprudent to reduce armaments in one region and at the same time build up armaments in another. This is why all the countries of the world should take part in ensuring security and reducing armaments.

The stands of the Soviet Union and the United States on the problem of arms deliveries to other countries are diametrically opposed. The Soviet Union delivers armaments to the national liberation movements and to the non-aligned countries that are upholding their independence. As for the U.S., it delivers armaments in enormous quantities to the most reactionary regimes of the world, specifically, South Africa, Israel and Chile, as well as to the bandit units of UNITA in Angola and to Afghan counterrevolutionaries. This policy creates and aggravates tension in various parts of the world. The USSR and the U.S. had talks in 1977-1978 on the reduction and limitation of arms deliveries to other regions and actually drew up an agreement to this effect. However, General Chervov said, the American side slammed the door, and the talks were stopped.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1455

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER COMMENTARY ON WARSAW PACT PROPOSALS

PM251315 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Major General V. Makarevskiy, retired, candidate of military sciences, under the rubric "A Military Scientist's Opinion": "In the Interests of Europe and the World"]

[Text] "The principal task of our time is to defend peace, check the arms race, and move on to specific disarmament measures, above all in the nuclear sphere. Resolving this task, breaking the trend toward the buildup of the danger of war, and returning international relations to the channel of detente is possible. Mankind can and must block the way leading to a nuclear catastrophe," the communique of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference says.

The documents of this conference are imbued with a spirit of historical optimism. One of them is the Appeal of the Warsaw Pact States to the NATO Member-States and All European Countries that contains the program for the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. This new large-scale initiative of the fraternal countries is inseparably linked with the program for the elimination of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons by the end of the current century as set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement, and it complements and expands it. In essence, both these documents are a master plan for delivering mankind from the nuclear threat, from ruinous material preparations for a new world war, and the race to produce the most lethal means of waging it.

The Soviet Union, as emphasized at the joint session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities, favors ending the race in both strategic arms and all arms in general, lowering the level of military confrontation, and ensuring conditions that preclude nuclear war.

The Warsaw Pact states new initiative clears the way for the implementation of the program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. It eliminates the obstacle invented by the West in order to justify its negative stance, that is the mythical threat from the allegedly superior conventional arms and armed forces of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries. In addition, the fraternal countries proposals have a role of their own to play.

In order to fully evaluate them, it is necessary to take into account the importance of European security for peace worldwide. It is here in Europe where the 3-million-strong groupings of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO confront each other. Furthermore, the approximate equilibrium that exists between them is maintained at an extraordinarily high and dangerous level.

Time dictates that immediate and effective measures to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe be taken as a matter of urgency. This would lead to a radical improvement of the situation not just on the European Continent but throughout the world.

In this connection the Warsaw Pact states propose that, as a preliminary step, a one-shot mutual reduction of the numerical strength of both alliances by 100,000-150,000 men each be carried out within 1-2 years. Within the framework of this measure, the reduction of tactical strike aircraft would be of great importance since it would mean a lessening of the danger of the surprise attack.

The appeal emphasizes that the Warsaw Pact states are prepared to agree to further substantial mutual reductions in order to achieve a situation such that by the beginning of the nineties ground forces and the tactical strike air forces of the states of the military political alliances that confront each other are reduced by approximately 25 percent compared to the present level. This reduction would total more than half a million men on either side and together more than a million men. Simultaneously with the conventional arms, operational-tactical nuclear arms with a range (radius of action) up to 1,000 km would also be subject to reduction. The geographical zone of the plan of action set forth in the appeal is the territory of all of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The need for prompt and substantial reductions in conventional arms as a matter of urgency is being dictated by the danger which these weapons present to mankind. As is known, the NATO countries' armies are now equipped with the most varied types of conventional weapons and combat hardware. However, the Atlanticists are persistently seeking a "wonder-weapon" which, while rating as a conventional weapons would match nuclear weapons in terms of their destructive capacity. Certain progress in this direction has already been achieved: Certain types of conventional arms approach tactical means of mass destruction in terms of their combat parameters.

Taking artillery, for instance. Whereas now its range totals 30-32 km, in the future, according to the Western press, it will be increased to 40 km, and in the longer term even to 70 km, that is it will be doubled through the improvement of artillery systems (using new liquid propellants, increasing the initial speed of the projectile, improving its aerodynamic qualities, and so forth). Precision of aim will also improve.

Mortar weapons are changing their "job." The main purpose of mortar bombs was hitting personnel in the open or in shelters. Now antitank small- and medium-calibre (81-120mm) mortar bombs are being developed. Their range is 5-7 km which is 1.5-2 times more than the range of existing antitank systems. The bomb homes in on the target by means of a laser semi-active self-homing head or an infra-red or radar device (which needs no illumination) and hits the tank from above. Such mines are being developed [sozdayutsya] in Great Britain (Merlin), in the FRG (Bussard), and in other countries.

Aircraft munitions produced on a similarly massive scale -- second and third generation guided bombs, including area bombs, which are 10 and more times more effective than ordinary gravitational bombs -- are also being improved. They can hit targets in any weather conditions, in any visibility, they can be dropped from minimal heights, and have a free flight range of 40-70 km.

Even strategic delivery vehicles, and not just the existing B-52 bombers but also the new supersonic B-1B bombers, are being adapted for conventional munitions. Such a bomber can carry from 38 to 128 conventional guided bombs (or 86-101 cluster bombs) that are very accurate.

This is by no means the full list of the latest conventional arms whose production is being expedited in NATO's military forge. The merchants of death are utilizing the latest achievements of science and technology. The automation and computerization of control systems and the introduction of robotics have led to the emergence of not only pilotless aircraft but also of ground combat hardware -- tanks, self-propelled guns, and other unmanned combat means.

The dangerousness of the modern conventional arms is compounded by NATO's new strategic concept, the so-called "Rogers Plan." It orients the North Atlantic bloc toward unleashing and waging aggressive actions with precisely these weapons at the initial stage and, in particular, toward delivering preemptive, accurate, and powerful strikes at the opponents' second and even third echelons and rear services.

In light of what has been said here, the timeliness of the Warsaw Pact states' new initiative in the sphere of the armed forces and conventional arms reduction becomes particularly clear. It presents a chance for Europe and the world to check the arms race, to revive détente, and to ensure reliable security for all countries without exception. This chance must not be missed.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1452

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS REPORTS SPEECHES AT MBFR ON WARSAW PACT APPEAL

Hungarian Delegate

PM201531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Vienna Talks"]

[Text] Vienna, 19 Jun -- Janos Nagy, head of the Hungarian delegation, addressed today's regular plenary session of the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe. He devoted special attention to the socialist countries' initiative for a large-scale reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- advanced at the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact states Political Consultative Committee. Dwelling in detail on the specific provisions of the Warsaw Pact states' appeal, he particularly emphasized that the proposals which it contains lend additional weight to and reinforce the Soviet program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Concerning the Vienna talks, the Hungarian delegation head leveled well-reasoned criticism at the Western countries' position and pointed out that its unconstructive and unrealistic nature is the chief brake on the Vienna forum. He displayed the advantages of the socialist countries' proposal of 20 February 1986, which provides a real opportunity to achieve a positive result in Vienna.

In conclusion, the Hungarian representative expressed the hope that the Western participants in the talks will review their position in a constructive way.

The speech by the NATO countries' representative boiled down to attempts to justify the arbitrary and excessively bloated verification [kontrol] system which the West is trying to impose at the talks.

Polish Delegate

LD261421 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Vienna June 26 TASS -- A regular plenary meeting at the talks on the mutual reduction of the armed forces and armaments in central Europe has been held here. On behalf of the Warsaw Treaty member-states it was addressed by Stanislaw Przygodzki head of the Polish delegation at the talks.

He spoke in detail about the significance of the address of the Warsaw Treaty member-states to the NATO countries, to all the European countries, which contained a program of the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, and emphasized that the initiatives put forward at the Budapest meeting had opened up new ways to stopping the arms race and reversing it. According to S. Przygodzki, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party stated that Poland would further do its utmost for the realization of the proposals contained in the address.

The head of the Polish delegation critically assessed the stand of the NATO countries at the Vienna talks and pointed out that some of its elements were obviously incompatible with the basic principle of the non-inflicting damage on security. He said that in a nuclear age genuine security could not be ensured by one of the sides at the expense of the other. S. Przygodzki pointed out that durable security could be achieved only through the bringing down, and not raising, of the level of military confrontation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1452

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRENCH PAPER VIEWS GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

PM161049 Paris LE MONDE in French 13 Jun 86 p 1

[Editorial: "Mr Gorbachev's Frantic Activity"]

[Text] Undaunted by the very poor response so far, Mr Gorbachev is tirelessly pursuing his "peace offensive." The latest proposal put forth by the Warsaw Pact on a reduction of conventional forces in Europe reopens another chapter in arms control negotiations, but does not make things clearer.

Basically, some positive elements have been confirmed, particularly the idea of extending the area affected by the reductions "from the Atlantic to the Urals." This is not so much a belated tribute to the Gaullist concept of a Europe reconciled with itself as a concession to good sense in the sphere of military balance; to be credible to the West Europeans, who are in the front line against the Red Army's might, any reduction in forces in Europe must be accompanied by a reduction in forces in a large part of the USSR's territory. The same is true of monitoring, to which the Budapest proposal does not really add any new elements but stipulates Moscow's acceptance of the principle of on-the-spot inspections.

However, there is reason to wonder what has happened to the plan on which the two camps had more or less reached agreement in the framework of the Vienna MBFR negotiations--the unequal reduction of Soviet and American troops alone in an initial phase. The new Budapest plan does not mention this, but it is true that the reduction of "100,000 to 150,000 men in 1 or 2 years" which it involves could include the much smaller contingents (11,500 for the USSR, 5,000-6,000 for the United States) discussed in Vienna.

There is even greater confusion about the form which the negotiations ought to take. Arms negotiation forums have increased with the different phases of detente which have followed each other over the past 25 years: Negotiations between the Americans and Soviets in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons; the MBFR negotiations in Vienna; negotiations on "confidence-building measures" between the two alliances in Stockholm; negotiations on chemical weapons, again in Geneva but in the UN framework...

Even experts become lost in this maze, because all these different areas are closely linked. Any prospect of eliminating medium-range nuclear

missiles makes it even more necessary to have an agreement aimed at restoring a balance in Europe in the conventional and chemical spheres. This will not be achieved unless a minimum of confidence is restored between the two military systems.... The Warsaw Pact is not helping to solve the problem, because it is proposing to set up yet another all-European type of forum without eliminating the other forums.

However, the wave of Soviet proposals opens up a new phase in a process which had been at a complete standstill for 5 or 6 years. Something ought to emerge from all this frantic activity one day.

/6091

CSO: 5200/2705

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW VIEWS SHULTZ' DIFFERENCES WITH ASEAN OVER NFZ

Economic, Military Issues

BK271054 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1300 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Vladimir Korolev commentary]

[Text] The main problem discussed during the ASEAN foreign ministers' meeting in Manila was the group's economic problem. ASEAN countries feel apprehensive about the discriminatory policies of developed capitalist nations. U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz also visited Manila. Listeners should not be confused about the intent of the U.S. envoy's trip to Manila; it was not made to extend assistance to ASEAN nations to overcome their economic trouble.

As could be seen by press reports, trade with Southeast Asian nations seems unimportant to the nation across the vast ocean. To the U.S. State Department leader the most important issue is how to tie the ASEAN nations to its neoglobalist policy. According to Washington's program, the only instrument to implement its policy is the Pacific community which is currently being formed; in other words, Washington desires to set up a military bloc to intervene in domestic affairs in the region. Henceforth, the United States plans to draw ASEAN together with Japan, South Korea, and its other allies into its military alliance. But the ASEAN countries, who recently met and made practical proposals in Manila, openly expressed their regret and stressed their strong desire to turn Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and a zone free of nuclear weapons. What ASEAN viewed as important is to free itself from the danger posed by the U.S. nuclear threat through practical actions. For example, about 1,000 cities and towns, comprising more than 40 percent of Japan's total population, have declared themselves as nuclear-free areas. Meanwhile, 13 South Pacific countries have made similar declarations and have intensified their protests against nuclear buildup.

Two tendencies are clearly taking shape in the Asia-Pacific region. One of them is to increase the number of conventional as well as nuclear weapons, to set up military blocs, and to force one's whims and fancies on others. This course is being undertaken by Washington and its allies. The other tendency, unlike the first, is to favor economic cooperation, equal rights and good-neighborly relations. Both these tendencies were apparent during the Manila meeting.

18 July 1986

Relations Seen Strained

OW280504 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 27 Jun 86

[From Novosti newscast, Yuriy Rostov commentary]

[Text] Sharp differences between the United States and the Southeast Asia countries have become apparent with Secretary of State Shultz' visit to the Philippines. Our commentary follows:

[Rostov] The main purpose of Shultz' visit to Manila was to hold talks with the participants in the ASEAN foreign ministers conference. This group includes Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand.

The secretary of state had a fairly cool reception in Manila, and not only from the people of the Philippine capital. During his talks, contradictions came to the fore, above all contradictions on the question of nuclear arms.

On more than one occasion, Shultz repeated his position that U.S. nuclear arsenals in Asia help restrain the Soviet Union and even play a stabilizing role in the region. The ASEAN ministers, on the other hand, expressed a completely opposite view. They noted the need to create a nuclear free zone in Southeast Asia.

Certainly there is a big gap separating the nuclear free zone idea and its realization. However, the ASEAN position can seriously complicate the course of U.S. aggressive policies in the region. For example, New Zealand spoke out recently against the presence in the South Pacific of weapons of mass destruction and proceeded to ban U.S. warships carrying nuclear arms from entering its ports. This decision led to the sharpest crisis in the military relations between the two countries.

Similarly, should the current trend continue, the same could happen in relations between Washington and the ASEAN countries, above all between Washington and the Philippines where the largest U.S. bases outside the United States are located. This is clearly indicated by the publication in Manila during the Shultz talks of the Philippine foreign minister's interview stating that the country's leadership intends to press for a ban on U.S. nuclear arms deployment in the Philippines.

'U.S. Bid Rebuffed'

LD020455 Moscow TASS in English 0038 GMT 2 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 1 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz returned from a ten-day tour which took him to the countries of the Asian-Pacific region. He attended the Manila Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN countries, the United States, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and also representatives of the Common Market.

During the conference Shultz made attempts to force on its participants the U.S. stance on major political issues and bolster the U.S. influence in Southeast Asia and the Pacific. Upon returning from the trip, neither the secretary of state himself nor his assistants assessed the results of the visit which, in the judgement of news analysts, is evidence of the failure of the attempts to enlist support of the U.S. interventionist course.

Manila July 1 TASS - The U.S. bid to shunt ASEAN onto the tracks of militarization was rebuffed by the members of this regional grouping.

An annual conference of the foreign ministers of the Southeast Asian association, which unites Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Brunei, held here, passed a decision of pressing for proclaiming Southeast Asia a zone free of nuclear weapons.

Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, addressing the conference, said that setting up such a zone would allow the ASEAN countries to avoid the lot of the Pentagon's nuclear hostages. He stressed that it would contribute towards enhancing security of the states in the region.

This decision, which was recorded in the joint communique adopted by the conference, aroused the United States' discontent. U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz was the first to express it when he said that the peace initiative of the Southeast Asian developing states was erroneous.

During his visit to Manila the top-ranking White House emissary tried to substantiate in every way the thesis of the usefulness of the U.S. military presence in the region. He also lashed out at New Zealand which dared to ban visits by U.S. combatant ships equipped with nuclear weapons to its ports and territorial waters. At a meeting with New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange here Shultz stated that the United States would withdraw its defence obligations to New Zealand.

The attempts by the United States to force militarization on ASEAN and South Pacific countries failed, however, to produce the desired results. Mankind keeps the memory of the U.S. nuclear genocide in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA writes. It emphasized that ASEAN would not allow the United States to convert Southeast Asia into a springboard of a nuclear conflict and strongly condemned Washington's attempts to force its concepts of war and peace on sovereign states.

David Lange stated that the New Zealand Government's policy was to prevent nuclear weapons from being introduced in the country. He said the New Zealand population did not view the defence of New Zealand with nuclear weapons as a guarantee of security.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1456

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S GAN VIEWS U.S. PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR TEST BAN

PM301105 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Vitaliy Gan article: "Washington's Servants of the People"]

[Text] Washington, June -- Comparisons are very revealing. That day in May confirmed this ancient truth. From very early in the morning, as soon as it became known that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was to speak on Soviet television, the correspondents' center was in a state of siege by telephone.

American acquaintances and strangers and activists from antiwar groups were calling. "Is it true that the Soviet Union is to announce an extension of the moratorium?" -- that question, which I was asked by T. Ferrera, coordinator of the coalition "National Campaign for a Nuclear Arms Freeze," was of concern to all those who called. American awaited the news from Moscow impatiently...

The atmosphere in the White House was quite different; an "Olympian calm" prevailed there. The key to the enigma of the ostentatious lack of emotion was unexpectedly and unpredictably provided by White House spokesman L. Speakes. When the correspondents assembled for the routine press conference asked him how the administration intends to respond to the expected statement, Speakes willingly shared his view with them: "If the statement is, in our view, significant, I will come out and say something. If we consider it insignificant, we will issue a written response..."

Having given these "guidelines," a few hours later -- after the Soviet leader's remarks -- people in the White House were rubbing their hands in satisfaction. The representatives of the U.S. "big press," having received a written response from the administration, uncomplainingly followed its lead in evaluating the announcement from Moscow.

Its importance was obvious to any more or less objective observer. The extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions to 6 August and the proposal to reach an agreement on a ban on nuclear tests were profoundly consonant with the interests and sentiments of the people of the United States and other countries. However, in accordance with the long established practice of Washington figures, the obvious, if it comes from the USSR, is regarded as, at best, improbable. Usually it is either simply rejected or hushed up. In its statement in connection with the speech by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the U.S. Administration decided to ignore the moratorium question entirely. The American "monopolies of the word" reacted accordingly, acting strictly according to the White House "guidelines." The majority of newspapers did not even bother to mention the Soviet initiatives in the

headlines. In general, "independent, objective" journalists concluded in their reports, as if by carbon copies, that the extension of the moratorium was dreamed up by the Soviet Union as an attempt to "distract attention from the nuclear accident at Chernobyl."

It was no accident that this episode sprang to mind. On the banks of the Potomac now one can hear absurd assertions, each more ridiculous than the last, that "people in the Soviet Union have virtually no influence on their government" and that "it is very important from the outset to draw a distinction between the people of the Soviet Union and the government which rules them." At the same time, naturally, the Americans are told that they should be grateful to the present administration, which supposedly reflects their will in its policy, takes account of their vital interests, and so forth.

Of course, it is always dangerous to underestimate and belittle the intellectual level of the opponent. But in this case official Washington's "arguments" do not stand up to any criticism. Especially since today, it is probably easier than ever before to detect the involvement in this slander campaign against the Soviet Union of those who would like to deny their own people the right to think independently and who dream of nothing less than the mass fooling of the nation. Those who, incidentally, were once aptly nicknamed by their own fellow citizens a "government of millionaires for millionaires and by millionaires."

It is clear that this scarcely flattering description contains the unambiguous opinion of Americans about whether or not the Republican administration is the "government of the people," as it tries to represent itself.

There would simply not be room to set forth, however briefly, the biographies and "track records" of the present incumbents of Washington offices, who joined the ruling elite by tracks and byways paved with green bills from the safes of industrial, agrarian, and banking monopolies. And while in the last 6 years the country has been the witness and at the time time the victim of record upsurges in unemployment, poverty and indigence, and an epidemic of hunger, it is doubtless not the interests of the people that are the prime concern of the hypocritical "guardians of the nation" from Washington.

This aspect obviously merits a separate discussion. But at the moment I would like to ask: What, specifically, has caused the present torrent of anti-Soviet fabrications, insinuations, and flagrant inventions? Why is the disinformation machine currently working at full speed?

The answers to all these questions can be found partially in the indisputable fact that the series of peace initiatives recently put forward by the USSR in the arms control sphere placed the U.S. Administration in an extremely difficult position. A wind blew away Washington's peacemaker clothes and the emperor turned out to be naked, with nothing to offer in opposition to the concrete, balanced Soviet proposals except for uncontrollable malice and clumsy excuses.

"In all the 40 years that I have been studying the Soviet Union," M. Shulman, a former State Department adviser and well-known expert on the Soviet Union, said recently, "I cannot remember a time when it was so seriously committed to holding talks with us."

That remark comes from a man who is in every respect far from sympathetic toward our country and can be admitted to be striking. It reflects the conviction that is spreading

and gaining strength in the United States, and, incidentally, in other countries, that the American Administration is the main obstacle on the path to nuclear disarmament.

Yes, that is what many people think, including the Americans who have already obtained from the local organs of power in 4 states and more than 100 cities resolutions in support of a mutual renunciation of nuclear tests by the USSR and the United States. They want to be heard by those who assume the responsibility for declaring loudly to all the world: "We, the American people..."

One recalls how firmly and with what conviction the New York Bishop D. White rejected the reprimands for "interference in politics" which were addressed "from above" to the council of bishops of the U.S. Methodist Church: "We are citizens of the United States. We have a right to express our view and as citizens we uphold that right. We call into question the policy of our country." The clergymen were subject to persecution due to their message to millions of parishioners condemning the administration for the "star wars" program and for militarist paranoia.

The flock heard their words. And the White House, as always, feigned deafness, stubbornly claiming that the moratorium is merely a Soviet propaganda tactic. The administration prefers the sophisms of A. Holms, director of politico-military affairs at the State Department, who told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "The Soviet Union knows very well that we cannot adopt a moratorium on nuclear tests." Why not, one wonders? WASHINGTON POST correspondents (F. Khayatta) and R. Atkinson did not find it difficult to get an answer. After visiting the Livermore laboratory, one of the Californian weapons development centers, a couple of weeks ago, they reported that the atmosphere prevailing there is one of an "animation unknown in recent decades." Laboratory employees, the correspondents wrote, are all but singing hymns to the "potential of the third-generation arms" fostered by the Reagan administration.

It is a question of creating weapons for the "star wars" program, all kinds of weapons of destruction using x-rays, gamma rays, electromagnetic bombs, and microwave guns, seemingly borrowed from Hollywood science fiction writers. It is this work, the journalists noted, that is the main reason for the refusal to join in the Soviet Union's ban on nuclear tests. And now, at that, can there be any question of stopping tests, when tens if not hundreds of "exotic" types of third-generation weapons have "booked" the Livermore and other similar laboratories, as well as the Nevada test range, for many years ahead?

THE WASHINGTON POST journalists, without intending to, also found in Livermore the answer to the question why absurdities permeated with malice are being poured out in relation to the USSR. It is apposite to recall that both the President and his advisers came to Washington from California, which not only leads the United States in weapons production, but is also the undisputed patrimony of the military-industrial complex. The state has more than 8,500 corporations that are subcontractors for the Pentagon. It is no accident that right back at the beginning of Reagan's presidency the newspaper PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER wrote that in Washington "there only remains one approach to everything -- the military approach."

It is hard to imagine how anyone in his right mind can claim that the militarist fever, which is profitable for the military-industrial complex and has had the country in its grip all these years, does not have a decisive influence on policy. It dictates Washington's approach to the Soviet peace initiatives, an insincere, unconstructive,

and usually negative approach. On one hand, for instance, they declare the intention to "carefully study" the recent Soviet initiatives, and on the other they fan the flames of the slander campaign against the Soviet Union.

"The administration," I was told by E. Snyder, one of the leaders of the Quaker organization Friends Committee on National Legislation, "needs to maintain among Americans a high level of fear and distrust toward the USSR so that they will continue to pay for the invention of more and more destructive arms and so as to make them support aggressive acts."

One can hardly fail to agree with that. Anti-Sovietism cripples human reason and poisons the mind, creating an atmosphere of hostility toward everything the Soviet Union says and does. And for the military-industrial corporations and their political agents, that is "just what the doctor ordered." Especially now that the administration is losing support both among the public and even in Congress. The other day the House of Representatives adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution demanding that the White House observer SALT.II. Also on Capitol Hill, draft laws have been submitted for examination by both chambers making provision for a ban on appropriations for the manufacture of arms that fall outside the bounds set by the treaty.

The rhetoric of professional demagogues is no longer as effective as before, finding fewer and fewer naive admirers. After all, you cannot simply shrug aside THE WASHINGTON POST figures according to which only 17 percent of Americans are now in favor of increasing military spending. And since that is so, the new paroxysm of anti-Soviet hysteria is not surprising.

But can one ignore the fact that more and more Americans are aware of the true state of affairs? The peace marches, the resolutions of senators and congressmen in defense of SALT II, the petitions protesting against "star wars"? Hardly. So it is obvious that the Washington figures' "diversionary" maneuvers are misfiring.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1456

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S., UK CARRY OUT NUCLEAR TEST IN NEVADA

TASS Report

LD252235 Moscow TASS in English 2221 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 26 TASS -- The United States set off another nuclear explosion on the Nevada proving ground. According to a spokesman of the U.S. Department of Energy, the yield of an explosion detonated during a "joint" U.S.-British test codenamed "Darwin", was up to 150 kilotons. This is the sixth nuclear explosion this year officially declared by the USA and the 13th since the time the Soviet Union declared the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions last August. Despite the protests of the American and international public, Washington stubbornly refuses to follow suit and stop nuclear tests.

PRAVDA Comments

PM261620 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Nikolay Kurdyumov "Observer's Opinion" under general heading "Blowing up the Path Toward Peace"]

[Text] Washington persists in its refusal to take a real step along the path of curbing the nuclear arms race, a step that could be achieved by ending nuclear tests. Ignoring the goodwill of the Soviet Union, which has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 6 August 1986 and proposed that an agreement be reached on banning these tests, the United States has carried out a new provocative action, this time jointly with Britain.

The explosion of a British nuclear device in Nevada is yet another confirmation of the U.S. Administration's express unwillingness to fully realize the extent of danger that hangs over mankind and to transform the opportunity for saving our planet from the threat of a catastrophe into a reality.

That is not all. The new test has also demonstrated the stubborn desire not just of Washington, but also of some NATO members not to permit a slackening of the arms race, a relaxation of tension, and an effort to achieve military superiority over the socialist world.

This dangerous course unmasks its exponents as the main culprits of the nuclear arsenal buildup and of the deterioration of the international situation. In taking this step the United States, together with its closest ally, has yet again thrown down a

challenge to the world community, which has appealed to the West to follow the USSR's example.

Furthermore this was done at the very time when thanks to the constructive peace policy of the USSR and the other fraternal socialist countries preconditions have been created for saving mankind from the threat of war and when a specific way to achieve this has been indicated. It is no accident that, addressing an urgent appeal to the U.S. Government to abandon its negative approach to a total ban on nuclear tests, the recent congress of the Socialist International noted in its Lima Manifesto that suspending and subsequently banning all nuclear weapon tests once and for all should serve as proof of the relevant governments' serious attitude toward arms control.

The continuation of the nuclear explosions in Nevada together with the U.S. Administration's declared intention not to observe SALT II in the future make it abundantly clear that the White House's declarations about its "devotion to the cause of nuclear arms reduction" are no more than a smoke screen, no more than yet another attempt to camouflage the course toward arms buildup that the administration has adopted.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1456

RELATED ISSUES

GORBACHEV SENDS REPLY TO JAPAN'S NAKASONE

LD010935 Moscow TASS in English 0917 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Text] Tokyo July 1 TASS -- The Soviet Union stands for the development and strengthening of all-round ties with Japan -- in the political, commercial, economic, scientific, technological and cultural fields, and will use every possibility for that purpose. This is the Soviet Union's firm policy which takes account of the vital interests of the Soviet and Japanese peoples, said a reply message from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone of Japan.

During a meeting here today Soviet ambassador to Japan Nikolay Solovyev handed over the message addressed to the head of the Japanese Government to Shintaro Abe, minister of foreign affairs of Japan.

In his message the Soviet leader pointed out that the results of the recent visit of the minister of foreign affairs of Japan to the U.S.S.R. were positively appraised in the Soviet Union, and noted that they were a graphic demonstration of how important it was for Soviet and Japanese statesmen to meet more often, to conduct a frank and honest discussion of problems of concern to the entire world and to both countries.

Mikhail Gorbachev highly assessed the two rounds of talks held by the ministers of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R. and Japan this year and emphasized that the meetings had reaffirmed the indisputable truth that "if both sides think realistically, come to realize their tremendous responsibility before the living and succeeding generations, and demonstrate the striving to understand each other, concrete practical results will be fast in coming."

These talks "give grounds for arriving at the conclusion -- the road toward the establishment of political dialogue on which we are embarking now is the correct and promising direction in every respect," the message said.

"Solving questions of bilateral relations, we, however, cannot disregard their international aspect," the message went on. "We understand full well your concern over the lack of progress in the sphere of disarmament and, above all, nuclear disarmament. It is correct that much depends on the Soviet Union and the U.S. But it is likewise correct that now it is insufficient to watch the course of Soviet-American negotiations: Efforts should be made to promote their progress. Actions are needed, and vigorous actions at that, in order to rid humankind of the constant fear of destruction."

"The termination of nuclear explosions," the message emphasized, "could become the first step in this direction. Japan knows what a nuclear explosion is and what its consequences for the people are."

Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the confidence that Japan could say its weighty word and that many would heed its voice.

The message said that the Soviet Union and Japan could accomplish much together in order to make the current year, that the United Nations had proclaimed the international year of peace, a year of an all-out offensive on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Having thanked the prime minister for reiterating the invitation to visit Japan, Mikhail Gorbachev replied that "in the near future such a possibility may present itself." He also said that a visit by the head of the Japanese Government would be welcomed in the U.S.S.R.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1447

18 July 1986

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE SECRETARY BIRYUKOVA ON ARMS ISSUES

WA271240 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 21 May 86 pp 1-2

[KIRTAG report on CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.P. Biryukova 20 May meeting with electorate].

[Excerpts] The indestructible unity of party and people and the fidelity of the working people of Soviet Kirgizstan to the general line of the CPSU charted by the 27th party congress were demonstrated by the meeting on 20 May in the capital of the republic of the electorate of Frunzenskiy-Oktyabrskiy Electoral Okrug 322 for elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities with candidate for member for this okrug Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

All the speakers expressed the firm confidence that on voting day the electorate would vote unanimously for the candidate for member of the highest organ of state power.

A.P. Biryukova, who was given a warm welcome by those present, delivered a speech. She said:

Permit me to thank you and the whole electorate of the Frunzenskiy-Oktyabrskiy Electoral Okrug for the trust which you are showing in me in nominating me candidate for member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I perceive this as an expression of trust in the policy line which is being pursued by our Leninist Party in a most critical period of the country's development.

Having dwelt on questions of the CPSU's foreign policy, the speaker emphasized that its cornerstone was and remains the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and struggle for a world without wars and weapons. Our party's Leninist peace-loving strategy was further developed in M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986 and in the Central Committee Political Report to the 27th congress.

The main component of this strategy is ridding the world of the crushing burden of the arms race.

As you know, our country has taken a series of practical steps aimed at an emphatic recovery of the international atmosphere. The biggest of them undoubtedly remains the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. Extending it three times and underpinning it by the proposal for an immediate start on negotiations concerning a complete halt to nuclear tests, we have been waiting for almost 10 months for positive impulses from the American side. As yet the response to us and the whole world community have been more explosions in Nevada and cynical statements from the Washington administration scorning world public opinion.

A month ago in Berlin, at the SED congress, M.S. Gorbachev spelled out the practical aspects of our proposal concerning the creation of an all-embracing system of international security. The specifying emphasis was put on the problem of all-European security and the principle of a fair, gradual lowering of the levels of conventional arms. Once again the reaction of the NATO countries cannot be called positive.

In advocating the creation of an all-embracing system of international security we consider that a natural movement toward such a state of the world would be the achievement of a certain mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States as the powers with the largest nuclear arsenals. A considerable part of the way toward this has been covered by the Soviet Union. It is now up to the United States. Unfortunately, we have yet to discern the U.S. willing to act in this direction. On the contrary, it has recently done much that is in no way consonant with this goal and runs counter to the fundamental accords arrived at in Geneva.

The imperial ambitions of the United States and its disregard for the interests of peace and security were manifested in the barbaric aggression against Libya. Our position on this issue has been clearly expressed: State terrorism is impermissible and can never be justified. We categorically condemn the policy of blatant pressure, blackmail and interventions that has found concentrated expression in the doctrine of neoglobalism. With its help U.S. imperialism would like to impose on the peoples of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Libya, Angola, Mozambique and certain other countries reactionary games that the U.S. has rejected.

The United States and its allies have tried in the most outrageous and spiteful way to use the accident in Chernobyl as a pretext for discrediting the Soviet Union and its foreign policy, lessening the impact of our peace initiatives and simultaneously blunting the criticism of their own militarist policy. This entire nasty to-do, which is the height of immorality, has revealed even more distinctly the character of those who for the sake of dubious political capital are prepared to jeer even at human misfortune. As M.S. Gorbachev observed in his speech on Central Television, whereas for all sober-minded people the Chernobyl tragedy was an argument in support of a multiplication of efforts for nuclear disarmament, the ruling circles of the United States saw it as a convenient opportunity to place one further mine beneath East-West relations and give the go-ahead for further military preparations.

The unconstructive line of the United States is also being manifested as clearly as can be at the Geneva negotiations, in attempts to undermine the fundamental accords in the sphere of limiting and reducing nuclear arms and in the accelerated development of work on the "star wars" program. To judge by everything, Washington is as yet incapable of renouncing hopes of achieving military superiority.

Nonetheless, the objective possibility of and real basis for an improvement in Soviet-American relations exists if the White House displays a realistic approach.

Whatever the current situation on the world stage, we are convinced that, given the present level of development of civilization, new political thinking can and must prevail. Our party and country are doing and will continue to do everything necessary for this.

In all our undertakings -- both domestic and international -- we enjoy the broad support of the fraternal socialist countries. The party congresses that have been held in them provide, like the 27th CPSU Congress, a precise and firm answer to the challenge of the times.

While reflecting the singularities of each country, this answer is fundamentally and basically one and ensues from our common communist world outlook. It has been dictated by the common goals of the utmost strengthening of the socialist community and the creation of a world in which people are delivered from the nuclear threat and can work calmly, bring up children without fear and live in an atmosphere of good-neighborliness and cooperation.

A.P. Biryukova said in conclusion:

Today there is no more important task than practical implementation of the plans determined by the 27th CPSU Congress.

The times demand that each citizen concertedly embark on work that is selfless and difficult and at the same time such as cannot fail to inspire by its thrust toward new qualitative frontiers -- a rise in public well-being and the strengthening of the might of our motherland.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1447

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET MILITARY POLITICAL CHIEF INTERVIEWED ON WWII LESSONS

LD210532 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Interview with Army General Aleksey Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, by correspondent Yakov Smirnov, on the occasion of a 20 June conference at the USSR Defense Ministry's Institute of Military History to commemorate the start of World War II, on 21 June in Moscow--recorded]

[Text] [Smirnov] Aleksey Dmitriyevich, tell us, if you will, what are the objectives of the conference that you are holding today?

[Lizichev] We have the following principal objectives: to show in greater depth the aggressive essence of the perfidious attack on the Soviet Union by fascist Germany; to reveal the party's activities to mobilize the country for the repulsion of fascist aggression and for achieving victory in the Great Fatherland War; to step up criticism of bourgeois fabrications concerning the causes and start of the war by fascism against the Soviet Union; and, finally, to analyze the lessons that come from the present-day struggle against the threat of war.

One of our important objectives is to demonstrate the significance of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress on military matters and military-patriotic education for the practical work of the officers and political staff of the Army and Navy. We arranged the proceedings of the conference in such a way as to ensure that the analysis of the events that led to the start of war and of the first days of the war itself does not merely look back to the past. To quote Vladimir Ilich Lenin, such an analysis is needed for a correct assessment of the present and fearless foreknowledge of the future.

The scientific reports and papers substantially augmented our knowledge. The latest achievements in scientific historical research were actively circulated, too. There was a good analysis of the practice of work, which proved itself justified, in training the personnel of the country's Armed Forces on the eve of and during the course of the war. The conference, developing and reinforcing the experience accumulated in connection with the celebrations of the great victory last year will become an important event in the military-patriotic education of Soviet people and servicemen of the Army and fleet.

[Smirnov] I would also like to ask you to tell our radio listeners why it is so important and necessary for us to recall that date, to hold conferences, and conduct meetings of war veterans and servicemen with young people.

[Lizichev] In recalling in our mind's eye those harsh days, we are looking ahead, so that those days may never be repeated, so that the Soviet people may be protected reliably, so that the Soviet people can labor in peace.

Since the war, new generations have grown up who know about the war only through books and stories and films. But the war is in the heart of the whole generation which is alive today and will live in the future. The war defended the honor, freedom, and independence of our motherland. The war demonstrated all the advantages of our order; the war demonstrated all the possibilities of our Soviet man and of all the peoples of the countries of socialism. This is the first thing.

And secondly: One must speak of this because today all our proposals -- whatever proposals are put forward by the Central Committee of our party, on behalf of our state, by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the general secretary of the Central Committee of our party -- all these proposals of ours meet with one single response from imperialism -- no, no, no! Imperialism is preparing war. The United States of America is presently doing everything in order to attain superiority over the Soviet Union, in order to dictate its will to us, in order to impose upon all other countries the line of its own dictate, in order to suppress the national liberation movements and other progressive movements. We cannot fail to take account of this. And our people must know that, unfortunately, a real danger of war exists. We are not in favor of in some way inflating this topic now. And we are opposed to those who consider that war can be unleashed. We believe that there is no fatal inevitability of war: It can be averted, there is power to do this. And this is first and foremost the might of the Land of the Soviets, the might of the entire socialist community, it is the might of all progressive forces.

And we must today, taking account of the policy of imperialism, first and foremost that of the United States of America and the NATO bloc, prepare our own people to defend the achievements of socialism. Our Army and our fleet must be prepared in such a way as to be ready at any moment to repulse an aggressor in a worthy manner. The entire activity of the servicemen of the Army and fleet has been, is, and will be subordinated to this.

The last war is for us not a simple fact of history. The further it recedes in time, the more mature appears the grandeur of the great deed accomplished by the Soviet people and its Armed Forces under the leadership of the party of Lenin for the sake of victory and its huge significance for the destiny of socialism, progress, and peace. For the Soviet people, war and victory are fused into one, and they will never be just history. They are our present and future. Victory in the most just of all the wars that our people ever had to wage is a subject of nationwide pride, a mighty factor in the upbringing of new generations, the creators and defenders of socialism, and a terrible warning to those who would wish once again to test our firmness.

Some people in the West call for the last war to be forgotten, as well as its results and lessons, and for the contribution of the Soviet Union in achieving victories over fascism to be belittled. It is given to no one to do this. Counterposed to the policy of peace and security conducted by the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries of socialism is the policy of militarism, social revanchism, and expansion. Only an absolute rejection of modern realities, as was stressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of our party, can explain the U.S. leaders' reliance on brute force, the nuclear fist, and terrorist brigandage, thickly entangled with ideological intolerance and hatred. Unable to offer the peoples

a peaceful historic alternative, the military-political elite of the United States of America and NATO are whipping up a militarist hysteria which is designed to put a brake on the historical process, freeze the development of socialism, and deflect us from the course of the party's 27th congress. Hence follows the conclusion: Supreme political and military vigilance in regard to the intrigues of imperialism is essential. One must fight against war before it starts. History has once again convincingly demonstrated that the new social order is indestructible. Its vitality rests upon a fundamentally new basis, upon the great advantages of socialism, which are consciously made use of in the activity of the party, the state, and the entire people, upon supreme moral and political qualities of our people.

And we recall again and again the immortal words of Vladimir Ilich Lenin to the effect that the people are invincible when the workers and peasants understand and feel that they are defending their soviet power.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1447

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S CHAZOV INTERVIEWED AT HIROSHIMA SYMPOSIUM

PM191336 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov dispatch under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview":
"To Live or Die Together"]

[Excerpt] Tokyo -- That is the title of a scientific symposium that opened in Hiroshima on Thursday. Participating in it is a delegation of the international movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War headed by the movement's cochairman -- Academician Ye. Chazov and Prof B. Lown. Before the sessions began Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov talked with our correspondent:

"In the present fragile and interdependent world it is simply criminal to remain indifferent to the chief problem common to all mankind -- the elimination of the nuclear threat. Awareness of this idea lies at the basis of our movement, which today is supported by tens of thousands of medics on all continents. The consolidation of common efforts in the struggle against this threat and the galvanization of action in defense of peace -- these are the priority tasks which we set ourselves. Our organization's recent congress in Cologne decided to conduct a broad campaign to propagandize the movement's ideas and to familiarize the international public with the disastrous consequences of nuclear war. Symposiums in Moscow and Beijing and this meeting in Hiroshima have been organized within the framework of this campaign. Trips to Spain, Cuba, and New Zealand lie ahead.

"Our starting point, on which we focus attention, is the need for the quickest full prohibition of nuclear tests as a very important step for the destruction of nuclear weapons in the future. The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions creates all the conditions for this. The call to end the arms race is another direction. Some 400,000 children now come into the world every day, and 10 nuclear warheads come off the production line. To what kind of future are we dooming the young generation, if this sinister line is not stopped?

"The U.S. militarist circles have recently been obsessed with the idea of creating [sozdaniye] space weapons. Their emergence would have catastrophic consequences. It is necessary not to create [sozdavat] SDI but to implement peaceful space programs in the interests of all mankind.

"We have full unity of views with our Japanese colleagues on all these positions."

/8309
CSO: 5200/1447

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S.-EUROPEAN DIFFERENCES ON ARMS ISSUES BELITTLED

AU291518 Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT in Bulgarian 26 Jun 86 pp 1, 3

[Interview by IZVESTIYA Political Observer Aleksandr Bovin and APN military affairs Observer Colonel Vasilii Morozov to OTECHESTVEN FRONT special correspondent Petyo Bluskov and correspondent Vasil Asparukhov in Moscow: "Revolt on Their Knees To Clear Their Consciences--Conversation in the OTECHESTVEN FRONT Correspondents' Room in Moscow"---first paragraph is introduction--date not given]

[Text] At the start of the 1980's a sharp shift to the right began to be felt in American foreign and domestic policies. The most characteristic feature came to be the intensification of anti-Sovietism in all spheres of bilateral relations. Official Washington is exerting mass efforts to draw its European allies into its adventuristic acts. Strange "counterproposals" unsupported by any trace of realism are being promoted. What do these contain? What really lies behind them? Our special correspondent, IZVESTIYA Political Observer Aleksandr Bovin and APN military affairs Observer Colonel Vasilii Morozov.

Aleksandr Bovin: First of all, I would like to point out that the situation in Europe differs markedly from that in the United States. In the "old" continent one can rarely find people among the highly placed political leaders with such reactionary views as Weinberger in the United States. In other words, at the top political level in Europe there are no inveterate opponents of detente. To varying extents, with different nuances, the overwhelming majority of the politicians in Western Europe declare their support for improving relations between East and West and renewing the policy of detente. In this sense their position is essentially different from that of the United States.

[Question] In such a case, how are we to explain the fact that in most instances Western Europe is joining with U.S. most adventuristic political and military steps?

Aleksandr Bovin: Between Western Europe and the United States there exist enough serious differences on political, economic, and military issues. These are constantly coming to the surface. But here the factor of "Atlantic solidarity" or as I would call it, NATO discipline, comes in. This is what holds back the impulses of common sense that appear in Western Europe.

[Question] Could you be more concrete?

Aleksandr Bovin: For instance, we proposed the elimination of the medium-range missiles based on European territory. Here it was not merely a question of us dismantling them, but of actually destroying them. In this context we insisted that the French and British medium-range missiles also be taken into account in the overall balance, but we do

not insist that the latter be destroyed. Our sole condition was that they not deploy its own nuclear potential and, naturally, that the United States not deploy its own nuclear weapons there. We are prepared to start immediate negotiations on these questions with England and France. However, unfortunately both the British and the French Governments declined to even discuss our proposals. They simply contented themselves with declaring them unacceptable.

[Question] What are their arguments for this?

Aleksandr Bovin: According to Britain and France there was no point in talking about their nuclear potentials, since they are so small in comparison to that of the USSR. At first sight there would seem to be some logic in these words. But what is the situation in reality?

At the present time for example, the British and French submarine-based missiles represent 2.7 percent of the U.S. potential. But as a result of the modernization being carried out at the moment in both countries, this figure will reach 26 percent. These are already powerful forces for destruction, which we cannot fail to take into account. Our anxiety and our wish to find a solution to this question are perfectly natural.

Vasiliy Morozov: One of the West's main "arguments" is that if it joins in the Soviet disarmament program, it will be outwitted, since the USSR has a superiority over the West in land forces and conventional weapons. But the last meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact states put an end to capitalizing on this argument too. A program was proposed to the NATO member-countries and to all the countries of Europe that is clear, reasonable, and precise, for reducing armed forces and conventional weapons precisely in Europe. And this is natural. As emphasized in the communique of the meeting, the concentration of troops and weapons on our continent has reached particularly dangerous dimensions. A sharp reduction in the armed forces and conventional weapons would create a fundamentally new military-political and moral-psychological situation in Europe. But let us look at the facts. Just as there exists a global strategic balance, so by the same token there is also balance in conventional weapons. What does parity mean? It is not a mirror image of weapons. Both the quantitative and qualitative aspects are taken into account. Thus, it is possible for us to possess more component elements in certain respects, and for them to have more in others. This is also acknowledged by sober specialists in the West. But fairy tales about the Warsaw Pact's superiority in this or that type of weapon are needed by the Western politicians, and chiefly the arms magnates, on one hand, in order to block the negotiations and, on the other to obtain ever greater budgetary means for military requirements.

[Question] But all same, what should one understand by the term "conventional weapon"?

Vasiliy Morozov: It is accepted that this includes all types of weapons except nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. The regional wars in Southeast Asia and the Middle East have particularly accelerated the improvement and spread of conventional weapons. Now their development is proceeding in such directions that certain modern types of such weapons approach nuclear weapons in their destructive power. Therefore the U.S. military doctrines are placing great hopes on the development and improvement of conventional weapons.

[Question] How are these hopes expressed in material form?

Vasiliy Morozov: It is well known that the present official American doctrine, the so-called Rogers plan, envisages the mass use of conventional weapons in the event of a future war. Western Europe is naturally one of the testing grounds for this plan. It has been reported in the U.S. press that by the end of the 1980's the U.S. troops stationed on the old continent will receive over 400 new weapon types and systems. The Pentagon's specialists have calculated that the rearmament of the U.S. Army with new weapons and equipment, combined with organizational measures, would permit, without any substantial change in the numbers of the U.S. military contingent in Europe, the might of this contingent to increase almost threefold by the middle of the 1990's as compared to the 1970's level. This is the picture.

[Question] In his speech to the collective of the Chepèlsk machine-building plant, Mikhail Gorbachev stated that the issue of halting nuclear tests is the litmus paper that determines the real policy of the Western states. Why, in spite of the sharp disapproval of world public opinion, in spite of pressure from its NATO allies, is the United States continuing the tests?

Vasiliy Morozov: They need the nuclear tests in order to implement their so-called "star wars" program.

At the testing ground in Nevada the U.S. military is completing development of the components of the future "space shield." According to reliable data, the last five nuclear explosions are connected with the testing of weapons from this program -- nuclear lasers. This is a completely new weapon that will exert its effect by nuclear energy. The United States is allocating trillions of dollars for the realization of the Reagan administration's space program. This is an extremely advantageous deal for the military-industrial program that will guarantee the U.S. military corporations a carefree and profitable existence for the next 30 years. When the United States declines to join the moratorium declared by our country, voices can often be heard saying that this is because they have completed fewer tests than us. I want to state categorically that this is incorrect. According to data from the Swedish Defense Institute, up to 1 January 1986 the United States had completed 801 tests, whereas the USSR had held 563. These figures are also confirmed by other specialists and institutes. In 1985, prior to the moratorium declared by the USSR, the Soviet Union and the United States had each completed 9 tests. Since this time, the United States has completed 5 more explosions. We are extending the period of the moratorium for the third time. In this way we are taking a risk in the name of peace.

[Question] One can often read assertions in the West that the Soviet military doctrine is supposed to be aggressive. What is your opinion?

Vasiliy Morozov: Here again we are witnesses of the old trick of the guilty party casting the blame on the innocent side. As a military historian, I can state with full responsibility that our doctrine has always been defensive and will always be so. It is aimed at defending our own land and the socialist countries. Remembering Lenin's testament, we must always be on our guard and possess the most modern weapons that our potential enemies may also have in their possession. Yes, we have nuclear weapons, but will only use them for a counterstrike. We have solemnly assumed such an obligation. Regrettably, the United States has once again refused to accept this proposal of ours. It is stated in the CPSU Program that the historical achievement of communism is the attainment of strategic parity. This is precisely the factor that brings our class enemies to their senses. We have succeeded in catching up with

capitalism in the military field and have preserved parity during the last 15 years. We are proposing that parity be preserved, but at a much lower level. That is, for it to be brought down to the level of reasonable security. Here we are speaking of that essential minimum that would restrain the hypothetical aggressor from carrying out aggressive actions.

[Question] Unfortunately, at the military negotiations on various problems of disarmament and security in the world the Western delegations most frequently follow an unconstructive line of conduct. How can this position of theirs be explained?

Aleksandr Bovin: First let us define the meaning of the concept "negotiations." First and foremost this means looking for compromises. In order for a compromise to be found, we must have learned how to take the interests of our partners also into account and how to look at the world through the eyes of Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen... The Americans, unfortunately, look at the world solely from the positions of their own interests. Let us examine, for example, the case of the strategic offensive weapons. I must point out that Western Europe has practically unanimously declared itself against Washington's intention to cease to observe the treaty requirements. The exception was France, which adopted a position something like this: "This is none of our business. This issue only concerns the 'superpowers.'" Practically all the other NATO members at the recent conference in Halifax declared themselves against Washington's position. Here we encounter an extremely important nuance. The West European countries declared themselves against the U.S. position. They cleared their consciences before their voters. But their "no" is not strong enough. It is a revolt on their knees. But the observance or otherwise of SALT II is an extremely important issue for modern world politics. It is the only international treaty in force that places any limitations on the arms race. The West European leaders are well aware of that fact. In spite of all this they accept the dictate of the United States, which is less and less inclined to take its NATO allies into consideration.

[Question] Sometimes the view circulates in the West that Soviet-American relations are predominant in Soviet foreign policy. Evidently, this is not a matter of chance?

Aleksandr Bovin: Soviet-American relations are very important for us, since on them depend such fundamental issues as whether there will be war or not. But we treat the European direction of our policy with great seriousness. Practically throughout all their history, the Americans have treated Europe with scorn. They maintain that the Europeans are not the center of world history. We do not agree with this position, and consider that Europe is the cradle of contemporary civilization. This function of Europe -- both political and economic -- will continue to strengthen. On the other hand, we are often told that allegedly we have tried to be cunning, and wished to divide the United States and Western Europe and, after separating Western Europe from the United States, to establish our own political hegemony.

But we are not as primitive as we seem to certain people. We understand perfectly that notwithstanding all the contradictions we are not in a position to cut those numerous close ties that bind Western Europe and the United States. We never set ourselves unrealistic tasks. And we are striving precisely to resolve real questions. Since Western Europe and the United States are allies, and in our opinion the elements of common sense in European politics are stronger, we are attempting to get Western Europe to influence the United States in order to make American policy more sober, reflecting modern quality to a greater extent. To a certain extent the Europeans are doing this, but in my view they could do more. Let them do more, in order that mankind may return to detente -- something against which the United States is constantly raising barriers. It refuses to halt nuclear tests, it attacked Libya, it renounced SALT II, and so on. Detente is in the interest not only of the USSR, but also of Western Europe itself and, of course, of the whole world.

RELATED ISSUES

DOCTORS CALL FOR IMMEDIATE NUCLEAR-TEST MORATORIUM

OW141251 Tokyo KYODO in English 1051 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] Tokyo, 14 Jun (KYODO)--An immediate moratorium on all nuclear tests is the key to prevent nuclear war, members of an international group of physicians against nuclear war said here Saturday. To stop new technical developments and proliferation of nuclear weapons across the world, an end to testing is the "medical prescription" from the doctors to the world's nuclear armed states, Dr Bernard Lown, cardiology professor at Harvard University, said at a press conference.

"It does not even require mutual trust among those states, because if a test were carried out, it would be immediately known by the other countries," he added.

Dr Lown attended a peace symposium in Hiroshima as a copresident of the doctors' group, the International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War, on Thursday. The group received last year's Nobel Peace Prize. He and five representatives of the group, including another copresident, Dr Yevgeni Chazov, a Soviet deputy minister of public health, reported devastating fear of nuclear war in Hiroshima from physicians' point of view. They also visited Nagasaki on Friday, and met reporters in Tokyo before leaving Japan Saturday.

Lack of information about the dangers of nuclear war makes people terrified, the doctors said, but a true understanding of the threat causes people to take protest actions against nuclear arms. "True knowledge is empowering," they said, citing a 10-year-old American boy's words that "to know is to be terrified, not to know is to be terrified and hopeless, but to know really will save us."

Vappu Taipale, director general of the Department of Social Welfare for Finland, said appropriate discussions about the threat of nuclear war makes even children active to prevent it. Manuel Velasco-Suarez, professor of neurology and neurosurgery at the National University of Mexico, said an estimated \$8 trillion is spent to produce arms in the world each year. That is almost half the world's total gross national product, he said, adding that such spending must be stopped as soon as possible. The doctors said visiting Hiroshima and meeting survivors of the atomic bombing had filled them with shame and anguish at the barbarism of human beings, but the experience also inspired them to bring that direct human testimony to the attention of the world.

END

/9604

CSO: 5260/099

104