

150028

JPRS-TAC-86-027

21 March 1986

19981105 114

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DMC QUALITY INSPECTED 5

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

9
128
A07

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

21 March 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. 'Ruling Quarters' Pressing 'Star Wars' Program (Moscow TASS, 1 Mar 86)	1
USSR: UK Radar Station Upgrade Violates Arms Treaty (Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 21 Feb 86; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 21 Feb 86)	2
Radio Commentary, by Sergey Sayenko IZVESTIYA Report	2
Soviet Army Paper Reports on SDI-Related Projects (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 26 Feb 86).....	4
Soviet Army Paper Views Effect of Shuttle Loss on SDI (M. Rebrov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 13 Feb 86)	5
Soviet Army Paper on SDI as Barrier to Disarmament (G. Kuznetsov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 22 Feb 86)	8
IZVESTIYA Notes Former President Carter's Criticism of SDI (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27 Feb 86)	11
USSR: European Symposium Cites SDI Ineffectiveness (A. Borodin; Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 26 Feb 86)	12
TASS Military Writer on Possible Countermeasures to SDI (Moscow TASS, 27 Feb 86)	13
Soviet Scientist Examines Weakness of SDI Systems (Boris Rauschenbach Interview; Moscow in English to North America, 27 Feb 86)	15
Soviet Academician Examines Danger of U.S. SDI Plans (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 26 Feb 86)	18

Soviet Commentary Views Japan's Position on SDI (Andreyev; Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 1 Mar 86)	20
TASS: Japan To Send Delegation to U.S. for SDI Talks (Moscow TASS, 4 Mar 86)	22
Belgium's Tindemans Comments on Western Defense, SDI (Leo Tindemans Interview; Bonn DIE WELT, 27 Feb 86)	23
Briefs	
UK Military Experiment	25
 U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
USSR: U.S. Buildup Plans Fuel Nuclear Threat (Ye. Nikitin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 16 Feb 86)	26
USSR: U.S. Response to Gorbachev Arms Proposal Draws Criticism (Various sources, various dates)	30
Termed 'Revamped Zero Option'	30
Arbatov Comments, by Stefan Babiak	31
Chernyshev Comments	32
'Negative' U.S. Position Noted, by Aleksandr Zholkver	34
Kornilov Commentary	35
Timing of Response 'a Riddle', by Aleksandr Yakovlev	36
U.S. Response 'Lopsided'	37
Soviet Union 'In No Hurry', by Vladlen Kuznetsov	38
U.S. Welcomes Proposal in Words Only, by Igor Fesunenکو	39
U.S. Delay 'Poisoned Logic', by Vladimir Pavlovich Dunayev	40
U.S., Soviet Arms Policies Contrasted	42
Colin Gray Cited	44
 Soviet Army Paper Assesses Gorbachev Proposal (V. Serebryannikov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 Feb 86) ...	45
 TASS Analyst on U.S. Policy 'From Position of Strength' (Moscow TASS, 3 Mar 86)	51
 TASS: Prospects at Geneva Arms Talks 'Growing Dim' (Moscow TASS, 3 Mar 86)	53
 Nuclear, Space Weapons Talks End, To Resume 8 May (Various sources, 4, 5 Mar 86)	55
TASS Report	55
Kasparov Comment, by Pavel Kasparov	55
Gen Chervov Remarks, by Stefan Babiak	56

USSR's 23 February Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' (Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, et al.; Moscow Television Service, 23 Feb 86)	57
Gromyko Speech at CPSU 27th Congress (A. A. Gromyko; Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Feb 86)	59
Paper Sees 'Trap' for Britain in Soviet Moves at Geneva (Editorial; London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 13 Feb 86)	61
USSR's Zhukov Links Summit Meeting to Arms Talk Progress (Hamburg DPA, 21 Feb 86)	62
USSR's Col Gen Chervov Discusses Disarmament Proposals (Nikolay Chervov Interview; East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service, 12 Feb 86)	63
Huang Hua Urges Elimination of Nuclear Weapons (Beijing XINHUA, 27 Feb 86)	65

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR Notes Development of 'Modernized' Cruise Missile (Sergey Pravdin; Moscow Domestic Service, 27 Feb 86)	66
USSR on U.S. Test of Cruise Missile Over Canada (Moscow TASS, 24, 26 Feb 86; Moscow World Service, 25 Feb 86)	67
Test Planned	67
Missile Falls Into Sea	67
Canada Suspends Test Flights	67
TASS: Dutch Ratify Accord on Cruise Missile Deployment (Moscow TASS, 28 Feb 86)	68
TASS Analyst Questions 'Metamorphoses' of West's Arms Stance (Moscow TASS, 2 Mar 86)	69
TASS Analyst Questions U.S. Aims Regarding European Missiles (Moscow TASS, 1 Mar 86)	71
Moscow Radio Answers Questions on Medium-Range Missiles (Moscow World Service, 23 Feb 86)	73
Soviet Experts Respond to Hungarians' Questions on Arms (Andras Sugar; Budapest Television Service, 24 Feb 86)	75
Briefs	
More Cruise Missiles to UK Base	77
Pentagon To Deploy New Type Cruise Missiles	77

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

- Swiss To Upgrade Chemical Warfare Defenses
(Marcel H. Keiser; Zurich DIE WELTWOCH, 30 Jan 86) 78

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

- TASS: CD Participants Dissatisfied With U.S. Arms Stance
(Moscow TASS, 27 Feb 86) 81
- USSR Ambassador Mikhaylov Outlines MBFR Proposals
(Moscow TASS, 27 Feb 86) 82
- Soviet Army Paper Assesses New MBFR Proposal
(V. Makarevskiy; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 Feb 86) 84
- TASS: CSCE Delegates Meet Finnish Representatives
(Moscow TASS, 1 Mar 86) 87

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

- USSR Assails U.S. Position on Nuclear Testing
(Various sources, 28 Feb, 1 Mar 86) 88
- Statements 'Not Backed by Practical Deeds' 88
- 'No Will' To Stop 'Nuclear Madness' 89
- Congressional Resolution Noted 90
- U.S. Violates 'Spirit' of Treaties 91
- USSR Assesses U.S. Position on Moratorium Issue
(Various sources, 2, 3 Mar 86) 92
- Administration Out of Step, by Yu. Bandura 92
- Resolution 'Setback' for White House 93
- Congress Vote Called White House 'Defeat', by B. Drekhov 94
- Admiral Crowe Cited 94
- TASS: U.S. Arms Control Body Comments on Test Ban
(Moscow TASS, 20 Feb 86) 95
- TASS: Robert McNamara Supports Nuclear Test Ban
(Moscow TASS, 22 Feb 86) 97

RELATED ISSUES

- USSR's Bovin Criticizes Arms Control Adviser's Article
(A. Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 6 Mar 86) 98
- TASS: NATO's Rogers Applauds Western Arms Programs
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 22 Feb 86) 100

Soviet Reports, Comments on Reagan's Weekly Radio Address (Moscow TASS International Service, 1 Mar 86; Moscow TASS, 2 Mar 86)	101
Supports Revised Arms Purchasing	101
Reiterates Military Budget Plea	101
USSR: 'Nuclear Winter' Possible From Conventional War (Moscow TASS, 28 Feb 86)	104
Soviet Book on Aftermath of Nuclear Conflict Published (Moscow TASS, 17 Feb 86)	105
USSR's Korniyenko, Akhromeyev, Zamyatin Holds News Conference (Moscow TASS, 28 Feb 86)	107
TASS Report	107
'Paramount Task'	107
USSR's Arbatov, Primakov, Velikhov Press Conference on Security (Various sources, 3 Mar 86)	109
Regional Conflict Could Start Nuclear War	109
Israeli Role in SDI Criticized	109
Velikhov on Soviet Space Stations	109
SDI Violates ABM Treaty	110
Arbatov on Security	110
'New Conception of Security'	111
SDI, Military Superiority Discussed, by Georgiy Arbatov, et al.	114
World Media Covers CPSU Congress Proceedings (Moscow PRAVDA, 26 Feb 86; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 26 Feb 86)	116
Peace Plan Discussed	116
Further on Foreign Reaction	117
Soviet Marshal Kulikov on Army, Navy Day (V. G. Kulikov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 23 Feb 86)	118
Soviet Envoy to New Zealand on Peace, Disarmament (Wellington THE EVENING POST, 30 Jan 86)	120

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. 'RULING QUARTERS' PRESSING 'STAR WARS' PROGRAM

LD011216 Moscow TASS in English 1154 GMT 1 Mar 86

"Usa Going Into High Gear With 'Star Wars' Program," -- TASS identifier]

[Text] Washington, March 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko reports: U.S. ruling quarters are pressing on with the "star wars" program which is the centerpiece of their hopes to upset the existing military parity and achieve global military superiority.

Work under the project, which is officially called the "Strategic Defense Initiative", is proceeding at full tilt, the ultra-rightist Heritage Foundation reported in the backgrounder bulletin.

It said, in particular, that substantial progress had been made at the U.S. Navy's laboratories developing a chemical laser. When its prototype was tested last September, the laser beam destroyed the first stage of a Titan-1 rocket, which was fixed on the ground and served as the target.

The Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California has come up with a free-electron laser with a rated peak power of one billion watts.

The bulletin's author, Heritage Foundation staffer Holmes, said that the significant headway made in devising lasers and targetting aids might mean that an antiballistic missiles system using lasers could be deployed ten years earlier than originally expected.

Washington is going to try out the projected ABM system's individual components at crash rates. The backgrounder made it clear that plans were already afoot to test a sophisticated array of early-warning pickups which would be installed aboard a plane. The system is intended to track ballistic missiles. Holmes said that a number of the system's assemblies had already been tested under an antimissile defense program pursued by the U.S. Army.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: UK RADAR STATION UPGRADE VIOLATES ARMS TREATY

Radio Commentary

LD212239 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Sergey Sayenko commentary]

[Text] The United States decision to start modernizing this year the radar station at Fylingdales Moor draws Britain into the violation of the ABM treaty. Sergey Sayenko has written this commentary.

By its consent to modernize the radar station at Fylingdales Moor, Britain, along with the United States, has in fact taken another step toward undermining the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems. In accordance with the treaty the Soviet Union and the United States agree not to set up such stations outside their national territories. So what is it? An occasional negligence on the part of the United States and Britain, a failure to realize that after the modernization of the radar facility at Fylingdales Moor it will considerably expand the range of its actions and the zone of surveillance?

Unlikely so. The matter is that the ABM treaty remains important and significant, and as usual strongly hinders attempts to upset the strategic parity in the world and achieve military superiority. One should bear in mind that the ABM treaty is a deterrent to an arms race in space. Before the Soviet-American summit in Geneva last November and after it London has repeatedly stressed the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to stand by the SALT II and ABM treaties. In them, if official signals are to be believed, London sees the guarantee of success at negotiations in Geneva. So it turns out that the right hand doesn't know what the left one does.

IZVESTIYA Report

PM211143 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA press service report under the "Theme of the Day" rubric: "Unseemly Involvement"]

[Text] Reports have recently begun appearing increasingly frequently in the Western press providing evidence that right-wing political circles in the United States together with the military are working intensively to undermine the 1972 USSR-U.S. ABM (antimissile defense) limitation treaty. Back in October 1985 the Pentagon chief

pronounced it "anathema" and revealed Washington's intentions: "We must examine the possibility of a real break with the ABM Treaty." C. Weinberger's report to Congress on the Pentagon's draft budget for fiscal 1986 published specific instances of gross violation by the United States of the spirit and letter of the ABM treaty. As the report pointed out, the construction of a phased-array radar station using solid-state elements will be completed this year at Thule in Greenland. The fundamental modernization of the Fylingdales Moor radar station (Britain) will begin.

The Fylingdales Moor station is part of an ABM early-warning system. Its modernization, according to Western press information, will considerably increase its range and observation zone. This move by Washington may be taken as nothing less than the creation of a radar field covering the entire country. In that event the United States is entering into direct conflict with Articles III, IV, and V, of the ABM treaty. It is well known that this treaty bans the deployment of phased-array radar stations other than within the stipulated areas, at test ranges, and along the periphery of its national territory and oriented outward. The sides also pledged themselves not to create such stations outside their national territory. The United States has now adopted a course aimed at the direct violation of its international commitments. Britain's agreement to the above-mentioned work at Fylingdales Moor makes it an accomplice in the violation of the ABM Treaty.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER REPORTS ON SDI-RELATED PROJECTS

PM261422 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Feb 86 Single Edition p 11

[TASS report: "Roaring Into Space"]

[Text] Washington, 25 Feb -- The Pentagon is expediting work within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," which envisages the deployment of space strike weapon systems.

According to the weekly magazine DEFENSE NEWS, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency of the U.S. Department of Defense is now paying particular attention to the creation [sozdaniye] of the X-30 space aircraft. Testifying at hearings of one of the subcommittees of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, Agency Director R. Duncan declared that this machine, which will be capable of achieving speeds several times the speed of sound and of entering low earth orbit, will be used not only to take payloads into low orbit but also as an interceptor of ballistic missiles. The U.S. Air Force hopes to receive the first prototype by the mid-1990's.

The total cost of the development work [opytno-konstruktorskiye raboty] is estimated at 600-700 million dollars, 80 percent of which will be born by the Pentagon and 20 percent by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). According to DEFENSE NEWS, the U.S. Air Force will start giving corporations contracts for the development [razrabotka] and production of the space plane in early April.

The agency, the magazine writes, is also conducting work on the creation [sozdaniye] of a top secret satellite under the "Teal Ruby" program. This program envisages the deployment in space of infrared observation systems that would operate jointly with ABM, air, and antisubmarine defense systems.

According to reports in the journal SCIENCE DIGEST, the U.S. Air Force and NASA are also studying the question of the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of space shuttles for putting big cargos into orbit, including some for the "star wars" program.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER VIEWS EFFECT OF SHUTTLE LOSS ON SDI

PM141615 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel M. Rebrov: "Concerning The 'Challenger' Disaster"]

[Text] Time has not yet unraveled the mystery behind the tragedy over the Atlantic. Many questions remain to be answered. Following Senator J. Danforth's statement that the "Senate Space Subcommittee will begin on 18 February reports on the circumstances of the loss of 'Challenger'," Reagan announced the setting up of a special independent commission to investigate the disaster. It is headed by former U.S. Secretary of State W. Rogers and astronaut N. Armstrong. The commission has been given 120 days to present its opinions and conclusions on the event.

Efforts are being made to persuade Americans that the investigation will be meticulous and objective, that "the commission is authorized to demand any information from all departments of state and private individuals," and that conclusions will be drawn from the tragedy.

Maybe so. The cause of the explosion will be established, of course... In the age of scientific and technical progress there is no obstacle to this, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. "It is necessary to gather as many facts as possible pertaining to the operation of all the space shuttle's systems from 'zero' to the fateful 75th second of flight." Naturally, this will take time.

The foreign press is continuing to comment extensively on the events of 28 January. It is noted that "judging by the photographs, a leak occurred in a solid-fuel booster rocket 14 seconds before the explosion." It was exactly the same number of seconds that saved the lives of the "Challenger" crew preparing for lift-off in August 1983. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL quotes the statistics relating to serious faults and failures that have occurred on previous shuttle flights. According to the paper, there have been warnings of serious "technical hazards" on at least 50 occasions. The CHICAGO TRIBUNE reports that there have been four major explosions, in which people have been killed, at the Morton Thiokol Company plant where the booster units are primed.

But the technical aspect of the problem is increasingly taking a back seat, and anxiety for the fate of the crew of "spaceship earth" is assuming increasing prominence amid the plethora of opinions and views. As is the question: "is the world about us more secure and safe than the spacecraft that are being put into space?"

Answering L'HUMANITE's questions, M.S. Gorbachev warned against adventurist ambitions to make human civilization a hostage to machines and automata and, therefore, to faults and breakdowns. How dangerous this is was demonstrated once again by the tragedy of the U.S. "Challenger" spacecraft.

And although a cloak of secrecy protected the U.S. military from public discussion of its failures, it will have to answer for the shuttle disaster. The "Challenger" tragedy must be a clear warning to those who continue to press for the development (sozdaniye) of an ABM system with space-based elements.

The Pentagon realized the possibility of such a reaction immediately after the tragedy over Florida. Only a matter of hours after the loss of "Challenger" and its crew, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL notes, General J. Abrahamson--who is responsible for the implementation of Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative"--was quick to call on prominent U.S. congressmen to do all they can to ensure that this failure does not hinder the development (razvertyvaniye) of SDI.

Citing the authoritative view of the military, THE WASHINGTON POST writes that "the accident was not as serious as was at first thought." Pentagon Chief C. Weinberger has been making a most vigorous effort to ensure the speediest resumption of shuttle flights. He is foaming at the mouth, trying to demonstrate the "need to further increase the U.S. nuclear potential" and militarize space.

Many people in America believe that the new investigative commission will not only seek the technical reasons for the disaster but will enable the administration to "launch an extensive public opinion indoctrination campaign to overcome the fears of Americans who believe that the loss of 'Challenger' is a serious warning to those who are planning to 'deploy a weapon system in space.'" These are not my words. It is THE NEW YORK TIMES writing.

The method of numbing brains is not new as far as U.S. propaganda is concerned. Especially when it comes to the actions of the Pentagon, which is the "chief shareholder, participant, and one of the most committed parties" in the shuttle program. Four shuttle flights had been planned for this year under a "special program." In 1987 the U.S. military department had intended to start testing a laser weapon in space for "star wars." And the shuttle had been given a very active part to play in this. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the spacecraft was to conduct an experiment codenamed ("Til Rubi"). Basically, it is to check systems for tracking bomber aircraft from space. The plan was that the shuttle would place the latest KH-12 reconnaissance satellite in orbit. It was planned to conduct a series of deadly experiments in 1988 as well.

That is why NASA specialists have been banned from passing comment and the investigation documents are secret. That is why a considerable effort is being made to divert Americans' attention from the evidence of those who believe that the plans to deploy weapon systems in space place mankind in mortal peril. This is the reality of it.

The telemetric data received from "Challenger" are currently being studied at the space center near Houston, from where I reported on the "Soyuz" and "Apollo" flight in summer of 1975 and watched the "Skylab" flight 2 years later. Every thousandth of a second of flight is recorded in the computer memory. U.S. news agencies reports that it was at this frequency that the data were transmitted from its 20,000 sensors. But seven lives remain hostages to fortune.

But there is fortune and fortune. "The 'Challenger' disaster has to be a serious lesson," G. Larocque (director of the public organization called "Center for Defense Information") noted.

The striking thing is that, while promising to analyze the technical details, the Reagan Administration is avoiding answering the most important question of all: What would happen to the world if such an explosion were to occur in space at a moment of military tension?

While expressing sorrow and condolence, the Japanese paper AKAHATA states that "the crew of 'Challenger' can be regarded as victims of the actions of the White House, which is conducting preparations for 'Star Wars'." This view is shared by many people. The explosion over Florida is an alarm signal. The deaths of seven astronauts must be a grave warning to those who place the existence of the human world at the mercy of "flawless" U.S. technology. The billions being spent on militarization should be used for the peaceful exploration of space. This is the will of the inhabitants of Earth.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ON SDI AS BARRIER TO DISARMAMENT

PM241150 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[G. Kuznetsov article under the rubric "Reading the Lines of the Statement": "Fundamental Condition"]

[Text] As is known, the draft new edition of the party program is being submitted for discussion at the 27th CPSU Congress. It emphasizes that, regarding general and complete disarmament under strict, all-embracing international control [kontrol] as a historic task, the CPSU will consistently strive to limit and narrow the sphere of war preparations, particularly those connected with weapons of mass destruction. Above all, space should be totally excluded from this sphere, so that it does not become an arena of military rivalry or a source of death and destruction.

The comprehensive program of large-scale foreign policy actions set forth in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is a vivid example of the desire of the Land of the Soviets to realize these goals. The primary goal, starting in 1986 -- International Peace Year -- is to implement and complete over the next 15 years, before the end of the present century, the process of freeing the earth from nuclear weapons and freeing mankind from fear of a nuclear catastrophe. During the first stage, designed to last 5-8 years, the USSR and the United States halve the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. "It goes without saying," the statement emphasizes, "that such a reduction is only possible if the USSR and the United States mutually renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms." It is proposed that at the second stage the accord banning space strike arms will become a multilateral accord, with obligatory participation by the leading industrial powers. This stand of the UN General Assembly resolution on the peaceful use of space was adopted by 151 votes (with 1 abstention -- the United States).

"Moving toward a nuclear-free world, mankind is obliged to surmount the obstacles which might arise on this path. And chief among the obstacles of this kind are attempts to militarize space and to saturate near-earth space with space strike weapons, turning it into a military bridgehead. The realization of the 'star wars' concept will cancel out hopes of reducing nuclear arms on earth -- everyone must realize this," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his message to the mayors of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were the first victims of American atom bombing.

Why is the question of "star wars," disguised as the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), raised so categorically? Official Washington calls SDI "highly moral" and "exclusively defensive," since it is said to be designed to destroy weapons, not people, and is called upon to render nuclear ballistic missiles "obsolete and unnecessary." But all these stilted expressions are nothing but exceptionally dangerous deception meant for naive simpletons. And this is realized by many people, although far from all, in the United States.

This is what P. Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, says, for example: "A security system based on the principle of nuclear deterrence and strategic parity between the USSR and the United States has taken shape over recent decades. The realization of SDI will upset it and lead to an immediate rise in the level of military confrontation between the two powers."

The approximate Soviet-U.S. strategic parity is socialism's historic achievement, for it has a deterrent effect on the forces of aggression and militarism. Two treaties -- SALT II and that on the limitation of ABM systems -- are aimed at preserving this parity (and this was admitted recently by Admiral Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff). The latter treaty is frequently called the most important of all agreements concluded in the arms limitation sphere between the USSR and the United States.

The work now being done in the United States under the SDI program with a view to creating [sozdaniye] a "space shield" is fraught with the undermining of the ABM Treaty. This means that R. Reagan's administration is deliberately trying to upset strategic parity and secure military superiority over the USSR with the help of space systems. P. Warnke calls this policy "fundamentally wrong, since it does not take the Soviet Union's security interests into account." It is noteworthy that six former U.S. defense secretaries come out in support of preserving the ABM Treaty -- McNamara, Clifford, Laird, Richardson, Schlesinger, and Brown.

The implementation of the "star wars" program would mean that the Soviet-U.S. talks now under way would be wrecked and all existing arms limitation agreements would be nullified. It is obvious to all sober-minded people that a situation of an absolutely uncontrolled arms race is strategic chaos. If President R. Reagan, Representative G. Studds stated, "does not compromise over 'star wars,' arms control will never get moving and the blame for that failure will lie with the United States."

Planning to launch many units of strike weapons into space, Washington claims that they will have one function -- defense against Soviet ICBM's. Even in the United States many people see this as camouflage for the Pentagon's real plans. Political analyst R. English, who used to work in the Pentagon, reports in an article published in the NEW REPUBLIC magazine that the calculations made by the military research firm (Argonne) National Laboratory show that orbiting lasers are capable of destroying targets on earth. The spread of the arms race to space, English stresses, is fraught with highly dangerous consequences, as the Soviet leadership warns.

How is it possible to speak of the "defensive" aims of SDI when a space-arms sword of Damocles will hang over mankind? And might not the creation of a "space shield" engender an illusion of impunity creating a temptation to carry out a first nuclear strike from behind the "shield," thus preventing or at least weakening the retaliatory strike? And that is not a hypothetical question. At a closed symposium held quite

recently in Washington J. Gardner, director of a Strategic Defense Initiative Organization department, frankly admitted that its implementation will "sharply change the nuclear balance in the United States' favor." According to the nuclear war "scenario" that he outlined, THE BOSTON GLOBE noted, the possession of an ABM system with space-based elements would permit the United States even after a "bilateral nuclear exchange" to reserve the strike capability [undarnyy kulak] of its strategic offensive forces.

Thus proponents of "star wars" themselves clearly refute the propaganda claims about their willingness to make missile weapons "obsolete and unnecessary." Incidentally, these are also refuted by the entire practice of Washington's acceleration of the race in offensive arms. Space systems are being planned and created not as replacements but as supplements for offensive strategic first-strike weapons. "While laying great stress and emphasis on defensive systems," Pentagon Chief C. Weinberger stated, "we are not only not abandoning offensive nuclear deterrent forces but are strengthening and modernizing them."

Requesting \$311.6 billion for fiscal 1987, the Pentagon plans to allocate \$4.8 billion for work on the implementation of SDI and \$25.4 billion for strategic arms (not counting spending on research and development). "The United States is now starting to act from a position of strength, which promises to increase our might in relation to the enemy," Weinberger boasts. "We must convince the Russians that this is not a short-term phenomenon."

It is necessary to "convince the Russians" -- the long-term U.S. plans for an arms buildup are no secret to us. Nor should it be a secret to anyone that no talks "from a position of strength" with our state will take place. Thus, as the saying goes, they are wide of the mark. The USSR will never allow anyone to gain military superiority over it. "Our material and intellectual potential makes it possible for the Soviet Union to create any weapons if we are forced to," M.S. Gorbachev's statement says. But we fully realize our responsibility to present and future generations. It is our profound conviction that it is necessary to enter the 3d millennium not with the 'star wars' program but with large-scale plans for peaceful space exploration through the efforts of all mankind."

The SDI is the means whereby U.S. imperialism would like to turn space into the military bridgehead necessary, in the Pentagon strategists' opinion, in order to gain world domination. That is why the Soviet Union resolutely opposes the implementation of this sinister scheme. That is why a refusal to deploy strike arms in space is the key to resolving the problem of strategic arms reductions and the fundamental condition for those reductions.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA NOTES FORMER PRESIDENT CARTER'S CRITICISM OF SDI

PM271622 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report: "J. Carter: Deceptive Illusion"]

[Text] San Francisco, 26 Feb -- Former U.S. President J. Carter has addressed the Council for International Affairs here and criticized the Reagan administration's SDI plans.

The arguments about the creation [sozdaniye] of a "defense shield," Carter declared, are a deceptive and exceptionally costly illusion. If this program is implemented, it will not make the United States secure. Research into the technical possibilities for the creation [sozdaniye] of an ABM defense was carried out during the Ford presidency and during my own presidency, Carter said. And this was done in full conformity with the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. This research confirmed the futility of such a project. As for the work envisaged by the "star wars" program, it would be in direct violation of the ABM treaty and would give rise to an arms race in space. Moreover, Carter said, the creation [sozdaniye] of such a system would considerably increase the risk of a military clash with the USSR. The recent tragic incident involving the Challenger shuttle clearly proved that complex space systems cannot be guaranteed against unforeseen faults and accidents.

I traveled extensively abroad during the last month, Carter went on, and I can say that statesmen and public figures in many states evaluate positively Moscow's proposals. The Soviet Union, he pointed out, is prepared right now to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe. This is an important and positive step. But the incumbent U.S. Administration is responding to it negatively.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: EUROPEAN SYMPOSIUM CITES SDI INEFFECTIVENESS

PM261537 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 26 Feb 86 p 10

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Borodin: "Groundless Claims"]

[Text] London -- Yesterday there was an international symposium at the headquarters of the Greater London Council on the theme "Can 'Star Wars' Ensure the Defense of Europe?" It was attended by representatives of a number of West European countries and the United States.

D. Healey, member of the British Labor Party's "Shadow Cabinet," called the U.S. Administration's claims about the defensive nature of the "star wars" program groundless. By implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative," he stressed, the United States intends to achieve a nuclear monopoly, create a powerful "shield," and under its cover acquire the potential to deliver a nuclear strike with impunity. It is the profound belief of the peoples of the European states that not only the deployment, but the actual development [razrabotka] of an antimissile system with space-based elements, including research work on it, would be an unprecedented spur to the arms race. It would divert funds necessary for solving acute domestic problems to military purposes, and would bring the world nearer to a nuclear catastrophe. The Conservative government has ignored Britain's true interests by agreeing to participate in the U.S. "star wars" program, the Labor Party figure stressed.

Using specific figures and diagrams, Professor G. Brauch of Stuttgart University (FRG) convincingly demonstrated that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" [SDI] would not safeguard the security of the West European peoples. Moreover, work to implement it contravenes the UN Charter and the aims of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

J. Pike, assistant director for space research at the Federation of American Scientists, urged the governments and peoples of West European countries to abandon their illusions that the U.S. Administration will enable the allies to participate in research work on SDI on an equal basis. There is an enormous gulf between U.S. promises and reality, he noted.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

21 March 1986

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS MILITARY WRITER ON POSSIBLE COUNTERMEASURES TO SDI

LD272021 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 27 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

Certain persons in Washington are disturbed by the CPSU's impressive plans for speedy development of the USSR and consolidation of peace on earth. So they make a recourse to anachronisms in an effort to play down the importance and attractiveness of the Soviet policy and at the same time to justify somehow the United States militaristic course dangerous for the whole world. Thus, U.S. Congressman Robert Dornan just said in Washington that the Russians know that they cannot keep up with countries of the free world in technological competition so they come out against the SDI.

The most egoistic groups of the U.S. ruling class linked with the military-industrial complex still cherish the illusion that there emerged an opportunity to outstrip the USSR, to press on it by creating a "superweapon" for outer space and thus ensuring strategic superiority. They are blinded with the bellicose philosophy of "who is the first in space will rule the earth".

The authors of such futile fantasies, idle dreams forget the lessons of history, forget with whom they are dealing now, for the Soviet Union has long since become a great scientific and technological power. This has enabled the USSR to hold out and win the Second World War, to blaze the trail into space and to launch space exploration on a large scale, to ensure reliable defence.

They deliberately ignore the fact that every new step of the USA in the qualitative build-up of armaments was immediately countered by the USSR with adequate measures and that any "technological advantages" on which Washington counted thus disappeared as a rule. Meanwhile, the situation in the world was becoming less stable as a result, ever more arms appeared in the world. As Robert McNamara and Hans Bethe wrote, literally all technical initiatives in the sphere of the nuclear arms race came from the United States, but their net result has been the gradual undermining of U.S. security.

This will also be the case if the U.S. "star wars" programme is implemented. But that programme will entail grave consequences for all peoples, will put an end to any restriction of the arms race, give an impetus to this arms race in all directions, replacing a relative stability with strategic chaos. The intention to place arms in space is extremely dangerous for all peoples, including the American people.

As to the "technological competition" in that "star race", the calculations of "star warriors" are based on obvious delusion. If common sense fails to prevail in Washington and the SDI is made "irreversible", the Soviet Union will take counter-measures to restore the status quo, the way it happened many times in the past. It will not remain idle. The following basic principles will be taken into consideration in deciding on counter-measures:

First, these measures might be taken in the sphere of defensive arms, or offensive arms. The reply measures must not necessarily be taken in the same sphere, they just must be effective. The USSR will choose methods of counter-measures that will suit the most the interests of its defence capability.

Second, the USSR will not allow the United States to get the monopoly in outer space. It is simply not serious to hope for that.

Third, the Soviet Union will not be reducing its strategic potential which would be tantamount to helping the United States to weaken it. Quite the contrary, in order to restore the balance it will have to enhance the effectivity, precision and striking power of its armaments so as to neutralise, if need be, the electronic "star wars" machine being created by the USA.

Fourth, in any case the Soviet counter-measures will be adequate to the threat posed to the Soviet Union and its allies.

The analysis made by competent Soviet organisations and scientists showed that the USSR's counter-measures will be effective, less costly and can be effected within a shorter period of time. Washington strategists should recall the lesson of history: the creation by the Soviet Union of inter-continental ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear weapons to any point in the United States territory. Those who now intend to dictate their will to the world will be unable to sit it out beyond a space "shield", either. The USSR declares firmly and consistently against placing weapons in space. But this does not stem from weakness or fear of the U.S. SDI, the way certain persons in Washington try to claim. The Soviet Union is guided by political wisdom that is so necessary in the nuclear space age, by the interests of consolidating universal security, removing the fear of nuclear catastrophe, preserving civilisation on earth.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET SCIENTIST EXAMINES WEAKNESS OF SDI SYSTEMS

LD281148 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 27 Feb 86

["Part one" of "Soviet technical assessment" of the U.S. "star wars" program during interview with Dr Boris Rauschenbach, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and specialist in complex automatic systems, by science correspondent Belitskiy; from the "Science and Engineering" program; date not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Belitskiy] Why is it, Dr Rauschenbach, that many scientists both in the Soviet Union and in the United States consider SDI unacceptable and dangerous to humanity?

[Rauschenbach] Consider the global aim of SDI. It is to create a system capable of destroying every single one of the ballistic missiles no matter how numerous launched in the direction of the United States by an enemy. Moreover, they are to be destroyed before they or any of their warheads are over American territory. Now, let's consider how it's proposed to accomplish this. The flight of a ballistic missile may be divided into several phases, and during each of those phases different weapons are to be used for missile destruction. In the ideal case, according to the SDI scenario, the first stage of missile destruction should take place over the territory of the potential enemy at an altitude of less than 500 kms. You must remember that while the missile is still in the earth's atmosphere it's practically invulnerable to laser weapons or to space based particle accelerators. But then the missile emerges from the atmosphere, its boosters still functioning. During this period of time, ranging according to various estimates from 2 to 5 minutes, an accurately pointed laser beam is to pierce its fuel tank walls, causing their destruction. The missile should in that case either fall on enemy territory or else fly in a direction different from the intended one owing to a fuel shortage or the malfunctioning of its on-board systems.

[Belitskiy] But surely it would be wishful thinking to count on destroying by such means all the missiles fired?

[Rauschenbach] That's why the American 'star wars' strategists envisage that during a second echelon of its flight a missile travels by inertia. During this phase it can no longer be deflected from its course and can only be destroyed. Furthermore, it's during this phase of the flight that the independently targeted warheads separate. It's they, according to the SDI scenario, that are to be destroyed by satellite-based small homing interceptor missiles or space-based rail guns capable of imparting to their projectiles velocities of up to several dozen kilometers a second. Still another possibility, according to this scenario, is the shooting down of the missiles by directed energy weapons. Finally, the scenario also envisages a third layer of

antimissile defense which consists of ground based antimissile weapons. What makes the whole SDI concept absurd is the fact that neither these three antiballistic missile layers nor any other number of them can assure the destruction of all the enemy missiles, let alone all the warheads, and each warhead is capable of blotting out a big city.

[Belitskiy] And so even the most sophisticated and expensive ABM systems cannot guarantee 100 percent protection of a country's territory, but new physical principles are being proposed all the time for weapons technology. One now hears talk of super-powerful hydrogen, fluorine, and other chemical lasers, and these would be based on the ground but their beams would be focused by space-based reflectors onto a target. The American press also speaks of x-ray lasers that would be activated by the energy of nuclear explosions. Possibly there may emerge other methods of upgrading ABM systems.

[Rauschenbach] Well of course there may, but take your last example, the nuclear-pumped x-ray laser. This is a space-based device that requires the explosion of a small atom bomb of the type dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Cylindrical rods would then be used to beam the blast energy at each target. For several such rods to direct energy at several targets the targets however must appear at the same time. But knowing the mechanism of nuclear pumping, the attacking side could merely stagger the missile launches or could launch decoys. This is a typical example. In the final analysis if one side builds a certain number of fantastically expensive battle-stations in space capable of destroying a certain number of ballistic missiles, the mere increase in missile numbers could make such an ABM system meaningless in practical terms. And of course, it's not difficult to increase the number of warheads on a missile by adding decoys such as balloons. A missile, let alone a warhead, is far simpler and less expensive than such a battle-station. It would also be possible to resort to false launches, disperse all kinds of chaff in space, and blow up battle-stations by space mines. This, too, would be far simpler than knocking out a missile, since a battle-station is a satellite flying in a known orbit observed daily and clearly vulnerable to any anti-satellite weapon. In short, considering the natural counter-measures available to the other side, the proposed missile shield turns out to be a highly unreliable system.

[Belitskiy] But this brings us to another question. Why then is SDI such a danger to humanity if it's a mere waste of enormous funds and resources?

[Rauschenbach] The main danger is that SDI is a terribly destabilizing initiative, it increases the probability of war. After all many people today consider nuclear war to be practically impossible since, as someone put it, whoever fires first dies second. In other words starting a nuclear conflict today is suicide. But a missile shield, even a partial one, can give some military hotheads and political ones too the false impression of relative security. They may reason something along those lines, since I'm firing all my missiles first retaliation at my territory will be weakened because many of the enemy missiles will have been destroyed in their silos or naval vessels. As for the weakened return strike, I can intercept that with my ABM shield, softening the blow at my country. American strategists have even invented such an unnatural term as "acceptable damage," in other words the side possessing even a partial missile shield may be tempted to deliver a preemptive nuclear strike.

And secondly, as I have said, one of the simplest responses to such an ABM system is to increase the number of one's missiles. What we are proposing, on the other hand, is drastic cuts in the number of missiles and the total abolition of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

[Belitskiy] I know that quite a number of American scientists share this view of SDI, for example Hans Bethe, the Nobel laureate in physics, has said against missiles there is no defense, the offense could always fool the defense, so anti-ballistic missiles for city defense are technically nonsense. Or consider this statement made by American politicians Robert McNamara, George Kennan, Gerard Smith and McGeorge Bundy. There is simply no escape, they said, from the reality that "star wars" offers not the promise of greater safety but the certainty of a large scale expansion of both offensive and defensive systems of both sides. "Star wars", in sum, is a prescription not for ending or limiting the threat of nuclear weapons but for a competition unlimited in expense, duration and danger. Well, what is surprising is that American scientists and engineers, although understanding the implications of "star wars", are nonetheless taking part in developing new types of space weapons.

[Rauschenbach] You must realize that scientists have a peculiar mentality. A scientist is often unable to resist the challenge of some problem that baffles him, he is motivated by a search for knowledge and knowingly, or unknowingly, he finds all sorts of excuses for what he is doing, say the excuse that the type of laser he is developing in his lab at the moment may prove useful in medicine, or genetic engineering, or somewhere else. He prefers not to think about the fact that this laser will be used first of all for military purposes. Naturally, this mentality of the scientist is much exploited in the West. However, by far not all scientists and engineers allow themselves to be deceived about the true nature of their work. I recently visited Prague, where we discussed what should be done to keep weapons out of space. Our West German colleagues told the meeting that professors and other researchers at many universities in their country were more and more often refusing to take part in military research projects. But an American scientist reminded the meeting that a large part of the scientists in the United States worked for various firms and not universities and for them the choice was either to do what they were told to do or else lose their jobs.

[Belitskiy] Still, more and more scientists in the United States too have lately taken a firm stand against the very idea of a space missile shield, against preparations for "star wars". Seventeen hundred American scientists, among them 14 Nobel laureates, have refused to become involved in SDI.

[Rauschenbach] Well I can add to that that in our country we have set up a committee, Soviet Scientists for Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat. I am a member of this committee, which is chaired by Dr Yevgeniy Velikhov a vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Not so long ago representatives of our committee spoke in the United States Senate about their findings on various problems related to the maintenance of peace in the world. We consider this work extremely important, and I regard this discussion with you as stemming from my duty, my duty as a scientist familiar with the technical and scientific factors that make it sheer madness to develop new antimissile systems leading to nuclear war in space. Such madness has to be fought by all possible means.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

21 March 1986

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN EXAMINES DANGER OF U.S. SDI PLANS

PM261539 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Feb 86 Single Edition p 11

[Text] In the section devoted to the party's foreign policy strategy in the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the words that it is vital to seek a real solution in order to guarantee that the arms race is not to be transferred to space sound like a warning bell.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondents B. Artemov and A. Korobov asked Dr of Historical Sciences Richard Sergeevich Ovinnikov, rector of the USSR Foreign Ministry Moscow State Institute of International Relations, to comment on this section of the political report:

In analyzing the foreign policy section of M.S. Gorbachev's report to the party congress and the part devoted to the "star wars" idea, let us remember the political backdrop against which this idea emerged. In the first few years after it came to power, the current U.S. administration did not consider it shameful to officially state that the United States had embarked on a massive rearmament program. As U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger put it, people overseas were prepared to "prevail" over the Soviet Union. Moreover, U.S. Vice President Bush once remarked that it is possible to win a nuclear war if well prepared for it. And in this specific respect "SDI" was seen as a decisive means of achieving global strategic supremacy.

Wherein lies the specific danger of "SDI"? I would note the following aspects. First, the very emergence of the "star wars" idea brings to mind an attempt to cover up the expedited development of U.S. offensive arms in all avenues with a smoke screen. Approximately a month before "SDI" was announced the Joint Chiefs met with the U.S. President. The meeting sought ways of justifying to Congress the new appropriations for various military programs, primarily the MX program. They then came to the conclusion that this would be promoted by positing some idea which would cover up the new military programs in a rosy defensive glow. The operation was dubbed "MX plus" -- that is, an operation to push the appropriations for the MX program through Congress.

Aspect two. As they say in Washington, the first phase of "SDI" development poses no threat since the United States cannot launch an attack if its own defensive system has not yet been perfected, and that, they claim, is why they are incapable of defending themselves. A good answer to this was given by Robert McNamara, the well-known U.S. figure, who stated that, of course, a leaky umbrella gives no protection from a shower, but it may be a help in a drizzle. He meant by this that an incomplete "SDI" system cannot provide cover against the first strike -- which the United States is not threatened by, incidentally -- but it may be useful for inflicting a first strike against the USSR and then providing cover against a weakened retaliatory strike.

Such an approach is irresponsible primarily in relation to the American people themselves. U.S. political scientists cynically state that some casualties on the U.S. side are inevitable, but justified. Those who contemplate using SDI at the first stage of its deployment proceed from the concept of "acceptable losses." The fact that between 20 to 50 million Americans would perish in this respect does not concern them: as long as socialism is erased from the face of the earth.

In justifying the full deployment of the SDI system, it is usually claimed that this system is of a defensive nature and envisages, they say, carrying out strikes only Soviet missiles in flight. But many American specialists attest to the fact that the use of a deployed SDI system is planned to attempt to destroy Soviet missiles in their silos before they are launched -- that is, as first strike weapons.

One of the most dangerous aspects of SDI is destabilization of the international situation. If the arms race moves into space, strategic stability in the world will be totally destroyed. What is more, this will signify the crossing of that fateful line, when the slide toward a thermonuclear war will be irreversible.

And there is another aspect -- the technical aspect. Primarily American scientists themselves cannot see sufficient theoretical and purely practical potential that would make it possible to build an SDI system. As a whole, SDI is a very risky game by adventurist U.S. circles, a game not only with the destiny of tens and hundreds of millions of people, but also with the fate of mankind as a whole. That is why it is natural for criticism of SDI to be given due attention in the report by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COMMENTARY VIEWS JAPAN'S POSITION ON SDI

OW020535 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 1 Mar 86

[Andreyev commentary]

[Excerpts] Judging from the nature of modern weapons, it would be impossible for any nation to rely solely on military technology to protect itself against such weapons, however strong a defense system it might develop. This is the position of the Soviet Union as stated by General Secretary Gorbachev in his Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress.

In this connection, we cannot but be concerned and apprehensive about Japan's position. The Japanese ruling circles have lately assumed a positive position on the issue of their country's participation in the extremely dangerous "star wars" program. Prime Minister Nakasone recently said that Japan has no plan to postpone a final decision indefinitely. Ruling party and government leaders also agreed to officially encourage private business to take part in the space militarization program. Japanese newspapers are reporting on vigorous activities being carried out before the Japanese Government makes a final decision on its position, which will probably be one that pushes Japan into a deeper involvement with the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Meanwhile, YOMIURI SHIMBUN has carried a noteworthy article saying that even private business leaders have expressed apprehension that their participation in SDI research and development projects might be perceived as research for military purposes. Frankly speaking, in this case those business leaders have clearer foresight than some political leaders, because as far as the "star wars" program is concerned, so many factors justify their apprehension.

According to a KYODO report, a U.S. Government leader recently told an official representative of the Japanese Government that the "star wars" program will not replace nuclear weapons but reinforce them. His statement reflects the true U.S. intention.

Japan had earlier attached a variety of reservations to SDI, which sometimes sounded like pretexts, even saying that it could take part should it be defensive in nature. It had long been known that such pretexts represented a clumsy attempt to justify Japan's involvement with the U.S. military program. Furthermore, politicians and military experts in many countries, including the United States, had pointed out the aggressive nature of the "star wars" program.

A former adviser to President Reagan on scientific affairs said that the purpose of SDI is to place a nuclear blanket over the Soviet Union. U.S. official quarters thus admitted that the U.S. Government views the "star wars" program not as a so-called shield for the free world but as (?an extension of nuclear weapons in the continental United States).

That the United States has revealed its true intention has provided the Japanese Government with a good opportunity to look again at prospective cooperation with the Pentagon. U.S. Government leaders have thus produced the possibility to find out the truth about Japan. If Japan should agree to participate in the U.S. space militarization program at this time when the United States has revealed its true intention, it would show that the Japanese Government's peace-loving pronouncements are not worth a penny.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: JAPAN TO SEND DELEGATION TO U.S. FOR SDI TALKS

LDO41048 Moscow TASS in English 0904 GMT 4 Mar 86

[Text] Tokyo, March 4 TASS -- The Japanese Government has decided to send into the United States a third high-powered delegation to study the question of participation in the Washington administration's so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative."

The delegation will comprise representatives of private Japanese corporations interested in Pentagon orders for the manufacture of space arms and their components. The decision, noted KYODO TSUSHIN news agency, actually means Tokyo's consent to join the "star wars" programme in response to the United States' persistent demands.

Yasuhiro Nakasone's cabinet timed the dispatch of the delegation of experts to America with the visit to Japan by U.S. Defence Secretary Casper Weinberger, due early in April, one of the chief objectives of which is to get Tokyo involved as soon as possible in the realization of the American programme to militarize outer space.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1279

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BELGIUM'S TINDEMANS COMMENTS ON WESTERN DEFENSE, SDI

DW280737 Bonn DIE WELT in German 27 Feb 86 p 7

[Interview with Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans by correspondent Helmutr Hetzel; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] DIE WELT: Do you see possibilities and chances in Western global strategy that Western Europe could play a medium- and long-term dominant role in the alliance, and what influence could such a development have on relations between Europe and Moscow?

Tindemans: Let me first say the two-track decision was an example of Europe's having a say. The European countries said at that time that deterrence was no longer credible if we did not respond to the SS-20 missiles. Let me get back to your question. First, there is no serious defense without U.S. participation. Second, strategic nuclear weapons are not in Europe [as published], and they are indispensable in a deterrence system. We need the nuclear protective shield of the United States, but do we always see the problems in the same way as the Americans see them? I would say no. The Americans see the situation from a global point of view. We live directly on the border with the Eastern bloc. For us it is different. Geopolitically we are neighbors of Eastern Europe. These are influential psychological and geographical factors. Even if we want the same things as the Americans, our people react differently than Americans do since they do not have the feeling of being directly threatened or of living in the direct vicinity of an aggressor. That results in different assessments. In case of estrangement between the United States and Europe, I am afraid that we, the Europeans, would be the victims. I do not say that the Americans want that, but there are clear indications of trends in the United States that oppose the presence of U.S. soldiers in Europe.

DIE WELT: What influence could the implementation of the American SDI plans have on relations between Europe and the United States?

Tindemans: SDI can have a great influence, technologically and economically. As you know, there are three SDI stages: the stage of research, the stage of production, and the stage of installation. We are still in the first stage. Technologically and economically SDI is of great importance. Whether Europe can keep pace with its own Eureka project or engages in SDI cooperation will be of very great importance for Europe.

DIE WELT: Could it be that SDI in the final analysis will substantially change relations between Europe and the United States?

Tindemans: It could be. When we discussed within the framework of the West European Union (WEU), several countries formulated conditions: First, our deterrence strategy must not be prejudiced by SDI. Second, SDI must remain within the framework of the ABM Treaty. Should it not, one would have to negotiate separately with the Soviets about it. Third, SDI should not mean superiority. We Europeans ask ourselves: Does SDI protect us or not? If the Europeans could speak with one voice on the SDI matter, they would definitely have a greater chance to gain influence over the substance of the project.

DIE WELT: Do you consider a kind of European Defense Initiative [EDI] project desirable?

Tindemans: Most definitely.

DIE WELT: Would this be an initiative that you could support without reservation?

Tindemans: You have asked two questions. Will we have our own EDI or will we try to persuade the Americans to do it for us.

DIE WELT: Are you talking about the Woerner proposal?

Tindemans: Yes. Whether one is for or against, the question is: "What happens in Western Europe when the United States implements SDI?" The Soviets are active as well. They are working on such a system as well. Will we become victims of these developments or will we be able jointly to give a European answer?

/9365

CSO: 5200/2641

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

UK MILITARY EXPERIMENT--London, 3 Mar (TASS)--London and Washington have reached agreement on British participation in an experiment involving the U.S. spy satellite "Real Ruby" which has been assigned the role of a space-based ingredient of the multitier anti-missile defense projected by overseas planners, the FINANCIAL TIMES reported. During the upcoming experiment, the paper said, Royal Navy vessels and aircraft from the Royal Air Force will act as "targets" for the satellite which will use its infrared sensors to obtain their heat images. British specialists will also take part in evaluating data from the trials. The experiment will thus be a test of a key "star wars" component, the FINANCIAL TIMES said. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 3 Mar 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1279

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: U.S. BUILDUP PLANS FUEL NUCLEAR THREAT

PM201118 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Second Edition p 3

[Captain 2d rank Ye. Nikitin "Military-Political Review": "To Avert the Looming Threat"]

[Text] Time is sweeping mankind toward the threshold of the third millennium. How many new opportunities does the future offer the earth's inhabitants! There is also, however, a great danger for the fate of peace, stemming from those who think in terms of confrontation and are totally incapable of abandoning their claims to world domination, whose untenability was already proved a long time ago.

The Soviet Union urges people to be aware of their responsibility for life on the planet, reorient their mentality and thinking in the nuclear age, display a sober approach toward prevailing realities, and learn to get along with one another having jettisoned the ballast of mistrust and suspicion. The new initiatives, which it recently put forward, really capture the imagination with their scope, comprehensiveness, and profound concern for the fate of peace. They display the wisdom and responsibility of the foreign policy implemented by the CPSU.

"The most acute problem facing mankind today is the problem of war and peace," the draft new edition of the CPSU Program reads. Peaceful coexistence is the only sensible, the only acceptable solution in a world abounding with acute contradictions and in the face of the nuclear catastrophe threatening the whole of mankind. The Soviet Union takes peaceful coexistence to mean not just the absence of war, but an international order under which good neighborliness and cooperation would dominate and there would be a broad exchange of the achievements of science and technology and of cultural values to the benefit of all peoples.

The Soviet Union's present foreign policy course is a law-governed and consistent continuation of Lenin's peace strategy. There is something symbolic in the fact that today, 15 years before the end of the century, the Soviet Union has put to the entire world its proposals to destroy nuclear and chemical arms and reduce conventional weapons. This is our stance, expressing the essence of the Soviet Union's foreign and domestic policy and their organic unity. The understanding that nuclear war is impermissible, that it must not be fought, and that there can be no victors in it determines the Soviet Union's principled stance in the international arena. And the problem of ensuring security is the key and central problem at the present stage.

The Soviet Union does not seek military superiority over the United States. Back in the past both sides determined the existence of strategic parity between them (and this has just been reaffirmed by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff). It is high time that Washington got used to this parity as the natural state of Soviet-American relations. And if there is to be talk about anything, it ought to be about lowering this level of this parity. In other words, to implement real measures to reduce arms, and primarily the means of mass destruction, on a reciprocal basis.

This presentation of the issue leads completely logically to a conclusion of fundamental importance. Namely, that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union must do anything that would open channels for an arms race in new spheres. It is, after all, obvious that if space weapons are given the "green light" the scale of military rivalry will expand immeasurably. It is possible to predict even now that the arms race would become irreversible and get out of control. Under these circumstances either side could at any given moment perceive a certain loss and would start seeking all kinds of methods for a response. This would whip up the arms race still further, and no longer only in space but also on Earth. To put it briefly, the pernicious process would gather headlong pace like an avalanche rolling down a steep mountainside.

These are the fundamental postulates by which the Soviet Union is guided in determining its foreign policy course. As M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his answers to questions from L'HUMANITE, "in the nuclear age it is impossible to live -- or to live for a long time at least -- with the mentality, customs, and rules of behavior of the Stone Age." The new Soviet proposals aimed at the total elimination of nuclear arms in the period until the year 2000 are evidence that the Soviet Union is opposed in principle to world history being written with the tips of missiles. It is in favor of ensuring that general statements about the need to improve the international situation are translated into specific deeds.

The idea that nuclear war is impermissible and impossible to win has also been expressed on many occasions by the American side. Furthermore, this idea was recorded in the Soviet-U.S. statement on the results of the Geneva summit meeting. However, Washington's practical deeds are fundamentally different from its much publicized peace-loving declarations. It is possible to perceive behind these deeds the sinister designs of the most reactionary imperialist circles to launch a new round of the arms race and transfer nuclear weapons into space.

It is planned to appropriate the sum of \$4.8 billion for the "star wars" program in fiscal 1987, which is almost double the appropriations for the current fiscal year. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, \$76 million will be spent just on research development [nauchno-issledovatel'skaya razrabotka] within the framework of the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative." Some experts even estimate the total cost of the program at \$1 trillion!

Specifically, the administration is asking Congress to appropriate funds for the ASAT antisatellite system in 1987. It is unbelievable and yet a fact that expenditure on the testing and production of ASAT, which is a component of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, is planned to increase... 33 times over 3 fiscal years (1986-1988). Democrat Congressman L. AuCoin described the U.S. intention to deploy the ASAT system as "insanity."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already spoken on many occasions about the essence of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." Let us recall just the main points. Space strike weapons, which are a component of an integrated offensive complex, are being created [sozdatsya] under cover of demagogic arguments about a defensive "shield." The fundamental objective is to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union. In attempting to extend the arms race into space Washington is essentially deliberately acting to wreck the talks that are in progress and to nullify all existing arms limitation agreements. The United States' continuation of its adventurist undertaking could result in the world finding itself in a situation of an absolutely uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, a most dangerous undermining of stability, and universal uncertainty and fear. In other words, the risk of a universal catastrophe would increase immeasurably.

The implementation of the "star wars" program is being accompanied by hitherto unprecedented expenditure on the so-called "nuclear rearmament of America" and the creation [sozdaniye] of almost 10,000 new warheads for strategic missiles. This was written in particular by Professor (F. Knelman), author of the recently published book "Reagan, God, and the Bomb" [Reygan, Bog, i Bomba]. Evidence of this is also provided by the draft budget of the U.S. Department of Defense for fiscal 1987, which has grown to the unprecedented sum of \$311.6 billion. It is well known that the Pentagon has requested funds for the stepped up implementation of literally all nuclear programs.

In particular, the purchase of 21 MX missiles is envisaged. The Pentagon is planning to acquire a total of 100 new MX ICBM's. Congress has already "okayed" the construction of 50 of these missiles. Furthermore, funds have been requested to start the creation [sozdaniye] of Midgetman missiles scheduled for deployment in the nineties.

Pentagon chief Weinberger is insisting on finance for the building of an additional "Trident" class nuclear missile submarine and on appropriations for the purchase of Trident-2 (D-5) missiles. This type of missile is meant for use as a first strike weapon and will become part of submarines' armament in 1989.

The building of B-1B strategic bombers will continue, and it is planned to complete the first squadron of these aircraft by as early as next fall. Funds have been requested for the creation [sozdaniye] of a qualitatively new bomber and new cruise missiles which would be invisible to ground-based radar stations. It is planned to deploy new nuclear missiles in West Europe, to substantially build up the arsenals of the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force, and to boost the potential of the interventionist Rapid Deployment Forces.

All this provides evidence that the United States remains obsessed by the ideas of gaining absolute security for itself and placing everyone else in a position of absolute danger. The total completion of the creation [sozdaniye] of some nuclear weapon systems is due by the end of this century. This means that they will be in service during the following decades of the 21st century. In contrast, the Soviet Union's profoundly humane and far-reaching peace proposals are aimed at ensuring that mankind goes into the third millennium totally free of all types of mass destruction weapons.

It ought to be particularly emphasized that the unrestrained buildup of all types of weapons is accompanied by the development [razrabotka] of various adventurist "doctrines" and "concepts." For example, Washington recently put forward the foreign policy doctrine of "new globalism." So-called "theoreticians" justifying and promoting these "concepts" have also emerged from among the most aggressive and reactionary circles of the ruling clique in present-day America.

The essence of the "new globalism" is that the United States is attempting to usurp the right to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states or in what it describes as "low intensity" conflicts which occur from time to time in different regions. Moreover, the United States itself is fanning these conflicts, engaging in saber-rattling, threats, and committing direct acts of aggression. All kinds of puppets, butchers, skilled executioners, and overthrown dictators, whose hands are stained by the blood of thousands of innocent victims, are received as guests of honor in Washington. There are more than enough examples: South African butchers, surviving remnants of Pol Pot and Somoza supporters, Afghan dushmans, Angolan members of UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], and other bandits and stooges of all colors and hues -- they all receive generous material and military assistance from Washington and paternal blessings to commit new crimes.

As the march of historical development undermines the positions of imperialism, its policy toward other peoples becomes correspondingly more hostile and aggressive. U.S. imperialism has become a true citadel of world reaction. It is the primary source of the threat of war. Laying claim to world domination, it proclaims entire continents to be zones of its "vital interests." The U.S. policy of diktat, support for repressive anti-people regimes, and interference in other states' internal affairs is exacerbating the international situation to an extreme extent. The danger looming over mankind is more terrifying than ever before.

But the opportunities to preserve and strengthen peace are themselves more real than ever before. Pooling their efforts, the peoples can and must avert the threat of nuclear annihilation. The path toward this is shown by the Soviet Union.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: U.S RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSAL DRAWS CRITICISM

Termed 'Revamped Zero Option'

LD261609 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, 26 Feb (TASS) -- White House Deputy Press Secretary L. Speakes announced at the latest press conference that the president has made a statement which, as he put it, is "a response to M.S. Gorbachev's proposal on disarmament. "He confirmed that the President had sent his response to Moscow after "the appropriate consultations with the U.S. allies in Europe and Asia."

It emerges from what Speakes said that the U.S. position on the problem of the nomilitarization of space, reduction of strategic weapons, and banning chemical weapons and nuclear tests has not undergone any changes. As regards medium-range missiles, the U.S. proposal in essence boils down to a revamped "zero option." The White House representative himself virtually admitted this in replying to a question.

As we know, the "zero option," of which most people will have heard, was put forward by Washington back in 1981 at talks on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe. It was unacceptable to the Soviet Union, since it envisaged unilateral military advantages for the United States of America. The "novelty" in this latest version lies, according to Speakes, only in the fact that Washington is now proposing a "3-year schedule" for its implementation.

Declining to give a straight answer to the all-embracing program advanced by the Soviet Union for full and universal elimination of nuclear weapons and its range of proposals on other questions of arms limitation, the Administration states the need to create "a greater degree of trust between the USSR and the United States" and to provide strict verification [kontrol] measures. A reduction in strategic nuclear arsenals is made conditional on the USSR's agreeing to the "star wars" program as well as on reductions -- and unilateral ones at that -- in Soviet conventional weapons. Also tied in with this are problems of regional conflicts, bilateral issues, and Washington's hackneyed question of human rights. As regards the issue of banning nuclear explosions, the United States of America has adopted a completely negative position, saying that as long as nuclear weapons serve as a "deterrent element" the United States of America will continue the tests.

The Administration representative was asked whether the President's proposal envisages the compulsory destruction of Soviet and U.S. missiles which are to be reduced "at various stages," or whether the United States of America will have the opportunity to remove them and keep them "for a short time" on its territory. The U.S. representative virtually confirmed that the United States of America adopts the latter stance. Judging from what he said, the United States of America would like to weaken the USSR's defense in the east while at the same time keeping U.S. military forces in that region. It would also like to block the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe by referring to the unwillingness of Britain and France to freeze their nuclear missile arsenals. The United States of America also refuses to pledge not to hand over strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries.

Arbatov Comments

LD262127 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1730 GMT 26 Feb 86

[Report on interview with Soviet Academician Georgiy Arbatov by correspondent Stefan Babiak in Moscow -- date not given; portions enclosed within quotation marks recorded in Russian with superimposed Slovak translation]

[Text] [Babiak] Our interview began with a question: What is the difference between the Soviet proposal and the U.S. reply which arrived in Moscow shortly before the opening of the congress?

[Arbatov] "The difference is that the Soviet proposals put forward a clear realistic plan for tackling a whole complex of very weighty international problems. This plan is quite concrete and, in my opinion, it does not threaten the safety of any country. The U.S. reply, on the contrary, is an unclear nebulous paper on the usefulness of eradicating nuclear weapons. It speaks in concrete terms on one topic only: nuclear weapons in Europe. It will take some time before the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks will explain the details of this reply. However, its fundamental features show already that the U.S. attitude ignores the basic facts of international development, and this in the very area in which the USSR took a huge step toward the Western countries."

[Babiak] I was also interested in how Academician Arbatov perceives the U.S. attitude to the Geneva process.

[Arbatov] "I would like to mention that this process actually started earlier, at the time of the agreement on the meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Geneva. For us this moment became the stimulus for making counterproposals and initiatives. As you know, there were quite a few of them. At the same time a discussion opened in the world about the crucial issues of disarmament, and it started in the United States, too. This political process has gradually developed and Geneva influenced it positively. Arguments have been going on in Washington about what will be the line of the U.S. policy. In my view, the Americans have still not made up their minds which path they will follow, whether they will continue in attempts to return to the cold war or whether they will seek a way forward. Ronald Reagan's reply has not convinced me that Washington has found the definite answer."

[Babiak] I asked Georgiy Arbatov in conclusion how he sees the prospects for the new USSR-U.S. summit meeting?

[Arbatov] "Comrade Gorbachev said clearly yesterday that a new summit might take place if it is to bring about positive results. If not, then another summit makes no sense. He also mentioned two areas in which it is the easiest to make progress: I have in mind the halting of nuclear tests and the eradication of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in central Europe. If these two items are on the agenda of a summit then Mikhail Gorbachev will be willing to take part in it. The date is no problem. Now it is up to the United States. We are waiting for an answer from Washington about whether the U.S. Administration is willing to discuss and solve these issues."

Chernyshev Comments

LD262147 Moscow TASS in English 2134 GMT 26 Feb 86

["Washington's Old Theme and Its Variations"--TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow. 26 Feb (TASS)--By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

The U.S. Administration has come up with a so-called answer to the Soviet initiatives set forth in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev of January 15, 1986. Although the "answer" has not been published officially about everything has been done to "leak" its contents to the American press in a bid to create a semblance of Washington's "activity" in the arms control field.

In the existing moral and political situation in the world the U.S. Administration has not ventured to reject the Soviet initiatives openly or declare them "propaganda" as Washington has done more than once. According to the newspaper MERCURY NEWS, to reject the Soviet plan would be suicidal. At the same time it has become impossible to remain silent on the subject of the Soviet initiatives any longer: in the definition of U.S. Senator William Proxmire, silence has become a shocking evidence of weakness.

So, another road has been chosen -- that of political maneuvering in a bid to split the complex of wide-scale Soviet initiatives, to single out at will its individual elements and to accompany them with the conditions that prejudice the security of the other side and are, therefore, unacceptable to it. Exactly this kind of manipulation has been made with respect to the Soviet proposal to eliminate the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone.

The Soviet Union is known to have proposed by way of a first step toward ridding Europe of nuclear weapons to eliminate completely the medium-range missiles of the U.S.S.R. and the United States, both ballistic and cruise missiles, in the European zone. At the same time the United States should undertake not to transfer its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France should pledge not to build up their respective nuclear arms. This has been proposed in the context of the entire set of Soviet initiatives that clearly provide for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons of all types and everywhere on earth in a limited period of time -- inside of 15 years. This proposal is quite understandable, feasible and fair. It does not damage the security of anyone.

Commenting on the Soviet proposal, U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has said that it afforded a chance to take first steps toward ridding the world of nuclear weapons. History will not forgive us if we blast that chance, he has stressed.

But does Washington really need that chance, does it need the prospect for easing international tension at all? Has it reviewed its approach to international affairs to make it comply with a new thinking that is indispensable in a nuclear and space age? Isn't the inertia of Washington's postulates of power and its orientation toward achieving superiority too great?

The "new thinking" Washington style is epitomized in the American counter-proposal on medium-range missiles which the former head of the U.S. delegation to the SALT-2 talks Paul Warnke described as a not serious one. It is designed to give less informed people the impression of a "positive reaction" to the Soviet proposal. But in effect it is an attempt to thrust on the Soviet Union the notorious "zero option" that has never got off the ground. Washington has proposed two "variations" on the old themes and has even quoted some figures to make them look "solid".

The first "variation", according to American press reports, provides for a reduction of all Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe and Asia (For Europe -- to 140 launchers on each side in the duration of the first year, to 70 in the second and to zero in the third year, and for Asia -- year-by-year reductions in similar proportions). The second "variation" calls for the removal of all medium-range missiles in Europe and their 50 per cent reduction in Asia.

The U.S. Administration has refused to undertake not to transfer its missiles to other countries. It is also opposed to a pledge by Great Britain and France not to build up their respective nuclear arms. But these are the issues that are directly linked to the European balance of nuclear forces. The more so, that in case the Soviet Union reduces its medium-range missiles in the European zone the importance of nuclear arsenals of Great Britain and France will grow at any rate and in case of their further build up it will do so to an ever increasing extent. This means that Washington reserves the possibility to disrupt the correlation of forces in Europe in NATO's favor through the delivery of its missiles to Great Britain and an overall buildup in the nuclear capability by Great Britain and France.

At the same time a unilateral reduction of Soviet missiles in Asia is proposed, while no mention is made at all of the U.S. nuclear arms (U.S. forward-based systems) there. Consequently, from that point of view, too, the "counter-proposal" is devised to give the United States a unilateral advantage. Artificial "linkage" of Soviet missiles in Asia with the issue of making initial steps to rid Europe of nuclear weapons is without a doubt aimed at complicating the problem and putting up a barrier in the way of its solution.

But where is the observance of the principle of equality and equal security, where is the regard for the interests of the partner in the talks in the American "counter-proposal"? Can it testify to the existence of a true intention to stop the race in nuclear arms and mark the beginning of their reduction? More likely than not the true intentions of the U.S. Administration were reflected in a recent speech made by General Bernard Rogers, supreme allied commander Europe, in the French Institute of International Relations. He praised in every way the nuclear arms buildup programs carried out by the United States and Great Britain as well as the siting of the U.S. medium-range missiles in Western European countries that proceeds at full speed.

'Negative' U.S. Position Noted

LD270016 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2030 GMT 26 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpts] Now on to the first responses to the work of the congress from the capitalist countries.

What has been Washington's reaction? After a month and a half of reflection, the White House has at last announced its reply to the large-scale Soviet peace initiative set out in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January. THE WASHINGTON POST notes that this reply was sent to Moscow with the intention of getting it published on the eve of the opening of the congress.

As you know, comrades, our attitude to the U.S. position has already been made known from the rostrum of the congress, including the fact that the President's letter gives no basis for any amendment to the assessment of the world situation set forth in the Central Committee's report before the message was received.

THE WASHINGTON POST itself admits that Reagan's reply does not contain any new U.S. negotiating position. In particular, the Washington administration has stated that the USSR's proposal for the destruction of all nuclear weapons by the end of the present century is not suitable for consideration at present. Why is this? A reply to this question is given, for example, by the current debate in the U.S. Congress about the draft budget for the coming fiscal year, which begins in the United States on 1 October.

U.S. concerns expect to obtain especially large profits from production of space arms. Even after the "Challenger" spacecraft disaster, some people in the United States try to pretend that nothing terrible has happened, and that work on the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative should proceed.

In Washington, a session of the presidential commission investigating the loss of "Challenger" is not under way. It transpires that a specialist from the Morton Company, which manufactures the rocket boosters, prepared a report several months ago in which he pointed out the danger of the spacecraft exploding, owing to a malfunction of the seals. However, the heads of NASA disregarded all these warnings.

Meanwhile it has been reported that the Pentagon is pressing ahead with new plans for launchings of shuttle-type spacecraft, and with the creation of a new aerospace aircraft, the X-30, which it is also planned to utilize for military purposes. And again, the military concerns are expecting to profit from it. The cost of only the first experimental design work on the X-30 is assessed at \$6 to 7 million, of which the Pentagon will bear 80 percent and NASA 20 percent.

To justify its negative position, Washington has recently been advancing certain other arguments, in particular saying that the West Europeans allegedly oppose the elimination of nuclear-missile weapons. They are supposedly very fond of U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles.

Kornilov Commentary

LD262033 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 26 Feb 86

["U.S. Sticks to Same Old Stance on End to Nuclear Testing" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, February 26 TASS -- TASS political commentator Yuriy Kornilov writes: Widely commenting on a Soviet proposal to set up an all-embracing system of international security, which has been made at the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union currently under way in Moscow, prominent politicians, public personalities and the press say that the system should include an end to all nuclear tests as one of its more important integral parts.

That is right. There is no need to argue that to put an end to nuclear blasts is to put an end to the upgrading of nuclear weapons and block the ways and possibilities of developing ever new varieties of these deadly systems.

It is with this aim in mind that the Soviet Union announced on January 15 that it extends its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing for another three months and urged the United States to stop its nuclear explosions too.

Nearly one and a half months have passed by but Washington's reply remains a flat "no". Why? One of the "arguments" brought forth to justify the U.S. refusal to terminate nuclear explosions claims "verification difficulties".

A special panel on arms control and disarmament formed at a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee in Washington, for example, recently issued a report which contended once again that it was "impossible" to verify a ban on nuclear tests.

But the false contention has now been repeatedly refuted by American scientists and authoritative military experts themselves. It has been strongly rejected also by prominent politicians in the West.

Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, for one, argued that the body of scientific and technological knowledge and experience accumulated by today made it possible to ensure the necessary verification of compliance with a treaty banning any tests of nuclear weapons.

As they apparently realize the flimsiness of their allegations about "verification difficulties", the advocates of the arms race claim also that the Soviet moratorium proposal is unacceptable because the USSR has by this time staged more explosions than the United States.

According to the authoritative Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), however, by the beginning of 1985 the United States conducted 772 nuclear explosions as compared with the USSR's 556. And the gap has increased even further since the Soviet Union declared its moratorium on all nuclear blasts.

These figures cut the ground from under the feet of Pentagon "hawks" trying to scare the man in the street with concoctions about "Soviet military superiority". In Washington they have brought into play of late also another "argument" meant to defend the U.S. negative posture. It is that the United States should not halt its nuclear testing because nuclear weapons are a "deterrent".

Those pushing this essentially militaristic postulate are not even embarrassed by it being in glaring conflict with their own peace-making statements about the need to do away with nuclear weapons.

No matter what angle one chooses to look at the problem of ending nuclear explosions from, it is more than obvious that all these "arguments" marshalled by Washington figures are nothing more than a cover story intended to vindicate their refusal to provide a positive response to the Soviet moratorium.

"The reluctance of the USA and its ruling circles to embark on the path of nuclear disarmament manifests itself most clearly in their attitude to nuclear explosions the termination of which is the demand of the whole world," the CPSU Central Committee said in its political report to the 27th party congress.

Washington itself adds more evidence to support these words time and time again.

Timing of Response 'a Riddle'

LD261658 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 26 Feb 86

[News Conference by CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department head Aleksandr Yakovlev at the CPSU Congress Press Center in Moscow on 25 February -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Unidentified journalist in Russian] I represent the U.S. magazine BUSINESS WEEK. Aleksandr Nikolayevich, how does the General Secretary view the fact that President Reagan's reply to his proposals arrived in Moscow 2 days before the congress opened.

[Yakovlev] This is a riddle for us as well. [laughter] To tell you the truth, we spent all day yesterday thinking about what this means. I do not want to accuse the President of wanting to place us in a difficult position because the questions are too serious and the people are too serious to engage in such games.

But we understood it in the following way -- and this was stated in the political report -- that the U.S. side apparently wanted to receive a response to its proposals, to its letter, from the congress rostrum and for some sort of more extensive dialogue on a world-wide scale to begin so that people would know the two sides' positions. As you know, the Political Report did not contain a detailed analysis of the President's message but it is, I would say, more capacious and extensive than a reply, and that is natural. It sets out our fundamental attitude to the positions expressed by the President.

But, all the same, to reply to the question, I do not believe that U.S. side and the President waited especially to send their letter precisely 24 hours before the congress. I do not believe so.

[ASAHI journalist in Russian] The newspaper ASAHI, Japan, [name indistinct] Please comment on the sharp criticism of U.S. imperialism which, despite the forthcoming summit meeting, was contained in Gorbachev's report.

[Yakovlev] Well, you see, on my way here I heard a different opinion, that the criticism was very gentle. How can one explain this? You know, this depends on one's point of view. But I would reply in this way. Recently, yesterday or the day before, I read Mr Reagan's speech in Grenada. You know, I did not find one compliment about us in it. [laughter].

We are still, it seems, at such a stage of our relations that we are still a very long way from compliments. This is dictated by the state of relations itself, which we describe very cautiously, so to say, with cautious optimism. Some features are emerging, some things are improving. But as was stated in the report today, there has been no major turning-point. Let us remove missiles from Europe, then this will be a major turning-point. Then one can talk about a turning-point. Then one can talk more gently.

U.S. Response 'Lopsided'

LD281008 Moscow TASS in English 0956 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS -- Getting acquainted with two recent statements made by President Reagan, one can say that the U.S. response to the Soviet proposals is not constructive, said Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee. He spoke in the press center of the 27th Congress of the CPSU today. It is lop-sided in character and actually moves in a direction that is diametrically opposite to the provisions formulated in the January 15 statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The American response fails to offer a solution to the principled issue of preventing an arms race in outer space. The U.S. "star wars" program is announced inviolable.

As to the strategic arms, the old American proposal is re-stated -- something on which the Soviet Union had already commented. If that proposal was realized, the United States would get a more than two-fold superiority in nuclear warheads. In that case the U.S.S.R. would have to scrap its strategic nuclear forces and build them according to the American pattern.

On medium-range missiles, Leonid Zamyatin went on to say, we are offered the so-called zero option which the Soviet Union rejected earlier because it would enable the United States to retain what it would like to retain. The United States has officially stated its negative position on a nuclear weapon test ban. It is equally difficult to detect in the American response at least a fraction of constructiveness on chemical weapons, just as on the Vienna talks and the Stockholm conference. The question of security, moreover, is linked at will with regional conflicts and other problems that have no bearing on that question.

The U.S. response, added Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., fails to advance the talks in Geneva by a single step.

Soviet Union 'In No Hurry'

PM241425 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Feb 86 p 3

[Article by Vladlen Kuznetsov under the rubric "Look at Events": "The World is Looking at Moscow"]

[Excerpt] Moscow is far from the idea of using the augmentation of its economic potential to pursue a "from a position of strength" policy, as is the custom in some states whose leaders gamble on the primacy of force, and military force at that, considering it to be the very foundation of policy and diplomacy. A socialist state has different political priorities. And different concepts and ideas of factors like economic might and military strength. Economic might serves to satisfy the fundamental requirements of the people and to ensure conditions of peace for them and the country's security. The USSR's growing economic might will never be placed on the side of war on the scales of war and peace. It will be placed on the side of peace.

"We are dealing with our most serious adversary in our entire history. It is particularly difficult for us because the language this adversary speaks is the language of peace." That is how M. Kampelman, the leader of the U.S. delegation at the talks now under way in Geneva, perhaps the most important talks in the history of mutual relations between the world's mightiest powers, responded to the USSR, because it is an adversary talks must be conducted with it "from a position of strength." That means it is necessary to seek to achieve one-sided advantages.

That means it is necessary to seek military advantage over it. But what if you look at the USSR not as an adversary but as a partner in resolving common problems? After all security, arms reduction, and the easing of the burden of military appropriations are no less necessary to America than they are to the USSR. It is obviously only those disinclined to seek a common language of peace with it who find it difficult to deal with the Soviet Union.

People throughout the world are now waiting to see how Washington will respond to the Soviet program for liberating the world from nuclear weapons in the next 15 years. They are waiting because they realize the importance of whether the USSR and the United States proceed in one direction -- toward a nuclear-free world -- or whether their paths diverge. The Soviet Union is in no hurry, realizing that it is not a simple question for Washington, that it will be more complex for it to resolve to do what the Soviet Union has resolved to do. Time is pressing. Time is pressing because every day of the arms race is a day lost to the world, a day which merely brings it closely to the nuclear abyss.

A reply is being born with difficulty, with pain, in the White House. People there evidently understand that this time they can no longer get away with high-flown declarations about their dream of living to see the time when nuclear weapons will disappear. It is reported that the president has already analyzed a number of possible options. But so far there is no one option which is the one which will be given. They say that before sending a reply to Moscow Washington has decided to

seek the advice and support of their allies and other countries. Its emissaries have visited West Europe, Japan, and China. But it looks as though the U.S. representatives have not been listening to and soliciting advice so much as themselves trying to influence moods among the ruling circles of other states. Disseminating scepticism with regard to the Soviet disarmament plan and presenting it as illusory and offering one one-sided advantages to the Soviet Union, they have made it clear what reaction the White House would like.

At the same time all kinds of "leaks" are being organized from Washington which are supposed to serve as some kind of crib in assessing Soviet initiatives. The USSR's comprehensive program is being divided and separated into parts. On virtually every point dirty tricks, concealed motives, a false bottom, and so forth are being sought. They are discovering, as has already been the custom in the West in preparing answers to Soviet proposals, "a number of constructive elements" but are putting forward so many captious objections and reservations and demanding so many explanations that it will perhaps be impossible to deal with them before 2000..."

But why all this? Because they have been faced with the need to respond honestly and unevasively to the main question put by the Soviet Union: is the West prepared to part with nuclear weapons, not verbally, but in deeds? Do people there really want to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" as the U.S. President proclaims, or is this nothing but a declaration designed to conceal the sinister aims of the "star wars" program?

To hear some opponents of the Soviet nuclear disarmament program, you would think Moscow had threatened the "holy of holies" of the Western world and its NATO alliance -- the "nuclear deterrence" ["sderzhvaniye"], without which the West will allegedly have a bad time of it. Without it, it is claimed, the entire peace which has been successfully maintained for these 40 years and more only thanks to the fear of retribution will collapse. If there are no nuclear weapons there will be no deterrent and no peace either. That is the logic to which we are advised to adhere. But what kind of logic is it? The logic of the perpetuation of the arms race.

U.S. Welcomes Proposal in Words Only

LD220029 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 21 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] Hello, comrades. I would like to begin this review with a quote from today's edition of the Warsaw newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU. It writes: It is extremely symbolic that namely now, in the course of the final preparations for the forthcoming 27th CPSU Congress, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev should send a message to the participants of the Geneva disarmament conference. This is yet another testimony of the huge significance the Soviet Union attaches to a peaceful offensive. This is yet another example of the unremitting activity of the USSR in all spheres of the negotiations on disarmament.

Yes, indeed, the message from CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, addressed to the disarmament conference currently taking place in Geneva, has evoked exceptionally great interest, both among the Geneva conference participants and the international public. Many political observers quote in their today's commentaries the section in the message which says that the Soviet Union has done and is doing everything possible for the successful solution of the problem of a ban on testing nuclear weapons, including the fact that the Soviet Union agrees to the strictest verification, including on-site inspection and the use of all the achievements of seismology.

Commenting on the message from the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, many mass information organs, in particular the London GUARDIAN, recall the fact that Washington so far has not yet given a reply to the integrated plan for eliminating nuclear weapons and other types of weapons for the mass annihilation of people, put forward as far back as January. Such a delay can hardly be acknowledged as being well-founded and it evokes just amazement and bewilderment.

In U.S. State Department circles, yesterday's message from the CPSU Central Committee general secretary to the Geneva disarmament conference is described as reassuring. A State Department representative--as some U.S. radio and television stations have already reported--said that Washington welcomes the new statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary on his readiness to allow on-site inspection, inspection fulfilling an agreement on a total ban on nuclear tests. With respect to this, the State Department representative said that the United States--I quote--would welcome a dialogue on this issue for a further rapprochement of both positions. Thus we see that Washington, on this occasion as well, is trying to react to peaceful Soviet initiatives in its by now traditional spirit: In other words, the Soviet proposals are seemingly being welcomed, there is talk that the United States is allegedly ready for dialogue which would contribute to a further rapprochement in the positions of both countries and both sides.

However, one forms the impression that talking in this way about dialogue--talking about dialogue--Washington is in effect trying to convert discussion of these very important problems of modern life into a dialogue of the deaf. I think that the protracted silence in reply to the Soviet integrated plan of peace initiatives put forward as far back as the middle of January, is a sufficiently eloquent testimony to this.

U.S. Delay 'Poisoned Logic'

LD230315 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Vladimir Pavlovich Dunayev report from Washington; from the "International Diary" program presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Text] Hello comrades! On 15 February, exactly 1 month had passed since the publication of the historic statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

containing wide-scale proposals directed at the elimination of mass destruction weapons by the year 2000. Actually, another week has passed; this has proved to be quite sufficient for the peace-loving public of our planet and many political and state figures, having carefully studied the unprecedented Soviet initiative to express enthusiastic approval of and support for it. Even the first reaction to it in the ruling circles of Western powers was, overall, positive. But, an official reply from the U.S. Administration to the USSR's concrete constructive proposals has not yet come, even though they are addressed primarily to it. What is the cause for this delay in replying? What are they saying on this matter across the ocean? I am asking this question of our correspondent in Washington, Vladimir Dunayev, who is now on the line. Vladimir Pavlovich, can you hear me?

[Dunayev] Yes, Igor Grigorevich, I can hear you well. Comrade Gorbachev's statement has placed the administration here in an extremely difficult position. All of the former hastily-dashed-off excuses, all of the counter arguments about monitoring, have evaporated. No one will believe them, having become familiar with the Soviet plan for freeing the world from nuclear weapons by the end of the century with thorough monitoring. If these were genuine apprehensions and not excuses, then of course one could have expected at least the advancement of some counter plans moving in the same direction if not acceptance of the Soviet proposals. But this has not happened. For over a month now, Washington has been silent. Clearly there is no unity either in the President's closest circle of advisers--U.S. observers currently are writing about this--or in his kitchen cabinet, as they call the President's old friends among Californian businessmen.

The first reaction of Ronald Reagan himself, I would remind you, was favorable, but then Weinberger tried to go on to the counterattack against the Soviet proposals. Then it was reported that a special group for arms control attached to the White House had set about studying and discussing the Soviet initiatives. Well, it discusses and discusses, and there is no result. In all the newspapers, on television, observers speak, congressmen speak, and they express extreme surprise: How is this? Such radical, far-reaching proposals have provoked a mass response in the country: Thousands of letters are sent to the editorial offices of U.S. newspapers, very many, through the embassy and through the correspondents' offices of Soviet newspapers, radio, and television, are sent to Moscow. Letters arrive from Americans who welcome these initiatives, and are extremely surprised by the fact that there is no reply from their government. Congressmen are surprised too.

[Surguchev] Vladimir Pavlovich, how loud are the voices in Congress in support of the Soviet proposals?

[Dunayev] You know, in Congress these voices are quite loud. I do not want our listeners to get the impression that every person in Congress is progressive; no, they are concerned by the reaction of the voters. There is a tradition here: If an American is dissatisfied by anything, he sends a letter to his Congressman. Over the past weeks tens of thousands of such

letters have been arriving in Congress where people ask Congressmen to demand an explanation from the State Department and from the White House. And so, Congressmen feel this pressure and, of course, questions are asked. This issue is not discussed formally on the pretext that one must not tie the hands of the White House; the White House and the State Department are preparing some sort of reply.

[Surguchev] Are there any suppositions about the possible content of the U.S. reply to the USSR's initiative?

[Dunayev] Well, you know, this is quite a risky matter. For this reason no one is prepared to say that a reply is being prepared accepting the Soviet proposals as a basis for negotiation, or that, on the contrary, the reply will be one of rejection from the start. I think it is hardly worthwhile to expect either the one or the other.

[Surguchev] But the U.S. Administration is still, it seems, remaining devoted to its Star Wars program, and does not intend to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. Surely this says something?

[Dunayev] This is perhaps the most acute question you have touched upon. Something that is particularly topical at the moment is the moratorium on nuclear tests. Here the administration has practically no arguments. To begin talks about banning all nuclear explosions for ever, this is a demand that is not made by just progressive people, but practically all public organizations in the United States, apart from the rightwing ones. I am not going to speak in detail about Star Wars. Here the issue is more complex because it is a long-term matter. But it seems there is plenty of time, and this is the argument of very many Americans. This is, of course, poisoned logic. They are already now practically placing the United States on to the Star Wars path and it will of course be unbelievably difficult to bring it off of that path.

U.S., Soviet Arms Policies Contrasted

LD200044 Moscow TASS in English 2327 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 19 Feb (TASS)--By TASS new analyst Vladimir Matyash:

The 15 January statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, which set out a package of new large-scale initiatives in the field of foreign policy directed at curbing the arms race, has generated worldwide interest.

Our country put forward for the entire world to see, for consideration of governments its programme for a total elimination of nuclear weapons all over the world by the year 2000, ridding mankind of the threat of self-destruction and ensuring reliable security for the present and succeeding generations.

According to the unanimous opinion, the Soviet leader's proposals is the most serious and far-going programme to establish a lasting peace ever advanced in the 20th century by any state or political leader.

Its practical approach to the all-important goal of eliminating nuclear arsenals is corroborated by the Soviet Union's yet another major step. The USSR extended for three months its unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts that expired on 31 December, 1985. That was not an easy decision for the Soviet Union to adopt. It cannot display unilateral restraint with regard to nuclear testing to infinity.

The United States was given more time to weigh the Soviet proposals for ending nuclear explosions. That is why demands are mounting worldwide that the American Administration join the Soviet nuclear test moratorium. It is now clear to all that the pursuit of evasive military superiority by the American side is a futile and dangerous undertaking. The USSR offers a path of sensible and responsible solutions.

Various sections of public opinion including authoritative anti-war organizations in the United States, urge Washington to give a positive response to the Soviet initiative. Influential American organizations, the Campaign for Nuclear Weapons Freeze, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Committee for National Security, and the Centre for Defense Information, announced that they welcome the Soviet initiatives, and demand that the U.S. Government come up with a positive response, end nuclear testing and start talks aimed at abolishing nuclear weapons.

The U.S. Peace Council, the American Friends Service Committee and the conservationist organization Greenpeace issued similar statements. But Washington remains silent as the Soviet appeal seems to be lost somewhere in the White House office.

Moreover, the bourgeois mass media, as if on a command, drew an "iron curtain" of sorts in front of the Soviet initiatives. Certain circles, unwilling even to hear about a nuclear test ban, are sowing doubts and suspicions, resorting to the favorite trick--dismissing the Soviet proposals as "propaganda."

Facts shows, however, that it is impossible to put out the spark of hope generated by the Soviet proposals in the hearts of all people committed to peace, as the Washington Peace Centre observed in its statement.

Massive actions are being held all over the world, urging an end to nuclear testing in particular and the arms race in general. Many prominent individuals in the West, including conservatives, come out openly in favor of the Soviet-proposed programme of banning nuclear weapons.

Colin Gray Cited

LD031620 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Colin Gray, a member of President Reagan's advisory panel on arms control, formulated "his considerations" on the Soviet Union-proposed program for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

As regards his political persuasions, Colin Gray stands to the right (on the political spectrum) of Edward Teller, the "father of the American hydrogen bomb", or former Nicaraguan strongman Somoza. Not surprisingly, this adviser to the American President described Soviet initiatives as "utterly unacceptable" to the United States, moreover, he even censured the diplomats who want to construct a deal with the Soviet Union with only those elements of the Soviet proposal "that serve U.S. goals."

Colin Gray achieved notoriety the world over back in the summer of 1980 after publishing an opus, called "Victory is Possible", in the magazine FOREIGN AFFAIRS. In that article he openly supported Washington's course toward attaining military superiority and declared that if expected casualties of the United States in a nuclear war could be limited to 20 million Americans or slightly more it would be perfectly justifiable to unleash such a war. It is said that the mentioned article attracted White House's attention to the political view of Mr Gray and assisted his appointment to the presidential advisory panel.

When a notorious burglar praises actions of a vigilant guard in public the latter has every reason to ponder if there are some mistakes in the way he is doing his job. If an advocate of nuclear war, even having the rank of adviser to the U.S. President, declares some or other proposals on the limitation and reduction of nuclear arsenals "utterly unacceptable", such an assessment can be interpreted as fresh proof of their realistic nature and acceptability to an overwhelming majority of the rest of the people on this planet.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ASSESSES GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

PM211622 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Feb 86 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Article by Lieutenant General of Aviation V. Serebryannikov, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, under the rubric "The Policy of Peace Against the Policy of War:" "Responsibility to the Peoples"]

[Text] Through the fault of imperialism the international situation has reached a level of tension and the development of world events has reached a point when particularly responsible decisions are demanded from all states and primarily from those possessing nuclear weapons, when inaction or delayed action are criminal because today we are talking about the preservation of civilization and of life on earth itself. The Soviet Union sets an example of precisely such decisions and such actions. The elimination of the threat of world war and the achievement of universal security and disarmament have been assigned first place among the main objectives and directions of the CPSU's international policy as set out in the draft new edition of the party program which will be submitted to the 27th CPSU Congress.

The program goals of this policy were specifically set out in the 15 January 1986 statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. This highly significant landmark document presents a new large-scale package of Soviet peace initiatives, whose core is a precisely timed program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere given the prohibition of the creation (sozdaniye) of strike space weapons.

Our party is approaching its 27th Congress with a Leninist program for making further progress toward communism and struggling for peace and international security. It perceives this program of practical actions from all viewpoints as a program of truly revolutionary nature and scale.

Not in words but in deeds the Soviet Union has yet again set an example of lofty responsibility for the fate of all mankind. Now it is important that the same responsibility permeates the ruling circles of other countries, primarily the United States and the other NATO states. The process of fundamentally improving the international situation as a whole can begin only with a reorientation of political thinking by these circles and a shift of this thinking from a militarist-adventurist mood to a constructive style. In order to avert the danger of nuclear war and free the peoples from fear

of it, it is necessary to rise above national egoism, tactical calculations, disputes, and discord, whose significance is miniscule in comparison with the preservation of the main value--peace and a reliable future.

Unfortunately, many figures wielding power in the West show no desire to reorient their thinking and political mentality in their approach to the problems of peace, cooperation, and international trust. The minds and moods of figures representing the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie and the military-industrial complex are dominated not by realistic evaluations of the prevailing situation and its development trends, not by common sense, but by narrowly egoistic and obsolete views that their own security increases as the security of others decreases.

This approach is unacceptable and fraught with dangerous consequences. Now that the world is oversaturated with nuclear missile weapons and the fates of all peoples are more interdependent, security--when speaking about the USSR and the United States--can only be mutual and, when speaking about the international community as a whole, it can only be universal. Replying to questions from the newspaper L'HUMANITE, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized: "...in our age there can be no security for the USSR without security for the United States, nor can there be security for the Warsaw Pact countries without security for the NATO countries. And without their mutual security there can be no universal security, either."

The documents of the CPSU and the Soviet state reveal a fundamentally new approach to security under present circumstances, and they reject any claims to achieve military-strategic superiority. The draft new edition of the CPSU program points out that the maintenance of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact Organization and the NATO bloc today provides a substantial guarantee for ensuring peace and international security.

But what level of arms possessed by each side under conditions of parity can be considered adequate from the viewpoint of reliable defense? The Soviet Union is convinced that the level of this adequacy is far below the actual level at which the USSR and the United States stand today. This, in turn, means that weighty practical steps on arms limitation and reduction are fully possible. On the basis of this premise, the Soviet Union proposes that a period of 5-8 years (the first stage) should see the halving of USSR and U.S. nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory and the elimination of USSR and U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe as the first step along the path of freeing the European continent from nuclear weapons, while the process of freeing the earth from nuclear weapons would be completed by the year 2000.

The Soviet Union also perceives as completely realistic the task of totally eliminating in this century such barbaric mass destruction weapons as chemical weapons. It further proposes that conventional arms and armed forces also become the object of agreed reductions. The USSR's stance is to secure an equilibrium of forces at the lowest possible level.

The totality of these measures not only will not weaken but will actually strengthen the security of both the USSR and the United States, universal security, and strategic stability in the world.

The United States and the USSR now have no alternative but to live with one another in peace. The CPSU and the Soviet state advocate normal and stable relations between the Soviet Union and the United States presupposing non-interference in internal affairs, respect for each other's legitimate interests, recognition and implementation of the principle of equal security, and establishment of the greatest possible mutual trust on this basis.

Differences of social system or ideology are no reason for strained relations. It is the CPSU's belief that the policy of the two powers must be oriented toward mutual understanding and not toward hostility, which is fraught with danger of disastrous consequences for the Soviet and American peoples and also for other peoples.

But reactionary imperialist circles are deaf to the voice of reason. Imperialism is fiercely resisting social progress and is making attempts to halt the march of history, undermine the positions of socialism, and gain social revenge on a worldwide scale. This is the actual source of the danger of war.

In a world abounding with acute contradictions and in the face of the looming nuclear disaster, there is only one sensible and only one acceptable way out--peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. This does not mean simply the absence of wars. It is an international order under which dominant sway would be exercised not by military power but by good neighborliness and fruitful mutually advantageous cooperation and there would be broad exchange of the achievements of science and technology and of cultural values to the advantage of all peoples.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is a vital necessity in our nuclear age. However, ignoring the realities of the prevailing situation, the reactionary circles of imperialism are, like before, relying on force and on the achievement of military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact Organization. Evidence of this is provided by the United States' unwillingness to join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions announced by the Soviet Union and also by its desire to implement the SDI program come what may.

"The priority we give to the 'strategic defense initiative' is well known and remains fully in force," U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger declared. "The United States will continue to implement SDI, and no changes are planned in this stance," U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz seconded.

The champions of SDI continue to claim that its implementation will allegedly render nuclear arms unnecessary, that it is a question of creating [sozdaniye] exclusively defensive means which are supposedly not weapons at all, and that the SDI program serves the interests of universal security and will make it possible to stabilize the situation.

In actual fact, this program envisages the deployment of strike weapons in space, which could be used against objects in space and to hit targets on Earth. The implementation of SDI will inevitably disrupt the present strategic balance. Naturally the Soviet Union cannot allow this. In order to restore military-strategic equilibrium it will be forced to boost the efficiency, accuracy, and power of its weapons so as to be able, should it become necessary, to neutralize the "star wars" electronic-space machine being created [sozdavayemaya] in the United States.

If, contrary to common sense, the United States nevertheless does deploy strike weapons in space, the nuclear arms race will not only not be halted but will actually spread with unprecedented force and will take a most dangerous direction. Mistrust between countries will increase still further. Universal security, including the security of the American people, will be substantially diminished. The entire world will find itself in a situation of uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, and increased risk of disaster.

The following question can be legitimately asked: If the United States is really interested in putting an end to the nuclear threat, why does the U.S. Administration not accept in principle the program proposed by the Soviet Union for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere by the year 2000? This program envisages a far shorter, more direct, cheaper, and--and this is the main point--safer way to avert the nuclear threat.

But, to judge by everything, influential circles in the United States are unwilling to take the path ensuring equal security for all. They would like to be the only ones to come out of the nuclear blind alley, in order to attain absolute security for themselves and to place everyone else in a position of "absolute danger."

This is precisely the objective pursued by the SDI program and the other U.S. militarist actions, including the nuclear tests carried out by the United States despite the Soviet Union's call to join the moratorium it has announced on all nuclear explosions. The United States has officially admitted having carried out seven explosions while our moratorium has been in effect. At the end of December 1985 it carried out a powerful nuclear explosion for the sake of creating [sozdaniye] one of the basic types of strike space weapons--a nuclear-pumped X-ray laser.

The implementation of SDI and the continuation of nuclear tests are two aspects of the same policy aimed at achieving military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. A fruitless and dangerous policy. It is fruitless because the Soviet Union's material and intellectual potential assures it the opportunity to create [sozdaniye] any weapon on which the aggressor

may rely. It is dangerous because it could lead to a nuclear war, to a nuclear catastrophe. The militarization of space could result in the creation of a situation when decisions which are of fundamental importance and irreversible in terms of their possible consequences would be essentially made by electronic machines with no part played by human common sense.

It would seem that Western politicians should have learned long ago the lessons of the paradoxes of strong-arm policies, when one thing is intended and the exact opposite actually occurs. In its pursuit of military superiority the United States has created a situation when the use of the military might that has been built up cannot give it victory and would be equivalent to suicide.

The more time that passes, the less will strong-arm policy methods be capable of ensuring the solution of any problem.

The cause of improving the international situation demands the affirmation of trust and goodwill in states' relations with one another and the overcoming of confrontational tendencies. It is also particularly important to eliminate the existing shortage of trust in Soviet-American relations.

The Geneva summit meeting was the first important step in this direction. Exceptional significance attaches to the shared understanding, recorded in the joint statement by the leaders of the two world powers, that a nuclear war must never be fought and that there can be no victors in such a war and to the commitment by the USSR and the United States, recorded in the same document, to build their relations on the basis of this indisputable truth and not seek military superiority.

It is only natural that the international public should be legitimately alarmed by occasions when statement against the "Geneva spirit" are made from authoritative platforms in the United States and other NATO countries and actions are taken which are clearly calculated to fan hostility and mistrust and step up confrontation.

Some people in the West are inclined to attribute the new Soviet peace initiatives and the USSR's readiness for improvements in Soviet-American relations to the "beneficial effect" of the buildup of U.S. military might. This is why a concept of "peace achieved and maintained by force" (the main point being force, with no "sentimentality" at all) is offered as a counter to the ideas of peace based on equal security and detente. Militarist doctrines and plans and nuclear war scenarios are being elaborated in the United States. The Pentagon intends to spend 2 trillion dollars on a 10-year program for the modernization of the U.S. Armed Forces.

All this is nothing but the result of thinking in the old militarist style. To judge by everything, people on the other side of the ocean are not giving a single thought to the fact that a completely different approach to the solution of international problems is demanded under the conditions of nuclear confrontation, when the threat of global war evolves into a threat of the destruction of human civilization altogether.

The Soviet Union is doing everything incumbent upon it to improve international relations and resolutely overcome the negative and confrontational tendencies which have increased in the last few years. The historic significance of the large-scale foreign policy initiatives set out in M.S. Gorbahcev's statement lies in the fact that they map out a real way toward improving international relations, generally reducing the danger of war, totally eliminating nuclear weapons everywhere in the next 15 years, and freeing mankind from constant fear for its future.

The world awaits a specific response from the U.S. side to the program put forward by the Soviet Union. What will this answer be? Will common sense and realism gain the upper hand, will the political will to act in the interests of strengthening peace and establishing trust be displayed? The Soviet proposals are a "moment of truth": They are forcing our partners to show their true face and to reveal what objectives are really pursued by their policy.

As for the main objectives and directions of the USSR's international policy, they originate in the human nature of the socialist society and are precisely defined in the draft new edition of our party's program. The CPSU's approach to foreign policy problems combines firm defense of the Soviet people's interests and resolute opposition to the aggressive policy of imperialism with readiness for dialogue and a constructive solution to international questions by means of talks.

The peace-loving foreign policy course elaborated by the party and consistently implemented by the Soviet state, coupled with the strengthening of the country's defense capability, has ensured for the Soviet people and for the majority of the planet's inhabitants a life of peace for the longest period in the 20th century. The CPSU will continue to do everything incumbent upon it to preserve peaceful conditions for Soviet people's creative labor, improve international relations, end the arms race which has swept the world, and avert the threat of nuclear war hanging over the peoples.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS ANALYST ON U.S. POLICY 'FROM POSITION OF STRENGTH'

LD031509 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Stereotyped views in politics are sometimes more durable than the strong metal used to make guns. This truth was borne out once again by the U.S. President's recent series of addresses and statements in which he repeated again and again that "strength is the most convincing argument" and that the United States is going to negotiate with the USSR "from positions of strength".

Granting an interview to CBS Television, Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger spoke in the same vein as he dispensed inventions about a "Soviet threat" to make a case for a continued arms buildup in the United States.

But no matter how many times Washington chooses to repeat it, its fixed idea of "the omnipotence of force" cannot bring it any political dividends. Facts, as is known, are a stubborn thing. And the facts are that in our nuclear age the world has become too small and brittle for wars and power politics since nuclear weapons harbor a tornado which can wipe the human race off the face of the earth. The possibilities and nature of modern weapons are such as make the policy of confrontation senseless. This is realized ever better by sober-minded politicians and public figures even in the United States itself, who level mounting criticisms on the administration's course of propelling the arms race and beefing up the military budget and demand that it reciprocate the Soviet proposal for banning all nuclear explosions.

The fixed idea of "the omnipotence of force" is clearly doomed also for another reason. It is known that it is the United States that has initiated every new round in the arms race. It is known equally well that, compelled to provide an adequate response to this militarist strategy and tactics, the Soviet Union has each time found a worth answer. So hasn't the experience of the past years been taken into account by the architects of U.S. foreign policy? Haven't they been able to realize that if the Soviet Union is compelled to do so, it will find an effective answer to any turns and zigzags of "power politics"?

One is surprised, however, not so much by the fact that in Washington, where the political, inertia of the past is strong. They keep repeating the postulates, disproved by political realities, that strength is almost the tool for settling international disputes. One is more surprised to hear this vigorous extolling of the nuclear-space stick today, after the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva during which the sides arrived at the conclusion that a nuclear war must never be fought and agreed on the need to improve the international situation. Characteristically, the statements on the need to build up America's military power at a crash rate have started to be made one after another right after the United States, in its reply to Soviet Union's peace proposals of January 15, demonstrated an obvious reluctance to get down to solving the cardinal problems of eliminating the nuclear threat.

But where then would those quarters in the United States, which are keen to step up material preparations for war, fuel the arms race on earth and extend it to other space, like to lead things to? What is the objective of these quarters?

The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the historical dispute between the two opposite social systems, into which the world is divided, can and should be solved only by peaceful means and by peaceful means alone. Socialism proves its advantages not by the power of arms but by the power of example in all fields of social life, including the dynamic development of its economy, science and culture, the improvements in the living standards of the working people and the extension of socialist democracy. Blinded by the cult of force, the U.S. ruling quarters, all indications are, intend to continue rejecting this only sensible, realistic and truly humane approach to solving international problems. In this case all responsibility for the international situation remaining tense and the mountains of arms keeping to grow and thus increasing the threat of nuclear catastrophe rests on them.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS: PROSPECTS AT GENEVA ARMS TALKS 'GROWING DIM'

LD032206 Moscow TASS in English 2107 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The Soviet programme of ensuring peace and security set out in the January 15 statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and in the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress opens a real opportunity to arrest material preparation for nuclear war, reverse the arms race on earth and prevent its transfer to space and enter the 21st century having eliminated nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction completely everywhere. The USSR is determined to throw down the burden of the arms race.

It would seem, it must be clear to everyone that such horrible weapons, unnatural for human civilisation, as nuclear weapons must be eliminated and that there cannot be a thinking individual who would oppose the concept of a world without nuclear arms. But they in Washington think along different lines. The so-called "answer" to the Soviet initiatives, the "new" U.S. proposals attest to a different thing. Washington refused to resolve the main, principled question, that of preventing the arms race in space. They in Washington believe that this problem must be kept outside any possible arrangements. Recourse was made to the old U.S. proposals on strategic nuclear arms and on medium-range nuclear arms, proposals aimed at getting unilateral advantages for the USA and therefore obviously unacceptable for the USSR. Washington has assumed an absolutely negative stand also on the question of banning nuclear weapon testing, an unconstructive stand on the problem of chemical weapons. Thus, everything has been done to place an insurmountable barrier to the solution of all problems.

The present U.S. Administration does not regard arms control the aim of its policies, American congressman Gerry Studds noted in this connection. Instead of studying thoroughly the Soviet statement of January 15 the U.S. Administration gives an extremely incomprehensible answer to it, "THE NEW YORK TIMES" writes. President Reagan has no wish to decide the problem of ensuring peace at political talks with the USSR, prominent American scientist Kogut summed up.

Moreover, the U.S. Administration has discarded the propaganda shroud with which it has been camouflaging its real designs and plans in the recent months. Without any coverup Washington again proclaims the militaristic course, boasts of the new generations of strategic nuclear arms, created in the USA, glorifies the deployment of U.S. first strike nuclear missiles in West European countries. Can all this indicate the existence of even the slightest striving for nuclear arms reduction?

And what about the openly resumed "flexing of the muscles", the lifting of the camouflage from the so-called "research" in the "star wars" sphere and a direct call to turn them into an advantage in concrete armaments? How can one evaluate the fact that the myth that SDI will render nuclear arms "impotent and obsolete" has been replaced with an outright statement that SDI cannot replace deterring factors of nuclear arms and will only be supplementing deterrence forces?

The conclusions that can be drawn from this are that the circles declaring for the spread of the arms race are apparently gaining the upper hand in the U.S. Administration and the prospects for the implementation of the arrangement on speeding up the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva achieved at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting are growing dim through Washington's fault.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

NUCLEAR, SPACE WEAPONS TALKS END, TO RESUME 8 MAY

TASS Report

LD041210 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1154 GMT 4 Mar 86

[Text] Geneva, 4 Mar (TASS)--The regular, fourth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons ended here today with a plenary session of the delegations.

It was agreed that the talks will resume on 8 May 1986.

Kasparov Comment

LD050858 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 5 Mar 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Pavel Kasparov]

[Text] The fourth round of USSR-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments has ended in Geneva. Let me remind you that the conversations held in Geneva last November between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan gave rise to considerable hopes among the world public that the work at these talks would be speeded up. The Soviet Union made considerable efforts to this end. As you will remember, Comrade Gorbachev set out a Soviet program for the full elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 on 15 January of this year.

The U.S. side, however, failed for a long time to give a specific response to it, and in his recent reported statement, President Reagan accompanied his reply with various kinds of reservations, linkages, and conditions that effectively block a solution to the fundamental issues of disarmament. This in turn could not fail to have a negative impact on the results of the fourth round of USSR-U.S. talks, which have just ended in Geneva. According to observers, the results of the present round confirm yet again that the U.S. Administration's peace rhetoric is manifestly not confirmed by its practical actions.

Gen Chervov Remarks

LD042042 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 4 Mar 86

[Report by Moscow correspondent Stefan Babiak]

[Excerpt] At the 27th CPSU Congress press center today, I met Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, a leading military expert. We discussed, in particular, the results of the fourth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on space and nuclear weapons, which ended today in Geneva. Nikolay Chervov told me this:

[Begin recording in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] Even with the best will in the world and even after a detailed analysis, we were unable to find anything new in the U.S. proposals. What Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev said on the rostrum at the 27th Party Congress has been confirmed: The U.S. proposals cannot be considered constructive.

A detailed explanation of all the nuances of the U.S. response to our far-reaching initiatives of January this year showed that Washington has not shifted its position in any respect. This does not mean, however, that stagnation at the Geneva talks will force us to fold our arms and passively wait. The Soviet Union is determined to continue to seek common ground with the United States with the aim of succeeding in finding ways to stop the arms race, prevent the militarization of space, and alleviate the continually high level of international tension, emphasized Col Gen Nikolay Chervov.
[end recording]

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

21 March 1986

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S 23 FEBRUARY WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD232218 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Feb 86

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

[Excerpt] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! In 2 days on 25 February, the 27th CPSU Congress will open in Moscow. As you know, following wide discussion in party organizations and in the party press, this congress will adopt the draft of the new edition of the party program and also the changes in its rules. The draft of the Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and the period through the year 2000 will also be confirmed for acceptance by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The importance and the scale of these documents are self-explanatory. They also provide evidence of the fact that the congress itself will represent a major event, not only in party life, but also in the life of our entire state. It must be said that the foreign public too, is showing a great interest in the forthcoming congress. The Congress Press Center has told me that almost 500 foreign correspondents, representing major news agencies, television and radio companies, newspapers and magazines, will be reporting on its work. This interest can be viewed as recognition of the grandiose role played by the CPSU, the ruling party in our country, in international affairs.

Indeed, this is a major role. Let us just take the complex of measures aimed at reduction in stages and full destruction of all kinds of nuclear arms, which was put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on behalf of the CPSU on 15 January this year. These initiatives have already been rightly appraised practically all over the world, because they affect the interests of all states and people, both large and small. Not a single bourgeois political party has acted in the world arena with such responsibility for the fate of the whole of mankind, or with such a concrete, well thought-out, realistic program for the transformation of our planet into a vast zone of peace.

The bourgeois parties in the major capitalist states, as a rule, confine themselves to solving domestic policy issues only; foreign political issues are set out in their programs and other documents by only general phrases with little specific content. A graphic example of this in particular is the foreign policy plank of the preelection platform -- that's what they call their program -- of the U.S. Republican Party, which was adopted at the national convention in the summer of 1984.

On foreign political issues, the CPSU acts not only on behalf of the Communists in our country, but it also expresses the interests of all the Soviet people. It is supported by the fraternal communist and workers' parties. The official friendly visit to the Soviet Union of Zbigniew Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, which took place last week, has yet again confirmed that People's Poland, as well as other fraternal socialist countries, have come out hand in hand with the Soviet Union and the CPSU for the practical solution of the cardinal task of the present time: halting the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race. The radical solution of this problem has been proposed in the detailed program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of our twentieth century under the condition of banning the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of strike space weapons.

In his message to the participants at the regular session of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized that there is only one possible way of freeing mankind from nuclear threat, the direct way, by eliminating nuclear weapons themselves. He pointed out that the objective reality is such that the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the "star wars" weapons will inevitably further the arms race in all directions. Therefore it is necessary to put strike space weapons under an effective international ban from the very beginning. Such an approach, as it is well known, has met with understanding in many Western state capitals. In the United States as well, there are many serious and level-headed political figures who are denouncing the Reagan administration's stubbornness on the space weapons issue. As we are aware, however, the White House so far has not heeded public opinion, either domestic or from other countries, and continues to conduct its affairs toward the implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. By doing this, it is generally increasing the complexity of the already highly complicated issue of the nuclear arms race limitation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GROMYKO SPEECH AT CPSU 27TH CONGRESS

PM271630 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Second Edition pp 5, 6

["Speech by Comrade A.A. Gromyko (chairman of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium)" (PRAVDA headline) at 26 February afternoon session of the 27th CPSU Congress]

[Excerpt] Comrades! Everyone who speaks from this rostrum certainly mounts it with emotion. And the person who is now standing on it is no exception.

The 27th CPSU Congress is an outstanding event of our time. The congress delegates, and together with them the party as a whole, are exactly assessing everything that has been done over the decades and lays the foundations for our new successes.

The problems solved since the grim trials of the war are clearly visible from the tremendous vantage point of the congress. Their resolution was within the capabilities of only a great country like ours, only a heroic people like the Soviet people, only a party like the Leninist party. (applause)

What is the ideological and political baggage of contemporary imperialism? It has foisted the arms race on mankind and stubbornly advocates its continuation. This is under conditions in which weapons, including mass destruction weapons, have already been stockpiled in such quantities that the earth is groaning. No, our country is by no means exaggerating when it tells everyone, absolutely everyone, of this terrible danger.

The world literally held its breath when it heard the historically important proposals on completely eliminating nuclear weapons before the end of the present century and preventing the militarization of space contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986. Opponents of war and everyone who rejects it held their heads higher. They saw for themselves once more that socialism is again displaying an inflexible will for peace and is demanding that the insane slide toward the abyss be stopped.

Certain circles in the Western countries are doing their utmost to belittle the influence of our proposals on people's minds. The things that are being done for this purpose!

There is the competition between professional and freelance propaganda criers and streams of official speeches stepped in the spirit of the arms race. There are the series of various conferences--overt and covert. And there is something like a reproach to our country to the effect that it has conceived the intention of mounting a real peace offensive.

Yes, it is a peace offensive, and we are not afraid of that reproach. The main weapon on which that offensive relies is our people's will to do everything possible to protect peace. The Soviet Union is appealing not to missiles and bombs, but to people's reason, irrespective of which part of the world they live in, which social system they prefer, and which ideology they support.

At the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva recently two policies met. The peaceful course of the USSR and our party was brilliantly demonstrated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. (applause) The results of Geneva are well known. A "glimmer of hope" for the future unquestionably appeared after the meeting. That considered remark by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee accurately describes the situation.

The Soviet Union believes that this must be followed by specific agreements--on reducing and totally eliminating nuclear weapons and on not spreading the arms race to space.

Soviet people, our allies and friends, and all peoples expect that a way will be found to rid mankind of the burden of armaments. The Land of the Soviets is placing all its prestige and all the influence of its policy in the scales on the side of peace.

The USSR and the United States are two mighty powers with wide world interests. But the United States must also see this not as a source of confrontation but as a source of these powers' special responsibility for the fate of present and future generations. That was said in the name of our country at Geneva, and that is also what we say after Geneva. (applause)

The Soviet people are a peace-loving people. Only dishonest people can claim the contrary. Everyone knows that they have not started wars. But, defending their motherland, they have ended them, and ended them in the right way, as justice demanded. (applause)

The claims of a Soviet threat to the West are a crude deception, and those who resort to it know this. What is it that they are trying to foist on us? In effect we are told: Either you change your social system and abandon socialism, or there will be war.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PAPER SEES 'TRAP' FOR BRITAIN IN SOVIET MOVES AT GENEVA

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 13 Feb 86 p 18

[Editorial]

[Text]

SIR GEOFFREY HOWE has moved quickly to rebuff the most seductive arms proposals yet seen from Mr GORBACHEV, declaring that it would be "quite wrong" for Britain to freeze her existing nuclear weapons (as the Russian leader seeks) and to cancel the Trident D-5 missile programme after 1988. The French will similarly resist all Soviet blandishments for a future limit on their ageing *force de frappe*. These predictable (and correct) responses will not, however, destroy the considerable interest in the latest GORBACHEV plan at Geneva. By accepting the American demand that SDI research should be separated from negotiations on intermediate nuclear forces, and by offering a zero-option vision of Europe freed completely of Cruise, Pershing and SS-20 IRBMs, the Russians have raised perceptibly the chances that a second REAGAN-GORBACHEV summit this year may have a serious arms control agreement to announce. That prize is more than enough to keep these talks going.

What the Soviet leader gains by the withdrawal of IRBMs (range circa 5,000 kms) from the European battlefield is multiple. He leaves Western Europe, militarily, at the mercy of the USSR's

vast range of non-nuclear missiles and chemical warheads, and still within reach of its 500-plus short-range nuclear weapons in forward positions in East Germany, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Secondly, he has the advantage that SS-20's withdrawn behind the Soviet borders can be rapidly redeployed in time of tension while American missile launchers cannot. More crucially, he makes an important gain in the Soviet objective of decoupling the U.S. from its Nato allies.

The special trap for the British at Geneva lies in the Russian ambition, once again, to drag the Polaris and Trident systems which we regard as long-range, last resort weapons, into the Geneva talks on intermediate nuclear disarmament. Sir GEOFFREY has often emphasised that Britain will involve its nuclear armoury only in talks, yet to be held, on reduction of ICBMs and ABMs; the French conditions are stiffer still. But this logical position could come under heavy attack if British resistance to Mr GORBACHEV emerged as the major obstacle to a U.S.-Soviet agreement in 1986. Sir GEOFFREY can hardly move too fast to dampen American enthusiasm for this skilful Soviet offer.

/9274

CSO: 5240/029

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ZHUKOV LINKS SUMMIT MEETING TO ARMS TALK PROGRESS

LD211931 Hamburg DPA in German 1636 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, Feb (DPA) -- A positive reply from the Federal Republic to the ideas contained in the latest Soviet offers regarding the removal of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000 will "contribute to a warming of our two states' relations." This was stated by Soviet Peace Committee Chairman Yuriy Zhukov in Moscow on Friday. He stressed that the most important question in Moscow-Bonn relations is the security question. "And there is a broad field for accommodation, for a normalization of relations between our states." The lack of mutual understanding on these questions cannot be compensated for by solving other problems.

Regarding the subject of medium-range missiles in Europe, Zhukov said this problem can now be solved immediately. It is linked "to no conditions." The Federal Republic can and must say its word on the subject because "some of the missiles are on its territory and others are aimed at its territory."

"For some reason," Zhukov went on to say, "an increased interest in space weapons is now being shown in the Federal Republic." He was not even speaking of participation in the development of the "United States' star wars program." Defense Minister Manfred Woerner is now presenting a new plan for a "Euro-SDI." This cannot be linked with Mikhail Gorbachev's disarmament ideas.

Regarding Soviet-U.S. relations, Zhukov noted that it is "possible and necessary" to solve a series of problems prior to the next Gorbachev-Reagan summit. The question must be put: "What results can and must be achieved before the meeting and not as an outcome of the meeting?" He regarded it as possible for some of the practical questions contained in the November Geneva summit communique to be solved.

Zhukov said that according to this document, the arms control negotiations in Geneva, whose aim is formulated in the Soviet-U.S. foreign ministers' agreement of 9 January 1985, are to be accelerated. The aim is to prevent a militarization of space and to reduce nuclear armaments. "It is, therefore, clearly necessary for some progress to be achieved on this path prior to the meeting." There is no point in "continuing to repeat the same thing" at a summit.

Zhukov named the areas of nuclear tests, medium-range missiles, and chemical weapons. It will not be possible to achieve success in all questions by the time of the Washington meeting, "but it is possible and necessary in some of these questions." In the event that Washington has the political will "to normalize" relations with Moscow "and to stop the mad arms race," there will be such a possibility.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S COL GEN CHERVOV DISCUSSES DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

LD122034 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1705 GMT 12 Feb 86

[Report on interview with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, department head in the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by correspondent Horst Grothe -- date and place not given]

[Text] [Announcer] The worldwide discussions on the peace and disarmament proposals put forward by General Secretary of the CPSU Mikhail Gorbachev show how important these proposals are for the vital interests of the peoples. The proposals particularly involve, as is well-known, a three-stage plan for nuclear disarmament and the complete removal of nuclear weapons. But, as Horst Grothe asked Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, department head in the USSR Armed Forces General Staff:

[Begin recording] [Grothe, in Russian with superimposed German translation] Comrade Chervov, in what way does the peace program take into account conventional armaments?

[Chervov, in Russian with superimposed German translation] The reduction and limitation of conventional armed forces also appears in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement as an inseparable element in our peace program. In the West it is generally stressed that the Soviet Union has superiority over the NATO countries. For this reason, nuclear disarmament is said to be a trap to give superiority to the Warsaw Pact. In reality, this is not the case; this is disinformation. But this question is not new. Currently, there exists between the Warsaw Pact and the armed forces of the NATO countries approximate parity in conventional armed forces.

How is the reality in this question (?distorted) in the West?

First of all there is talk of an inequality in conventional armed forces. But NATO does not include the armed forces of France and Spain in this. The available reserves are not counted either. In addition, NATO only takes into account the conventional forces that are under the command of General Rogers. But there are also others. There are armed forces which are under the national command of these NATO states. Nor are reserved formations counted. With regard to the Soviet Union everything is counted. In addition, the numbers are given exactly, while NATO (miscounted) them.

It would be a secret from no one, and it could not be hushed up, if a total count of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO were undertaken. Then the following would have to be counted. The NATO countries have almost double the population -- to be exact it is 1.7 times higher. That means that the NATO countries have a superiority in human resources. In addition, the NATO countries have highly organized, well trained, strongly deployed armed forces that are not inferior to the Warsaw Pact in many weapon types.

For example, I could name the number of combat-ready divisions. On the Warsaw Pact side there are currently 78 divisions in Europe; on the NATO side, 94. In the United States the strength of a division is 19,000 men and the strength in the FRG, 24,000. The divisional strength in the countries of the Warsaw Pact is, in contrast 11,000-12,000. That means that in the number of combat-ready divisions and the strength of these divisions the advantage is made much of.

The Warsaw Pact is said to have a great advantage in tanks and, for that reason, there could be no disarmament. None of this is correct. Here, too, the picture is distorted: First of all, only the number of tanks that Rogers commands are counted. Some say 12,000, others 14,000, sometimes the talk is of 18,000, although in truth there are over 20,000 tanks under Rogers' command. In addition, the West European countries have another 6,000 tanks in reserve; the United States has 2,500 tanks in reserve and they could easily be brought across the ocean by plane. They only need to be manned and then form further combat-ready divisions. In short, in the number of tanks, also, the NATO countries are not behind the Warsaw Pact.

As regards anti-tank equipment they have a superiority. There is an approximate balance of forces in artillery and other armored troops. The Warsaw Pact has a slight superiority in tactical airforces. But, by and large, even according to Western sources and also according to our own analysis, there exists an approximate balance in conventional armed forces. It is not by chance that the London Institute for Strategic Studies, which really no one could accuse of being pro-Warsaw Pact or pro-Soviet, gives an objective assessment in 1985 in its published annual report, where it stands in black and white that today the weapons potential of both pacts is such that neither one side nor the other can begin a war with the aim of winning it, because their military strength is approximately equal. So, the so-called question of conventional weapons has been thought out and disseminated by those who do not want any nuclear disarmament, but rather want to continue the arms race.

I would like to stress the following, which has been said in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, that currently [words indistinct] at a reduction in conventional armaments. We do not want to expand, but reduce. And both sides should also reduce their conventional armed forces. In addition, we are putting forward at the Stockholm conference a series of proposals to strengthen mutual trust. In particular, the Warsaw Pact proposes a treaty on nonaggression and the renunciation of the use of force, both with nuclear and with conventional weapons. Therefore, in addition to the resolution of the problem of the balance of strength, of nuclear disarmament, the measures which we have proposed in Vienna, as in Stockholm, involve the problem of the consolidation of peace and security. [end recording]

/9738

CSO: 5200/1281

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

HUANG HUA URGES ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

OW271112 Beijing XINHUA in English 1030 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 26 (XINHUA) -- Former Chinese Foreign Minister Huang Hua has urged the U.S. and Soviet leaders to strive for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Speaking at a meeting of the policy board of the Interaction Council, an international organization formed by 29 former heads of states in 1983 to promote world peace and development, Huang Hua said: "The two superpowers should get down to genuine negotiation (on nuclear disarmament) with the complete prohibition and total elimination as its final goal."

Huang, one of the 30 members of the policy board drawn from leading figures in politics, governments, business, banking, trade unions, and academy, said the council should try to persuade the United States and the Soviet Union to abandon their quest for military superiority. He asked the superpowers to take the lead in reducing nuclear armaments and coventional weapons. Such reductions should be carried out proportionately "in all different categories" and "in all the continents concerned," he said.

Huang attributed rising trade protectionism and the worsening international debt crisis to the existing international trade and financial systems. "Revitalization of world economy would not be possible without a reform of international economic relations," he stressed. Huang also called for North-South dialogue on trade, finance and other interrelated issues and for greater South-South cooperation.

The three-day meeting of the policy board concluded today after deliberating proposals on peace, security and revitalization of the world economy for consideration by the Interaction Council. U.S. Vice-President George Bush met with Huang in his official residence this afternoon.

/8309

CSO: 5200/4027

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR NOTES DEVELOPMENT OF 'MODERNIZED' CRUISE MISSILE

LD282219 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Sergey Pravdin commentary from the "International Diary" program]

[Text] The United States is not only developing strike systems in space, but is also continuing its build-up of other weapons at a rapid rate. AFP, quoting sources close to the Pentagon, reports that the U.S. Air Force will acquire, in the course of the coming year, the first so-called modernized cruise missiles. This name has been thought up specially so that these missiles may attract as little attention as possible. In reality, several features make them fundamentally different from previous cruise missiles. The chief of these, the agency says, is the special compound with which their cases are coated: This creates an electromagnetic field around the missile which causes strong interference to radar. The main contractor manufacturing these new cruise missiles is the corporation General Dynamics.

The modernized cruise missiles also have a greater range -- about 4,000 km as against 2,400. The Pentagon strategists calculate that these missiles, which are clearly offensive in nature, will reach both military and civilian targets throughout the whole territory of the Soviet Union.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1277

21 March 1986

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR ON U.S. TEST OF CRUISE MISSILE OVER CANADA

Test Planned

LD241219 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT 24 Feb 86

[Text] Ottawa, February 24 TASS--The Pentagon is to hold in Canada tomorrow, February 25, this year's second free flight test of a U.S. cruise missile. This was reported by a representative of the Canadian Armed Forces. Just as in the first test, a nuclear-capable cruise missile is to be launched from a U.S. B-52 bomber over the Beaufort Sea. It will fly 2,500 kilometres over Canada's north-western areas to the test range in the Alberta Province. Canadian fighter planes will imitate interception of the cruise missile. Four tests of cruise missiles, considered to be the first strike weapons, are planned for this year.

Missile Falls Into Sea

LD260107 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 25 Feb 86

[Text] An American cruise missile without a warhead on Tuesday fell in the Beaufort Sea, north of Canada, soon after it was launched from an American B-52 bomber. International news agencies have said the missile was to cover 2,100 km over northern Canada. A similar missile fell 55 km from the target in January.

Canada Suspends Test Flights

LD261958 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 26 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 26 TASS -- The Canadian Government has decided to suspend the tests of American cruise missiles over the country's territory, UPI news agency reported today. The Canadian authorities undertook the step after a cruise missile, during a test flight on Tuesday, went out of control immediately after separating from a B-52 plane. A group of Canadian and American military experts left for the fall site in the Sea of Beaufort. Harvie Andre, Canada's minister for national defence, said that the flights will not be resumed until the causes of the disaster are known. Missile tests in January also ended in failure. The Canadian population are enraged over the fact that their territory has been turned into a proving ground for advanced American weapons, and demand total termination of the tests. Jim Fulton of the New Democratic Party demanded that the United States take back its cruise missiles.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1277

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: DUTCH RATIFY ACCORD ON CRUISE MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

LD291959 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] The Hague, February 28 TASS -- The ruling right centrist coalition, which resorted to procedural tricks, managed to get approval by an insignificant majority of votes at the second chamber of parliament of the American-Dutch agreement on terms of deployment of 48 American cruise missiles on the territory of the Netherlands.

The governmental parties which actively support the dangerous nuclear missile plans of NATO and USA in Western Europe hold at the second chamber a little over a half of the deputy seats. Therefore they resorted to such a vote formula under which a simple majority of votes, but not the two-thirds majority, was enough for ratification of the agreement. The parliament by 79 votes against 70 has backed the agreement on deployment of new American medium-range nuclear weapons and for that the ruling parties had to draw to their side deputies from small right-wing groupings.

The decision on ratification of the agreement was taken by parliament despite mass protests of the peace public of the country. In the opinion of the democratic forces, deployment of nuclear missile weapons to be controlled by the United States will lead to the Netherlands' losing the sovereign right to conduct its own policy in questions of war and peace. In the course of the national campaign about four million Dutch people put their signatures against deployment of American first strike nuclear missiles.

Representative of the Labour Party Claas de Fris has stated that official approval of deployment of American nuclear missiles is the cause of profound anxiety since it might have a destabilizing impact on the efforts being exerted towards reduction of nuclear arsenals.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1277

21 March 1986

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS ANALYST QUESTIONS 'METAMORPHOSES' OF WEST'S ARMS STANCE

LD031455 Moscow TASS in English 2338 GMT 2 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 2 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev:

According to a report by BELGA NEWS AGENCY, Belgium's Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans, during a meeting with Belgian journalists, said that the West had always offered a "zero option", and now offers it with regard to medium-range missiles. Further clarifications make it clear, however, that Washington's previous "zero option" for Europe, rejected as totally unacceptable by the Soviet side because it gave the United States unilateral advantages, has now been expanded nearly to global dimensions. Nearly -- for the point at issue is not only the elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone, but, so to say, the expansion of Europe at the expense of Soviet territory nearly up to Sakhalin Island.

In accordance with this "geography", the demand is that all Soviet SS-20 missiles, and shorter-range missiles, be scrapped. All that is linked to the "balance of conventional armaments" and even to regional conflicts.

When the Americans were told about the absurdity, they in Washington replied: What is important is that the U.S. plan calls for the elimination of missiles. Indeed, it calls for the elimination of all Soviet missiles throughout Soviet territory and only part of American medium-range missiles, and only in Western Europe.

Of course, such an approach is rather far from the principle of equality and equal security of the sides which the Soviet Union will never give up. The Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles in Europe does not give advantages to either side. It is proposed, specifically, to eliminate all ballistic and medium-range cruise missiles of the USSR and the United States in the European zone within 5-8 years as a first step towards ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. It is clear and fair in the extreme. One should also bear in mind that the Soviet Union has already undertaken a number of unilateral steps in Europe -- it introduced a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles, cut their number, and assumed the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Instead of giving a constructive response to the Soviet proposals, the West started undergoing metamorphoses. The question of medium-range missiles in Europe is being attached to the questions of military balance in Asia, the practical solution of which is envisaged by the Soviet programme at a corresponding stage. On the whole, the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe is blocked by references to the position of

Britain and France, to the demand for weakening Soviet defences in the country's east, while American military forces in that region are to be preserved.

It is perfectly obvious that those who pile up together all security problems in East-West relations are apparently seeking to hinder the accords and impede concrete steps towards nuclear disarmament.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1277

21 March 1986

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS ANALYST QUESTIONS U.S. AIMS REGARDING EUROPEAN MISSILES

LD011334 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 1 Mar 86

["Washington's Real Aims in Europe" -- TASS identifier]

[Text] Moscow, March 1 TASS - TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Why Washington declines a treaty with the Soviet Union on medium-range missiles in the European zone?

If one is to believe official representatives of the U.S. Administration, the White House originally even "began preparing a positive reply" to the Soviet Union's proposals on that issue. But things were allegedly hampered because of the obstinacy of the allies. If one is to believe such claims, the latter refuse point blank to say good-bye to the American nuclear missiles. The Bonn and London leaders feel ill at ease also without Soviet missiles in Europe.....

American General Edward Rowley is claimed to have gone to the Far East with the sole aim of convincing the Japanese that a "reduction of missiles is better than fruitless talks", the NEWSWEEK magazine claims. Paul Nitze, a consultant of the U.S. President, was running off his feet, paying visits in London once to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, once to the secretary for the defence. But, as is claimed, the allies of the United States have flatly rejected disarmament. And, if one is to believe the USA, the American "peace-makers" returned in Washington empty handed.

Such a sorry picture of a "collapse of the U.S. peace efforts" is painted now also by some U.S. mass media. Not only newspapers and magazines have joined in the noisy propaganda show staged by Washington around the European security problems. The most obedient Natoists -- Helmut Kohl, Margaret Thatcher, Yasuhiro Nakasone and some others were forced to appear in the title roles in that comedy.

What are the real aims of that show?

Quite recently representatives of the White House were trying to convince the world public for everybody to hear that the United States was prepared to eliminate a "whole class of medium-range missile weapons". Yet now the same political figures claim that it is undesirable to eliminate these missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone. American General Bernard Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander, Europe, who earlier quoted fantastic data about some "multiple superiority of the Soviet nuclear forces in Europe", is saying now that a mutual elimination of the same medium range nuclear missiles "would be disadvantageous to NATO".

The point, certainly, is not obstinacy of the European allies of the USA. Usually American emissaries in Western Europe do not reckon too much with the allies of the USA. Quite recently they were twisting the arms of Dutch political figures to force their missiles on that country contrary to the will of the population and Parliament of the Netherlands, and did so quite successfully.

One cannot help drawing the conclusion that Washington is out to preserve whatever the cost its first strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The propaganda campaign launched by the U.S. Administration around the problem of European security is designed to facilitate the attainment of that aim.

The main obstacle in the way of resolving the question of elimination of medium-range missiles in the European zone, is, as before, that the U.S. Administration set out not to reduce weapons through talks, but to ensure an uncontrolled build-up of the mass destruction weapons by the United States.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1277

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW RADIO ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILES

LD232123 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Excerpts] Listeners have asked for details of the Soviet proposals to eliminate the Soviet and U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. Here are questions and answers on this topic.

[Question] How many medium-range nuclear missiles does the USSR have in its European part?

[Answer] Two hundred and forty-three SS-20 missiles and a small number of old SS-4 missiles which have been gradually withdrawn. Last year the Soviet Union called off duty part of the SS-20 missiles deployed in its European part.

In response to the siting of U.S. Pershing II and Tomahawk weapons in Western Europe the SS-20s' stationary installations have been dismantled. Even earlier the Soviet Union had withdrawn quite powerful SS-5 missiles. So on the whole the number of intermediate range missiles in the European part of the USSR is far fewer than 10 or even 15 years ago. The Soviet Union has made such self-limitation for the sake of facilitating an agreement on a nuclear arms reduction in Europe.

[Question] NATO has been persistently alleging that the USSR has 441 SS-20 missiles. How true are such allegations?

[Answer] This is a deliberate distortion of the real state of affairs. On the whole, the number of SS-20 missiles on USSR territory, both in the West and in the East, is much smaller than the figure 441 cited by NATO. This has been officially stated by the Soviet Defense Ministry.

[Question] And how many medium-range nuclear missiles designed for the first strike have been deployed by the United States in Western Europe?

[Answer] According to figures for 1 January, the United States installed 236 such missiles in Western Europe. But the deployment of such weapons has been continuing, so this figure should be increased. Generally speaking, NATO has more intermediate-range missiles than the USSR today, since one should take into account not only U.S. weapons, but also British and French missiles. And with the total number of medium-range vehicles, aircraft included, NATO surpasses the Soviet Union in nuclear warheads about one and one-half times.

[Question] When and how does the Soviet plan envisage the abolition of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe?

[Answer] Already at the first stage, which according to the Soviet program can start this year to last for 5 to 8 years, there must be not merely a removal of both ballistic and cruise missiles but precisely their destruction. The destruction of warheads and delivery vehicles alike. As a result, the number of missiles would be reduced by several hundred units and more than a thousand nuclear warheads would be done away with.

[Question] And how will the abolition of Soviet and U.S. missiles affect the arms of Britain and France?

[Answer] Neither French nor British nuclear forces are entered in a Soviet-American count. However, it would be logical if in the solution of the issue the United States would assume the commitment not to supply strategic or medium-range missiles to other nations, and Britain and France would take the commitment not to build up their corresponding nuclear potentials. The USSR is also prepared for a direct talk on nuclear issues with France and Britain.

[Question] It has been maintained at various levels in NATO that the Soviet proposal to eliminate medium-range nuclear weapons can be considered seriously only after the USSR agrees to scrap its SS-20 missiles, deployed not only in the west but also in the east of the country. It has been alleged that having dismantled its missiles in the European zone the USSR could easily and quickly transfer them there from remote Asian areas. How grounded is such a supposition?

[Answer] The region referred to as the European zone of the USSR is the one from which Soviet SS-20 missiles can hit targets in Western Europe. As for the eastern part of the USSR, SS-20 missiles have been sited there not to be moved back and forth.

They have been placed there as a counterbalance to the U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in the adjacent region and capable of reaching Soviet territory. These include aircraft based at Misawa on the Japanese Island of Hokkaido. Following this logic about the possible transfer of missiles, the Americans could transfer their Pershing II missiles to Western Europe still easier and quicker since even now they are delivered there by aircraft.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1277

21 March 1986

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET EXPERTS RESPOND TO HUNGARIANS' QUESTIONS ON ARMS

LD250615 [Editorial report] Budapest Television Service in Hungarian at 1900 GMT on 24 February carries an 85-minute "forum" roundtable discussion program, presented by Andras Sugar, and broadcast to coincide with the eve of the 27th CPSU Congress. All of its participants are from the USSR: Academician Oleg Bogomolov, CEMA cooperation expert; Vladimir Kudinov, deputy chairman of the State Commission for Science and Technology; Lev Voznesenskiy, Soviet Television presenter; Lieutenant General Konstantin Mikhaylov, deputy department head in the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, in charge of disarmament matters; and Tomas Kolesnichenko, member of the PRAVDA Editorial Board.

Viewers earlier had the opportunity to phone in with their questions and members of the audience could ask questions during the broadcast. All the guests speak in Russian with a superimposed Hungarian translation. Speakers are mostly unidentified.

The next question was addressed to Mikhaylov by Sugar: "I would like to pose the following question to the Comrade General: What is your opinion of the West's most frequently used argument against the reduction of nuclear weapons, that the Warsaw Pact would then gain superiority in the field of conventional weapons?"

Mikhaylov replies: "It is true that such claims are often made in the West, but these value judgments in reality completely lack realistic foundations. A balance of power has evolved in Europe, and this balance of power exists in the field of conventional weapons as well. This, by the way, is borne out by specific figures which I could cite, but I do not wish to bore you with them. I could, however, say this much -- pointing out in indices things such as the size of the population or the size of the Armed Forces, NATO has superiority over the other alliance in this respect. As far as battle-ready divisions are concerned, the situation is the same. I can even give you precise figures. NATO, the North Atlantic bloc, has a superiority of 94 over 78. As for the ratio of the number of tanks, a subject so often mentioned in the West, a balance of power exists. Both alliances have about 27,000 units. The number of artillery systems is also about the same. On the NATO side, there are slightly more antitank weapons, while the Warsaw Pact countries have a slightly larger number of tactical aircraft. But in the number of bombers, NATO again has superiority.

"The existence of this equilibrium is not only recognized and acknowledged, by the way, by us, experts of the Warsaw Pact countries, but also by some Western experts. I must add that several scientific research institutes, such as the International Institute for Strategic studies in London, also acknowledge it. What is more, the Confidence-Building, Security and Disarmament Conference, can, in accordance with its mandate, deal with questions of European disarmament in its second stage. So there are

no questions of debate here: this is a problem only for those who want to maintain tension in Europe by trying not to see the necessity of nuclear disarmament."

Sugar tells the general that a viewer named Peter Szasz asks if there is not a danger of the USSR merely transferring its SS-20 medium-range missiles from its European territory to Asia and thus keeping them?

Mikhaylov answers: "The answer to this question is unequivocal. It has been stated several times already that all the medium-range SS-20 missiles will be dismantled and destroyed. Under these same conditions we perceive that the U.S. medium-range missiles should also be destroyed. So, I mean not only the rockets but also the nuclear warheads. We would destroy these as well."

/6091

CSO: 5200/1277

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

MORE CRUISE MISSILES TO UK BASE--London, February 27 TASS--Ignoring strong public protests, the Conservative government does not intend to abandon plans to deploy a new batch of U.S. first strike cruise missiles in Britain. According to PRESS ASSOCIATION news agency, the Tory cabinet plans to appropriate close to three million pounds sterling for setting up an additional security and guard belt around the military base at Molesworth. Intensive preparations are under way now at this military base, which in recent months has repeatedly been the scene of mass protest demonstrations by the public against the Tory's militarist course, to accept a new batch of 64 missiles. PRESS ASSOCIATION news agency said that the government spent over two million sterling over a year only on guarding this facility. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 27 Feb 86 LD] /6091

PENTAGON TO DEPLOY NEW TYPE CRUISE MISSILES--Washington, February 24 TASS--The Pentagon intends to start the deployment of a new generation of air-based cruise missiles, that will be "invisible" to ground radar stations. The first batches of these new higher-range missiles can be supplied to the U.S. Air Force already within the next year, the AP news agency said. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 24 Feb 86 LD] /6091

CSO: 5200/1277

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SWISS TO UPGRADE CHEMICAL WARFARE DEFENSES

Zurich DIE WELTWOCHEN in German 30 Jan 86 p 39

[Article by Marcel H. Keiser: "We Will Protect Ourselves Against Poison Gas in the Next Decade: Could the Swiss Army Survive a Chemical Attack? Equipment Shortages Give Rise to Doubt"; first paragraph is introduction]

[Excerpts] Uncomfortable Fact: The Swiss soldier is insufficiently armed against modern chemical weapons. The warning system is uncertain and the protective outfit (mask and cape) is out-of-date and largely ineffective. As an immediate step, the EMD is planning to buy new suits abroad. An uncomfortable fact: The protective measures will not meet pressing demands until the next decade.

Every Swiss soldier knows the gas "Tuergg." At the most ridiculous moment, someone yells "Gas!", and a nervous corporal, a dashing lieutenant, an edgy cadet try to bring some order to the regulation AC outfits. But the cape is not handy, the personal gas mask is not properly in one's pocket, and anyway, it is necessary to first put out one's cigarette.

Serious Gaps

Or the troops, ordered by commanding officers, are done up in AC outfits, some wise gut has removed the filters from the masks, just being under the layer of rubber is difficult enough, and the non-commissioned officers must see to it that the infantryman does not relieve himself from his outfit.

Gas training, or to be more precise, protective measures against chemical weapon use, is again being seriously undertaken. And it is not very popular: most soldiers think, well, in an emergency I will conscientiously do what I am ordered to do. There may be good intentions, but they will be of little or no use, just as more drills will hardly protect the life of the Swiss soldier against a chemical warfare attack: The alarm system is insufficient and the protective means are out-of-date and scarcely of use against modern combat materials.

Tests have shown that during the deployment of volatile nerve gas, troops in the target area--even while wearing carefully adjusted gas masks--will suffer

losses of 10 percent. If 30 seconds pass before the masks are put on, 20 percent will suffer fatal injury while another 10 percent will be seriously injured; if protective measures are not taken for 2 minutes, then the fatality rate is practically 100 percent.

Chemical weapons, fired over great distances with high degree of target precision, are today fully integrated into the "conventional" forces of both the Warsaw Pact and the American contingents. The Red Army has strong special units and has--which is particularly unsettling--already integrated these weapons into its tactical stage. Corps Commandant Eugen Luethy, the new general chief of staff, remarks: "For the foreseeable future, I view a nuclear war as improbable. A war involving the deployment of chemical weapons seems to me to be much more likely. We are obligated to protect our soldiers from this danger. It will take quite an effort in the next few years to guarantee this protection."

In view of this threatening situation, the 1986 arms budget--which comes to about 1.6 billion francs, of which about 900 million francs are for the TOW II anti-tank missiles transported by the Piranha tank--is to take a first step: The EMD is planning to acquire, for 11.3 million francs, an initial supply of total-body protective suits to replace the only slightly resistant overclothing made of polyethylene film that has been standard issue for soldiers for nearly 20 years. Troops involved in demolition or with anti-aircraft guns at military airfields--first strike units--will be equipped first.

In the sense of an immediate step, the EMD is considering buying "a suit tested abroad" made of fabric impregnated with activated coal. However, the protective clothing that will definitely be acquired by around 1990 should wherever possible be manufactured in Switzerland; for the sake of local development of this capability, tests have already been carried out this year by the troops of four varieties, including special underwear. Because natural rubber gradually cracks, even the masks given soldiers at home are to be replaced (the masks used by the civil defense, since they are made of synthetic rubber, have a longer life). In stages, atropine shots are currently being replaced with modern combo-pen shots, and military doctors are receiving special supplies for the medical care of poison victims. The most serious gap for the time being remains the alarm system: Because the newest weapons are not perceptible to human sensory organs, ways in which they can be located using technical equipment are being sought.

The assessment of Bernhard Brunner, head of the Spiez AC Laboratory: "There is no doubt that we are lacking things, but it would be erroneous to say that Switzerland is faced with a catastrophe. In the next decade we will move ahead to a leading position in protective steps, in international terms as well."

Today, Afghanistan is serving as a Soviet test lab for chemical weapons, after poisons originating in the USSR were allegedly used in Laos and Cambodia. In 1984, the United Nations sent four independent experts to the battlefields of the war raging between Iraq and Iran: In Sweden and in the Spiez AC

laboratory, samples taken from Iraqi guns were identified as sulfur yperite and tabun.

Today, there are alarming prospects in the situation. On the one hand, the danger of a deployment of chemical weapons increases as nuclear deterrence declines. On the other hand, the example of the states involved in the Gulf War provides evidence that chemical weapons, occasionally called the "atomic bomb of the ordinary citizen," are finding increasingly more widespread use: the club of countries with chemical weapons in their arsenals already numbers more than 10. However, at present only the United States and the Soviet Union have a significant offensive potential. It is estimated that the Red Army has a stock of about 350,000 tons (approximately half of which are nerve poisons), which surpasses the reserves of the United States by a ratio of approximately nine to one. Since U.S. President Richard Nixon ordered a halt in production in 1969, U.S. capacity has been based on partially out-of-date systems, which are only to a certain extent ready for deployment. This is why Washington now wants to "build up" with "binary" chemical weapons: the basis of this is the principle of two components relatively low in poison being combined only during deployment and through a chemical reaction forming a highly toxic weapon. General Bernhard Rogers, supreme commander of the NATO troops in Europe, argues that without a "chemical buildup" nuclear weapons would have to be deployed at an earlier stage.

Chemical weapons are thus being viewed as a means for avoiding the nuclear holocaust.

12271

CSO: 5200/2636

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: CD PARTICIPANTS DISSATISFIED WITH U.S. ARMS STANCE

LD281104 Moscow TASS in English 2153 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 27 TASS -- The unwillingness of the United States to heed the opinion of the world public, who demand concrete results in ending the arms race and attaining disarmament is the cause of dissatisfaction of the majority of the participants in the Geneva conference on disarmament. The American stand has been criticised by many delegations of socialist and non-aligned countries, which were proving the need of prohibition of nuclear explosions, prevention of militarisation of outer space, prohibition of chemical weapons.

Speaking at the meeting today, Rolf Ekeus (Sweden) emphasised that continuation of the tests cannot be justified either by linkages with reduction of nuclear arsenals, or "care" for ensuring efficiency of nuclear "deterrence", or references to difficulties of verification. Full prohibition of tests would promote progress in negotiations on reduction of armaments, consolidation of confidence, said Sweden's representative. As to verification, contemporary scientific-technological means ensure sufficient reliability, let alone the possibility of having on-site inspection. In this connection Rolf Ekeus favourably appraised the latest Soviet proposals.

Head of the U.S. delegation Donald Lowitz in his speech actually reaffirmed that the American leadership is rather seeking to hamper the quest for solution of cardinal problems, by advancing all sorts of conditions, than to facilitate it.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1276

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR AMBASSADOR MIKHAYLOV OUTLINES MBFR PROPOSALS

LD272057 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Vienna, February 27 TASS -- A full-delegation session of the states participating in the Vienna talks was addressed today by Ambassador Valeriy Mikhaylov, the head of the USSR Delegation. He described the socialist countries' constructive steps outlined in their new draft "agreement on an initial cutback by the Soviet Union and the United States in land forces and armaments with a subsequent non-increase in the levels of the armed forces and armaments of the sides and related measures in Central Europe." These steps, he emphasized, cover, in essence, all the main areas of a possible accord: cutbacks in Soviet and U.S. troops, an obligation not to increase them, verification provisions, etc.

1. Taking into account the West's unpreparedness to go farther than that, we have agreed with reduced amounts of initial cutbacks in the troops of the USSR and the USA.
2. The West suggests cutting down Soviet and U.S. troops simply "part by part". We agree to that formula on the understanding that the units shall be from among combat troops and combat support troops.
3. The West suggests that information on concrete military units subject to cutbacks be given before an agreement is signed. We have no objections.
4. Our partners are for a freeze pledge to take effect immediately after Soviet-U.S. cutbacks are completed. We have no objections.
5. The West suggests a three-year freeze term. We agree to that.
6. Socialist countries are also ready to show flexibility with regard to the character of a freeze pledge. As is known, the West seeks the implementation of the pledge on a collective basis but limited to national sublevels of the troops of the USSR and the USA. We proceed from the premise that not only the USSR and the USA should contribute to a cutbacks and limitation agreement. All direct negotiators should make their contribution. At the same time, in the interests of reaching an accord, a possibility of applying full collectivity for both sides without any national sublevels could be considered.
7. The draft agreement submitted by socialist countries envisages an exchange of information with a view to specifying data on troops which fall under the action of a non-increase pledge, and annual renewals of the data according to the parameters which were already applied at the talks earlier.

8. In order to rule out the emergence of new troop contingents in the outback area in excess of the frozen levels, as well as in order to clarify some other contentious situations connected with the fulfillment of obligations under the agreement, provision is made for an on-site inspection at a well-founded request.

9. In addition to the above-mentioned verification measures, socialist countries have agreed to the establishment of permanent verification stations to monitor the entry and withdrawal of troops into and from the cutback area throughout the period of the currency of the agreement.

10. The draft agreement includes a provision for the setting up of a consultative commission and for its functions for the period of the currency of the agreement.

11. The West has expressed concern that difficulties as regards control over the dynamics of troop levels in the area of Central Europe may arise in the period of the action of the non-increase pledge, and that national technical verification means will be inadequate in this connection.

As for an increase in national troops resultant of a call-up of reservists, we are introducing a separate clause envisaging preliminary notification about a call-up of reservists. We also provide for mutual notifications about movements of land forces to the cutback area, inside it and from it, just as a notification about military exercises of land forces.

12. The concluding provisions of the draft agreement take into account the wishes of the Western side about a procedure for the ratification of a possible agreement.

Thus, Valeryan Mikhaylov pointed out, the overall picture of the new elements which are present in our detailed draft agreement dated February 20, this year, indicates that the Warsaw-Treaty countries have made serious constructive efforts in the interests of achieving positive results in Vienna. We have also made compromise steps with regard to verification. Eight out of seventeen clauses of the draft agreement deal with verification.

The introduction of the draft agreement by socialist countries on February 20 substantially broadens the sphere of mutual understanding between the negotiating parties and furnishes a practical basis for the elaboration of a mutually acceptable agreement.

The head of the USSR delegation also said that attempts by the Western negotiators to return to the question of spreading verification measures beyond the agreed-upon area of Central Europe are arbitrary and unfounded. There is no such question in existence, and the delegations of socialist countries will not discuss it in any way.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1276

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ASSESSES NEW MBFR PROPOSAL

PM241015 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Feb 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article under the "Military Scholar's Opinion" rubric by Candidate of Military Sciences Major General V. Makarevskiy, retired: "Urgent Need: Conventional Armaments and Armed Forces Must Be the Object of Agreed Reductions"]

[Text] Eliminating all the nuclear weapons in the world by the end of this century is the main task of the present day. By that means and that means alone can mankind be freed of the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. However, when making this problem a priority, the large-scale Soviet peace program set out in the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary's 15 January Statement goes even further. In addition to removing the weapons of mass destruction from the states' arsenals the Soviet Union proposes that conventional armaments and armed forces be the object of agreed reductions.

To some people, perhaps, this concrete initiative may seem inopportune. The main task has not been carried out, they will say, and other problems, which at first glance may not seem of paramount importance, are already being put forward. That is not the case, however. The USSR'S proposal to reduce conventional armaments completely deprives the militarists and politicians of the strength of their "argument" that the elimination of nuclear weapons will leave the West "defenseless" in the face of "Soviet military superiority."

But that is just one aspect of the matter, albeit a very important one. Conventional armaments in themselves pose a serious threat to peace. Furthermore, they are already sowing death in the world right now every day. They have already taken the lives of over 20 million people in the course of localized wars and military conflicts launched through the imperialist states' fault in the years since World War II. Although huge arsenals of conventional weapons have already been stockpiled they continue to be augmented with more and more new, more acute, and more powerful types.

According to a DAILY TELEGRAPH report, in 1986 alone the European NATO countries' armed forces will receive 500 tanks, mainly "Leopard-2" and "Challenger," 400 other armored vehicles, 100 heavy artillery pieces, 260 warplanes, and a vast amount of other combat hardware, weapons and munitions.

Without abandoning their criminal plans for launching nuclear war the NATO strategists are intensively preparing to wage nonnuclear wars, too. In their documents and speeches you increasingly often find such concepts as "general conventional war," "conventional war in the theater of war," and "conventional war in the theater of military operations" ...The Atlanticists' strategic concepts envisage the possibility of conducting successful aggressive combat actions using conventional armaments.

The so-called "Rogers plan" -- a new aggressive concept -- which has been adopted by NATO creates a special danger in this respect. In the operational and strategic respect it envisages using conventional means to deliver preventive strikes deep into the Warsaw Pact countries' territory. The "Rogers plan" directs the North Atlantic bloc's armed forces toward destroying the opposing Warsaw Pact countries' troops throughout their operational-strategic formation, the follow-on forces, above all the command centers, airfields, highway and bridge junctions, and other important facilities. What we have here, so to speak, is the transition from so-called "forward-based defense" to "defense in the enemy's rear." That is the description that this concept has been given by the Atlanticists.

What is it founded on? On what are its authors basing its implementation? Primarily on those changes which have occurred in the existing types of conventional weapons. They radically change the picture of the modern "battlefield." For example, according to figures from the London Institute of Strategic Studies, the depth of the single-shot penetration of a target with firing means has increased approximately tenfold -- from 50 km to 500 km or more -- in comparison with the war and has increased to 2,000-2,500 km using medium-range conventional missiles. The area of dispersed targets hit is now calculated in tens and hundreds of hectares, sometimes even square kilometers. Strike accuracy has increased by 10 to the power of 2: where previously 100 charges were needed, now only 1-2 guided missiles or Copperhead type charges are required. The means to place mines deep behind enemy lines by remote control have now appeared. Let us add that there has been a considerable increase in the yield of individual munitions and in firepower density.

Such are the qualitative characteristics of the existing "conventional" means of destruction. It is fair to say that they are already becoming unconventional and, in terms of their combat potential, are very close to tactical nuclear weapons. A considerable operational and even strategic effect can be achieved by means of them. West German military specialists have calculated that a 20-day "conventional" war using the latest types of weapons would inflict on their country the same damage as a 5-day war using tactical nuclear weapons.

NATO's military-political leadership is taking measures to create a new generation of conventional weapons. The whole range of the West's scientific and technical achievements are being used to that end. Ultramodern electronic means of reconnaissance and the direction and control of the new combat systems and munitions with exceptionally high strike characteristics are going into production. For example, the energy from exploding the so-called "vacuum bomb" will in the future be 10-20 times greater than TNT-equipped mines of equal weight. The NATO countries plan to spend around \$100 billion on the conventional arms race in the next 6 years.

The appearance in the armories of large quantities of new and improved weapons and combat hardware is being accompanied by changes in the organizational structure of divisions and units. The U.S. Army, for instance, is switching to an organizational-staff structure known as the "division of the nineties." Structural changes are also being carried out in the West German Bundeswehr and the armed forces of other NATO countries. According to the estimates of North Atlantic bloc strategists, the reorganization will make it possible to considerably increase military divisions' offensive strike force, firepower, and mobility, which should ultimately promote the more effective waging of combat actions.

The development and stockpiling of new conventional arms facilities and the modernization of NATO's armed forces should be viewed as a significant addition to the West's nuclear

potential and a serious destabilizing factor. The times dictate the imperative need to halt this process and to proceed toward agreed reductions in conventional armaments and armed forces. The beginning of movement in this direction could be signaled by an accord at the Vienna talks where the question of the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe has been under discussion for many years now. The Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies have the will to achieve success here.

A new manifestation of the socialist countries' readiness for concrete measures in this sphere was provided by the detailed draft "Agreement on the Initial Reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of Ground Forces and Armaments With a Subsequent Non-Increasing of the Levels of the Sides' Armed Forces and Armaments and Related Measures in Central Europe," which they submitted to the Vienna talks yesterday. The Warsaw Pact states' initiative takes into account those elements of the Western participants' position which seem acceptable. Compromise solutions are being offered on a number of important aspects where there is no agreement between the sides. In particular this applies to the establishment of three-four permanent points for controlling the entry into and exit from the reduction zone of all military contingents throughout the period of the agreement's operation; the situation regarding requests for on-site inspection [proverka na mestakh]; and finally the mutual exchange of statistical data on armed forces in the reduction area. All this makes it possible to begin at the present stage the concrete formulation of a mutually acceptable agreement in Vienna. The ball is now in the other side's court. With political will on the West's part it may be possible in the foreseeable future to end the arms race and lower the level of the sides' military confrontation, primarily in Europe. This will undoubtedly make it possible to reduce international tension and will contribute to resolving the main task -- ensuring mankind's future without wars or weapons.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1276

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: CSCE DELEGATES MEET FINNISH REPRESENTATIVES

LD011147 Moscow TASS in English 0149 GMT 1 Mar 86

[Text] Stockholm, March 1 TASS -- The USSR delegation to the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe had a meeting here with a group of members of Finland's national Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

Head of the USSR Delegation Oleg Grinevskiy called the attention of the participants in the meeting to important assessments of the development of the international situation contained in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress. Our party has advanced a comprehensive programme of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction before the end of the current century, he said. This is a historic programme for its scopes and significance. A new proposal for the creation of an all-embracing system of international security was made from the rostrum of the party congress on the very first day of its work.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1276

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR ASSAILS U.S. POSITION ON NUCLEAR TESTING

Statements 'Not Backed by Practical Deeds'

LD282125 Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Larry Speakes, deputy press secretary of the White House, in reply to a request to comment on the House of Representatives' resolution calling to press for a ban on all nuclear tests, has stated in Washington that the measures envisaged by the resolution do not serve the interests of the United States. Thereby Washington confirmed that it intends to go ahead with nuclear weapon testing.

The White House spokesman's statement has laid bare once again a different approach, moreover -- a diametrically opposite approach to such major problems of disarmament as cessation of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union is known to have introduced a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions way back in August last year and then extended it until March 31. Highly appreciating this Soviet act of goodwill, prominent political and public figures of various countries have pointed out and continue to do so with good reason that the act is a big and concrete practical step which, if reciprocated by the United States, could become a major stage on the way to reliably cutting off the channels of nuclear weapons' sophistication.

However, the U.S. ruling circles stubbornly adhere to a different line and a different approach. Although there is no lack of "peace-making" statements in Washington now about the administration's commitment to the cause of arms control, the statements are not backed up by practical deeds. The architects of U.S. foreign policy continue the course towards whipping up the arms race, and publicly declare, as President Ronald Reagan did recently, that strength is the most convincing argument in the international arena. Such a line also determines Washington's attitude to the Soviet moratorium.

The preamble of the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, which was concluded as far back as 1963 and which was also signed by the United States, has it that the states which are parties to the treaty, will seek to secure termination of all tests of nuclear weapons forever and that they are resolved to continue talks to that end. Twenty-three years have passed since then. And what did Washington do to fulfill the obligation it assumed? Nothing at all. Nuclear tests in the USA are going on -- are being continued pointedly as an overt challenge to the world public. Since the Soviet Union announced the moratorium, the United States has carried out seven nuclear explosions. Sixteen nuclear tests were conducted in the USA in 1985 all in all.

Washington politicians and bourgeois propaganda media resort to every kind of conjectures in an attempt to conceal, to camouflage the true goals of its militarist course! Those include mythical "verification difficulties", completely false discourses to the effect that the Soviet proposal on a moratorium is unacceptable because the USSR ostensibly carried out more nuclear explosions than the United States, although it is known from reports of the authoritative Stockholm Peace Research Institute that by the beginning of 1985 the USA had carried out 772 nuclear explosions whereas the USSR -- 556. It is also being stated in Washington that nuclear explosions should not be discontinued because nuclear weapons serve as a certain "deterrent factor"...

In actual fact, of course, the causes of Washington's stubborn refusal to discontinue nuclear explosions have nothing to do with those "arguments", if one may call them so. Congressman (Dem.) Edward Markey, touching upon the question of why the White House is in opposition to the demands for an end to such tests, has pointed out that the resolution of the House of Representatives urges the President to stop the tests of X-ray nuclear-pumped lasers -- one of key elements of the "star wars" programme. Mr Markey went on to say that the administration opposes general and complete termination of nuclear tests because it wants to get ballistic missiles of increased power, the Trident-2, and new-generation nuclear warheads. Therein is the essence and the root of the negative attitude of those circles in Washington which, contrary to the spirit of time and to reason, are unwilling to abandon the dangerous and absolutely prospectless attempts at achieving military superiority and at regarding power, the nuclear-space cudgel, as the "only argument" in relations with sovereign states and peoples!

Congressman (Dem., Massachusetts) Gerry Studds maintains that the U.S. Administration does not consider arms control the goal of its policy.

The White House spokesman's statement, in which the idea of a ban on nuclear tests is rejected, once again confirms that this is really so.

'No Will' To Stop 'Nuclear Madness'

LD020018 Moscow World Service in English 0001 GMT 1 Mar 86

[Text] The White House has said it opposes a congressional resolution urging the President to resume negotiations with the Soviet Union for a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. Here are some details:

In his latest speech on military spending, President Reagan has drawn a grim picture of the United States not having enough weapons. On the next day, a Pentagon report said that in no other time in American history was the nation as strong militarily in peace time than it is at present. There were similar inconsistencies and contradictions in the past but never before were they so glaring. In that same speech of his President Reagan solemnly declared: We want agreements that truly diminish the nuclear danger. We want real agreements, agreements that really work, with no cheating.

How true is this verbal fireworks? How true are all those statements about Washington's passionate desire for disarmament that travel from one speech to another? Mikhail Gorbachev's plan to rid humanity of nuclear arms by the year 2000 continues everything in terms of control and verification those peace champions in Washington have claimed they had wanted all along. They scorn national means of control as inadequate and want international ones that would use the latest achievements in seismology. All this is in the Soviet plan. They wanted on site inspection; it is also there. What else do they want to exclude cheating?

This country is as interested in control and verification as the United States is. The Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests till 31st March and if this bold Soviet commitment to slow down the arms race was violated that would become known immediately, but Moscow honors its obligations. If there is a will there is a way, but there is no will in the White House to stop the nuclear madness. They want to go on with it because nuclear testing is vital for their nuclear buildup. It is also vital for their star wars program, which relies on nuclear powered chemical lasers and other weapons. In Washington they don't want to stop. This is the only truth and there can not be two ways about it.

The U.S. Administration has been offered a unique opportunity to do for humanity the only thing that makes sense: To save it from potential destruction. No weapons can give one side an adequate protection. No defenses can provide security. It is a political problem which requires new thinking, new ideas and a new set of moral values and at the current Communist Party congress in Moscow the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, was most emphatic about it. The moment of truth has finally arrived for the American people. There is a genuine and widespread desire in the nation to do something about the arms race and the nonbinding congressional resolution urging the White House to resume test ban talks is a case in point. On the other hand, they have an administration, described as very popular, who oppose even the slightest pause in the race while asking for more powerful and newer means of mass destruction.

Congressional Resolution Noted

PM281410 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report: "U.S.A.: The Stance of Congressmen..."]

[Text] Washington, 27 Feb -- Following a fierce debate, the U.S. House of Representatives passed by 268 votes to 148 a resolution calling on the administration to immediately resume talks aimed at the conclusion of a treaty on a universal and total nuclear test ban.

The resolution also contains a recommendation to the President to submit for ratification by the Senate the treaties on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapons Tests and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes.

The passing of the resolution, which was approved just minutes before President Reagan's address on nationwide television yesterday, in which he again advocated conducting talks with the Soviet Union "from a position of strength," was a major defeat for the White House. For more than a year now and with help from its proteges on Capitol Hill, the administration has been trying hard initially to block the examination of the resolution, and later to emasculate its content.

Exposing the real reasons for the opposition from the White House and its reactionary supporters to the demands to end nuclear tests, Democrat Representative E. Markey pointed out that "this resolution calls on the President to halt the tests of nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers, which are one of the key elements of the 'star wars' program." The administration, he went on, is against the universal and total termination of nuclear tests because it wants to acquire the increased-yield Trident-2 ballistic missiles and new-generation nuclear warheads. The time has come to disperse the propaganda cloud of arguments by opponents of the treaty on total and universal nuclear test ban, the congressman said.

21 March 1986

"The proposals recently put forward by Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev have a far-reaching significance," Representative J. Huckaby (Democrat, Louisiana), pointed out. "For the 7th month now the Soviet Union has been unilaterally observing a ban on all nuclear explosions. Why does the United States not follow the USSR's example?"

U.S. Violates 'Spirit' of Treaties

LD010056 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2054 GMT 28 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program; presenter unidentified]

[Text] Commentaries in the U.S. press show that the decisions of the CPSU Congress will have a long-term effect not only on the life of the Soviet Union, but also, probably in the United States and other countries.

THE WASHINGTON POST sharply criticizes the Reagan administration for declining to give a positive response to the Soviet Union's call for an end to nuclear tests. The refusal to discuss with Moscow the question of a nuclear test moratorium and a total ban on them, the paper writes, is a violation of the letter and the spirit of the appropriate international treaties signed by the United States. It is dictated by Washington's desire to create more and more efficient types of nuclear weapons.

Many prominent political and public figures of various countries are noting that the USSR's latest major peaceful proposals, reaffirmed in the report by Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev at the congress, create a good basis for the attainment of practical results in the most varied fields of restricting arms. All the more disappointment is caused by the Reagan administration's reaction to the Soviet Union's constructive steps. The United State's overt unwillingness to come to terms with world public opinion is also condemned by the majority of participants in the Geneva disarmament conference. The U.S. stance has already been criticized there by many delegations from the socialist and nonaligned countries. They have stressed the urgent need to ban nuclear explosions, prevent the militarization of space and ban chemical weapons. And by all accounts, this is precisely what Washington does not want to achieve, preferring to urge the country onto a militaristic path.

It should be noted that the administration's position is bringing forth fairly sharp criticism in the United States itself. For example, THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses: The refusal to discuss with Moscow the question of a moratorium or a test ban means that the President is violating the legal obligations he has undertaken both according to the 1963 partial nuclear test ban treaty and the 1968 nuclear weapons non-proliferation treaty. According to these agreements, the United States pledged to undertake steps and conduct negotiations aimed at ending any nuclear tests. Pointing out that ending them would make difficult or even impossible the creation of new kinds of nuclear weapons, the newspaper reasons: This is the reason why Reagan does not want to ban nuclear tests.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1278

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR ASSESSES U.S. POSITION ON MORATORIUM ISSUE

Administration Out of Step

PM031551 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 12

[Yu. Bandura "Pertinent Notes": "'The Others' Don't Count... The White House, the Congress, and Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] Less than a month remains until the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions expires. Will Washington reciprocate? A positive response is hoped for in the USSR, in the United States, and -- it can be claimed without fear of exaggeration -- throughout the world. But as yet R. Reagan's administration is doing everything to see that these hopes are not realized.

Why? "Why do we not follow the USSR's example if the termination of nuclear tests is a first logical step toward eliminating the nuclear threat?" J. Huckaby, member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, asks. "Why is R. Reagan missing the best opportunity available to the superpowers to reach agreements which, in the President's own words, would be "truly effective, without any cheating?" Well-known American observer T. Wicker asks.

The questions are rhetorical. Because awareness of the unreasonableness of R. Reagan's course of continuing tests is gaining headway in the United States.

Another manifestation of this change of mood was the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress recently calling on the White House to immediately resume talks with a view to concluding a treaty on the complete and total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests -- which is also the objective of the Soviet moratorium -- and to submit to the Congress for ratification the treaties on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests (signed in 1974) and on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes (signed in 1976).

The 268 members of the House of Representatives who voted in support of the resolution are convinced that "the conclusion of a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests would promote the strengthening of U.S. security since it would limit American-Soviet rivalry in the field of nuclear arms."

Logical? Yes. Convincing? Yes. But not for the White House, apparently. Its spokesman L. Speakes dismissively branded resolution no. 3 as "not being in keeping with the interests of the United States and its allies."

It would probably not be superfluous to recall that a similar document was also adopted back in 1984 by the Senate (by 77 votes to 22). The impression you get, therefore, is that in general the overwhelming majority of congressmen have expressed themselves in favor of the complete and total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. But if you follow the White House's logic, the inhabitants of Capitol Hill are incapable of understanding "U.S. interests." Moreover they are acting to the detriment of these "interests" with their resolutions. "Only the White House" is capable of understanding them and reflecting them in their policy.

It seems that in its approach to the Soviet moratorium the present U.S. Administration is claiming a monopoly of the truth in the final instance. And the fact that this "truth" is rejected both by the American people themselves and by American legislators themselves is of no interest at all to the White House. It is the only one marching in step. Alone...

Resolution 'Setback' for White House

LD022111 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 2 Mar 86

[Text] Washington, March 2 TASS -- The House of Representatives of U.S. Congress has approved after heated debates by 268 votes to 148 a resolution urging the administration to immediately resume talks for concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. The document also demands that the President send for Senate ratification the treaty limiting underground nuclear weapons tests and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes.

The adoption of the resolution became a major setback for the White House. The administration, with the help of its supporters on the Capitol Hill, has frantically sought for one year first to block the consideration of the resolution and then to emasculate its content.

A White House spokesman said after the adoption of the resolution that the measures envisaged in it do not serve the interests of the United States, its allies and friends. At that, he alleged that the document might undermine prospects for progress in the arms control effort.

Revealing the true causes of the opposition on the part of the White House and its reactionary supporters to the demands for an end to nuclear testing, representative Edward Markey (D-Mass.) pointed out that the resolution urges the President to stop tests of nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers -- a key element in the "star wars" programme. The administration, he said, opposes the termination of nuclear testing because it seeks to obtain enhanced power ballistic missiles and new-generation nuclear warheads.

It is time to disperse the propaganda smoke of arguments advanced by opponents of the nuclear test ban, the congressman said. Given thorough study, their assertions fall down like a house of cards.

The proposals recently put forward by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev are far-going, said Rep. Jerry Huckaby. The Soviet Union has observed its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions for seven months. Why shouldn't the United States follow the USSR's example? Ending nuclear tests is the first logical step toward averting the nuclear threat, he said.

Congress Vote Called White House 'Defeat'

PM031449 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 12

[B. Drekhov article under rubric "rejoinder"; "Hawks Get a shap" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress has adopted a resolution by 268 votes for and 148 against, which urges the U.S. Administration to immediately resume talks with the aim to conclude a treaty on the general and complete nuclear test ban. It also contains the demand that President Reagan send to the Senate for ratification the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapons Tests and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. According to reports from across the ocean, the resolution was adopted after a vigorous debate and just a few minutes before President Reagan spoke over the national television and again advocated the holding of talks with the USSR 'from the position of strength'.

The decision of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress attracted keen attention everywhere and has been regarded in the world as a defeat of the White House. People recall how the resolution put forward a year ago was discussed earlier. First the "hawks" tried to block the discussion with the help of their loyal supporters in the Congress. When they failed to achieve it, they tried to destroy its main content. The debate on the resolution became very vigorous.

The situation of supporters of the policy of confrontation, of continuing and whipping up the arms race, is getting ever more difficult.

It is difficult to say how much the U.S. congressmen who discussed the resolution know about the nuclear disarmament program put forward by the Soviet Union and reiterated and developed at the 27th CPSU Congress which is under way in Moscow. However, it could not help but influence to some extent the way of thinking of a number of American law-makers. "The proposals put forward recently by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev are far-reaching," the U.S. Congressman Jerry Huckaby said recently "the Soviet Union has been observing unilaterally for seven months the moratorium on any nuclear explosions. So, why does the U.S. not follow its example?"

And really, what is the reason for the U.S. not to do so?

Admiral Crowe Cited

LD022054 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 2 Mar 86

[Text] Washington, March 2 TASS -- Chairman of the U.S. Chiefs-Of-Staff, Admiral William Crowe, has reaffirmed that the United States is not going to join the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing. Appearing in a program of the NBC TV company, the admiral said that in his view a nuclear test ban is senseless. He argued that the United States needed the tests to ensure the dependability, stability and safety, of nuclear munitions. The admiral thus ultimately gave the lie to Washington's claims that the U.S. Administration would like to rid mankind of nuclear weapons.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. ARMS CONTROL BODY COMMENTS ON TEST BAN

LD201514 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, 20 Feb (TASS)--TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko reports:

Paul Warnke, who headed the U.S. delegation at the SALT-2 talks, told a press conference here that there is no doubt that the Soviet Union is sincerely interested in a complete and general ban on nuclear weapons testing. The press conference was sponsored by the Arms Control Association, an influential American public organization. As Paul Warnke said, a world-wide termination of nuclear testing would strengthen the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. He stressed that if the U.S. displayed readiness, it would be possible to reach agreement on complete and general ban on nuclear weapons testing.

As Richard Garwin, a prominent American arms control expert, said in his turn, the joining of the U.S. in the moratorium on all nuclear explosions unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union would be an important step towards an end to all nuclear testing on our planet. In his words the claims of representatives of the administration that a ban on nuclear testing "would not be verifiable" hold no water.

An end to nuclear testing accords with the common interests, including the interests of the U.S., since in this case the appearance of new even more destructive weapons would be prevented, believes Lynn Sikes, a prominent expert on arms control. The main obstacle to concluding a treaty on complete and general ban on nuclear weapons testing are by no means technical considerations but the deep conviction prevailing among members of the U.S. Administration that the national security interests of the U.S. are best served by arms buildup rather than arms control.

At this juncture the problem of complete and general ban on nuclear testing stands as follows, the press conference was told by Spurgeon Kenny, president of the Arms Control Association. The Soviet Union has proposed a moratorium on nuclear testing, but the U.S. is declining the imposition of a ban on nuclear explosions, does not wish to negotiate that issue. The U.S. Administration, he pointed out, does not wish that a treaty on complete and general ban on nuclear weapons testing be drawn up for the obvious reason--it strives for continuing testing. S. Kenny pointed out the

imposition of a ban on nuclear arsenals and emergence of nuclear weapons of the so-called "third generation", including nuclear powered x-ray lasers.

These latest weapons are known to be intended for use in an ABM system with space-based elements conceived by the U.S. Administration.

The press release issued by the Arms Control Association says that in his all-embracing proposal in the field of arms control, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev announced the unilateral extension by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on any nuclear explosions by another three months. A moratorium on nuclear testing, the press release says, may become a useful first step, if both sides wish to draw up an agreement on complete and general ban on nuclear testing. By voluntarily putting an end to testing, the nuclear powers would then demonstrate the intention to slow down the strategic weapons race, to achieve progress in drawing up a treaty on complete and general ban on nuclear weapons testing. The moratorium on nuclear testing, the press release says, is a useful step.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1278

21 March 1986

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: ROBERT MCNAMARA SUPPORTS NUCLEAR TEST BAN

LD221327 Moscow TASS in English 1253 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] Nashville (Tennessee) 22 Feb (TASS)--TASS special correspondent Aleksandr Shaŭnev reports:

Robert McNamara, a prominent U.S. politician and former defense secretary, has declared for the United States to join in the nuclear test moratorium, announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union.

Addressing a seminar here on questions of East-West relations, McNamara said that it was in the interest of the United States to accept the proposal.

McNamara criticized the much-vaunted "Strategic Defense Initiative" of the Reagan Administration. He said it was a wrong solution of the problem of bridling the nuclear arms race. The former minister expressed serious concern over the fact that under the cover of the quest for one hundred percent defense against enemy missiles work was under way to create systems designed to be added to the existing arsenal of offensive nuclear armaments. He also stated that the Strategic Defense Initiative, if implemented, would bring about a violation of the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems.

However, the speech delivered at the seminar by Jack Matlock, a high-ranking official of the National Security Council, confirmed that the Reagan Administration does not intend to abandon its perilous intentions. He made it clear that work to carry through the project to develop space arms would be continued at an accelerated pace.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1278

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S BOVIN CRITICIZES ARMS CONTROL ADVISER'S ARTICLE

PM061545 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 12

[IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin "Notes Apropos": "Unofficial Advice"]

[Text] The Soviet mass media have already mentioned Colin Gray -- president of the National Institute of State Policy at Fairfax (Virginia) and member of R. Reagan's nongovernmental group of advisers on arms control. They have mentioned him, in particular, because together with his constant colleague and coauthor Keith Payne, he denied the thesis of the impossibility of victory in a nuclear missile war and insisted energetically that such a war can and must be won. Of course, it is the United States which is supposed to win it... For a person who believes that "victory is possible" (that, incidentally, was the title of an article by C. Gray and K. Payne published in 1980), arms control, and especially disarmament, are hardly likely to appear reasonable, vitally necessary measures. C. Gray's new article, published in the WALL STREET JOURNAL, confirms this. Having mentioned in passing the "tempting features" of the Soviet plan for the phased elimination of nuclear arms, C. Gray calls the plan "absurd," "risible," contrary to "common sense," and so on, and so forth. The Soviet plan is "absolutely unacceptable" -- that is C. Gray's conclusion.

It is said that on one occasion W. Churchill, preparing for a speech in parliament, underlined one passage in his speech and wrote in the margin: "Not enough arguments -- emphasize the voice!" "Strong" epithets often play roughly the same role -- they are intended to conceal the weak points in the argument and the gaps in the logic. All the same, in our day you cannot manage entirely without arguments.

Let us look at how the unofficial adviser argues the "absolute unacceptability" of the Soviet plan. He makes seven points. The first six amount to saying that you cannot trust the "Russians." The last, the seventh, deals with the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

So let us consider trust. It is a reciprocal thing. We do not need the kind of agreements with the Americans that cannot be verified. We have no objection to trusting the Americans, but only if they can be trusted. The Soviet Union has stated clearly: We are prepared to elaborate and adopt a reliable system of mutual verification. If American worries about verification are serious and sincere, we have given the go-ahead for our positions to be brought closer together.

Official Washington is still hesitating, "considering," and, in all probability, seeking pretexts to go into reverse. Now the unofficial adviser has performed that operation. The pretext has been found. It seems that there can be no question of

reliable verification at all. "...By means of satellite observations and reconnaissance," C. Gray writes, "and by using a group of foreign inspectors, it is absolutely impossible to be sure that the Soviet Union is not secretly concealing nuclear weapons in bunkers, in their forests, in silos or buildings which look ordinary."

Given the "absolute impossibility" of verification, distrust naturally becomes absolute, too, and the Soviet proposals become just as "absolutely" unacceptable. That is C. Gray's logic. And it is an absolutely artificial, far-fetched logic, because even given the existing verification system any strategically significant changes in nuclear missile potentials cannot go unnoticed. And the question is being raised of making verification even better.

Now, SDI. Here too C. Gray can only think in terms of absolutes. "Complete or even very substantial nuclear disarmament," he insistently tells the administration, "would be acceptable for Western security only if we deployed an extremely effective strategic defense. This logic is absolutely implacable."

If C. Gray proceeds on the basis that "victory is possible," he can have no other kind of logic. But that is the whole point. And that is what the Americans have been told repeatedly: The "star wars" program cannot but be seen as an attempt to secure a decisive strategic advantage, to secure that advantage and risk "victory." We do not claim that our logic is "absolutely" implacable. In human affairs, only death is absolute and everything else is relative. We claim that our logic serves life, not death. The path to disarmament on earth does not require the transfer of the arms race to space -- that is what the Soviet Union has insisted on and does insist on. I realize that C. Gray is expressing his personal, unofficial view. But the impression is created that this is closer to the real U.S. positions than many official statements.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: NATO'S ROGERS APPLAUDS WESTERN ARMS PROGRAMS

PM240908 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Feb 86 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Speech by G. Rogers"]

[Text] Paris, 21 Feb -- U.S. General G. Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, has delivered a report to the French International Relations Institute on the subject "Strengthening NATO: The Role of Western Europe." Repeating hackneyed theses about "the Soviet military threat," the general lauded in every possible way the programs for building up nuclear arms that are being implemented by the United States and Britain and the Atlantic alliance's plans under which the siting of new U.S. nuclear missiles is proceeding at full speed in the West European countries.

Rogers also praised the French Government's plans to modernize French nuclear forces. He did not conceal his satisfaction at the creation of so-called "rapid action forces" in France. This French Armed Forces formation, which is virtually a copy of the interventionist U.S. Rapid Deployment Force, is intended for carrying out combat actions in Europe along with the NATO countries' forces.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET REPORTS, COMMENTS ON REAGAN'S WEEKLY RADIO ADDRESS

Supports Revised Arms Purchasing

LD021347 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2334 GMT 1 Mar 86

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1114 GMT on 2 March carried a service message killing the following item]

[Text] Washington, 2 Mar (TASS) -- Tass correspondent Yuriy Shvets, reports:

In his radio address President Reagan declared his support for the plan of reorganization of the system of arms purchases by the Pentagon. It was drafted by a two-party commission led by former deputy secretary of defense David Packard. As it emerges from the address of the White House chief, the aim of the plan is to accelerate the arms buildup. The President once again called for the continuation, as he called it, of the "historic program of rebuilding America's military might" and accused Congress of "undermining the efforts" of his administration in this sphere. This accusation was provoked by the fact that dissatisfaction has recently been growing among legislators over the excessive growth of the Pentagon appropriation at the same time as a sharp reduction on expenditure on social programs.

Although the Packard commission was created last year to investigate the many cases that have come to light of the Pentagon squandering U.S. taxpayers' money and of swindling by the war department's [as received] contractors, the plan proposed by it gives no answer to the question of how to combat these phenomena. Instead, it has worked out recommendations, the substance of which consists in seeking to produce more weapons in conditions of an unprecedented budget deficit. The main demand of the plan's authors is that Congress interfere less in Pentagon affairs and "eliminate all barriers" in the path of an unbridled arms race. In essence, it is a question of completely liberating the war department from the control of the legislators.

The president has expressed his resolve to implement the Packard commission's recommendations.

Reiterates Military Budget Plea

LD021408 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 2 Mar 86

[Text] Washington, March 2 TASS -- In his latest radio address to the nation U.S. President Ronald Reagan has once again issued a plea for further increases in the country's military spending.

"We've come far," he said, "in building the solid foundations of a strong and secure national defense, but we have not finished the job. We must not let all that we've accomplished in the last five years be undermined by careless slashing at the defense budget." Over the Reagan administration's five years in office, U.S. military expenditures have swelled dramatically to total over one trillion dollars.

The White House now is pulling all the stops out for the Pentagon's budget in the next fiscal year to grow by nearly 12 percent over the current one. Otherwise, the President claimed, America would "slide back into helpless insecurity" and become a "paper tiger". "It is the prime duty of Congress to appropriate the necessary resources to keep our defenses strong," he said.

Reagan's radio address came as a followup on his recent televised statement to the nation. The U.S. President used both opportunities to try and muster the Americans' support for foisting another round of the arms race on the United States and for continuing to maintain the same old unconstructive and hopeless positions-of-strength approach to relations with the Soviet Union. The objective of this policy is to achieve a decisive military advantage over the USSR and gain a possibility to threaten it with a first nuclear strike.

This policy is criticized by many prominent U.S. politicians noting that mounting his pressure on Congress, Reagan resorts to a crude doctoring of facts.

Senator William Proxmire said the President was basically wrong when he went on talking about a U.S. military lag behind the Soviet Union. The United States, the senator argued, did not need any extra appropriations for military needs, which its chief executive was calling for. The United States, Proxmire stressed, should conduct arms control talks from positions of military parity.

Congressman Sander Levin said Reagan was trying to give the nation and Congress a scare with his claims about a "Soviet threat". But even a high-ranking administration spokesman briefing newsmen the other day, Levin added, had conceded there was an essential military equilibrium between the Soviet Union and the United States. The truth was, the senator said, that the United States had adequate defense capability.

THE WASHINGTON POST quoted an unidentified highly-placed administration official as saying that three in four Americans thought their country already had enough defense capability.

Barbara Boxer, a member of the House of Representatives, said, for her part, that the United States did not need at all to add further billions of dollars to its already outside military budget.

According to the latest public opinion surveys, 59 percent of the Americans consider U.S. military spending unreasonably high and think it necessary to axe it to reduce the enormous federal budget deficit. Only 22 percent of the Americans, as indicated by public opinion polls taken by THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC television, support increases in military outlays.

Rear-Admiral Gene Larocque (ret.), director of the Washington-based Center for Defense Information, said that in his bid to convince Congress and the American people of the need to boost military spending by another 34 billion dollars, the President had chosen to ignore the real buildup of U.S. military power in the past 20 years. The President

had claimed, he noted, that in the past 20 years the United States had not modernized its nuclear force, while in fact since 1965 it had built more than 1,300 new ballistic missiles and 10,000 nuclear warheads for them.

Importantly, during the 1970s, which were described by Reagan as a period of "decline" for the U.S. nuclear force, the Pentagon actually installed more nuclear warheads on its strategic missiles than the Soviet Union.

Speaking in a NEW YORK TIMES interview, former U.S. President Jimmy Carter accused President Reagan of "habitually" misstating the record of U.S. military modernization programs and of following an agenda for national security that had little chance of success. Carter said that President Reagan was persisting in a pattern of statements "he knows are not true and which he personally promised me not to repeat".

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: 'NUCLEAR WINTER' POSSIBLE FROM CONVENTIONAL WAR

LD281434 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS -- The latest developments by Soviet scientists showed the need for reviewing the principles underlying relations between the peoples, as well as ways and means of solving conflicts.

The computer centre of the USSR Academy of Sciences undertook research into different vital problems, including that of staving off nuclear war. A specially drafted mathematical system helped create a model of nuclear war, which served as a basis for a strictly scientific evaluation of the impact a new world war would have on the biosphere.

The mathematical models showed the earth enveloped in soot, impenetrable to sun rays, but not only as a result of the use of nuclear weapons. An effect, similar to the "nuclear winter" one, might also emerge as a result of the use of conventional weapons whose capacity is constantly increasing; the NEW TIMES [NOVOYE VRYMYA] magazine quotes Academician Nikita Moyshev, deputy director of the computer centre.

In his article, he also cites other problems facing mankind. Scientists, for example, plan to look into the way ocean pollution affects the climate. A thin film, formed by pollutants on the ocean surface, throttles the energy flow from the ocean to the atmosphere. Evaporation from the surface also decreases. Research showed that tons of oil products are dumped into harbour areas. Scientists will also study its impact on the climate and the distribution pattern of precipitation.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET BOOK ON AFTERMATH OF NUCLEAR CONFLICT PUBLISHED

LD171836 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 17 TASS--Mankind and nuclear weapons cannot co-exist forever and the present, historically crucial period is the time for solving the issue of doing away with nuclear weapons once and for all, the chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for Peace said today.

Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice-president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, was speaking at a news conference at the press center of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which opens in Moscow next week.

The news conference was devoted to the release of a book called "The Night After...The Climatic and Biological Consequences of a Nuclear War," which has been edited by Velikhov.

The book, prepared by the Soviet scientists' committee, is a kind of response to the U.S. movie "The Day After" dealing with the aftermath of a nuclear conflict.

The conclusion of the book's authors is that there will be no day after a nuclear conflagration. Nuclear blasts, Velikhov said, will kindle massive fires which will send huge amounts of soot, ash and gases up into the atmosphere.

The clouds formed by the tiny particles of combustion products will absorb and diffuse solar light and black out the surface of the earth. The so-called nuclear night will set in: The radiation balance on the entire planet will be upset and within a matter of days temperatures on the ground will plummet by 30 to 40 degrees centigrade as compared with the normal for the given time of year.

This will be an unprecedented climatic catastrophe which will cause the wholesale destruction of the flora and the fauna, Velikhov said. He said this picture of the aftermath of a nuclear conflict is a result of accurate computations by both Soviet and American experts. The studies by scientists proving that a nuclear conflict will be followed by a "nuclear winter" make one even more convinced that a positions-of-military-power approach to resolving political problems is unacceptable. The modern weapons of mass destruction, Velikhov said, are weapons for collective suicide.

The latest, well-considered proposals for a step-by-step complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, which have been advanced by the Soviet Union, are a highly important guidepost for all peace forces, Academician Velikhov said. Urging others for joint efforts in the name of peace and security, the Soviet Union demonstrates its will for peace by practical actions. Suffice it to recall the extension of its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions by another three months.

Velikhov said the great task of ridding humanity of nuclear weapons by the end of this century, which has been put forward by the Soviet Union, is realistic. Not only Soviet scientists but also the vast majority of scientists in the West believe that nuclear arms reductions are only possible on condition that the USSR and the United States will both renounce the development, testing and deployment of space strike arms.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S KORNIYENKO, AKHROMEYEV, ZAMYATIN HOLD NEWS CONFERENCE

TASS Report

LD280821 Moscow TASS in English 0813 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS -- "The Soviet program for ensuring peace and security" is the subject of a news conference that opened in the press center of the 27th Congress of the CPSU. The speakers at the news conference are: Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces and first deputy minister of defense of the U.S.S.R., and Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

Matters related to the foreign policy activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet state are dealt with in detail in the political report given to the congress by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as well as during the discussion of the report. The cornerstone of these activities, it was stressed at the news conference, is the provision made by V.I. Lenin and reiterated in the new edition of the CPSU Program that the historical dispute between the two opposing systems into which the world is divided can and should be resolved by means of peaceful competition, and not by military means.

'Paramount Task'

LD280852 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Excerpt] Accordingly, the chief aim of the foreign policy of the CPSU always was and remains to give the Soviet people the possibility to work in the conditions of lasting peace. However, it is not only the Soviet, but all other peoples as well, that need a lasting peace. Peace is an indispensable condition for social progress in general, and today it is even more than that -- it is a matter of human survival. Now that people have come to control means of self-destruction, the Soviet Union considers it a paramount task to stop material preparations for nuclear war, to turn around the arms race on earth and to prevent it from spreading into outer space, and to eliminate nuclear weapons totally and everywhere by the end of this century. Regrettably, the response which came the other day from the American side to the nuclear disarmament program proposed by the Soviet Union can in no way be considered constructive, as was pointed out at the congress. Conversely, it shows that the U.S. leadership intends to continue spurring on the arms race on earth and spreading it into outer space in a bid to secure military superiority.

The continuous escalation of the level of armed confrontation is by no means a way to peace, as President Reagan claims. If the arms arsenals keep swelling, even parity ensures at best equal danger rather than equal security. In the age of nuclear missiles the genuine security of states is only possible as security for all. Even in the past -- in the prewar period and after the war -- the Soviet Union gave preference to ideas of collective security but today, according to our profound conviction, it is not merely a preferential but the only possible way of ensuring lasting peace.

This explains why our party has raised the question of developing a comprehensive system of international security, the military, political, economic and humanitarian foundations of which are presented in the political report. These foundations could become a starting point and provide a framework for a direct and regular dialogue among the leaders of the countries of the world community, both bilateral and multilateral. The idea was also put forward in this context that the leaders of the five states, the permanent members of the Security Council, sit down to discuss what can be done to safeguard and strengthen peace.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S ARBATOV, PRIMAKOV, VELIKHOV PRESS CONFERENCE ON SECURITY

Regional Conflict Could Start Nuclear War

LD031231 Moscow TASS in English 1224 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS -- Conflict situations that emerge in the areas in which one of the sides has nuclear weapons or is close to having them are extremely dangerous for the cause of peace, Academician Yevgeniy Primakov has stated. This could create a situation in which a nuclear conflict could emerge not on a global level, but within the framework of a regional conflict, for example, in the Middle East or in the south of Africa, he pointed out, speaking today in the Press Centre of the 27th CPSU Congress at a press conference devoted to the Soviet concept of security.

The Soviet Union pursues a consistent policy aimed at non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, bearing in mind a possibility of the emergence of such a situation, Ye. Primakov said. The Soviet side is sure that all the present-day conflicts in the world should be settled by means of political talks.

Israeli Role in SDI Criticized

LD031347 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS -- The Soviet Union regards the participation of Israel in the preparation and development of the U.S. "star wars" program as a negative factor that destabilizes the international situation, Academician Yevgeniy Primakov has stated. He spoke today in the press centre of the 27th CPSU Congress at the press conference devoted to the Soviet concept of security.

It is obvious that the participation of Israel in the developments within the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" of the Reagan administration on the level of private companies and state research institutions does not promote the stabilization of the situation in the Middle East, he stressed.

Velikhov on Soviet Space Stations

LD031325 Moscow TASS in English 1319 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS -- The permanent space stations that the Soviet Union now has in outer space have no relation whatsoever to "star wars", said Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov. He addressed a press conference at the Press Centre of the 27th CPSU Congress on the subject "Soviet Concept of Security" here today. These stations are

21 March 1986

launched under the definite scientific and technical programme. Certainly they demonstrate the level of the Soviet space technology. On March 6 and 9, our "Vega" probes are to pass Halley's Comet, Academician Velikhov went on. Given an immeasurably great imagination, one could portray it as a certain "accuracy experiment". In reality there is nothing of this kind. The task being fulfilled by the stations is purely scientific. On the other hand, our research shows that the Soviet Union possesses an adequate scientific and technical base for elaborating respective counter-measures against the U.S. "star wars" programme.

SDI Violates ABM Treaty

LD031208 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, 3 March (TASS) -- The U.S. "star wars" program violates the accords which the United States and the Soviet Union reached in 1972, when an ABM Treaty was concluded, stated Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. This treaty, Velikhov noted when speaking in the press center of the 27th CPSU Congress today, represents the basis of the entire process of arms control and arms reduction. Its violation therefore means destruction of the basis of this process, he said.

Nowadays, continued Yevgeniy Velikhov, there are no space strike weapons. Appearance of such weapons in space would mark a fundamental change in the strategic situation. Findings from serious scientific research which has been carried out in the Soviet Union and around the world have proved that putting strike weapons into space cannot make a country invulnerable; but it can significantly worsen strategic parity and make it less stable, Velikhov said.

Arbatov on Security

LD031405 Moscow TASS in English 1349 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS -- Efficient and reliable security cannot be ensured nowadays by military-technical means alone. Security has become a political problem and it can be resolved only through political means, said Director of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences Academician Georgiy Arbatov at a press conference today. The press conference was devoted to the Soviet concept of security.

One cannot have security at the expense or to the detriment of others. Security can only be mutual, universal, security for all. Despite acute contradictions existing in the world, all countries should master the science and art of peaceful coexistence, he stressed.

Speaking at the press conference, Vice President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov pointed to the extreme danger of the American "star wars" programme to peace.

It violates the Soviet-American treaty, the mainstay of the entire process of control over armaments, reduction of armaments. It has been fully proved, said Academician Velikhov, that placement of strike weapons into outer space cannot make a country invulnerable. The character of contemporary weapons does not leave any state the hope to protect itself through military-technical means alone, through creating the most powerful defences.

Answering a question, Academician Velikhov has said that the Soviet Union's permanent space stations are in no way linked with "star wars" and are put into orbit according to a certain scientific-technical programme. But these, certainly, demonstrate the standard of Soviet space technology.

Director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, who participated in the press conference, has noted that the question of settlement of regional conflicts holds a major place in the Soviet concept of security. But the Soviet side turns down Washington's attempts to view regional conflict situations through the prism of Soviet-American relations. The USSR, stressed Academician Primakov, is open to any consultations that could help liquidate such situations. Meanwhile, in a number of cases, specifically in the Middle East, the United States is leading things to barring the Soviet Union from active participation in political processes of settlement of conflict situations.

Touching upon the Soviet American negotiations, Academician Arbatov has said: The Soviet Union is doing the utmost to firmly accelerate the process of negotiations, which was agreed upon in Geneva. We hope to find support in that question.

Academician Velikhov declared for broad cooperation between scientists in the whole world in joint research bound to promote durable and reliable peace. He mentioned thermonuclear synthesis, environmental protection, exploration of the world ocean, forecasting of earthquakes, etc, as programmes of such cooperation.

'New Conception of Security'

LD031920 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1415 GMT 3 Mar 86

["Excerpts" of 3 March press conference entitled: "The Soviet Concept of Security" with Academician Georgiy Arkadeyevich Arbatov, director of the USA and Canada Institute; Academician Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, vice president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations; held in the 27th CPSU Congress press center -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Arbatov] On 3 October 1985 in Paris, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, speaking about the fact that human thought has the regrettable capacity to lag behind fast changing reality, noted that we, in the Soviet Union, have begun a process of rethinking, and of bringing many primary matters into line with new realities, including matters in the military and, of course, political fields.

In other words, it is a process of working out a new conception of international security and new approaches to it. At the congress, Comrade Gorbachev revealed what we were basing ourselves on when we posed ourselves the task of working out a new conception of security; not just some kind of concrete proposals, but the wider conceptual framework of our approach to this most important of international tasks.

He spoke -- I'll just remind you very briefly of what you have read -- first of how, in our time it is not possible to ensure a truly reliable security with military technical means and defense systems alone. Security has become a political problem, and it can be solved only by political means. This has become especially obvious thanks to the appearance of new weapons which have turned military power into a real boomerang, a nuclear boomerang, which strikes whoever resorts to this weapon with as much certainty as it does his opponent.

Second, in working out a new conception of security, we took as our starting point the fact that you cannot have security at the expense of the other side, or to the detriment of the other side, and that now we can have either security, or absolute danger, only jointly. If we talk of the United States of America, or if we talk in a wider international context, security can only be universal security, or security for all -- this term was put forward in the Palme Commission report, which was in fact called: "Security for All."

We took as our starting point the fact that such an approach -- although the United States still continues to remain the locomotive of militarism, as the report put it -- that such an approach to security corresponds not only to ours, but also to American interests. Besides, the world doesn't consist only of Americans and it is in the interest, to speak the truth, of the whole world community.

Another element in our approach consists in the fact that the world is in a process of fast-moving change. A status quo is not possible, and no one can guarantee it -- this makes things more difficult, but it is a reality which has to be taken into account. Dozens of states exist in the world, each one of which has its own legitimate interests. However, in spite of all these sharp contradictions which exist, all of these states must master the science and art of peaceful coexistence, the science and art of behaving in a restrained and circumspect way in the international arena and live in a civilized way -- that is, in conditions of correct international relations and cooperation. There I am quoting Comrade Gorbachev.

In a word, today's world has become too small and fragile for wars and a policy of strength. We drew the conclusion that in order to preserve peace and to create a real and reliable guarantee for survival and security, we must break away decisively and irreversibly from the ways of thinking and acting which for centuries were built on the admissibility of wars, armed conflict, and the arms race. But in this connection the report outlined a program for establishing the basis for an all-embracing system of international security. It touched upon a whole range of problems in the military sphere, in politics, in the economic sphere, economic security for everyone, and in the humanitarian sphere. It also included questions of cultural relations, cleansing, so to speak, the spiritual atmosphere of all dangerous elements, human rights and all kinds of humanitarian issues, and broad cooperation in culture, science, the arts and so on. All this was presented, of course, not in the form of an ultimatum but as a basis for talks, for serious conversation as a framework for dialogue, if you like.

[Unidentified speaker] A question from Hungarian TV for Academician Arbatov: On Friday, [28 February] the U.S. House of Representatives, with a large majority of 268 to 148, adopted a resolution on the need to start talks on the total banning of nuclear tests immediately. And on Friday, President Reagan proposed in his radio appearance that no less than 12 percent more should be spent on military appropriations in the next financial year than in this financial year. How do you evaluate these two facts?

[Arbatov] I shall answer both in turn. The first question -- President Reagan has entered into conflict on this issue not only with us, but also with the U.S. Congress. You see, the Senate had adopted the corresponding resolution even earlier. Here, moreover, President Reagan turned out to be the only U.S. President ever to oppose stopping nuclear tests and talks on this. He violated and continues to violate, with his current policy, even the treaty obligations of the United States, which the United States took upon itself regarding the 1963 treaty on partial banning of nuclear tests

and the 1969 treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear arms, where the undersigned gave their solemn oath to strive -- within the shortest possible time span -- towards an accord on the total banning of nuclear tests.

The position of the United States on this level is becoming odious. I think one could say that on this level our proposals are working quite well, since they are tearing off masks and fig leaves and are showing the true worth of everyone? who is really concerned about peace and who is concerned with military preparations under the guise of a concern for peace. This is on the first question.

As for the second question, you know that this, I feel, precisely exposes all the administration's talk about its desire to strive for peace, disarmament and so on -- the fact that despite its scandalous budget deficit, it is calling for a record military budget, for its further increase.

[Unidentified speaker] Here is a written question for Academician Velikhov: In his recent TV appearance, U.S. President Ronald Reagan said that preparation for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace; strength is the most convincing argument we have to convince our opponents to hold talks seriously. How would you comment on these words by the U.S. President?

[Velikhov] Well, first of all, part of the answer has been provided already by Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, speaking about issues precisely concerning force. And I must say that we are indeed hearing very contradictory statements now.

Under the influence of public opinion, both the President and the administration are saying on the one hand that the United States is not seeking military superiority, while on the other the question arises -- what does strength mean then, since talking from a position of strength always implies superiority above all.

A second issue is that if nuclear war must not be waged, if it is impossible to win it, then what is the meaning of the question of preparing for war? Why is there this argument for preparing for war; how can it be a valid argument, if everybody knows that this war must not be waged and that it is impossible to win? It seems to me that today these ramblings [bluzhdaniye] of the administration show that it has no clear and firm program for how to live in the nuclear age. But there is also a more profound aspect to this matter; here I will again refer to the resolution...

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] Excuse me, Yevgeniy Pavlovich. I would like those present in the hall to value the references to the resolution, since the resolution will be in the press only on the 6th, I think.

[Unidentified speaker] But it has been adopted.

[Unidentified speaker] Yes, it has been adopted.

[Velikhov] ... that in the nuclear age, even parity will cease to be a factor in military-political restraints, because of the development [razvitiye] and perfection of nuclear and other kinds of weapons. This is a very important point. You can see that not only the superiority that the administration is talking about, but even parity may cease to be a factor in military-political restraint. For that reason there is only one thing that can guarantee the survival of mankind; that is the stand of a genuine policy of peaceful coexistence, and a policy of nuclear disarmament.

SDI, Military Superiority Discussed

LD032010 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1630 GMT 3 Mar 86

[Press conference held 3 March with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of United States and Canada Studies; Yevgeniy Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations; and Yevgeniy Velikhov, deputy president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; held at the 27th CPSU Congress press center -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Unidentified speaker] The Soviet concept of international security has an all-embracing nature. It deals with both hotbeds of conflict in various parts of the world, and space. But, one of the Italian journalists asked, are the Soviet space stations really an answer or a counterbalance to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative? Academician Velikhov, deputy president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, answered thus:

[Begin Velikhov recording] First of all I would like to say that the platforms and the permanent stations which the Soviet Union now has in space are stations which are in no way connected with the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, or star wars. They are being launched in a quite definite scientific-technological program, it is a generally well known one. Of course, they do show indirectly simply the level of Soviet space technology. I can give an example. On 6 and 9 March two of our Vega satellites are to fly past Halley's Comet; that is, we will reach Halley's Comet at a distance of 250 million km. Of course, this could also be viewed from such a somewhat distorted point of view as being an experiment in targetting, but in fact it is nothing of the sort. Thus I would like to say that these are not to any extent responses; it is simply the implementation of the program which we have in the Soviet Union, the fact that we are launching the satellites. The conclusion of a report by Soviet scientists is well known: The creation of an impenetrable shield is impossible, an impenetrable shield is an aggressive act, appropriate measures can and should be adopted, and the Soviet Union possesses a sufficient scientific and technological base to adopt corresponding measures. [end recording]

[Announcer] Many of the journalists' questions concerned Soviet-U.S. relations, and particularly the assessment of the latest statements by President Reagan, which were, in essence, the reply to the Soviet proposals of 15 January. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, is speaking:

[Begin recording] [Arbatov] It seems to me that the statement, the harshness of the statement, the pre-Geneva spirit, I would say, of his statement last Wednesday can be explained by what the U.S. press has written -- that secret public opinion polls taken in the United States have shown a drop in public support for the U.S. military programs and military spending. And he has decided to work up the mood and to try to upset the tendency in the mood of the U.S. public. In general, I can see one very interesting thing in the United States. That country, which used to be so proud of being such an open society and so on, is becoming more closed; it is beginning to get nervous, to react nervously to comments from others, and to behave uncertainly in general. These eruptions from Reagan and from his aides did not convince me that they really feel that they are very strong.

[Chairman] In his recent television address U.S. President Ronald Reagan said: Preparation for war is one of the most reliable methods of preserving peace. Strength

is the most convincing argument we have to convince our opponent to hold serious talks. How would you comment on these words by the U.S. President? The question is addressed to Academician Velikhov.

[Velikhov] I must say that we are now hearing very contradictory views. Under the influence of public opinion both the President and the administration are saying that on the one hand the United States is not looking for military superiority, and on the other hand the question arises: What is strength -- because talks from a position of strength do always presuppose first and foremost superiority.

The second question is that if a nuclear war must not be fought, if it cannot be won, then what does the question of preparation for war mean? Why is the argument of preparation for war, or why could it be, a real argument if everybody knows that this war must not be fought, and cannot be won?

It seems to me today that these ramblings by the administration show that it does not have a clear and firm program of how to live in the nuclear age.

[Chairman] Georgiy Arkadyevich, you want to say something?

[Arbatov] I wanted to add -- you know, it seems to me that here we are seeing such a striking contrast -- on the one side a search to understand this new state of affairs, to take a broader look at it somehow, to try to take into account the interests of the other side, to find some kind of general, mutually acceptable way out, to indicate some kind of prospect for mankind other than the prospect of that destruction, total destruction. As one of my friends, Professor Galbraith said one day, it would be hard to distinguish the ashes of socialism from the ashes of capitalism, if there is a war. And on the other side we see a mish-mash of threadbare, disparate truths with which they have been deceiving people for millenia in preparing war: If you want peace, prepare for war, no one ever insults the strong. And I am worried most of all, you know, by the situation when the weakness of the other side, including its intellectual weakness and its mediocrity, begins to make you anxious. Here too there is interdependence in today's world. When you see these threadbare discussions, these pathetic conclusions, in which the whole history of mankind is compromised, you think: But where is the great power which is called a superpower? What kind of policy does it have? What is it showing to the great American people and to the whole of mankind? [end recording]

[Announcer] Summing up the press conference, Academician Arbatov said:

[Begin Arbatov recording] I should like to remind you of one place in Comrade Gorbachev's political report, where he says that in those questions which affect the survival of the whole of mankind, we simply cannot take no for an answer. We cannot. There are questions where we cannot take no. We shall go on fighting with all our capabilities, with all our force, use every chance, and we are counting on the widest possible support of all other countries, all other peoples, for it is matter of our joint, collective interests, including the interests of the Americans themselves. [end recording]

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

WORLD MEDIA COVERS CPSU CONGRESS PROCEEDINGS

Peace Plan Discussed

PM261501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 86 Second Edition p 12

["Own correspondent" reports under the general heading "International Information. The Attention of the Whole World"]

[Excerpts] Berlin--Television screens in the GDR lit up earlier than usual today: A direct broadcast from Moscow began, from the session hall of the 27th CPSU Congress. The working people of the German socialist state were given the opportunity to hear at the same time as the Soviet people the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

The realistic program to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000, which the CPSU Central Committee general secretary has submitted for consideration by all states and peoples, opens up clear, optimistic prospects. It inspires peace-loving forces working to attain the great aim of nuclear disarmament.

Paris — Millions of French people saw on their television screens reports from the Kremlin's Palace of Congresses on the 1st day of work by the supreme party forum. French political commentators and correspondents stress the great importance for international politics of the 27th congress' work and of the decisions that will be adopted at it.

In his program speech at such an exceptionally important forum as the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet leader noted in particular the importance of the task of eliminating the threat of nuclear war and substantiating the USSR's cardinal peace initiatives.

Lisbon — The main event of the day. This is how the Portuguese mass information media characterize the 27th CPSU Congress which has opened in Moscow. Reports on the CPSU Central Committee's Political Report in news bulletins, television, radio, and the ANOP news agency note the realistic, well-argued nature of the positions contained in this report.

The Soviet leader, the newspaper *DIARIO DE LISBOA* writes, once again, indicating the catastrophic consequences for mankind of the unleashing of nuclear war, confirmed a course of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

London — The CPSU congress, which opened today in Moscow, may become a turning point for the cause of international peace if the West makes use of the historic opportunity inherent in the latest Soviet proposals on disarmament. This was said today by D. Healey, a prominent political figure in Great Britain and foreign minister in the Labor "shadow cabinet," speaking at an international symposium on disarmament problems in progress here.

There are two obstacles, Healey continued, in the way of using this opportunity. The first obstacle is U.S. President Reagan's persistent desire to force the pace of the "star wars" program, which is being questioned by his own advisers and rejected by his allies.

The second obstacle is the striving by the British and French Governments to increase almost tenfold the destructive force of their nuclear arsenals. This could become an obstacle in the way of concluding an agreement on eliminating medium-range nuclear missiles in the European zone.

I fully share the opinion expressed by M.S. Gorbachev in his report on the necessity for a new approach to the problems of international relations, D. Healey said in reply to a question by our correspondent. A truly historic opportunity has now been offered for this.

Further on Foreign Reaction

PM261604 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Feb 86 Second Edition p 11

[TASS 25 February roundup: "The Historic Mission of Socialism"--first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Excerpts] The entire world's attention is focused on Moscow where the 27th CPSU Congress is being held. Judging by reports in foreign countries' mass media, very few people missed the opportunity to watch the television broadcast, carried all over the world, of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivering the Political Report to the congress, or to hear this document on the radio. Not only our friends, but even our ideological opponents emphasize in their response to this document: The fundamental tasks of the Soviet Union's economic and social development, which are the subject of discussion at the forum of Soviet Communists, also determine the CPSU's international strategy. The paramount program demand which Lenin's party makes of foreign policy is to ensure for the Soviet people the opportunity to work under conditions of lasting peace and freedom. Under present-day conditions, to fulfill this demand means primarily to halt material preparations for a nuclear war.

A Czechoslovak Radio observer emphasized that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his dynamic report which abounds with weighty formulations and profound theoretical conclusions, outlined ways to resolve the ambitious tasks of accelerating the socioeconomic development of the Soviet State and society. Soviet people need peace for the implementation of these tasks. This is why the USSR intends to struggle persistently for the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons by the year 2000, perceiving this as the central dimension of its foreign and domestic policy in the coming years. It is indisputable that the decisions of the forum of Soviet Communists will exert an enormous influence on the entire march of mankind's historic development.

The attention which M.S. Gorbachev paid to the questions of preserving peace and saving the planet from the nuclear threat is evidence that the struggle against a new war and for the preservation of human civilization from destruction will remain the main foreign policy objective of the CPSU, Vietnam's VNA correspondent reported from Moscow. Moscow proceeds from the premise that the policy of total antagonism and military confrontation has no future. An escape into the past is not a response to the challenge of the future but rather an act of desperation. The USSR is prepared to do everything within its power for a radical change for the better in the international situation. Moscow has invariably advocated and continues to advocate peaceful coexistence between states belonging to different systems.

An impressive program for the creation of an all-embracing system of international security has been put forward at the CPSU Congress, a Cuban Radio commentary emphasized. This program includes the series of measures in the military, political,

economic, and humanitarian spheres formulated by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Soviet leader proposed, in particular, that the leaders of the five nuclear powers which are permanent members of the UN Security Council gather around a round table to discuss what can and must be done for the strengthening of peace.

With his fundamental Political Report Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev set a businesslike tone for the work of the congress, the U.S. news agency AP reported. Touching in his report on Washington's reaction to the 15 January Soviet statement which contains a program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee declared that even though in his letter in reply R. Reagan agrees in general with some Soviet proposals on disarmament and security questions, his positive statements are drowned in all kinds of reservations, "linkages," and "conditions." All this, in Moscow's opinion, blocks the solution of fundamental disarmament problems.

A correspondent for UPI, another U.S. news agency, reported: Having described the United States as "the locomotive of imperialism," the Soviet leader declared that he perceives the significance of his next meeting with the U.S. President in the possibility that it may yield practical results along the most important avenues of arms limitation and reduction. The Soviet Union considers that there are at least two issues on which accord can be reached: the termination of nuclear tests and the elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET MARSHAL KULIKOV ON ARMY, NAVY DAY

PM251033 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 3

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of Warsaw Pact Nations, under the rubric "23 February Is Soviet Army and Navy Day": "Our Pride, Our Glory"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Armed Forces have been standing guard over the Great October's gains for 68 years. Devotion to the Communist Party and selfless love for the motherland make our servicemen fearless in the heat of battle and staunch in the hour of severe trials. Army and Navy servicemen are the working people's loyal sons and their reliable shield and support. This has repeatedly been demonstrated in practice. This is why our whole country celebrates Soviet Army and Navy Day.

Imperialist forces were reluctant to reconcile themselves to the results of World War II, the emergence of the world socialist system, the sharp upsurge of the national liberation movement, the collapse of the colonial system, and the considerable narrowing of their own sphere of supremacy. They began drawing up new, perfidious plans — at first behind the scenes, but then openly as well. The U.S. imperialists and their NATO allies surrounded our country with a network of their military bases, then launched a large-scale program to build up their nuclear capability and other types of weapons and thereby embarked on preparations for a new war.

It is quite understandable that under those conditions the CPSU and the Soviet Government were forced to show due concern for strengthening the defense capability of the Land of the Soviets and maintaining our Armed Forces combat might and combat readiness at the appropriate level. The equipping of the Army and the Navy with missile and nuclear weapons, supersonic missile-carrying aircraft, and nuclear-powered missile-carrying submarines; the creation of the Strategic Missile Forces; and other measures — all this fundamentally changed the face of the Soviet Armed Forces, significantly enhanced their combat capability, and finally, made the West's militant circles reckon with the USSR's might. The achievements of military equilibrium have been a decisive factor in the preservation of peace for more than 40 years now.

However, this state of affairs clearly does not suit the U.S. ruling circles. Distorting historical facts, they try to portray our country as the instigator of the arms race and, concealing their plans behind the dilapidated bugaboo of the "Soviet military threat," they give another, still more dangerous twist to the arms race spiral. The United States is creating [sozdat] new strategic nuclear weapons systems, deploying medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, and carrying out work on the creation [sozdaniye] of a more efficient class of conventional arms — highly accurate means of destruction. Despite international public protests, the Pentagon is embarking on the creation [sozdaniye] of a comprehensive ABM system with space-based elements. The aim of these preparations is to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union.

As is known, the Soviet Union counters this adventurist course with a policy of consistent love of peace. The evidence of this is a whole series of initiatives on a wide range of questions on the nonmilitarization of space, the limitation and reduction of both strategic and medium-range nuclear arms, and the cessation of all nuclear weapon tests. At the very beginning of the new year, 1986, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Soviet Government adopted a decision on a number of major foreign policy actions of a principled nature. The statement by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, points out that the most important of these actions is the

specific program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world, calculated for a precisely defined period of time.

At the same time, the Soviet people remember the lessons of the war well and continue to display high vigilance. The draft new edition of the party program points out that the CPSU will invariably continue to ensure that the Soviet Armed Forces combat capability represents a strong fusion of the personnel's military skill, ideological fortitude, organization, discipline, and loyalty to their patriotic and international duty and a high level of technical equipment. No one must have any doubt that, if imperialist forces do not value our goodwill and continue practical preparations for the militarization of space and the improvement of other strategic strike means, then Soviet people, just as in the past, will spare no effort to find a response to those U.S. actions.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ENVOY TO NEW ZEALAND ON PEACE, DISARMAMENT

HK051522 Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 30 Jan 86 p 10

[Text] The Russian ambassador to New Zealand, Vladimir Bikov, yesterday pleaded for world peace and total nuclear disarmament.

He told the Wellington South Rotary Club 1986 had been named the Year of Peace by the United Nations. Every state, large or small, could contribute practically to achieve disarmament and peace.

When the leaders of the United States and Soviet Union met at Geneva recently they made encouraging statements about this. These were a form of a gentlemen's agreement, once considered stronger than an international treaty.

Mr Bikov said it was a matter of surviving or dying together. Some military men boasted there were stockpiles of nuclear weapons big enough to wipe out the world four or five times over.

"What does it matter to you or me whether we are killed once or five times," he asked.

Mr Bikov said the Soviet Union was optimistic about future world peace.

"We believe that one day the world will kick the habit. The process of ridding mankind of nuclear arms is the most important problem in the world."

Just two weeks ago the Soviet Union put forward a wide-scale, concrete and accurately timed programme for the removal of nuclear weapons everywhere, Mr Bikov said.

For the South Pacific this would mean the end of nuclear tests and the solution to the problem of nuclear armed ships.

Unfortunately there were those who wanted the nuclear arms race to continue. They believed it would end in the collapse of the Soviet system.

"What can I say to that," Mr Bikov said. "Countless attempts were made in the past to force the Soviet Union to its knees, to exhaust it. All those have failed, and all such attempts will fail in the future as well."

"We understand there are certain people who don't like our system, who don't like our laws, who don't like our traditions. But what can be done? They're deeply rooted in Russia."

It was proud of what had been achieved in less than 70 years since the revolution. "But we are still experimenting with our system. We are not ideal, we make mistakes, we have shortcomings, but we see them."

Mr Bikov challenged anyone to show him a society in the West that was happy, with no flaws in the system.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1280

END