211002

JPRS-TAC-85-002

1 April 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980605 199

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

0
114
A06

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

211002

JPRS-TAC-85-002

1 April 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

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.

JPRS-TAC-85-002

1 April 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Commentaries on Prospects for Upcoming Talks
(Various sources, various dates) 1

PRAVDA Editorial on Peace, Disarmament
U.S. Delegates' Statements Hit
U.S. Sincerity Questioned, by Alexandr Bovin
Burlatskiy Commentary, by Fedor Burlatskiy
March PRAVDA Review, by Nikolay Kurdyumov
3 March TV Roundtable
Soviet Peace Offensive
Arbatov Interview, G. A. Arbatov Interview

Comments on Talks During Gromyko Visit to Italy
(Various sources, various dates) 22

Gromyko-Craxi Talks
Gromyko-Andreotti Talks
Gromyko Luncheon Speech
Andreotti Luncheon Speech, by G. Andreotti
Joint Statement Issued
Arms Talks Stressed, by N. Paklin

Comments on Talks During Gromyko Visit to Spain
(Various sources, various dates) 29

Meets With Gonzalez
Gromyko-Moran Talks
Gromyko Luncheon Speech
Moran Luncheon Speech
Importance of Arms Control, by V. Vernikov

Comments on Talks During Genscher Visit to Moscow
(PRAVDA, 5 Mar 85; TASS, 2 Mar 85) 34

Gromyko-Genscher Talks
Genscher Press Conference

Soviet Leaders' Comments During Election Campaign
(Various sources, various dates) 36

Chernenko Address, by K. U. Chernenko
Gromyko Hits U.S. Attitude
TASS Report on Gromyko Speech
Tikhonov Speech
Gorbachev Speech
Romanov: 'Rebuff to Imperialism'
Grishin: 'Agreement Possible'
Ponomarev Stresses Space Arms
Rusakov Speech
Vorotnikov Remarks on Foreign Policy, by Vitaliy Vorotnikov
Shcherbitskiy Speech

L'HUMANITE Interviews Solomentsev on Upcoming Talks
(Mikhail Solomentsev Interview; L'HUMANITE, 22 Feb 85) 57

Briefs
Pact Meeting Discusses Geneva Talks 59

SPACE ARMS

Commentaries Assail U.S. SDI Plans
(Various sources, various dates) 60

PRAVDA Editorial Article
PRAVDA Review 24 February, by Nikolay Prozhogin
24 February TV Roundtable, by Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, et al.
U.S. 'Deception' Condemned, by S. Kulik
U.S. Commitment to Space Arms
Reagan Cited
Weinberger Hit on ABM Treaty
SDI, ABM Testing Violates Accords
Said to Undermine ABM Treaty

Allied Attitudes Toward SDI Examined
(Various sources, various dates) 79

Strauss Support of SDI Hit
FRG Science 'Militarization'
SPD Opposes FRG Support of SDI
Italians Demonstrate Against SDI, by G. Zafesov, V. Mikhaylov
Italian CP Document on Peace
Danish Ministers Support Space Arms, by A. Bessonov
Japan's Efforts in Space Militarization, by I. Mikhaylov
Nakasone Statements Hit, by Pavel Potapov

Spanish Magazine Cites Soviet Laser Expert
(N. G. Bazov Interview; CAMBIO 16, 11-18 Feb 85) 86

Unnamed General Urges French 'Star Wars' Effort
(Hoplites; LE MONDE, 6 Mar 85) 87

RPR Spokesman's Nuclear Arms Policy Analyzed
(Etienne Copel; LE FIGARO, 6 Mar 85) 89

Gromyko 'Veils Warning' on U.S. Arms
(AFP, 26 Feb 85) 92

Foreign Ministry Communique on Gromyko's Visit
(Rome Domestic Service, 27 Feb 85) 93

L'UNITA Views Craxi Stance on Space Arms
(L'UNITA, 1 Mar 85) 94

U.S. SDI Will Accelerate Arms Race, Upset Parity
(Richard Hajsky; CTK, 2 Mar 85) 95

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Spadolini Comments on Euromissiles, SDI
(ANSA, 2 Mar 85) 96

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

Socialists Countries', NATO CDE Stances Contrasted
(V. Kuzar; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 3 Mar 85) 97

Delegate to Stockholm Conference on Chemical Weapons
(TASS, 1 Mar 85) 99

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. Accused of Blocking Chemical Arms Ban
(TASS, 1 Mar 85) 100

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Scandinavian Nuclear-Free Zone Issue Supported
(M. Kostikov; PRAVDA, 22 Feb 85) 102

NUCLEAR TESTING

Call Made for Total Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
(B. Serov; PRAVDA, 26 Feb 85) 106

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

COMMENTARIES ON PROSPECTS FOR UPCOMING TALKS

PRAVDA Editorial on Peace, Disarmament

PM281502 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Feb 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "A Principled Course of Peace"]

[Text] Our socialist power [derzhava] is great and mighty. It plays a vast and responsible role in the contemporary world; it enjoys high prestige among the peoples in the planet, as does its peace-loving foreign policy.

"The core of our foreign policy today is, of course, the struggle to end the arms race imposed by imperialism and avert the threat of a nuclear world war," Comrade K.U. Chernenko noted in his speech to voters. This speech confirmed the USSR's principled course in the international arena, formulated its specific goals, and put forward important initiatives aimed at helping realize mankind's supreme aspiration -- lasting peace.

Now this task is more topical than ever before. The situation on the planet remains very complex and highly dangerous. Imperialism has replaced the historical competition between the two opposed social systems with psychological warfare and confrontation in relations between states. Unable to claim a single constructive idea about the future to their credit, the modern transatlantic "crusaders" oppose the forces of peace, freedom, and progress with an unprecedentedly large and costly arms race, which they now intend to transfer to outer space.

The adventurist gamble on attaining military superiority and diktat in its own fashion reflects the essence of the capitalist society of exploitation and lack of human rights. It has absolutely no future in the sphere of international relations. We will not allow the prevailing military-strategic parity to be disrupted. However, the pursuit of the chimera of overwhelming military power by U.S. imperialism and its NATO allies in itself seriously increases the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

The complex international situation demands high vigilance, staunchness, and endurance. Concurrently, it demands vigorous actions to improve the international climate.

All this is to be found in the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, which resolutely uphold the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between states with opposite social systems in the international arena. Their fraternal unity is a great force both in implementing socioeconomic plans and in ensuring the external conditions for peaceful labor.

The extension of the Warsaw Pact's term will be of paramount importance for the prospe of peace in Europe and throughout the world. Our fraternal alliance is unbreakable. It is in mankind's vital interest to enhance the role and influence in the internatior arena of the world socialist system as a whole socialism and peace are indivisible.

The Soviet Union cooperates with all peace-loving forces on earth in the strengthenin of international security. Among these forces a great roal is played in our time by the freedom-loving and independent states whose peoples have cast off the yoke of colonial slavery. They are our natural partners and sympathizers when it comes to defending the rights of peoples and the peaceful future. The USSR will continue to develop the line of freindship with them.

The fate of peace largely depends on whether the arms race will be successfully prevented in space and halted on earth.

This is the objective of the forthcoming new Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, an objective precisely formulated on the USSR's initiative. The comprehensive and interrelated sol tion of the questions of space and nuclear arms is absolutely necessary for success in this work. This is the fundamental meaning of the Geneva agreement. No matter how ea people across the ocean may be for "star wars," there can be no other reasonable alter native. It is clear to the peoples that unless the militarization of outer space is p vented, it will be impossible to reverse the process of building up nuclear and other arsenals of war on earth.

Our country's intentions for the forthcoming talks, expressed by Comrade K.U. Chernenk are of fundamental importance. In the first place, the USSR does not seek to acquire unilateral advantages over the United States or the NATO countries; nor does it aim fo military superiority over them. Second, we want to end and not continue the arms race This is precisely why the Soviet Union is also raising the question of such initial st as freezing the sides' nuclear arsenals, halting the further deployment of missiles, a so on. Third, our country desires a real reduction of stockpiled weapons and, for a start, the destruction of a considerable part of them, instead of the development of increasingly new weapon systems, be they in space or on earth, offensive or supposedly defensive. Our ultimate objective here is the total destruction of nuclear weapons everywhere and the total elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

The lessons of history show that states and peoples, regardless of differences in thei social systems, can and must set common goals and take joint actions whenever a univer danger arises. This is how it was during the years of the war against fascism. Today the threat of a nuclear catastrophe is a similar, common deadly danger for all mankind

Under these circumstances, enormous significance would attach to a binding agreement between the nuclear powers to adhere to certain norms in their mutual relations, norms which would preclude the start of a nuclear conflagration. There was wide response among the world public to the Soviet suggestion that, in the year of the 40th anniversary of the end of the bloodiest and most destructive war, the USSR and U.S. leaders would confirm jointly and in a form suitable to both sides, the essence and spirit of the main commitments made by both powers both at the end of the war and under the acco of the seventies, a period which has gone down history as the decade of detente.

To dispel the clouds of the war danger, maintain peace in space, and level to the grou the Himalayas of deadly weapons is a very difficult task, but a task that is realistic and within the power of the peoples. Our country and the other socialist countries are

sparing no efforts to resolve this task. What is needed is for people across the ocean to finally abandon their imperial ambitions and honestly undertake the solution of problems on the only promising basis of equality and identical security.

The peoples demand that the opportunities that exist for strengthening peace be utilized. The Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is meeting with growing support from millions of people and the broadest public forces. The peoples link their hopes for the future, for lasting peace, with this policy.

U.S. Delegates' Statements Hit

LD271725 Moscow TASS in English 1628 GMT 27 Feb 85

[Text] Washington February 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

The Reagan administration does not intend to take a constructive and serious stand at the upcoming Soviet-American talks in Geneva and will continue staking on an accelerated buildup of its nuclear potential and militarisation of outer space. This follows from the statements made at the hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Paul Nitze, a consultant to the President and to the U.S. secretary of state on talks on arms cuts, and the leaders of the American delegation Max Kampelman, John Tower and Maynard Glitman.

They talked at length about the wish of the USA to ensure a "fair settlement." But as soon as things came to concrete problems, it turned out that these long words were not confirmed by Washington's real interest in ensuring meaningful progress at the talks with the Soviet Union. Thus each of the four representatives of the administration confirmed that the White House did not intend to discuss questions in connection with Reagan's star wars program which is known to lead to spreading the arms race to outer space. In doing so, Paul Nitze, adviser to the U.S. secretary of state for the Geneva talks, even described as "nonsensical" the deep concern expressed worldwide over the militarisation of outer space. The representatives of the White House were no less zealous in upholding the program from building MX intercontinental first strike ballistic missiles.

In reiterating President Reagan's "arguments," they were trying to claim that if the Congress voted against the "MX", the upcoming talks would be doomed almost to failure.

Such claims met with open skepticism of some legislators, who attended the hearings. Senator Paul Sarbanes (Democrat, Maryland) frankly said that the implementation of the Star Wars program would lead to an escalation of the arms race. The same view was expressed by Senator John Kerry (Democrat, Massachussets). Carol Rosin, president of the Institute for Security and Cooperation in Outer Space, described as "disappointing" the statements in the Senate commission by the heads of the American delegation. Speaking in a TASS interview, she pointed out that by their pronouncements they had reaffirmed the administration's intentions to hold talks with the USSR from the positions of strength. The White House claims that the creation of a large scale ABM system with outer space based elements is "a justified approach" to arms control. Yet the implementation of these plans will bring the world closer to a nuclear catastrophe. The only right way is peaceful cooperation in outer space, she stressed.

U.S. Sincerity Questioned

PM251627 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Feb 85 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Alexandr Bovin "Political Commentator's Opinion": "Test of Intentions"]

[Text] The arms race occupies a special place among those global problems which, if exacerbated, would make the future daunting for mankind, if not doubtful. This is because it threatens disastrous nuclear catastrophe and considerably slows down economic and social progress. There is no task more urgent, vital, or humane than halting the growth in military potentials and beginning to reduce the arsenals of death until they are completely eliminated.

The solution of this task entails the kind of difficulties which sometimes seem insoluble. Even the very limited experience of recent decades nevertheless shows that agreement is possible: provided, of course, the intention to reach agreement exists. But this is precisely where doubts set in. Too often our Western partners have been insincere, resorted to trickery, renounced previously agreed positions, and sought to alter the correlation of forces in their favor. You cannot help thinking of this on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. talks.

The dialogue in Geneva will be hard and demanding. It will take great efforts and a lon time to achieve the set goal of preventing a further arms race and reducing the mountains of weapons. At the same time certain interim, limited measures could be conceived which would make the solution of the main task easier. The Soviet Union's repeated suggestion to freeze the production and deployment of nuclear munitions and delivery vehicles is just such a measure, as is the complete and general banning of nuclear weapons tests -- a question which has been to the fore in the disarmament struggle for 30 years now.

On 10 May 1955 the Soviet delegation submitted the following proposal to a subcommittee of the UN Disarmament Commission: "As a priority measure in implementing the program of arms reduction and banning atomic weapons, states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons pledge to reduce the testing of these types of weapons." The corresponding talks involving the USSR, the United States, and Britain began at the Palais des Nations in Geneva in the fall of 1958. It was an unusual event. There were many long arguments. Finally the sides agreed to ban nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in space, and under water. In August 1963 the treaty which has become known as the Moscow Treaty was opened for signing simultaneously in Moscow, Washington, and London.

This was the first step on the path toward limiting the arms race. But the 1963 treaty's significance is not confined to purely political aspects. The ending of test explosions in the three spheres also sharply reduced the danger of radioactive contaminated soil into the atmosphere. In 1964, however, the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences reported that the total radioactivity of precipitation had fallen 100 times in comparison with the test period.

The Moscow Treaty's terms of reference did not include underground test explosions. Therefore, wide-ranging opportunities remained for improving nuclear weapons and continuing the arms race.

The danger of environmental pollution also continued, therefore, because the radioactive materials formed during underground tests can reach the surface by various means. The Soviet Union insisted that underground tests by banned too. The United States and Britain would not agree and cited the verification problem. But, verification was merely a pretext. In a special letter to the U.S. Senate, where the Moscow Treaty had been sent for ratification, the Joint Chiefs of Staff insisted on the need to "conduct a broad, energetic, and continuous program of underground nuclear tests designed to increase our knowledge and improve our weaponry in all spheres of significance for our military situation in the future." The continuation of underground tests was an unusual kind of compensation for the Pentagon's agreement to give the treaty the "go ahead."

Time passed and the world entered the era of detente. On the wave of detente the USSR and the United States concluded a treaty on 3 July 1974 limiting the yield of underground test explosions to 150 kilotons (let us recall that 1 kiloton is equivalent to 1,000 tons of TNT), and on 28 May 1976 a treaty was signed which introduced a 150,000-kiloton threshold on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. These decisions were palliatives, halfway measures, but as temporary decisions they were still useful. But then a story began which has since been repeated many times. First Ford tricked us. Then Carter tricked us. Both treaties remained unratified.

Nevertheless, talks began between the USSR, the United States, and Britain in June 1977 on the complete banning of underground nuclear tests. Our country treated those talks with the utmost seriousness. We believed and still do believe that the complete cessation of nuclear weapons testing would slow down drastically the qualitative arms race and that this would make military-strategic parity more stable. The confidence thus created would promote further joint moves toward disarmament. The regime governing the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons would also be strengthened.

Our partners seemed to share that approach. Because many points had already been clarified, the talks made tangible progress. The text of the treaty was practically agreed upon in 1980. Certain provisions of a primarily technical nature remained to be clarified. Once again political upheavals in Washington wrecked the agreement that had been reached. In fact, Washington has always been full of opponents of an all-embracing test ban. On 14 August 1978 -- at the height of the talks -- Donald Kerr, the U.S. deputy energy secretary, (whose department is in charge of nuclear weapons tests) stated that the conclusion of a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear tests could lead to a loss of "advantages" in the sphere of nuclear weapons production." Such sentiments began to dominate when the new administration came to power. The Americans torpedoed the talks after the 12th round.

Washington's silence lasted until 1982. On 27 July the White House stated that the verification procedures envisaged in the 1974 and 1976 treaties did not suit the Americans because they enable the "Russians" to go beyond the agreed threshold. Therefore, before ratifying those treaties Washington would try to improve the means of verifying their observance. Only after that would tripartite talks on a complete test ban resume. On 17 February 1983 the United States officially proposed to the USSR that talks begin on amendments to the 1974 treaty.

The Soviet Union rejected that proposal. First, references to treaty violations were absolutely groundless. Incidentally, leading U.S. geophysics and geology experts, including Lynn R. Sykes, director of the geological observatory at Columbia University, are highly skeptical of the administration's claims.

Second, the verification and control procedures envisaged by the 1974 treaty were carefully thought out and highly effective. They provide for the exchange of the r geographical and geophysical characteristics of the ranges where tests are being carried out, including information on the geology of each test site. All this, in conjunction with the present level of equipment for measuring seismic changes in tl earth's crust, makes it possible to reliably monitor the observance of the 150-kilc threshold. Third, we should not be moving backward, toward a revision of treaties already signed, but forward, to the conclusion of a new treaty completely banning all underground test; especially since the Soviet Union, meeting its partners halfway, agreed in the final case to combine national monitoring facilities with ir national inspection on a voluntary basis.

But arguments and logic are of the least interest to Washington. It has other conc Addressing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on 13 May 1982, Eugene Rostow, then director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, told senators: "Many gov ment subsections" are of the opinion that the United States "will need to conduct tests for a long time" to come in view of the "need to create new and modernize exi weapons systems"...And THE WASHINGTON POST spoke eloquently on the age-old complain about "verification." The "verification" question, the newspaper said, is "constan raised by those who time after time oppose all bans on nuclear weapon tests. The creators of new weapons systems and certain military men brandish that bugaboo when it seems that someone in the administration is moving toward concluding a test ban treaty." The people THE WASHINGTON POST is writing about think in terms dating bac to the prenuclear era: More weapons equal greater security. There is a different pendence now: Genuine security can only be guaranteed by a mutual renunciation of buildup of military muscle.

Many Americans understand that. Last summer the U.S. Senate proposed that the Pres: rapidly resume talks on a complete cessation of nuclear weapons tests. A few days ago, B. Boxer and N. Mavroules, members of the House of Representatives, submitted : the examination of the U.S. Congress a draft joint resolution of both houses demand: that the President "temporarily" suspend nuclear weapons tests and begin talks on a complete test ban.

Ultimately, one's attitude to the cessation of tests may be regarded as a kind of litmus test making it possible to verify (exclusively by means of national facilitie the sincerity and seriousness of one's intentions and the real weight of one's statements on the readiness to begin arms reduction. At the moment, our U.S. partne do not pass this test -- the test of intentions.

The Soviet Union's position may be put very briefly: We are ready to ratify at any time the 1974 and 1976 treaties and resume the tripartite talks.

Burlatskiy Commentary

PM271003 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 27 Feb 85 pp 14, 15

[Article by political observer Fedor Burlatskiy: "In the Name of Mankind; Soviet-American Talks on Nuclear and Space Weapons Open in Geneva 12 March"]

[Text] It would be an understatement to say that the world's public attention is focused on these talks. Actually, there has not been an international event so ea

awaited in all corners of the globe for a long time. Yes, this time it really is the whole of mankind that is awaiting with bated breath the start of the talks and, most important of all, their favorable outcome and practical results.

K.U. Chernenko declared on behalf of the Soviet side: We want a real reduction of stockpiled weapons and, as a start, the destruction of a considerable proportion of them, instead of the development of more and more new weapons systems, be they in space or on earth, be they offensive or supposedly defensive means. Our ultimate goal in this is the total destruction of nuclear weapons everywhere on the planet and the total elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

A White House statement, issued after a conference with the U.S. delegation that is going to Geneva, claims that the United States "will have concrete ideas to put on the negotiating table."

Ah, well, let us be patient and wait for the talks to start. We soon will learn how serious these promises are. For the time being, let us to plunge into the torrent of passions raging around the forthcoming meeting.

Hopes or Illusions

We can judge how heated these passions have become by a fact that is almost without precedent. The British press is criticizing its prime minister not for, of all things ...softness, tractability toward the USSR, and excessive optimism in evaluating the possibilities of reaching accord at the talks. Could it be that the metal of which the "Iron Lady" is made has really started to melt?

London's authoritative THE TIMES carried an editorial entitled "Talks Without Illusions." It says: "It is highly surprising to hear Mrs Thatcher in Bonn describe 1985 as a 'year of decision in which East-West relations will be on the verge of a great step forward.' Such a statement suggests a misunderstanding of the potential 'pitfalls' in a resumption of arms talks. There is a colossal gap between the hopes the Soviet Union and the United States place on these talks, that Thatcher seems to be ignoring. Such an approach only stimulates Western opinion to a desire to conclude any treaty which would pay lip service to the idea that things are better, whereas the only safe and realiable attitude to adopt toward the question of East-West relations is one which recognizes the incompatibility of our two systems and the need therefore to be firm and unemotional in our relations with the East." Margaret Thatcher thus finds herself among the creators of illusions regarding relations between the two world systems. She is requested to maintain hardline positions and is instructed to uphold the West's ideological values at the talks....

What is the cause of such an unprecedented criticism of Britain's prime minister "from the right?" This is how the same newspaper explains it: "The Geneva process is doomed if the Russians decide that either the U.S. Administration or America's allies in Europe are desperate for a new arms treaty at any price. That is certainly not true of President Reagan. The choice individuals Shultz appointed to make up the delegation shows that the State Department gives greater recognition to Reagan's tenacity on this point than one would have suspected from the rumors reaching us from Washington since the election."

The mention of the U.S. delegation's composition calls for a more detailed examination of it. The question of who the U.S. Administration considers necessary to send to Geneva has, of course, nothing to do with us. But here is what the U.S. press writes on the subject. THE NEW YORK TIMES published an article by Leslie Gelb, entitled "The

Delegation to the Arms Talks Speaks Without Words." "According to the general conse the newspaper writes, "this is a delegation whose composition brings to mind the int tion to engage in persistent barter. The people chosen to bear the basic burden of barter (a Democrat with uncompromising foreign policy views and a former Republican senator said to be a hardline conservative) do not have the reputation of arms contr advocates. If Moscow does not meet them halfway or procrastinates, then, in the opi of a number of administration officials, the new delegation, bearing in mind its rel tions with Congress and the public, will probably manage to blame Moscow for the failure.... Over the last 10 years Kampelman and Tower have been critical of arms control. Bearing in mind their view that the Russians have military superiority, th will obviously continue to seek substantial concessions from Moscow. Kampelman als supports the idea of using arms in space."

To engage in barter.... To blame the other side for failure.... To force Moscow to make concessions.... Let us hope the newspaper is mistaken. Is there any point in sending a delegation to Geneva if this is what it will bring along? Is this what A.A Gromyko and G. Shultz agreed upon last January? Has the White House learned nothing from the experience of the previous talks, which collapsed through the U.S. side's fault?

Actually, the British press had no reason to fear Margaret Thatcher's "tractability." During her stay in the United States, she declared total support for Washington's sta concerning the "defense initiative" and for President Reagan's military-political strategy as a whole. Yet I would like to speak in favor of the idea expressed earlie by Margaret Thatcher: The 1st year will be decisive for the Geneva talks. That peri will show clearly how matters are progressing, and everything will depend on the side political will and on their readiness to agree on the basis of reasonable compromise. The Soviet Union has already repeatedly declared that it does have such a will. In regard to the United States, its stance probably also will be determined during this year. Many U.S. experts are justified in claiming that the U.S. President has substa tial incentives to reach agreement at the Geneva talks during the next 1-2 years. Th would give the Republicans a good chance to consolidate their positions for the mid-t Congressional elections and for the struggle for the seat in the White House in the 1 elections. It is, however, difficult to say whether this motivation is strong enough to render the U.S. stance truly constructive.

"Star Wars" of Defense

The greatest difficulty at the talks -- and this is known to everyone and written abo by everyone -- involves the White House's stance on the militarization of space. The U.S. President expressed a certain displeasure with the term "star wars" and requeste that it be replaced by something more euphonious. So a new formula is beginning to emerge imperceptibly but very purposefully. So far, it has not been firmly establishe Some speak of the DI -- defense initiative -- and others of the SDI -- strategic defe initiative. But what has really changed?

The nature of this threat was already considered and evaluated at sufficient depth and with due thoroughness not just in our own country, but also abroad and particularly in West European countries. The overwhelming majority of experts in all countries agree that this is a new, long-term round of the arms race, and that the development of ABM weapons and the "defense" system as a whole will lead to an acute destabilization and could provide a casus belli of a world conflict.

Even U.S. press organs which support the White House's "defense initiative" in principle cannot hide their grave doubts regarding the attempts to implement this system in practice, particularly regarding the effect this will have on the Geneva talks. The view expressed by S. Solarz, prominent member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in THE NEW YORK TIMES is typical in this respect. He calls on the United States to undertake a review of its strategy for the forthcoming talks and claims that without "certain changes in our positions... the chances of reaching agreement on arms control would be extremely limited." Proceeding from the categorically expressed wish of the President, who rejects limitations on space weapons research, S. Solarz suggests that a restriction on tests for deploying the "star wars" system is necessary for any agreement envisaging a reduction of strategic arms and medium-range weapons. "Without such a ban on the development of systems in the spirit of 'star wars' the Soviet Union will probably reject a reduction of offensive nuclear weapons. Moscow, fearing the consequences of U.S. technological superiority, will no doubt draw the conclusion that the interests of its security require a buildup of its nuclear arsenal, enabling it to overcome any defense systems we perhaps could deploy subsequently."

There is, however, a very simple question being asked by many people in the West, including the United States: What is the need for research into space weapons if there is no intention of either testing or deploying them? What is this, a game?

It is obvious to everyone that research in this sphere is just the first step. If it produces the slightest significant result, the next step will be taken. No one in the world is simple enough to believe that the White House will throw away tens of billions of dollars for the sake of pure curiosity.

The U.S. press is extremely disturbed by the negative reaction to the "star wars" program in West Europe. In an article entitled "France and 'Star Wars,'" THE WASHINGTON POST attempts to draw the White House's attention to French criticism of Reagan's strategic defense initiative. The French are "furiously clinging to" their status of an independent nuclear power, the newspaper notes, and to everything this means for themselves and for Europe's defense. Their argument against "star wars," furthermore, is approximately the same as that of Britain, another possessor of nuclear potential.

TIME magazine writes anxiously of the FRG's negative attitude toward the strategic defense initiative: "...Despite the assurances of support, doubts exist here concerning three dangers: If the Reagan project proves technologically feasible, which Bonn doubts, it would lead to different degrees of security for America and Europe and would consequently increase the danger of a limited nuclear war in Europe; Bonn feels that the other side will respond to the strategic defense initiative projects, even at the scientific research stage, by building up its nuclear arsenal. It will show even less readiness to reach agreements in other spheres, particularly in confidence-building measures, which Bonn considers very significant; the enormous costs of the strategic defense initiative, it is feared, will impose a heavy burden on the European allies who will have to find additional funds to strengthen the nuclear forces."

Detente or Confrontation

For my part, I would like to add the following point, which people in the West are not yet considering. What will be the immediate and long-term consequences of the so-called defense initiative for mutual relations between West and East and for the entire international climate?

I am profoundly convinced that the implementation of the "star wars" program, even if it only concentrates on research during the first few years, will without a doubt, cause an acute exacerbation of international tensions and confrontation between the two systems, making the rebirth of the "cold war" a reality. We can see how this program has already inflamed passions in world politics and public opinion. The next steps will be even more dramatic. The research into antisatellite weapons, conducted under conditions of absolute secrecy, will intensify mutual mistrust, acute suspicion regarding the results produced by the other side, and the quest for effective countermeasures -- in short, military competition will rise to a higher level.

Of course there are people in America who seek exactly this. One of them is Edward Teller, notorious as the "father" of the hydrogen bomb and a fierce supporter of the "star wars" program, who claims to have been the first to put this issue before the President. Answering an Italian newspaper's questions as to what might happen if ABM weapons were possessed not only by the United States but also by the Soviet Union, Teller said: "If the Russians also possess them, if they acquire them before us, or if theirs prove better than ours, that will be the end of us. If we are the first to reach the set goal, that will still not be the end for them."

So there you have it, the core of the entire "star wars" plan! There you have the real scheme, blurted out with the artlessness of a simpleton or an arrant scoundrel! In the hands of the Russians, "defensive" weapons become offensive. They undoubtedly condemn the West to total defeat. But in American hands, the very same weapon becomes a means of self-defense and peace.

Really, what shattering logic! What exceptional scientific intellect one must possess to reach such a mind-boggling conclusion! In the one instance ABM weapons are a shield, and in the other, a devastating sword. But are these not the same arguments, put forward by the same Edward Teller when he upheld the need to develop the hydrogen bomb in the struggle against Robert Oppenheimer? In America's hands the bomb is good, and in the USSR's hands it is evil....

Moreover, these people shamelessly claim that "defensive" weapons are more moral and ethical than offensive ones. It would be better if these 20th century alchemists were to keep silent about ethics, since they draw only one conclusion from their knowledge and experience -- death.

THE NEW YORK TIMES writes: "Official Pentagon and State Department spokesmen said that they are trying to formulate an approach toward the Western allies who, in their words, are developing an aversion to any involvement with nuclear weapons." And what other feelings can be generated by a bomb which is capable of instantaneously destroying several hundreds of thousands of people?

It must be said that the majority of U.S. physicists are resolutely against "star wars." In particular, they are correct in believing that the development of the laser bomb -- the basis of the "space defense" -- is yet another step along the path toward "nuclear gigantism" and that "the third generation of nuclear weapons opens the door to world war III in space." They describe the laser bomb as a "bomb packed with lies."

There is only one approach capable of creating conditions for a successful conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. This approach proceeds from the viewpoint of all mankind. This is actually the approach already, declared in the joint USSR-U.S. communique on the objectives and nature of the talks. It is an approach founded on both

states' lofty sense of responsibility for preventing a war capable of destroying human life on earth. Any other approach, based on the positions of national egotism, the quest for benefits and advantages, and even more any attempt to use the talks as a cover for a new and even more dangerous round of the arms race, will doom them to failure.

The talks due to open in Geneva -- and this is what people all over the globe are counting on -- must be not a stage in the military rivalry, arm-twisting, and tug-of-war, but a step leading mankind away from nuclear catastrophe.

March PRAVDA Review

PM051014 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Kurdyumov "International Review"]

[Text] Embarking on the Path of Realism

The entire world public has perceived the speech of K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at his election meeting with voters as a timely call for reason and yet another visible reaffirmation of the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy and its readiness for constructive talks in order to achieve a turn for the better and curb the arms race.

The universal interest generated everywhere by the speech of the leader of the CPSU and the Soviet state is understandable and natural. Mankind is at a turning point in its history. And the very future of our civilization depends on where events will lead; whether it will be possible to find ways of improving the international situation, whether the main tasks of our time -- how to prevent the arms race from being transferred to space and reverse it on earth -- will be resolved, or whether the world will continue to slide ever more rapidly into the arms race and a mounting war threat.

The historical battle for world peace and the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, which is being steadfastly and consistently waged by the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, corresponds to the vital interests and aspirations of all states and the overwhelming majority of humanity. It is no accident, as the reactions have shown, that there is such understanding and support for the Soviet Union's principled stance aimed at creating a climate of trust, asserting the principles of peaceful coexistence, and persistently calling on the United States to eschew its conducting talks from a "position of strength" and to embark on the path of a realism.

"The Soviet Union," K.U. Chernenko points out in his reply to a letter from U.S. World War II veterans, "favors collaboration with the United States on questions of war and peace in the cause of saving mankind from the nuclear threat. In our view, the forthcoming new talks aimed at preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and strengthening strategic stability make it possible to take a practical step forward along the road to a peaceful and secure future."

The Soviet Union's readiness to travel its part of the road to a mutually acceptable accord instills hope in people's hearts. It is a matter of having a similar readiness from the other side to respect each other's rights and legitimate security interests,

not striving to violate prevailing equilibrium of forces, and refraining from any steps running counter to the aims of the talks. The statement by THE WASHINGTON POST, which noted the other day that "to all appearances, the Soviet Union is launching a new peace offensive" and that NATO representatives, in their words, were "struck by the flurry of initiatives advanced by the Russians," is unique evidence of the prestige and magnetic attraction of the Leninist foreign policy of the Land of the Soviets.

Recognizing its responsibility for mankind's future, the Soviet Union believes that the tense and complex situation in the world requires urgent action and tangible measures to improve it and create a favorable climate at the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

There can be no doubt about the favorable effect for the creation of an atmosphere of trust that would be produced by a U.S. rejection, following the Soviet example, of the first use of nuclear weapons or by an abiding agreement between the nuclear powers to observe definite norms in order to prevent a nuclear war breaking out. Something else is equally obvious: a freeze on nuclear arsenals, an end to further missile deployments, and a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests, which the Soviet Union has persistently been calling for, would put a firm brake on the nuclear arms race and thereby help the talks.

The goals of reducing the level of military confrontation, creating a climate of mutual understanding, and getting international relations back to detente and the development of cooperation are also served by other Soviet initiatives. Among these are the proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenanc of peace submitted for examination at the Stockholm Conference on the basis of the Wars Pact states' common position and the draft agreement on initial Soviet and U.S. reductions of ground forces and arms in central Europe presented at the Vienna talks.

Comrade K.U. Chernenko's reply to the appeal from the Nordic "Treaty Now" organization which reaffirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to act as guarantor for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe has generated a lively response from the European public.

Last week's visits to Italy and Spain by USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, were a graphic manifestation of the fidelity of the Land of the Soviets to the principles of peaceful coexistence and its desire to rule out war as a means of resolving international disputes and promote in every possible way the strengthening of European security and the development of mutually advantageous cooperation. As the Soviet-Italian statement on the results of the talks that were held points out, both sides reaffirmed their fidelity to the policy of strengthening trust and cooperation in relations between states, including on the European Continent, and stressed the importance of the accord reached at the Soviet-U.S. meeting regarding the subject matter and goals of the forthcoming Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States

The Soviet Union and Italy reaffirmed that universal and total disarmament under effective international control is their ultimate goal. This requires the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes, the total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons and the removal of all other types of arms.

The problems of preventing the militarization of space, restricting the arms race -- primarily the nuclear arms race -- and strengthening European security, as well as questions of the development of mutually advantageous bilateral cooperation were at the center of the Madrid talks between A.A. Gromyko and Spanish statesmen. Both sides

expressed satisfaction with the expansion of cooperation in the economic, scientific, technical, and cultural spheres and attached importance to the developing political contacts between the two countries.

Unscrupulous Means

While the USSR's initiatives are aimed entirely at creating good conditions for productive talks at Geneva on space and nuclear arms, that can by no means be said of the U.S. approach to the talks and the mood reigning in official Washington. And it is not simply a question of deliberately pessimistic forecasts and arguments about not being "hypnotized by Geneva." There is an obviously stubborn and and downright obsessive desire -- clearly running counter to the tasks of the forthcoming talks -- to further build up the gigantic arms programs at an expedited pace and transfer the arms race to space.

There are many farsighted scientists, experts, and politicians in the United States who realize the immeasurable dangers with which the U.S. strategists' space adventure is fraught. H. Bethe, the famous physicist and Nobel prize winner, has stated, for instance, that the "star wars" program worked out by the Washington administration is aimed at turning space into a combat zone.

But the Washington strategists, nurturing plans for a military breakthrough in space, could not care less, directing their energy to masking the highly dangerous nature of their aggressive concept and giving it a "defensive" and even "highly humanitarian" hue. To this end, as THE NEW YORK TIMES has reported, the administration is conducting a feverish quest for a name for its military program which would make it "digestible." A competition to rename the President's initiative has even been announced. But, as the saying goes, what's done is done. However Washington may try to select a new appellation, it will not alter the essence of the aggressive venture.

The United States is earnestly striving to involve its West European allies in the space adventure too. Calculating above all on support from Bonn, it is knocking together a front of supporters for turning space into a bridgehead for aggression, which cannot fail to arouse growing concern among broad sections of the public. Thus, the influential Canadian newspaper THE GLOBE AND MAIL, pointing to the shortsighted position of certain governments and criticizing the position of Canada, Britain, and the FRG, which have acceded to Washington's plans, noted the other day that these countries' leaders prefer to ignore the dangerous consequences of U.S. schemes. The German Social Democratic Party, [SPD] Board expressed itself in the same vein last week in Bonn. Calling on the FRG Government to "unamibiguously renounce any support" for the "star wars" plans, the SPD's leading organ noted in resolution that the development of space arms is leading not to greater but, on the contrary, to less security.

The U.S. Administration's unscrupulous means clearly calculated at poisoning the atmosphere around the forthcoming Geneva talks and complicating the businesslike, constructive examination of solvable problems also cannot fail to arouse alarm. An example of this is the slanderous campaign launched in the United States around the administration's latest "report" to Congress regarding violations of international commitments allegedly committed by the Soviet Union.

Resolutely rejecting the unfounded and groundless claims contained in the White House "report," the Soviet Embassy in Washington stated in representations to the State Department that any fabrications about some kind of "violations" and "failings"

concerning the observance of arms limitation agreements are nothing but an attempt to distract the world public's attention from the unprecedented military programs bei implemented by the United States and the course of undermining the system of limitati in the arms sphere and the measures to strengthen international security that have be created over the course of many years.

Washington, the document says, would like to cover up the fact that the United States has long been setting its sights on undermining the open-ended 1972 ABM Treaty. Essentially, this intention was officially proclaimed in connection with the announce ment of the "star wars" program, which envisages the creation of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, which is banned by the treaty. Moreover, in direct contravention of the 1972 Treaty provisions, the United States is pushing ahead at full speed with work to create mobile ABM radar stations; Minuteman missiles are being tested in order to give them an antimissile capability; MIRVed antimissile warh are being created; and so on.

In this connection it is apposite to quote a statement by Democratic Senator W. Proxm of Wisconsin, who said: How can one speak of the administration's desire to reach ne accords if even before the start of the Geneva talks it has set its sights on undermining an important agreement already in existence -- the ABM treaty?

3 March TV Roundtable

LD031745 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 3 Mar 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Kim Gerasimov and Viktor Levin, international affairs journalists; and Nikolay Agayants, foreign policy commentator of All-Union Radio]

[Excerpt]

[Agayants] In this connection, I think it would be worthwhile dwelling in somewhat greater detail on the results of the visit to Italy and Spain by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and minister of foreign affairs of the Soviet Union. The Soviet-Italian statement notes in particular that the sides positively value the very fact that the subject of the forthcoming Soviet-American talks in Geneva will be the set of issues connected with space and nuclear armaments, both strategic and medium-range. What's more, all these issues are to be examined and settled as interrelated matters. The sides are convinced that the basis for the talks that has been agreed upon in Geneva is capable of encouraging a substantial advance in all directions covered by the talks. The sides consider it very important that the forthcoming Geneva talks take place in a businesslike and constructive spirit. The talks should make it possible to find a positive solution to the problem of preventing an arms race in space and a radical reduction in nuclear armaments, including medium-range ones, upon a basis of effective and balanced agreements that ensure the security interests of all, the Soviet-Italian statement says.

[Levin] Similar ideas were also reflected as a result of Comrade Gromyko's talks in Madrid. This point deserves attention, primarily in view of the fact that as you know, comrades, the U.S. Administration is trying -- and more and more attempts in this direction have been made over the past few days -- to take issue of space armaments outside the realm of the Geneva talks.

Voices are being heard from Washington asserting that whatever happens over there, the plans for space armaments will in no way be in doubt: Washington has no intention of giving them up. I think it is very noteworthy that Italy, for example, has taken a completely unamibiguous position on this issue.

Criticism of the U.S. space armaments plans can be heard practically everywhere in the world to some degree or other. Sober voices ring out in the United States itself. There are numerous statements by serious, perfectly serious political and public figures, who criticize these plans, the realization of which might undermine any decisions on the limitation of armaments. These voices ring out in Western Europe, too, but the ruling circles of the West European countries allied with the United States in NATO do not dare to oppose, and some of them -- for example the FRG as well as Britain's Prime Minister Thatcher, as was shown by her recent Washington visit -- support the American concepts in general.

[Gerasimov] Yes, Viktor Nikolayevich, that's correct. The Italian Government has taken a different position. It does not support Washington's dangerous space plans. In the sentences that set out the position of the sides in the Soviet-Italian statement, one can clearly trace the hope that Italy also has that as result of the Soviet-American talks, space will not become a new sphere of the arms race. And it states there directly: We shall hope that it will prove possible to find a positive solution to the problem of preventing an arms race in space.

[Levin] What is more, here is yet another new peace initiative by the Soviet Union. At the Geneva disarmament conference, the Soviet delegation issued a statement that directly states: We are willing to halt nuclear weapons tests immediately if the other countries agree to this, even if an appropriate agreement, an appropriate treaty covering this, is not immediately worked out. That is to say, the proposal here is that the technical issues should be solved later; The cardinal decision, the decision of principle, should be made now. This is a very bold and constructive step, for the technical questions have repeatedly become the stumbling block at many talks. It is precisely technical questions that have been used by the American side to avoid making concrete decisions. Once again, we recently put forward very constructive proposals. The West has not yet given a firm reply to our proposals, but fears that there, too, technical details will take priority over issues of principle exist, and this places one very much on guard. If there is goodwill, and for its part the Soviet Union is demonstrating this goodwill very vividly, then any problem can be solved.

[Agayants] Today, and this is clear to anyone, the destinies of peace depend in large measure on whether it will at long last prove possible to curb the arms race on earth and to prevent its transfer to the expanses of the universe. Space must be clear and free of all weapons. As is well known, such is the objective, set out and formulated in clear-cut terms on the initiative of our country, of the forthcoming Soviet-American talks in Geneva. A comprehensive and mutually-related approach to the tackling of issues to do with space and nuclear armaments is aboslutely necessary for things to succeed. A positive outcome of the Geneva meeting and of accords achieved there would naturally promote an overall improvement in the political climate on our planet and would constitute a major practical step on the road to solving some

of the most important, pressing problems of the present day. In this situation, the plan for preparing for so-called "star wars" that Washington has put forward carries a potentially colossal threat for humanity, try as the United States might to camouflage this dangerous venture and to lend it the semblance of some sort of defensive measures.

U.S. SDI Concept

[Gerasimov] Might I say a few words about the term which is being used to camouflage these measures -- the term "strategic defense initiative?" There is an obvious discrepancy here on Washington's part. Generally speaking, the Americans are great experts when it comes to thinking up all sorts of propaganda cliches. Undoubtedly, the source of this is business and marketing, their experience of competing commercially: If you are the first to think up a catchy name or flashy label for a product, you can overtake your competitors. One cannot deny the sharpness of the American psychological warfare specialists who think up labels.

But when it comes to this "strategic defense initiative," the President's men, I repeat, simply got it wrong. From the very start, the label, as they say, didn't catch on. It didn't catch on at all, above all because of the absurdity of using the term "defensive" for something which is quite obviously aggressive and offensive. Using a phrase coined by Senator Kennedy, people started calling Reagan's space plan the "star wars" plan literally the day after it was made public. The most vexing thing for the President is that this is how even his closest comrades-in-arms are expressing themselves.

The administration is feverishly seeking a name to make this radical military program digestible. Yes, of course, all this could even be rather amusing were it not for the fact that they are trying to dress the devil up in cherub's clothing. Let us recall what Comrade Chernenko has said: Using the term "defensive" is a play on words. Essentially, this is an offensive concept; to be more precise, an aggressive one. The aim being pursued is to try to disarm the other side, to deprive it of the possibility of launching a counterstrike if it is the object of nuclear aggression.

[Agayants] Yes, Kim Antonovich. The realization of the U.S. militaristic designs on space would open the floodgates for the further arms race in all directions and would have a serious destabilizing effect on the strategic balance that currently exists. We are frankly and bluntly warning the Washington administration of this.

To judge by continuing statements by statesmen of various levels of seniority, including the highest seniority, however -- the latest example was remarks by Caspar Weinberger, the secretary of defense, who asserted that the militarization of space would speed up accords on other types of weapons and would be a guarantee of peace on earth -- to judge by these statements of American leaders, there is the conviction there that the position of the U.S. delgation at the forthcoming talks in Geneva on space weapons must be tough and uncompromising. Alas, this is a position that can only lead up a blind alley. If Washington persists in its ambitions, it will have to bear the full blame for the grave consequences of this.

Something else that cannot fail to put one on guard is the fact that the White House has again returned to its bellicose rhetoric. World public opinion is seriously concerned by the actions of the Reagan administration, undertaken with the clear objective of giving itself a free hand for carrying out possible direct acts of aggression and overt interference, including armed interference, in the internal affairs of other countries,

countries which do not wish to submit to U.S. diktat, which are upholding their right to be the arbiters of their own historical destiny. The ideologists of imperialism are striving to lend the practice of terrorism, which has been elevated to the status of state policy, some sort of theoretical and, if you like, philosophical underpinning. This strident and dirty campaign is being conducted bo the accompaniment of the lowest slander against the USSR and the other socialist countries, against the Third World states. In championing this philosophy of imperialist brigandage, the United States is hardening its foreign policy line, which just does not coincide with the widely-hyped declarations of Washington's alleged commitment to peace and cooperation.

Nuclear Parity

[Levin] Concerning the question of the philosophy of imperialist brigandage that you, Nikolay Ivanovich, were just talking about, I would like to refer, by way of illustration, to a speech recently devlivered by Richard Burt, U.S. assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian affairs, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He spoke very loquaciously there in the very same key as his boss, Secretary of State Shultz, spoke in San Francisco. Well, this is quite understandable that he repeated the ideas presented earlier by Shultz, yet it seems to me that Burt's speech deserves attention in view of the fact that it contained a number of revelations, which -- I would put it this way -- somewhat more explicitly represent the concept of Shultz.

One of these revelations is as follows: Burt tries to prove that the Soviet Union, in his words, has continuously built up its military power, and it forces, as he says, the United States to take appropriate measures. If the United States relinquishes its military programs, then again efforts to find political solutions to the problems that the world is facing would become more complicated, he says. But, holding forth on the subject, Burt -- I quote him literally -- says the following: "The nuclear potential of the Soviet Union has also been developing rapidly. In the past 20 years, the Russians progressed from being weak in the nuclear area to parity." Let's think about this phrase comrades. What do we have here? According to Burt, we have been rapidly developing our nuclear potential, and as a result, we -- he admits this -- have stopped lagging behind and arrived at parity. Where does he think there is a threat to the United States? This most clearly, in a most evident way, shows that it is parity that does not suit the Washington administration. It is parity that is unacceptable for that administration, which is bent on achieving military superiroity. This very line, which, in Burt's opinion, has to secure the position of strength at the talks with the Soviet Union, is very clearly traceable, and the position of strength at the talks is necessary for pressure.

The Soviet Union has stressed a number of times that it would not allow a shift in the strategic parity that has been shaped in recent years to occur. Only parity is a reliable basis for truly equal talks, as well as for a solution to the current problems on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security of the parties.

Soviet Peace Offensive

PM041644 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Mar 85 p 3

[Political observer Gennadiy Shishkin's "View of Events": "The Command of the Times"]

[Text] The important initiatives put forward recently by the Soviet Union are being actively discussed by the broad international public. Attention continues to be focused on Comrade K.U. Chernenko's replies to the appeals by the leaders of the northern European antiwar organization "Treaty Now" and the Argentine "Appeal of the 100 for Life" movement.

There was a particularly broad response to the speech at the election meeting of the working people of the capital's Kuybyshevskiy Electoral Okrug. Even the U.S. paper THE WASHINGTON POST was forced to admit that the calm and confident tone and constructive nature of Soviet leaders' speeches are making an indelible impression on people. "The Soviet Union," the paper believes, "has launched a new peace offensive on the eve of the commencement of talks between the USSR and the United States on space and nuclear weapons." In these conditions, THE WASHINGTON POST states, "NATO representatives, as they themselves have said, are astonished by the hail of Russian initiatives."

Comrade K.U. Chernenko's speech has been seen everywhere as an authoritative confirmation that at the upcoming Geneva Soviet-U.S. talks on space and nuclear armaments, the Soviet Union will act constructively to achieve accords based on the principle of equality and mutual security. The Soviet leadership's intentions in connection with the upcoming Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, which are clearly stated in the speech, have also met with a very warm response in various countries. It is stressed, first, that the Soviet Union does not want to obtain any one-sided advantages or military superiority over the United States and the NATO countries. Second, the USSR wants to halt and not continue the arms race. Finally, the Soviet Union is seeking a real reduction in arms stockpiles and the destruction of a considerable proportion of them to start with, not the creation of more and more new weapons systems, whether in space or on land, be they offensive or defensive.

There was also a broad response among the world public to the idea put forward in Comrade K.U. Chernenko's speech that in the year of the 40th anniversary of the end of the bloodiest and most devastating of wars the leaders of the USSR and the United States should jointly confirm, in a form appropriate for both sides, the essence and spirit of the main pledges adopted by the two powers at the end of the war and in line with the agreements of the seventies, which have gone down in the annals as the decade of detente.

At the same time, that the Soviet peace offensive has produced a near-panic reaction among certain cricles in Washington. In the U.S. capital, Secretary of State G. Shultz, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, his assistant R. Perle, and other senior administration spokesmen have been falling over one another to make statements. They will not consider putting aside all the plans to transfer the arms race to space. In fact, the statements emphasize the continuation of gigantic arms buildup programs being carried out by the United States. All this also sharply contradicts the task of the ultimate complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere, which has been set by the two powers in the joint statement on the subject and objectives of the upcoming talks, and the principle of equality and mutual security.

The recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee speech by R. Perle, assistant to the U.S. defense secretary, is highly indicative in this respect. On the one hand, it abounded

in malicious attacks on the Soviet Union. On the other hand, there was not a word to indicate that the United States intends to hold serious talks with the USSR on disarmament questions. In fact, R. Perle stated that the U.S. President will never adopt a seventies detente stance. Moreover, the Pentagon spokesman described as insulting and ridiculous the "suggestion made in Congress that Reagan may revert to the process of detente in the world." Perle also insisted also that the President's strategy, based on the attainment of superiority over the Soviet Union, allegedly meets U.S. interests and that Washington intends to act in that direction in the future.

At the moment Washington is obviously trying to "forget" that an important accord has been reached in Geneva on the subject and objectives of Soviet-U.S. talks on questions pertaining to space and nuclear armaments, specifically, that they will be based on the principle of the examination and solution of these problems in their interrelationship.

This "forgetfulness" is no accident, since everyone knows that in Geneva the U.S. representatives did their utmost to prevent a discussion of the problem of nonmilitarization of space, confining themselves to a consideration of questions concerning the types of armaments on which talks have been held before, that is, on strategic armaments and medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. It was only as a result of persistent, hard work by the Soviet side that the U.S. delegation finally had to adopt the viewpoint that questions relating to space and nuclear armaments are inseparable and must be discussed and solved together.

In an effort to justify its attempts to depart from the accord that was reached and its general practice of violating agreements signed by the United States, Washington has recently launched a slanderous campaign over another administration report to Congress concerning alleged Soviet "violations" of its international commitments. These unseemly attempts and unfounded and groundless claims have been resolutely rejected in representation to the U.S. State Department by the USSR Embassy in Washington.

The whole world knows how scrupulous the Soviet Union is about fulfilling its international commitments. This gives all the more reason to be wary of the unscrupulous methods of the U.S. side is using on the very eve of the talks on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva with the obvious purpose of poisoning the atmosphere of the tasks from the outset and hindering the businesslike, constructive consideration of the problems which are to be solved at them.

Despite the intrigues by the enemies of detente, who are trying to undermine the Soviet-U.S. talks, the Soviet Union is firmly and steadily implementing a course of safeguarding peace and eliminating the threat of thermonuclear war. As Comrade K.U. Chernenko stressed in his election speech, an accord is essential and perfectly possible. "It is essential," he said, "because otherwise the world would slide with every increasing speed down the slippery slope of the arms race and the threat of war would increase. An accord is perfectly possible because all that it requires is respect for the rights and legitimate security interests of both sides and no attempts to disrupt the established balance of power."

This realistic and constructive approach to the matter meets with growing support among the peoples and governments of many countries. This is evidenced by the results of the Soviet-Italian talks which were held during the visit to Italy by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister. As the Soviet-Italian statement says, both sides stress the importance of the accord on the subject and objectives of the forthcoming talks between the USSR and the United States on questions of space and nuclear

armaments, reached at the 7-8 January 1985 Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva. The decision to embark on the elaboration of effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space and stopping it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, and at strengthening strategic stability is a major step on the road to overcoming international tension, which remains the aim of both sides.

While approving the Soviet Union's businesslike approach to the talks and its constructive initiatives, world public opinion is demanding reciprocal steps by Washington.

Arbatov Interview

PM071125 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 85 p 3

[Interview with Academician G. A. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent D. Yakushkin: "A Time To Decide"--date, place not specified]

[Excerpt] [Yakushkin] For many years, Georgiy Arkadyevich, you have been engaged in the study of Soviet-American relations. What would you single out as their specific feature in the mid-eighties?

[Arbatov] I would say we are experiencing a moment in the history of relations between our countries when it is clearer than ever before that it is necessary to make a decisive turn toward the normalization of relations, the ending of the arms race, and detente. On the other hand, there is a great danger that such a turn will not take place, and then a very serious threat to the international situation will arise.

We have reached the stage where delaying positive solutions to problems whose solutions are due or overdue could in itself lead to a situation where the elaboration of an arms limitation and reduction agreement, which is in any case complex, will become practically impossible.

Take, for instance, just one aspect of the agreements to be concluded -- their verification; after all, nobody will sign a treaty without the possibility of verification. Yet weapons systems that will make this problem insoluble are already being commissioned. For instance, cruise missiles are relatively small in size, and it is impossible to establish how many there are and whether they are on a particular ship. Moreover, the Americans intend to equip some of these missiles with conventional warheads and some with nuclear warheads. How can this be verified?

The new weapons will make it extremely difficult to even define the military-strategic balance. And what complex problems would be created by the appearance of the ABM defense systems with space-based components that the United States is now planning!

[Yakushkin] One can understand the full complexity of the present situation and the difficult [neprostoy] nature of the forthcoming talks. All the same, very many people have a great desire to see practical developments toward finally lessening tension.

[Arbatov] Yes, there is a great desire for this, and it is attainable. After all, the prevention of war is in the interests of all the world's people equally.

It is another matter that it has happened more than once in history that people, and whole states, have acted against their own interests, either failing to fully understand them, or because they were pushed into it by different interests which, in the final analysis, were incomparably more trivial. Such conduct, which is contrary to the true national interests of the United States itself, is evidently characteristic of Washington's policy today.

It is not long since the accord was reached in Geneva on the start of talks on a whole range of questions connected with nuclear and space arms. However, in these few weeks, the American side has taken a whole series of steps which provide food for serious thought: Does the present administration really want to achieve an accord on arms limitation and reduction at all?

How can the desire to achieve progress at the talks be reconciled with the government's publication of an official document on the eve of the start of the talks containing the false accusation that the Soviet Union has supposedly violated arms limitation agreements signed earlier? This can only be regarded as a conscious, deliberate attempt to sow doubt as to whether the USSR is an honest partner, and at the same time, to justify in advance their own negative stance at the actual talks. Can the new bout of hysterical anti-Sovietism and anticommunism expressed in Secretary of State G. Shultz' recent speech really be compatible with the desire to hold talks honestly, in a spirit of good will?

Another aspect is the attempt to use the very fact of the talks to exert pressure on the American Congress with a view to obtaining larger appropriations for military programs, including programs on which it has hitherto displayed caution and has to some extent delayed. Is not this an example of cynicism -- using an accord on the start of talks in order to build up armaments?

CSO: 5200/1013

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

COMMENTS ON TALKS DURING GROMYKO VISIT TO ITALY

Gromyko-Craxi Talks

LD261858 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 26 Feb 85

[Excerpt] Rome February 26 TASS--Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., had a meeting with Bettino Craxi, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Italy, here today.

During the exchange of views on international issues Andrey Gromyko set forth the principled approach of the Soviet Union to the need of curbing the arms race on earth and preventing it in space, strengthening peace and security in Europe and the world over. In this connection attention of the head of the Italian Government was drawn to the main points of Konstantin Chernenko's speech of February 22, 1985. The thought was stressed that in the forthcoming negotiations with the U.S. on space and nuclear arms the Soviet Union would work constructively toward attaining accords based on the principle of equality and equal security.

It is necessary that the other side, too, display a serious approach.

Speaking of the importance of creating a felicitous atmosphere for a success of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations, Andrey Gromyko reminded of the Soviet proposal concerning a freeze on nuclear arsenals and termination of further deployment of missiles.

Bettino Craxi said that the government headed by him was striving to assist the restoration of positive processes in East-West dialogue and of international detente, approached relations with the Soviet Union from that angle and came out in favor of further development of mutually beneficial cooperation between the two states.

Gromyko-Andreotti Talks

LD262033 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 26 Feb 85

[Excerpts] Rome February 26 TASS--Talks were held here today between Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and foreign minister of the USSR, and Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti of the Italian Republic.

A useful exchange of opinions was held in a businesslike atmosphere on a number of pressing international problems as well as questions of further developing Soviet-Italian relations.

Andrey Gromyko stressed that the situation in the world remains tense and complicated since the U.S. policy of seeking military superiority and heightening tension and confrontation remains essentially unchanged. The Soviet Union was and remains strongly opposed to such a policy. It pursued and will continue pursuing a principled policy of peace.

Setting forth the Italian position, Giulio Andreotti said, in particular, that the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. talks on space and nuclear arms are welcomed in Italy. He expressed the wish for the talks to be constructive and produce mutually acceptable accords. Italy, for its part, will facilitate this.

Andrey Gromyko stressed the importance of preventing the militarization of outer space. The resolution of this question would make it possible to adopt far-reaching measures in such areas as strategic arms and medium-range nuclear systems. It is essential in the process to refrain from any steps going counter to the subject and objectives of the Soviet-American talks such as the installment of American medium-range missiles in some West European countries.

It was reaffirmed that both countries intend to facilitate the continuation of the European process and the success of the Stockholm conference. In this context Andrey Gromyko stressed the significance of the Soviet document, the draft provisions of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations, whose aim is to consolidate and concretize this principle at the present stage of development of inter-state relations.

The sides expressed themselves in favour of working out at the Geneva conference on disarmament as soon as possible a convention that would ban and eliminate inhuman chemical weapons.

Gromyko Luncheon Speech

LD262123 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 26 Feb 85

[Excerpt] Rome February 26 TASS--The Soviet Union shares the striving of the Italian Government for maintaining good, stable relations between our states. There are more things that bind the USSR and Italy than those that separate them. This has been stated by the member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Andrey Gromyko who spoke at the luncheon given in his honour by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Italian Republic Giulio Andreotti.

The current Soviet-Italian talks are held in the situation when the world watches, literally holding its breath, where the development of events will turn, whether the dangers which loom before countries and nations will continue to be piled up, and the world will go down under the weight of heaps of weapons, or a way will be found towards the improvement of the international situation.

I believe it is clear to everyone what is the significance in this situation of the success or failure of the coming Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. They touch upon the principal problem of today: What is the way to preventing the transfer of the arms race to outer space, to stopping and reversing the arms race on the earth, how the threat of a nuclear war could be lessened?

We harbour no illusions and we know that the talks will be difficult. However, we are far from a fatal hopelessness either. On behalf of the Soviet leadership I state most definitely that our country is ready to travel honestly its part of the road towards mutually acceptable understandings. We expect the United States of America to do the same.

The subject and objectives of the negotiations have recently been determined jointly. The two powers have assumed an obligation on that matter in front of the entire world. And the most important pre-requisite for the negotiations to be a success is adherence to the said agreement in practice. Its component and major part is the recognition of the interrelationship between all the three directions in the negotiations.

But there is something that cannot but give rise to concern. The negotiations have not begun yet. But there already are more than enough statements by high-ranking officials in the U.S. to the effect that huge arms buildup programs will be carried on with. In pursuit of the mirage of military superiority they are averse to the very idea of giving up all kinds of plans for spreading the arms race into outer space. All this sharply contradicts the task of the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere which was formulated by the two powers in the joint statement and the principle of equality and equal security.

Its observance is the absolutely indispensible condition for the success of the negotiations.

Making plans for a military breakthrough into space, all kinds of sophisms are used, facts and ideas are forged in every way to lull the vigilance of the people. We in the Soviet Union prefer to call things their proper names. Let me remind you of Konstantin Chernenko's words: "The use of the term 'defensive' is juggling with words. In its essense this concept is offensive, or to be more precise, aggressive. The aim is to try and disarm the other side, to deprive it of the possibility to deal a retaliatory blow in case of a nuclear aggression against it".

The task of state leaders lies not in turning into grim reality the predictions of science fiction writers about "star wars", not in the manufacture of ever deadlier weapons. True wisdom of those who are at the helm of state is not only to preclude the formidable threat coming from space but also to preclude war as a method of solving international disputes, to ensure peace for all peoples regardless of their social system, ideology, world outlook. This is what we call peaceful coexistence of states. These golden words, this humanistic principle was bequeathed to us by the founder of the Soviet state, man of genius, Lenin.

If there are leaders who, like sleep-walkers, tread without realizing it the brink of the abyss, then the peoples must protect themselves, so that all humanity is not dragged into the precipice.

The Soviet Union will be waging a resolute struggle against the militaristic line, against power methods in the policy used for interference in internal affairs of

peoples, for imposing orders suiting some or other country or group of countries. It should not be allowed that arbitrariness would reign instead of law and order, that arms would serve as the supreme manifestation of law and morality. We are urging all states for a policy of peace, law, respect for the right of peoples to independent existence.

The situation in Europe, certainly, deteriorates considerably as a result of the implementation of the plans of the deployment of new U.S. missiles. Has this increased anyone's security? No. Quite the contrary, a mine of huge yield has been placed under the European Continent. It should be said outright that the responsibility for this is borne both by those states that were pushing others towards missile deployment and by those that agreed to this. Willingly, half-willingly or reluctantly, is a different matter. In the end, the destructive force of a missile does not decrease depending on the degree of willingness with which it was deployed. This is how we should assess this fact, Andrey Gromyko stressed.

The question arises: Does such a situation promtoe the forthcoming negotiations? Our answer is: absolutely not. To begin with the Soviet Union suggests that the corresponding steps of either side be discontinued. We are not only against any further raising of the level of military confrontation in Europe, we stand for its radical lowering. Common sense, if its access has not been finally blocked to those spheres of the NATO countries which shape their foreign policy, should prevail.

What is referred to as East-West dialogue is not confined alone to the negotiations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. for all their importance. Contacts, exchanges of opinion, and -- the important thing -- attaining of greater mutual understanding between European countries can substantially promote the return of international relations to the rails of detente. I would make no secret of the fact that we would like to see Italy among those who raise their voice against the arms race soaring into space heights, in favor of slowing down the operation of arms manufacturing conveyors, and then, for stopping them altogether. We are confident that Italy, if it uses its potentialities, can promote with its concrete actions the constructive course of Soviet-U.S. negotiations.

An unsatisfactory situation is taking shape at the Stockholm conference. Judging by all appearances, the opponents of the improvement of the situation in Europe dominate there at the moment. As is known, the Soviet Union propses to reach agreement on the no-first use of nuclear weapons by all the nuclear powers, on the non-use of military power at all. Recently we displayed flexibility and put forward additional proposals. However, a positive response to them has not come yet. I should like to express hope that it is not the last word or our partners at that forum.

Andreotti Luncheon Speech

PM281234 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Feb 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report on speech by Italian Foreign Minister G. Andreotti at 26 February Rome luncheon in honor of Gromyko, under general heading "Talks in Rome"]

[Excerpt] Welcoming the Soviet guest, G. Andreotti said that A. A. Gromyko's visit to Italy is an important indication of the high level chracterizing political contacts between the USSR and Italy.

Dwelling on the most topical international problems, G. Andreotti singled out the Soviet-U.S. accord on holding talks on nuclear and space arms. This accord, as he stressed, is a step in the right direction. He expressed hope as to the possibility of achieving agreements at the talks that would prevent an arms race in space and stop the arms race on earth, limit and reduce nuclear arsenals, and strengthen strategic stability.

Italy devotes special attention to the development of the process of security and cooperation in Europe, including the conference under way in Stockholm, the conference in Ottawa, and the cultural forum in Budapest. For us, he noted, the Stockholm conference is of particular significance, since it could objectively help the Geneva talks, too. An agreement in Stockholm on confidence-building measures accompanied by the confirmation of the commitment on the nonuse of force or the threat of force in international relations, G. Andreotti said, would be a contribution to the cause of renewing the climate of confidence on the European Continent, and this is turn would create the prerequisites for productive talks on real reductions in conventional arms.

Joint Statement Issued

PM281033 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Feb 85 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Soviet-Italian Statement"]

[Text] Rome February 27 TASS -- As a result of the Soviet-Italian talks that were held in the course of the visit of Andrey Gromyko to Italy, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR foreign minister, the concurrence of views on the following issues was placed on record:

The sides reaffirm their adherence to the policy of building up confidence and cooperation in relations between states, including on the European Continent, eliminating the threat of war, and strengthening peace. In this context they underscore the importance of the accord reached at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva on January 7-8 1985, as regards the subject and aims of the talks to be held between the USSR and the United States on outer space and nuclear weapons.

The decision to start drawing up effective agreements aimed at preventing the arms race in outer space and putting an end to it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, and at strengthening strategic stability is a major step forward on the way to putting an end to international tensions, which remains the aim of both sides.

The sides positively evaluate the fact that the subject of the talks will be a package of issues concerning outer space and nuclear weapons, strategic and medium-range ones; all these questions will be examined and resolved in their interconnection. They are convinced that the basis for the talks, agreed upon in Geneva, can contribute to substantial progress in all directions, which will be the subject of the talks.

The sides consider it highly important that the upcoming Geneva talks be held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere and make it possible to find positive solutions to the problem of preventing the arms race in outer space and a drastic cut in nuclear weapons, including medium-range ones, on the basis of effective and balanced

agreements, the security interests of all being ensured. The USSR and Italy will, each on its side, make vigorous efforts to contribute to finding just and mutually acceptable decisions.

The sides are expressing satisfaction with the agreement reached on the procedure of work at the Stockholm conference, which will make it possible to thoroughly examine the proposals tabled at the conference. They intend to contribute to the attainment of mutually acceptable agreements on measures to build up confidence and security in Europe, including the commitment of the participating states to renounce the threat or use of force.

A successful completion of the conference would, in the opinion of the sides, contribute considerably to strengthening the security and confidence in Europe politically and militarily. This conference is a component part of the all-European process, which resulted 10 years ago in the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki, whose implementation in all of its provisions remains a good basis for cooperation in Europe.

The USSR and Italy reaffirm that their ultimate goal is general and complete disarmament under effective international control. This calls for the use of outer space solely for peaceful purposes, and the total scrapping of nuclear weapons everywhere, as well as eliminating all other types of weapons.

The sides favor, as before, a strengthening of the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, a total and effective ban on chemical weapons, progress at the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments and associated measures in central Europe, for stopping and reversing the arms race.

Both sides consider close cooperation to be useful in accordance with the Soviet-Italian protocol on consultations with the aim of contributing to a resumption of the detente process, elimination of the existing seats of tension, and normalization of the international situation.

Arms Talks Stressed

PM041257 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent N. Paklin report under the rubric "The Day's Events": "Useful Talks"]

[Excerpt] Rome--The Soviet-Italian talks in Rome lasted 3 days. In the course of his official visit, A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, met and talked with the top Italian leaders.

The Rome talks were the natural continuation of the Soviet-Italian political dialogue which has been going on all these years and were an important constituent part of this dialogue. They confirmed quite clearly that real potential and the desire on both sides for the further development of our countries' relations exist.

Soviet-Italian dialgoue goes far beyond the bounds of bilateral relations. This was clearly manifested at the Rome talks. The participants analyzed the main international problems in depth. Naturally, attention was concentrated in the first instance on how to avoid the nuclear apocalypse and strengthen peace. They devoted particular

attention to the forthcoming Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States on questions of space and nuclear arms. Italy is not participating directly in the talks. But together with the other West European states it is capable of promoting constructive progress at the talks through concrete actions.

It is well known that Washington managed to secure the consent of a number of West European countries, Italy included, to the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles. It is no secret that now the United States is trying to involve its West Eurpean NATO allies in plans for "star wars" preparations.

What position will Italy take on this important question? "I will not conceal the fact that we would like to see Italy among those who are raising their voices against the takeoff of the arms race to cosmic heights and in favor of slowing down the military conveyor belts and then stopping them," A.A. Gromyko said at the luncheon held in his honor by Italian Foreign Minister G. Andreotti.

The agreement Soviet-Italian statement notes in this connection: "The sides consider it very important that the forthcoming Geneva talks take place in a businesslike, constructive spirit and make it possible to find positive solutions to the problems of preventing an arms race in space and radically reducing nuclear armaments, including medium-range weapons, on the basis of effective and balanced agreements with the safeguarding of everyone's security interests."

CSO: 5200/1022

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

COMMENTS ON TALKS DURING GROMYKO VISIT TO SPAIN

Meets With Gonzalez

LD281607 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 28 Feb 85

[Text] Madrid February 28 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., who arrived here for an official visit at the invitation of the Spanish Government had a meeting with Felipe Gonzalez, prime minister and president of the council of ministers of Spain. They had a conversation. During the conversation which was friendly in character, the sides discussed the state of and prospects for development of Soviet-Spanish relations, and certain key problems of the present international situation.

Both sides expressed satisfaction at the expansion of Soviet-Spanish cooperation in the economic, scientific-technical and cultural spheres. The importance of the developing political contacts between the two countries was stressed.

When international problems were being considered Andrey Gromyko made a critical assessment of the U.S. militaristic line which underlied the present tensions in the world, and made note of the need of active efforts of all states for enhancing international security and eliminating the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. The need was stressed of refraining from such actions which would raise the level of confrontation in Europe even higher, thus, complicating the arrival at mutually acceptable agreements on radical improvement of the political situation in the European Continent.

Felipe Gonzalez welcomed the agreement reached on the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. negotiations at Geneva on nuclear and space arms. Both sides expressed the hope that the negotiations would make it possible to put up a barrier in the way of space militarization and lead to a lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe and the world as a whole. On behalf of the Soviet Government Andrey Gromyko reaffirmed the invitation for Felipe Gonzalez to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with gratitude. The timing of the visit will be agreed upon additionally. On the same day Felipe Gonzalez gave a luncheon in Andrey Gromyko's honor.

Gromyko-Moran Talks

LD281751 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 28 Feb 85

[Excerpts] Madrid February 28 TASS--Talks have opened here today between Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR foreign minister, and Fernando Moran, foreign minister of Spain.

Andrey Gromyko pointed out that the United States continues the course at the stepping up of military preparations, is disrupting the existing military-strategic parity. Washington is thus striving to assume such a command post from which it could dictate its terms to other states, could decide what internal structure should exist in some or other country, how states should build their relations. The Soviet Union opposes this aggressive course with a line at easing tension in the world, against the militarisation of space, at the quest of practical ways of ending the arms race, above all that of nuclear arms.

Andrey Gromyko and Fernando Moran expressed the consensus that the present tense international situation requires efforts of all states aimed at removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe, at curbing the arms race and improving the international climate.

Within this context, Fernando Moran welcomed on behalf of the Spanish Government the Soviet-American agreement on the subject and aims of the forthcoming Soivet-American talks on space and nuclear armaments. It was stated from the Soviet side that, given goodwill and strict observance of the Geneva agreement, it is possible to ensure the reaching of mutually acceptable accords directed at preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth.

Having discussed the course of work of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, the sides expressed their readiness to facilitate the reaching at the conference of accords on mutually acceptable confidence- and security-building measures both of a political and international level and of a military-technical character.

Gromyko Luncheon Speech

PM041000 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline "Talks in Madrid"]

[Excerpt] Madrid 2 March--A political dialogue between our two countries has started comparatively recently, but it is developing.

The same, however, can be said of Soviet-Spanish relations as a whole. They mean now a complex of ties and exchanges in different spheres.

It follows from your pronouncements that the Spanish Government intends to continue widening cooperation with the Soviet Union. This is fully in keeping with the wish of the Soviet leadership. As Konstantin Chernenko stressed: "We are in favor of the development of Soviet-Spanish relations in the spirit of peacefulness and mutual confidence, and we hold that this would meet the national interests of our peoples, the

interests of security in Europe and the whole world. The Soviet people have the best of feelings for the Spanish people."

Our conversations and talks here, in Madrid, center on the problems that cannot but agitate all peoples and states. These are nonadmission of space militarization, curbing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, prevention of new war. Humanity, actually, approached a landmark when the question is posed in all its magnitude whether it has enough wisdom and strength to arrest the sliding to nuclear catastrophe.

Maybe this is an exaggeration? No, it is not. Of decisive importance now is the task of preventing the spread of the arms race to space. It is clear to any unbiased person that otherwise the arms buildup will assume a qualitatively new, uncontrollable character in all directions. The overwhelming majority of peoples and states are aware of this and demand that a horrible danger should not loom over humanity. It there is a need of any proof of this, you may see decisions of the latest UN session, the resolution on nonadmission of the militarization of outer space that was virtually unanimously adopted.

There are leaders, however, who defy world public opinion. They are obsessed with the plans of space militarization and are trying to present this as all but a guarantee of arms reduction. Even medieval scholars would, perhaps, have envied such logic. It appears that the road to disarmament is to pass through the manufacture of ever more sophisticated arms.

If it is sought to turn outer space into a military launchpad with the hope to dictate from there the will to other states, the Soviet Union has this answer: It will not be possible to implement the plans of achieving military superiority either on earth or in space. The hope to protect oneself from a retribution for aggression by an antimissile shield is an illusion.

So isn't it better to seek honest and mutually acceptable arrangements so as to curb the arms race on all directions? This is precisely how the Soviet Union will be acting at the coming Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

Our country, Konstantin Chernenko said in his speech on February 22, is not striving to acquire any unilateral advantages, wants termination of the arms race, wants a real reduction of the arms stockpiles, destruction of a substantial portion of them by way of a beginning, and not the development of ever new weapon systems, be it in space or on earth, offensive or purportedly defensive systems.

As is known, the USSR and the USA agreed that all questions concerning space and nuclear arms be considered and resolved in their interrelationship. This expresses the essence of the matter with mathematical precision. If the plans of "star wars" are given up, an opportunity will open to agree on reduction, even a drastic one, of strategic arms and medium-range nuclear weapons systems. Such a magnificant goal as complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere would be brought much closer. The Soviet Union has been pressing for the removal of nuclear weapons since the moment the first atomic bomb was created.

Even though the talks will be conducted by two states, the USSR and the USA, it is apparent that they have a bearing on the interests of security of all states and peoples, and certainly of Western Europe, not the least of all. Every state, large and small, has opportunities to promote or not to promote the success of the talks.

The Spanish Government's decision to preserve Spain's status as a nuclear weapon-free country has been specifically and duly assessed in the Soviet Union. We would like to hope that along the lines of independent policy Spain will consistently promote the curbing of the arms race. Can it do so? We believe it can, if it so wishes.

Isn't it in the interest of Spain that the level of nuclear confrontation should not grow in Europe, that there should be no room for attempts to call in to question the existing realities, above all the territorial ones, that the all-European process should strengthen on the basis of the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act? One of the stages of this process, and a positive one, once took place in Madrid. Nowadays it is necessary to ensure by joint efforts the success of the Stockholm conference. The Soviet Union favors the adoption there of weighty decisions that would strengthen Europe's security both politically and militarily.

Moran Luncheon Speech

LD011806 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Madrid March 1 TASS--Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Moran today delivered a speech at the luncheon given in honour of Andrey Gromyko. Greeting Andrey Gromyko, the Spanish foreign minister said, in particular, that in May 1983 he had paid his first official visit to the Soviet Union in the capacity of Spain's foreign minister and even at that time had had a possibility to conduct very important talks. Soviet-Spanish meetings have since that time been growing more frequent and fruitful, demonstrating how close Soviet-Spanish relations are.

The year 1984 as a whole was characterised by a tense international situation. Spain, however, did not give way to pessimism but strove to use every means available to it to revive the process of detente. Believing that it is the duty of all the states to advance the cause of disarmament, Spain spared no effort both within the Western security system, to which it belongs, and at various multilateral forums to promote true and fruitful dialogue.

Spain responded with great satisfaction to the Soviet-U.S. accord on talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons. We are fully convinced of the possibility to reach equilibrium in armaments at a lower level without prejudice to the legitimate security interets of any state.

Having noted that Spain, by virtue of obvious geographic, historical and cultural causes, was an integral part of the West, Fernando Moran stressed that Spain considered it its duty to seek and preserve independence to a certain extent so as to protect its national interests without upsetting the balance of forces but without permitting any subordination either. Today's Spain has assumed moral obligations to contribute to a safer and at the same time fairer international order.

We know well that it is not always easy to reconcile these goals but we must not give up hope in our efforts because we are convinced that the progress which we can achieve in detente and disarmament would be illusory if we do not strive simultaneously for a fairer and better balanced socio-economic order.

Fernando Moran furthermore quoted from a speech by King Juan Carlos the First of Spain during his visit to the Soviet Union. The king stressed, in particular, that Spain "believes that it is both possible and necessary to pursue mutually beneficial coexistence between countries with different socio-economic systems, coexistence based on close cooperation, mutual understanding, trust and mutual respect and aimed at mutual benefit and at the enhancement of the international order."

Spain proceeds from the need to renounce war as a means of settling disputes between different social systems, which presupposes the need to respect the interests of every state on a mutual basis, particularly as regards its own security. Acting in this manner, the minister stressed, it is possible to create the necessary climate of mutual understanding and trust among all the states so as to ensure genuine peace.

Importance of Arms Control

PM061034 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Vernikov dispatch: "Spain-USSR: To Develop Dialogue and Cooperation"]

[Excerpt] Madrid--A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, has ended his official visit to Spain.

The conversations and talks held in the Spanish capital centered on problems perturbing all peoples and states -- after all, the international tension resulting from the actions of the aggressive forces of imperialism does not leave anyone unaffected. To curb the arms race and primarily the nuclear arms race, prevent new wars, and block the militarization of space -- are these not questions of life and death for mankind, making all other global problems pale in comparison?

How can the Soviet Union and Spain contribute to the struggle against the threat hanging over the world? The USSR's stance is well known: Our country consistently advocates the prevention of an arms race in space and its cessation on earth. The Spanish Government's decision to maintain the country's nuclear-free status, coupled with the possibility of taking constructive steps to help curb the arms race and reduce the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe, constitute a policy which would undoubtedly serve the consolidation of the all-European process of detente.

CSO: 5200/1022

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

COMMENTS ON TALKS DURING GENSCHER VISIT TO MOSCOW

Gromyko-Genscher Talks

LD041436 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "A. A. Gromyko's Conversation With H.-D. Genscher"]

[Excerpts] Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, on 4 March met and talked with Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG vice chancellor and minister for foreign affairs, who is currently on a short working visit in Moscow.

In the course of the conversation they discussed a number of international problems as well as questions concerning bilateral Soviet-West German relations.

Andrey Gromyko gave a principled evaluation of the U.S. policy as the prime cause of the current international tensions. It was pointed out that the U.S. Administration, which is out to ensure military superiority for itself, is continuing to whip up the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, and wishes to turn outer space also into an arena of confrontation. A tense situation remains in Europe, where the deployment, including on the FRG's territory, of new American first-strike nuclear missile weapons is continuing.

In opposition to that dangerous course, the Soviet Union pursues a policy toward a radical improvement of the whole international situation and toward a quest for practical ways for ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space, Andrey Gromyko stressed.

In this connection, the attention of Hans-Dietrich Genscher was attracted to the Soviet foreign policy initiatives spelled out in Konstantin Chernenko's speech, in particular in his speech of February 22, this year, where emphasis is laid on the idea that the Soviet Union intends to act constructively and in a businesslike manner at the upcoming talks with the USA on a package of mutually interconnected questions of outer space and nuclear weapons, by strictly adhering in all parts to the agreement reached on the subject and on the aim of these talks. Success of the talks will depend on whether the American side acts likewise.

In this context of the problem of preventing a militarization of outer space, the Soviet side expressed concern over the stand of the FRG Government on the American

space plans. The FRG's joining in "research work" to create outer space weapons capable of strikes, Andrey Gromyko said, would actually make it an accomplice in the violation of the treaty on antiballistic missile defense and thus in the torpedoing of the whole process of the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons. Hope has been expressed that the FRG Government would display on that issue of principled significance an attitude according with the interests of peace.

Pointing out that an essential component part of the upcoming Geneva talks is the question of medium-range nuclear weapons, Andrey Gromyko pointed out that the FRG Government, which repeatedly declared its interest in resolving that issue, could contribute to the success of the talks in that area by taking measures to end the deployment of American missiles on FRG territory.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher declared in general terms for lessening the present-day international tensions and for continuing political East-West dialogue.

At the same time, he set forth the old known viewpoint of the FRG's Government on the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe and tried to interpret U.S. actions in the outer space field in a distorted light.

In the course of the meeting, the intention of the sides to contribute to the success of the Stockholm conference was reaffirmed. The Soviet side stressed the great significance of the proposals of the socialist countries to conclude a treaty on mutual nonuse of military force between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO states, which would lead to essential positive changes in the international situation.

Touching upon the state of things at the Vienna talks, Andrey Gromyko expressed the hope that the NATO countries, including the FRG, will use the opportunities inherent in the fresh Soviet initiative of February 14 this year, to achieve, at last, the first tangible results at these talks.

Genscher Press Conference

LD041824 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1731 GMT 2 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Moscow, 4 Mar (TASS)--Hans-Dietrich Genscher, deputy federal chancellor and FRG foreign minister, spoke today at a press conference held at the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry. He spoke about the talks he had here today with Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister.

In his address to the press conference, Genscher agreed with the USSR foreign minister's assessment that the talks were useful. The FRG foreign minister said that he discussed with Andrey Gromyko both the development of bilateral relations and international problems and the questions of disarmament. He said his government was interested in seeing a positive outcome to the talks between the USSR and the United States, which begin 12 March in Geneva.

When asked whether the FRG's position on "star wars" would have a negative influence on the results of the Geneva talks, Genscher confined himself to general remarks about the "contribution" of the government to "the creation of favorable climate for the talks." At the same time, he said the Geneva talks would be qualitatively different from all previous talks on disarmament. Immediate results could not be expected from them.

CSO: 5200/1022

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET LEADERS' COMMENTS DURING ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Chernenko Address

PM222120 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Comrade K. U. Chernenko's Speech"]

[Excerpts] Dear Comrades, I express my sincere gratitude to the working people of the Kuybyshev District of Moscow who again nominated me as candidate to run for the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. I will do my best to justify this great trust, this high honor.

Comrades, the core of our foreign policy today is, of course, the struggle for terminating the arms race imposed by imperialism, for averting the threat of a world nuclear war.

We are at the threshold of new negotiations with the United States. Both sides have stated that they enter them to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth. They have come to terms to consider and resolve questions of space and nuclear arms as a complex, in their interrelationship, which is absolutely indispensable to the success of the undertaking. This is the essence of the Geneva Accord. I would like to state once again with all clarity what our intentions in connection with the forthcoming talks are.

First: We do not strive to acquire any unilateral advantages over the United States and NATO countries, or for military superiority over them. We do not need it, as we have no intention of either threatening them or imposing our will on them, but want to live in peace and maintain normal, good relations with them.

Second: We want termination, and not continuation, of the arms race. This is precisely why the Soviet Union raises the question of such opening steps as a freeze on nuclear arsenals of the sides, an end to further deployment of missiles, etc. We consider the use of the negotiations for opposite purposes--for justifying and camouflaging further buildup and deployment of mass annihilation systems--to be an immortal and dishonorable business, a deception of peoples and a crime against them.

And third: We want a real reduction of the arms stockpiles, destruction of a substantial portion of them by way of a beginning, and not the development of increasingly new weapon systems, be it in space or on earth, offensive or purportedly defensive systems. Our ultimate objective here is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere on this planet, the complete removal of the threat of nuclear war.

The divergence of views of the sides on the matters that will be discussed is great now. This is obvious to all. There is no shortage of gloomy forecasts which doom the negotiations to failure in advance, but we do not share them.

Agreement is absolutely necessary and quite possible. It is necessary because, otherwise, the world will with increasing speed keep sliding down the inclined plane of the arms race and the threat of war will grow. Agreement is quite possible because what is needed for that end is simply to respect the rights and legitimate security interests of both sides, not to strive to upset the existing equilibrium of forces.

We call upon the leaders of the United States of America to approach the forthcoming negotiations seriously and in good faith. We call upon them to get rid of the senseless hopes for military superiority over the Soviet Union, for conducting negotiations with us from "positions of strength." We call upon them to renounce attempts at imposing such an agreement on us that will unilaterally bind the hands of the Soviet Union in strengthening its defenses, while throwing the doors wide open for the realization of record-high military programs drafted by Washington.

Such attempts bear absolutely no promise, yet they can undermine the possibility of agreement, which the peoples of our countries and all peoples are looking forward to, wishing lasting peace and a tranquil, happy life.

Comrades, the 40th year since victory prompts all of us to look once again both at our wartime experiences, at what was after the war, and the prospects, which are opening to the world today.

The countries of the coalition which defeated fascism belonged to different social systems. Yet they became allies. Their leaders succeeded in jointly outlining the fundamentals of the postwar arrangement. These fundamentals are recorded in the documents of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Their main essence remains topical today as well: It is to translate into practice mankind's greatest desire--lasting peace. A way towards that was also charted--to preserve the unity of aims and actions, which made it possible to defeat Nazism and deliver the peoples from enslavement by the Hitlerites.

Some people might say that this could have happened only because there was war, that Hitlerism was seen as a universal danger. This is true. But in this day, too, mankind, all peoples, have a common deadly enemy--the threat of a world nuclear catastrophe.

Take the events of the past decade. The leaders of the states of East and West were able, despite the serious differences dividing them, to display the necessary determination and understanding of the demands of the times. They made major strides towards lasting peace. A solid fabric of mutually beneficial cooperation began emerging, and long-term principles of peaceful mutual relations were outlined by joint effort.

We find these principles in the document, which put on record the fundamentals of relations between the USSR and the United States, in the agreement between them on preventing nuclear war. They were also mirrored in the treaties of the socialist countries with the FRG, which sealed the postwar realities in Europe. They, finally, won collective approval and were further developed in the Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki.

Now history poses even more urgently the question of mankind's future. Courage and foresight in statesmen have become even more indispensable. I have already had occasion to speak of the enormous significance that a binding agreement between the nuclear powers could have, an agreement to observe certain norms in their mutual relations so as to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. Our proposal on this score remains in effect.

We also believe that in celebrating the 40th anniversary since the end of the most terrible and destructive of wars, the leaders of the USSR and the United States could jointly reaffirm, in a form suitable to both countries, the essence and spirit of the main commitments undertaken by both countries at the end of the war and in the agreements of the seventies. They could declare their intention to act further in their foreign policy in the spirit of these commitments. This would certainly help toward strengthening mutual trust and toward a general improvement of the world situation. I am confident that such a joint act would win the support of all peaceable states and of all peoples.

Gromyko Hits U.S. Attitude

PM191734 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 85 First Edition p 2

[TASS report on 19 February Kaliningrad meeting between A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, and Kaliningradskiy Electoral Okrug voters: "Under the Banner of Peace and Friendship Among the Peoples"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet people warmly support and approve the domestic and foreign policy of the Communist Party and Soviet state and are striving to fittingly greet the 27th CPSU Congress with labor achievements. This was stressed at a 19 February meeting in Kaliningrad, Moscow Oblast, between Kaliningradskiy Electoral Okrug voters and their RSFSR Supreme Soviet candidate deputy Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister. The meeting was opened by Kaliningrad Gorkom First Secretary Yu. N. Drozdov.

A. A. Gromyko, who was warmly greeted by those present, delivered a speech. He said: I attribute the high trust placed in me to the glorious party of Lenin, the organizer and inspirer of all our successes. The authority and respect which our Communist Party and its Central Committee and Politburo enjoy among Soviet people are great. It is perfectly understandable that the people are nominating as their first candidate K. U. Chernenko, that outstanding figure of the party and state and the international communist and workers movement. He places all his experience and knowledge at the service of our motherland. Major actions concerned with developing and strengthening our country as well as broad initiatives aimed at eliminating the threat of war and strengthening peace on earth are linked with his name.

In their international activity, the CPSU and the Soviet state are invariably guided by our people's unanimous mandate: to strengthen the foundations of universal peace, the candidate deputy went on to say. We hold firmly in our hands the banner which was hoisted over revolutionary Petrograd in October 1917, the banner of peace and friendship between peoples.

The socialist community states act harmoniously and dynamically in the international arena, united by the unity of their world outlook and their common goals and ideals in the struggle for peace and socialism. The alliance in which these states are united augments the effectiveness of their foreign policy. Its foundation is, like a monolith, firm and unbreakable.

In the exacerbated international situation that has taken shape over the last few years, the peoples in the world can clearly see how great a role is being played by the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community in upholding man's supreme right: the right to life. Socialism's peace-loving foreign policy inspires them with hope that a nuclear catastrophe will not befall mankind.

The great and unflagging efforts by our party and state are now focused on ensuring the improvement of the political climate in the world and attaining a turning point for the better in international affairs. Millions of people on all continents are awaiting this turning point and are struggling for it. Today there is a clear-cut watershed between those who believe in human reason and those among whom everything is overshadowed by imperial ambitions and bellicose anticommunism.

One cannot describe as anything but reckless the calculation, made by certain U.S. circles in their policy, of attaining military superiority so as to impose their will upon others. The experience of history offers irrefutable evidence that "peace on the basis of strength"--and this is precisely the proclaimed goal of this course--is a worthless and dangerous policy. Furthermore, it is hopeless for its makers.

Our country and its allies resolutely oppose this line in world affairs. We have been rebuffing and will continue to firmly rebuff any attempts to pressure us.

The United States' overtly militant course has generated concern even among its NATO partners. At times they--although not all of them--frankly express their dissatisfaction with the adventurous ways of U.S. policy. The feeling of concern has also increased among the population in Western countries, where the wave of antiwar movement has risen, and has not bypassed the United States, either.

Of course, our peace policy and our specific proposals aimed at eliminating the threat of war have exerted and continue to exert a great influence on positive trends in the international situation. The truth about what the Soviet Union advocates in the world arena and what it persistently calls on other states to do, does get through to the people's masses even in NATO countries.

Washington could not fail to take all this into account. It eventually did come to the conclusion that it is necessary to get down to the talks proposed by the Soviet Union. Hard as it was for it, the American side was forced to agree with our viewpoint regarding the subject and objectives of the talks and with the need to comprehensively examine questions at these talks in their organic interrelationship.

Our evaluation of the Geneva accord is well known. The United States and its allies must know that this accord must be fulfilled honestly and seriously.

"A positive outcome in the new Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons," K. U. Chernenko stresses, "would have a beneficial impact on the situation in the world and would be a major step on the road of resolving the cardinal problems of the day."

The CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo continue to be convinced that there are no international questions which could not be settled at the negotiating table. We have repeatedly reminded the United States and the other NATO countries that the highest goal of all states and governments must be the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The voice of our country sounded the alarm when nuclear weapons made their appearance on earth.

There would be no danger now had the United States adopted the proposal submitted by the USSR back in 1946 on banning nuclear weapons for all time. And nobody can whitewash the policy of those who rejected that proposal.

Today our country is warning about the new threat to mankind at the top of its voice. This threat includes the plan to militarize space put forward by Washington. Soviet people are informed about the aggressive essence of this plan. It sharply increased the threat of nuclear war. That is why we are posing in such acute terms the question of preventing the militarization of space.

Any attempts to mask the meaning behind this plan by labeling it "defensive" must not delude anybody. The Soviet Union has bluntly warned the U.S. administration that the implementation of its schemes regarding space would mean that there could be no question of reducing, let along eliminating, nuclear weapons. Moreover, this would open the floodgates for a further arms race in all its aspects and would shake international security.

The reality of the present situation is that military-strategic parity, that is, approximate equality of forces, exists between the USSR and the United States.

Our country does not strive for military predominance, but we will not allow the existing parity to the altered to the detriment of our security.

Reliably safeguarding the security of each side is only possible by reaching agreements that are mutually acceptable and based on the principle of equality and identical security.

Washington goes to great lengths to prove that the arms buildup and the colossal budget requests for military purposes are creating better conditions for talks. According to that logic, the higher the mountains of weapons, the simpler it should be to agree on reducing them.

The falsity of such arguments is glaringly obvious. This line is, in reality, aimed precisely at undermining the chances for success at the talks. The peoples and, of course, the American people, must know that.

To deceive one's partner and public opinion--K. U. Chernenko stresses that we cannot agree with that kind of morality--should not be the goal of the talks, but rather to seek accords which would correspond to the interests of peace. The possibility of reaching such accords must not be wasted.

We are told that a lot of time is spent doing just that, and that a long and difficult road lies ahead. Yes, we view the existing difficulties realistically. Everything will depend on the presence on both sides of the desire, political will, and readiness to reach agreement on the basis of sensible compromise. The Soviet Union has all this.

The question is how the U.S. side will behave. If it does not create artificial difficulties in the talks and shows the necessary restraint in its actions, positive results may be achieved. I think everyone realizes that if reaching an agreement is made the goal, at the very least nothing should be done to prevent that goal from being achieved.

What is currently happening in Washington? Every day there are statements one after the other from ranking statesmen that the U.S. stance at the forthcoming talks with the Soviet Union must be firm and unyielding. The importance of using space for military purposes is being particularly stressed. This is the most militaristic of the doctrines that have emerged from Washington.

They state bluntly that all the U.S. representatives at the Geneva talks have to do is to simply give explanations of their space plans. They are saying beforehand that there is no intention of amending these plans. However, the U.S. leadership knows full well that this position is a blind alley. If the United States defends such a position at the talks, it will take all the blame for the consequences.

[MoscowLENINSKOYE ZNAMYA in Russian 20 February 1985 publishes on pages 1 and 2 a version of Gromyko's speech which varies from the PRAVDA version by adding at this point: "Both powers--the Soviet Union and the United States--must be fully aware of the tremendous responsibility they carry. This is the responsibility for the resolution of the most urgent problems of the modern world, problems connected with ending the arms race and with real disarmament, up to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

"The frivolous attitude with which certain U.S. circles are approaching the talks which are soon to begin merits stern condemnation from all states which occupy positions of peace and call for a positive outcome of the talks."]

As for the statements you are hearing from Washington just now to the effect that the Soviet Union will not be able to keep pace with the United States with its plans to militarize space, there is more than enough arrogance in these allegations.

Proceeding from the interests of peace, that is, the supreme interests of all mankind, our country proposes: Let's agree immediately to eliminate the very possibility of weapons appearing in space once and for all. The goal, common to all humanity, of preserving life on earth requires that the USSR and the United States compete in word and deed in only one respect--in putting forward initiatives and taking specific steps aimed at resolving this historic task.

We are sure that the American people are no less interested than all other peoples in its solution.

We are in favor of putting the talks on space and nuclear arms on the correct path from the outset and of creating favorable atmosphere for them. I shall cite the priority steps which could be undertaken on this plane.

The question of renouncing first use of nuclear weapons. As is known, the Soviet Union has made an undertaking on this score. Washington, however, has declared that it will not follow our country's example. How does the United States look in the light of the fact that the United Nations has adopted a decision declaring the unleashing of nuclear war to be a criminal act? On this question of exceptional importance, the United States is challenging all mankind and running counter to mankind's clearly expressed will.

We have frequently urged the U.S. side to resume and carry through to a conclusion talks on the complete cessation of nuclear weapons tests. However, Washington does not conceal the fact that it will continue tests in order to create new types of these weapons and enhance their lethal power. It constantly seems to Washington that it has not stockpiled sufficient nuclear munitions and that its destructive potential is still too small.

What can we say to these people? Let them put an ear to the ground. It is literally groaning under the weight of armaments, yet they still continue to pile up these armaments.

There is perhaps no issue in the world today on which there is such a broad and general agreement as the issue of the need for an immediate nuclear arms freeze.

This requirement is dictated not only by understandable human emotions. It reflects people's understanding of the fact that the existence of approximate parity with respect to nuclear armaments enables the sides to embark on a freeze without detriment to their security. It is also obvious that we cannot advance toward lowering nuclear arms levels without first stopping and without ceasing the stockpiling of them.

The Soviet Union is in favor of doing this. And at any moment, even tomorrow. We cannot fail to emphasize the importance of the socialist countries' joint initiative on concluding a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military forces between the Warsaw Pact and NATO states. Its implementation would lead to substantial positive changes in the international political atmosphere.

This and a number of other major proposals from the socialist community states have been submitted for discussion by the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament. We want the work of the Stockholm forum to be productive and to be crowned with success.

In connection with the state of affairs in Europe, we cannot fail to single out one aspect in particular. The Soviet Union will not overlook the fact that forces that to this day have not renounced hopes of revising the European borders as they took shape after World War II are raising their heads in some places. The revanchists are emboldened by the protective pat on the back they are receiving from the official circles of some Western countries which are issuing statements from there which clearly reveal their desire to cast doubt on the pledges made by the members of the anti-Hitler coalition.

However, postwar realities were engendered as a result of the great victory over fascism.

They were enshrined in the agreements between the allies concerning the postwar setup, in bilateral treaties between a number of states, and in the Helsinki Final Act. Adherence to all this constitutes a guarantee for tranquillity and security in Europe.

No one has a right to encroach upon the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, which for 4 decades now have formed the foundation of European and world peace. The peoples paid a high price for these agreements. Struggling resolutely so that the conflagration of a world war may never again flare up is the essence of the pledges made by the victor-states. The Soviet Union is loyal to its sworn promise and reaffirms this today when all mankind and all who truly value the interests of peace are preparing to mark the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II.

If one is to briefly describe our common approach to the conduct of international affairs, then we, together with the other socialist countries, advocate the kind of legal order in the world whereby the people of each country, great or small, may independently determine their own destiny. We resolutely condemn the policy of diktat, the policy of state terrorism with respect to another people or another country, be it Nicaragua, Cuba, Afghanistan, Lebanon, or Namibia.

The peoples will never reconcile themselves to the tyranny perpetrated by imperialism. The activity of the Nonaligned Movement confirms this, as do the stances it takes on questions of war and peace and the development of equitable international cooperation. The Soviet Union highly values the role of this movement in the contemporary world. Our country, aware of its historic responsibility, is invariably in the vanguard of the forces of peace, democracy, and social progress. Its policy is permeated by genuine humanism and concern for mankind's present and future.

"We are prepared," stressed K. U. Chernenko, "to honestly and constructively cooperate with all who truly desire that the future development of world affairs should proceed not via new stages of nuclear competition, but via the strengthening of peace and security, detente, and trust."

Our achievements both in the domestic and international spheres are inseparably bound up with the party of Lenin, the party of Communists. The trust of Soviet people in the party is boundless, for the CPSU has no other interests than the interests of the people. The unity of the party and people, which is strengthening day by day, is an inexhaustible source of the Soviet state's might and of its influence in the world.

In conclusion, A. A. Gromyko once again offered thanks for the high trust [placed in him] and gave assurances that he would not spare his efforts to justify this trust.

TASS Report on Gromyko Speech

LD191537 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 19 Feb 85

["Andrey Gromyko: Responsibility for the Destinies of the World"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Feb (TASS)—"The CPSU Central Committee and the Political Bureau are convinced, as before, that there are no international problems that it would be impossible to settle at the negotiating table," stated Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, who stands for election to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, addressing the electorate of the city of Kaliningrad near Moscow today.

"We have reminded the United States of America and other NATO countries more than once that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons should become the highest goal of all states of the world, of all governments," he said.

"Our country has rung the tocsin since the emergence of nuclear weapons. The danger existing today would not exist if the United States had agreed to a proposal, tabled by the USSR as far back as 1946, for banning nuclear weapons once and for all. And nobody can whitewash the policy of those who have declined that proposal."

"Today our country warns at the top of its voice about a new threat to humanity. It flows from a plan for militarizing outer space, which has been put forward by Washington."

Andrey Gromyko pointed out that "the Soviet people are informed about the aggressive substance of the mentioned plan. It dramatically heightens the threat of nuclear war. That is why we raise with such urgency the question of preventing militarization of outer space.

Any efforts to camouflage the substance of that plan, by sticking labels with the inscription "defensive" to it, must not mislead anyone.

The Soviet Union candidly warned the U.S. Administration: Realization of its design with respect to space would mean that any reduction, to say nothing of elimination of nuclear weapons, would be out of the question. Moreover, that would open the gates for the further race in arms in all directions and would undermine international security."

"Here everything will depend on whether the sides have the desire, political will and readiness to reach agreement on the basis of a reasonable compromise. The Soviet Union possesses all this."

The question is how the American side will behave itself. If it does not create artificial complexities in the negotiations and if it displays the necessary restraint in its actions it will be possible to achieve positive results.

Tikhonov Speech

PM221224 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report on 21 February Moscow meeting between N. A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of hte USSR Council of Ministers, and voters of Moscow's Frunzenskiy Electoral Okrug: "Triumph of Soviet Democracy"]

[Excerpts] The current election campaign is taking place in an atmosphere of lofty political and labor upsurge by Soviet people, who are persistently implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent party Central Committee plenums and are preparing to fittingly welcome the 40th anniversary of victory in the Great Patriotic War and the scheduled party congress.

This was noted 21 February at a Moscow meeting, held in the USSR Bolshoy Theater, of working people from the capital's Frunzenskiy Electoral Okrug with RSFSR Supreme Soviet candidate deputy Nikolay Aleksandrovich Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Those assembled warmly welcomed N. A. Tikhonov, who delivered a speech.

Comrade N. A. Tikhonov's Speech

The candidate deputy then dwelt on international questions. The main one--the question of questions, one might say--is the task of preserving peace and removing the threat of a nuclear missile war. That is why the party and

government persistently seek ways of resolving this task. It is these goals that are served by important USSR initiatives such as the adoption of the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and our proposals on establishing norms of relations between the nuclear powers, mutually renouncing the use of military force, freezing nuclear arsenals and reducing them, and preventing the militarization of space. It is hard to cite any important international problem on which the USSR has not come out with specific, just, and realistic proposals. The Soviet Union does not need the arms race; it is alien to the very nature of socialism, whose ideal is peace. We are the most consistent advocates of resolutely curbing the arms race, which has become an immense threat to peace and a heavy burden for the entire world economy. We favor general and complete disarmament. This would make it possible to channel gigantic funds into the resolution of general human problems, into eliminating the hunger and poverty of hundreds of millions of people in the nonsocialist part of the world, developing production forces, education, and health care, conserving nature, and other good deeds.

However, we are not utopians. While a military threat exists in the world, we have to cherish the security of our country and its allies and friends like the apple of our eye.

The Soviet Union will never allow anyone to achieve military superiority over it. At the same time, we are always ready to seek solutions of international problems by peaceful means, through talks. Our chief demand here is for strict observance of the principle of equality and identical security.

The party and government will continue to do everything necessary to defend our people's peaceful creative labor and strengthen the country's defense capability. Our glorious Armed Forces have and always will have everything necessary to defend the motherland. Soviet people need have no doubts on that score!

The socialist community and its mighty economic and defense potential are the main barriers in the way of imperialism's aggressive aspirations. The cause of preserving peace is faithfully served by the Warsaw Pact organizations, whose 30th anniversary we will be celebrating immediately after the victory holiday.

The lessons of history show that it is necessary to struggle against war before it begins, and this is particularly urgent now that the international situation has been seriously complicated through the fault of imperialism.

The United States has launched an unprecedented arms race on earth, at sea, and in the air, and now intends to start one in space, too. The militarization of space is a most dangerous adventure. If it is not reliably blocked, everything that it has been possible to achieve so far in the sphere of strategic arms limitation will be nullified and the world will be on the brink of nuclear catastrophe. Conversely, the nonmilitarization of space will make nuclear disarmament--which all people on earth are waiting for--substantially easier.

Our position is realistic and fully accords with the interests of peace. This is the position we are taking into the new talks with the United States on the whole complex of questions of nuclear and space arms, which are soon to start in Geneva. We are ready for the most radical solutions. The ball is in the U.S. court. We are profoundly convinced that detente will be reborn, that there is no sensible alternative to it. We are optimists and profoundly believe in the triumph of reason and that the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems will be the fundamental basis for relations between them. This policy alone can ensure mankind's salvation from the nuclear threat; it alone can guarantee lasting peace and mankind's paramount right--the right to life!

Gorbachev Speech

PM201728 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 85 First Edition p 2

[TASS report on 20 February Moscow meeting between M. S. Gorbachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Kiyevskiy Electoral Okrug voters: "Following the Course of Unity and Cohesion"]

[Excerpts] The election campaign in our country is taking place in an atmosphere of great labor and political activeness. It graphically demonstrates the unbreakable unity of the party and people and the firm determination of Soviet people to strengthen the motherland's economic and defense might through selfless labor. This was discussed at a 20 February meeting of Kiyevskiy Electoral Okrug voters with RSFSR Supreme Soviet condidtate [as printed] deputy Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Presidium included Comrades M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin, Ye. K. Ligachev, and N. I. Ryzhkov, leading production workers, party and soviet officials, scientists, and representatives of the public. The meeting was opened by Kiyevskiy Raykom First Secretary A. V. Korovitsyn.

M. S. Gorbachev, who was warmly greeted by those present, delivered a speech. More than 60 years ago in his famous speech "What Is Soviet Power," Vladimir Ilich Lenin spoke words whose significance is still great even today: "Soviet power is the path to socialism which has been found by the working masses and it is therefore correct and therefore invincible."

Describing the international situation, the candidate deputy noted that the past 4 decades without a world war are the result of major positive shifts in favor of socialism, freedom, democracy, and peace in the world arena and are to be historic credit of Soviet foreign policy and all peace-loving forces on earth.

The Soviet Union, the socialist community, and the international communist and workers movement are making a decisive contribution to the cause of maintaining peace. All the large-scale initiatives aimed at removing the threat of war, expanding international cooperation, and ending the arms race have proceeded and continue to proceed from them.

The Washington policy of confrontation clearly reveals the source of the war threat. It is being rejected increasingly actively by the peace-loving peoples as an alien and dangerous phenomenon. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko has stressed, "People are not just aware of the drama of our time, they realize increasingly clearly where the watershed lies between the two main political courses--the policy of peace and the line of preparing for war." This inspires a sense of confidence and strengthens the conviction that mankind will succeed in curbing militarism.

Today the world's peoples are showing enormous interest in the forthcoming Geneva talks in the entire range of space and nuclear arms. The Soviet Union is going into the talks with a sincere desire to achieve concrete results. Unfortunately, this cannot be said of the Washington administration's approach. On the eve of the talks, the United States has embarked on activity which sows doubts as to the American side's real intentions in agreeing to hold the Geneva talks. What can we say about this? One thing only: Calculations of this kind are mistaken. Indeed its very approach is unacceptable if there is seriously to be any question of reaching agreements. The world public expects Washington to take a constructive attitude toward the talks on unswerving observance of the principle of equality and identical security.

While attaching great significance to the normalization of relations with the United States and to honest talks with it on all the topical problems of international life, at the same time, we never forget for a minute that the world is not limited to that country alone, but is a much bigger place. The Soviet Union has and does devote great and constant attention to its relations with all states that want peace and equal, mutually advantageous cooperation.

Discussing the problem of European detente, the speaker stressed that Soviet people believe in the good sense of West Europeans and in their interest in preventing Europe, our common home, from being turned into a theater of military actions and a firing range for testing Pentagon doctrines of "limited" nuclear war. We are pleased to note the desire of many West European states for political dialogue. For its part, the USSR has been and remains attached to the policy of good-neighborly relations among all European states.

Romanov: 'Rebuff to Imperialism'

Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 85 pp 1-2

[Unattributed item: "The Speech of Comrade G. V. Romanov"]

[Excerpt] We must emphasize, comrades, that we have had and have to today to solve our large-scale tasks of internal development in an extraordinarily complex and dangerous international situation. The cause of this increasing difficulty is well known: imperialism, above all American imperialism, has attempted to stop the process of social development and of national and social liberation of the peoples.

The most reactionary and adventurist circles in the West have raised an even worse threat: they have decided to establish imperialist authority all over the world. Since the second half of the 1970's, that is for almost 10 years, we have seen desperate attempts by imperialism to change in its own favor the military-strategic parity which has emerged and to achieve military superiority over socialism.

In the dreams of imperialist strategists, the success of their attack on real socialism and its "neutralization" would give them the ability to decide with impunity the fates of the peoples of the world. All this, in conditions of an accelerating arms race and of the working out of the most evil aggressive plans, has increased international tension and led mankind to the brink of thermonuclear catastrophe.

And if the worst, the irreparable, has not happened, this is only thanks to our great Motherland, to our party and to the countries of the socialist commonwealth. (Applause) The CPSU, the Soviet state and our friends and allies have taken the only correct decision: to give a resolute rebuff to imperialism's aggressive pretensions and at the same time to actively seek the complete normalization of international relations.

Recent years have shown that the consistent and firm application of this care carefully-considered line will produce tangible results. The main result is that the violent [silovaya] attack against the socialist commonwealth has stopped. Decisive measures by the Soviet Union and the socialist states have brought to naught the attempts by the United States and NATO to change the military balance in their favor. (Applause)

The positions of our countries on the world stage have not only not been weakened. We have gone forward and are continuing to go forward in all directions.

In these conditions the United States has been faced with the necessity to adjust to the situation created by the results of past years and to accept the Soviet Union's proposal to conduct new negotiations on the entire complex of questions dealing with nuclear and space armaments.

The Soviet Union is ready for the most radical solutions of these problems. Our goal is to stop the arms race in space, to end it on earth and to limit and cut back nuclear armaments, in the final analysis to ban and liquidate nuclear weapons completely and everywhere.

However, the outcome of the upcoming negotiations depends entirely on how responsibly and constructively the United States of America approaches them. We are facing a difficult struggle for a real change for the better in the international situation. And in the interests of all mankind the Soviet Union is ready, as always, to show good will.

We are a few months away from the fortieth anniversary of the victorious conclusion of the Soviet people's Great Patriotic War against Hitlerite fascism. The results of the struggle with what was then imperialism's shock force are a severe warning to those who seek world domination today.

Grishin: 'Agreement Possible'

Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Feb 85 pp 1-2

[Unattributed item: "Comrade V. V. Grishin's Speech to the Voters' Meeting in the Veshnyakovskiy Electoral Okrug"]

[Excerpt] Historical experience teaches that we must fight against war until it begins. That is precisely what the USSR and the other countries of the socialist commonwealth have declared. The USSR's businesslike, concrete proposals make up a realistic program for delivering all the peoples of the world and all mankind from the threat of nuclear war. Not armaments or an "arms buildup" ["dovooruzheniye"] but honest, businesslike negotiations and agreements on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security--this is the only real path to peace.

The peace-loving course of the Soviet Union is directed to solving the urgent task of our times--preventing the militarization of space, stopping the arms race, and reducing and then completely eliminating nuclear weapons from the arsenal of armaments. This is a task of historic size. A definite step toward its solution has been made on the initiative of the Soviet Union. At the meeting in Geneva of Comrade A. A. Gromyko, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, as is known, agreement was reached relating to the subject and goals of Soviet-American negotiations on questions of space and nuclear armaments which will be jointly considered and solved.

The attainment of an agreement to prevent the militarization of space has great significance. It would also open up more favorable perspectives in questions of the reduction of strategic and other armaments. As the Soviet leadership has already more than once declared, the Soviet Union would be ready to sharply reduce them. Needless to say, this is only if the fundamental principle of equality and equal security is upheld.

All the peoples of the world are vitally interested in this. Agreement is completely possible. Only the desire and the will are needed. The Soviet Union has these and is ready to meet the United States halfway [proyti svoyu chast' puti]. It is now up to the United States. This is the principled and constructive approach of the Soviet Union to the Soviet-American negotiations which will begin 12 March in Geneva.

Ponomarev Stresses Space Arms

PM081115 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 85 First Edition p 2

[TASS report on 7 February Saratov meeting between B. N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and voters of Zavodskoy Electoral Okrug: "For the Sake of the People, for the Sake of Peace"]

[Excerpts] The peace-loving course of the Soviet Union is aimed at resolving an urgent task of our times--averting the threat of war, ending the arms race, preventing the militarization of space, and limiting, reducing, and subsequently

totally excluding nuclear weapons from arms arsenals. The USSR's stance, imbued with concern for safeguarding and strengthening peace all over the world, is clear and understandable to the people and accords with their innermost aspirations and vital interests.

Fervent approval and unanimous support for the wise Leninist domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state were expressed in Saratov 7 February by the participants at a meeting of Zavodskoy Electoral Okrug voters in RSFSR Supreme Soviet candidate deputy Boris Nikolayevich Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

B. N. Ponomarev, who was warmly welcomed by those assembled, addressed the meeting. He conveyed to working people of Saratov and the oblast cordial greetings and wishes for good health, happiness, and new labor achievements from K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The Soviet Union is conducting a historic battle for world peace, and this corresponds to the interests of all the world's peoples. The USSR expresses its defense of peace in specific, businesslike proposals strictly observing the principle of equality and identical security.

The Soviet commitment to non-first-use of nuclear weapons has received a high assessment and recognition from peace-loving forces. The Soviet Union resolutely opposes the militarization of space. Wide support is enjoyed by these and other Soviet initiatives: a freeze on nuclear arsenals, a total ban on nuclear tests, establishing norms of behavior for the nuclear powers--in short, our steps aimed against the arms race. The world public welcomes the fundamental proposals submitted by the Soviet Union at Stockholm for a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and support for relations of peace.

The USSR has approached the question of Soviet-U.S. talks with great responsibility. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo has stated the importance of the accord reached between A. A. Gromyko and G. Shultz regarding the subject matter and goals of the talks on space and nuclear arms issues, which will be examined as an interrelated whole.

If the Soviet Union opposes the militarization of space it is not because it is incapable of responding to the U.S. military's schemes. "If we are forced to," Comrade K. U. Chernenko notes, "we will do everything, as we repeatedly have done in the past, to safeguard our security and the security of our allies and friends."

Now the U.S. Administration endlessly reiterates that the militarization of space is meant to serve the "defense of the United States."

It also wants to present scientific research work in this sphere as "inoffensive." All this is one big lie, and an extremely crafty one to boot. It is meant to conceal Washington's scheme of using space for an unchecked arms race and winning domination of mankind.

But this policy is encountering increasingly great opposition from the world's peoples. Workers and peasants, scientists and cultural figures are angrily protesting the U.S. policy of militarizing space. The dangers of the "star wars" program are being pointed out by many eminent U.S. politicians.

The part of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement that says that the goal of the forthcoming Geneva talks will be the development of effective accords aimed at halting and ending the arms race, which must ultimately lead to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons forever, is of fundamental importance. This is a serious commitment. It provides a new basis for the extensive antiwar forces, and all those who do not want a nuclear catastrophe, to demand its strict fulfillment from the United States. If the aforesaid commitment is not implemented--it will show all mankind that the U.S. Administration is indeed opposed to reductions of all arms.

The Soviet Union firmly advocates strict observance of what was achieved in Geneva. Following routes leading to the ending of the arms race and the exclusion altogether of aggressive wars from mankind's life, the USSR is prepared for the most radical solutions.

In the present situation it is very important to disseminate the truth about the position of the USSR and the United States and the essence of the United States and NATO program for the militarization of space and the arms race as a whole. This truth incites the masses to campaign against the sinister imperialist plans and promotes the spread of the antiwar movement.

The pooling of the selfless struggle of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community with the struggle of all peace-loving forces serves to resolve the tasks of preventing a nuclear war. Imperialism cannot fail to take account of the antiwar movement. It has acquired great moral and political force and its influence is rising steadily.

Communists were present at the birth of the peace movement and today they are the most persistent in defending the cause of peace. They have an essential role to play in spreading the mass antiwar movement and the campaign against the siting of U.S. missiles in Europe and against the militarization of peace. Communist parties are now struggling not only to destroy exploitation but also to save life itself on earth.

Many prestigious statesmen in the nonsocialist world are increasingly actively launching constructive initiatives, too. A vivid example of that is the joint antiwar declaration of the leaders of the six states from the four continents: Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden. Their declaration--yet more important evidence of the prestige of forces advocating peace--demands that the advocates of the arms race listen to the voice of the people.

In 3 months' time, B. N. Ponomarev went on to say, we will be celebrating the 40th anniversary of the great victory. This was one of the decisive turning points in 20th century history. However, in the West, statements such as "would it not be better to ignore this date, since it gives the 'advantage' to the Soviet Union?" are not uncommon.

Yes, the Soviet Union has every reason to be proud that during the war we opposed and routed the enemy which perfidiously attacked us.

Just as the sun cannot be blotted out with the palm of the hand, so it is impossible to ignore the great truth that the decisive contribution to the victory over the Hitlerite coalition, to the liberation of the peoples from fascist servitude, and to the saving of world civilization, was made by the Soviet people who, under the leadership of the Communist Party, defended the socialist motherland's freedom and independence, upheld the cause of October, and saved mankind from barbaric fascist dominion.

The lessons of the Great Patriotic War have a continuing importance. And the main lesson is that we must struggle against war before it starts.

That means increasing activeness in the struggle for peace and removing the threat of war. It means strengthening the might of the land of the soviets and the socialist community, which are making a decisive contribution to the cause of the defense of peace and the peoples' security. It means being vigilant and ready to rebuff any aggressor and to strengthen our glorious armed forces.

The peaceful future of our country and mankind as a whole depends on the results of Soviet people's labor.

In conclusion, the candidate deputy stressed that, true to the Leninist peace policy, the CPSU will continue to do everything to ensure peace and prosperity for the Soviet people.

Rusakov Speech

PM061415 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 85 First Edition p 2

[TASS report on 5 February Rostov meeting between K. V. Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug voters: "In the Interests of Peace and Socialism"]

[Excerpts] On 5 February voters of Rostov-na-Donu's Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug met with RSFSR Supreme Soviet candidate deputy Konstantin Viktorovich Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The meeting was opened by M. I. Ivanov, first secretary of the Proletarskiy CPSU Raykom. Those present enthusiastically elected an honorary presidium consisting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade K. U. Chernenko.

Next to speak was K. V. Rusakov, who was warmly greeted by those present. After cordially thanking the working peoples' collectives and all the voters of the Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug for the honor they had accorded him in nominating him as their RSFSR Supreme Soviet candidate deputy, he stressed that above all, he sees this as a manifestation of the Soviet people's profound confidence in the Leninist Communist Party.

Socialism and peace are inseparable. This is shown by the peace program proposed by our party and by the extensive range of peace initiatives presented to the United Nations by the USSR and contained in the documents of Warsaw Pact states, especially the Political Declaration adopted at the Prague conference. The peoples of the socialist countries would like nothing more than to limit the buildup of military arsenals and to resolutely set about reducing them until they are completely eliminated.

Speaking about the Soviet-American talks on a range of questions concerning space armaments and strategic and medium-range nuclear armaments, which begin in March, the candidate deputy stressed that in its approach to these talks, the Soviet Union speaks not just for itself, but for its allies. The fraternal socialist states' security interests must be just as well protected as our own country's security interests.

Vorotnikov Remarks on Foreign Policy

LD091229 Moscow TASS in English 1224 GMT 9 Feb 85

["Vitaliy Vorotnikov's Speech at a Meeting With Electors"--TASS headline]

[Excerpt] Volgograd, 9 Feb (TASS)--"A consistent peaceful course steered by the Soviet Union, the countries of the socialist community underlied by their high economic and defense potential has made it possible to ensure four decades of peace on the European Continent, to prevent the unleashing of a world war, to thwart many an aggressive plan of imperialists." This was stated today by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, who is running for the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. He spoke here today before the electorate.

The policy of peaceful coexistence of state irrespective of their social system has taken deep roots and received broadest backing of peoples, the speaker stressed. It manifests its vigor and viability at the present moment when actions of imperialism, U.S. imperialism, above all, seriously complicated the international situation.

In the existing conditions, Vitaliy Vorotnikov said, the Soviet Union is working with even greater energy toward the adoption of effective measures capable of preventing a disastrous course of events. Soviet initiatives meet with support on the part of broad circles of the progressive international public, all those who are sincerely interested in preserving and consolidating peace.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the forthcoming negotiations with the United States on the entire complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms. Our approach to these negotiations is fair and businesslike. We are prepared, and we like to hope, the speaker went on to say, that the partners in the negotiations will duly appraise our position and display political realism.

"One can hardly assume," Vitaliy Vorotnikov said, "that Soviet-U.S. negotiations will be easy. But it would be fair to expect those who wish their successful completion to strive for creating a felicitous atmosphere in the negotiations.

"We have done much to that end. Why shouldn't the United States follow the example of the Soviet Union and renounce first use of nuclear weapons, announce a freeze on its nuclear arsenal and agree to a complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests? All this would improve the conditions for the negotiations immensely."

Shcherbitskiy Speech

PM131510 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Feb 85 First Edition p 2

[TASS report on 12 February Kneprodzerzhinsky meeting between V. V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and voters of Bagleyskiy Electoral Okrug: "Every Effort To Serve the Party and the People"]

[Excerpts] Great political enthusiasm and an intense labor rhythm reign in the labor collectives of industrial Dneprodzerzhinsk. Metallurgists, chemical industry workers, construction workers, and workers in transportation and other sectors are multiplying their efforts to fittingly welcome the day of the republican supreme soviet and local soviet elections. This was said 12 February by participants in the meeting in Dneprodzerzhinsk of the voters of Dnepropetrovsk Oblast's Bagleyskiy Electoral Okrug with Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet candidate deputy Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy, who was warmly welcomed by those present, delivered a speech. After expressing gratitude for the great honor and trust extended to him--the nomination as Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet candidate deputy--he noted that the Communist Party has no loftier goal than to selflessly serve the people's interests and show tireless concern for their good and happiness. The forthcoming elections will be graphic new confirmation of the monolithic nature of the unbreakable bloc of communists and nonparty people and of Soviet people's close cohesion around the CPSU and its Central Committee.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy dwelt on certain topical questions of the international situation. The Soviet Union operates in a single formation with the fraternal socialist countries in the world arena, and, increasingly, broad masses are coming to realize that socialism is the mainstream of social progress. Imperialist reaction is incapable of seriously slowing, much less stopping, socialism, but the deeper the general crisis of capitalism becomes and the more entangled it becomes in its contradictions, the more desperate and adventurist are the measures to which it may resort.

The maintenance of peace and, above all, the prevention of nuclear war are a task of significance for truly all of mankind. History has entrusted socialism with the difficult and responsible mission of averting the threat of nuclear war hanging over mankind. That is increasingly understood by the world's peoples, which is why the Leninist peace-loving foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state has won profound respect from all progressive mankind. The meaning of our state's peace initiatives is understood by and close to every sober-minded person and corresponds to the aspirations of all the peoples.

In his replies to questions from a correspondent of the CNN TV company, Comrade K. U. Chernenko pointed out that success at the forthcoming new Soviet-U.S. talks requires the presence on each side of goodwill, a readiness for sensible compromises, and strict observance of the principle of equality and identical security. I would like to hope that the United States will show realism, act in precisely this way, and join the Soviet Union in the search for effective solutions aimed at strengthening world peace.

History has repeatedly confirmed and continues to confirm that attempts to talk to our country in the language of moralizing and threats and from a position of strength are an absolutely hopeless venture. Nobody will succeed in shaking the Soviet people's close moral and political unity, their monolithic cohesion around the Leninist party, and their devotion to communist ideals. We are confident of the rightness of our cause, sure of our strengths, and capable of reliably defending our land, our system, and our way of life--and we are doing so effectively.

CSO: 5200/1011

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

L'HUMANITE INTERVIEWS SOLOMENTSEV ON UPCOMING TALKS

PM251531 Paris L'HUMANITE in French 22 Feb 85 p 7

[Interview with CPSU Politburo member Mikhail Solomentsev by Jean George in Paris--date not given]

[Excerpts] Mikhail Solomentsev headed the CPSU delegation invited to attend the 25th PCF Congress. We met him on that occasion and asked him first about the USSR's internal problems now that preparations are being made for the 27th CPSU Congress.

Geneva Talks

[George] How do you view the current international situation?

[Solomentsev] We have noted a number of reassuring factors recently. The most important is the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on opening new negotiations relating to all space and nuclear weapons. It is very positive that the U.S. Administration has finally decided to start preliminary talks aimed at preventing an arms race in space and reducing arsenals on earth. The very existence of agreement on these preliminary talks is contributing to some easing of tension in Soviet-U.S. relations.

But it would be wrong to overestimate these facts, and especially to cherish unfounded illusions. It must unfortunately be noted that the nuclear arms race is continuing. None of the military programs announced by President Reagan has been canceled or postponed. The deployment of U.S. missiles in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet Union's borders is continuing, and this is further increasing tension in Europe. Preparations are being hurriedly made to deploy MX missiles and B1-B bombers on U.S. territory and to put Trident II submarines into service. In addition to this there is the "star wars" program, which is not being slowed down either.

[George] What are the prospects for the Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva?

[Solomentsev] The Soviet Union is making every effort to ensure that these preliminary talks are fruitful. The essential thing here is not to negotiate for the sake of negotiating but to achieve specific results. This depends on the positions adopted by the two sides and their desire to seek mutually acceptable solutions in practice and not in words. The Soviet position will not fall short of the sincere positions of peace and disarmament.

It is important to be aware of the content and rationale of the Geneva talks. The questions that will be examined in them -- space, strategic, and medium-range weapons -- are all, it must be stressed, closely interconnected and form an indivisible whole. In our view, the Pershing missiles are not much different from strategic weapons. Consequently, it is impossible to separate the question of strategic weapons from that of medium-range missiles. Of course the main question, let us even say the key question, is how to prevent a space arms race.

This program is in no way defensive but is in fact offensive, since the aim is to create the right conditions for carrying out first strikes with impunity. Without this program there would be no reason to fear that the arms race might be extended to a new and even more dangerous sphere.

If the United States launches an arms race in space and pursues costly research in this sphere, the Soviet Union will have to do likewise, while strengthening its other means, including strategic and medium-range weapons. This will be a new and even more dangerous resurgence of the arms race that will swallow up vast resources. The Soviet Union rejects this. It is urgently necessary to prevent a space arms race.

Is the United States prepared to do this? There is at present no sign that it intends to review or cancel the "star wars" program. But, from a different viewpoint, it has agreed to conduct negotiations to prevent a space arms race. There is a degree of inconsistency here. The future will show us how it will be resolved. This will determine the success or failure of the preliminary talks. As Konstantin Chernenko said in reply to a U.S. television correspondent: The USSR will honor any agreement reached in Geneva.

I repeat that the Soviet Union is prepared to accept the most radical solutions in this sphere. We expect the same approach from the United States.

Cooperation With France

[George] What do you think of the state of Franco-Soviet relations and the prospects for their development?

[Solomentsev] The Soviet Union always advocates good relations with France. We believe that Franco-Soviet relations are a major factor in security and stability in Europe. Historical experience, including that of the recent past, shows this.

The Franco-Soviet summit meeting in Moscow last summer dealt with possibilities for extending cooperation between France and the Soviet Union in different spheres.

It is possible, in particular, that our two countries might reach a joint concept of opposition to space militarization. The USSR and France can also make their contribution to strengthening security in Europe and to achieving progress in the Stockholm meeting. There are also areas of agreement between our two countries in their assessments of some conflicts, be it in the Near East or Central America. And, although we do not agree with France on all points, there is objectively a broad similarity of national interests, based on common interest in the consolidation of peace.

CSO: 5200/1021

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

BRIEFS

PACT MEETING DISCUSSES GENEVA TALKS--Moscow March 1 TASS--A working meeting of deputy ministers of foreign affairs of Warsaw Treaty member states was held here today. It was attended by Lyuben Gotsev (Bulgaria), Istvan Roska (Hungary), Herbert Krolikowski (GDR), Jan Kinasta (Poland), Aurel Duma (Romania), G. M. Kornienko, B. I. Aristov (USSR), Jaromir Johanes (Czechoslovakia). Views in connection with the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, opening on March 12, were exchanged at the meeting which passed in a businesslike, comradely atmosphere. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 1 Mar 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1023

SPACE ARMS

COMMENTARIES ASSAIL U.S. SDI PLANS

PRAVDA Editorial Article

PM250958 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 85 First Edition p 5

[Editorial Article: "Washington-Style Morality"]

[Text] America is a land of publicity. If they wish to sell something, they will try to prove anything they like: that black is white and that a wolf is a sheep. They will even advertise the guillotine as a cure for a headache. It may sound absurd, yet should it serve the Pentagon's book, they will try to prove even that.

This is precisely what is happening now with the "strategic defense initiative" declared by the U.S. President in March 1983. They are advertising this American military invention as nothing less than a highly humanitarian, exceptionally moral initiative which allegedly aims to deliver mankind from the fear of nuclear destruction.

A futile attempt is made to prove that the creation of a large-scale antimissile system with space-based elements planned by the Washington administration will make nuclear weapons unnecessary; hence, it will even become possible to scrap them. The calculation is that an uninformed person may begin to think that this is almost a program for nuclear disarmament.

Yet this demagogic verbiage does not achieve the aims its authors would like it to. People alarmed by the Washington "star wars" designs ask simple questions calling for explicit answers. Under the impact of these questions the cheap glitter of the trumpery, with which they were trying to camouflage the real essence of Washington's outer space "initiative", begins to fade.

The question is asked, for example, if the said "initiative" is put forward in order to make offensive nuclear weapons unnecessary, why it is accompanied with an unprecedented buildup of the American strategic nuclear arsenal.

This buildup includes the production of MX ICBM's, the deployment in Europe of the Pershing II missiles, and the manufacture of B-1 bombers. A go-ahead was given to the development and production of new Stealth bombers, cruise missiles, and Trident II missiles for nuclear-powered submarines. Meanwhile, U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger does not even deem it necessary to conceal that the implementation of all these programs in the strategic weapons sphere aims to sharply increase their nuclear first-strike capability. The outer space ABM shield is designed to serve as a cover for these weapons.

A reasonable question is asked: If it is proposed to lay emphasis on "defense", why should first strike nuclear weapons be deployed near the borders of the USSR and its allies?

Or such a question is asked: If the United States aims only at ensuring "defense", why then does it refuse to follow the USSR's example and commit itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons? At the recent UN General Assembly session, more than 100 states declared that the nuclear powers which have not yet done so, should make similar statements. The United States voted against that resolution.

Another question is asked: If the United States favors the renunciation of nuclear weapons, why is it against nuclear disarmament talks? The latest UN General Assembly session adopted by an overwhelming majority vote three resolutions calling for such talks. The United States voted against all the three of them.

Finally comes the question: How do the U.S. statements on the "humane" character of its outer space initiative tally with the U.S. stand at the UN on the issue of outer space?

At the latest General Assembly session 150 states were in favor of taking immediate measures to prevent the arms race in outer space. The United States was the only country not to support that resolution. They in Washington do not give any answers to these and other questions; but they stubbornly evade them.

Then wherein does the morality of the "strategic defense initiative", which Washington boasts, lie? Does it lie in the fact, as Colonel Jack Lousma, commander of the space shuttle, put it with cynical straightforwardness: We can keep the whole world in fear from outer space?

In other words they dream of obtaining the capability of launching with impunity the first nuclear strike from beyond the outer space shield and winning a dominating position in the world in order to dictate their will, and bluntly speaking, to blackmail other peoples. Then wherein does humaneness, which is even described as high, really lie? Is it in the fact that they are trying to jeopardize the lives of hundreds of millions of people, even the whole civilization on earth?

Recently a team of authoritative American scientists gave a short and explicit definition of the publicity wrapping, in which the U.S. Administration is trying to sell its "strategic defense intiative." A book on that issue is rightly entitled "The Fallacy of Star Wars." U.S. plans for the militarization of outer space are aptly described as an act of terrorism against the whole of mankind.

Washington's stubborn reluctance to give up the drive for the specter of military superiority -- now through outer space -- cannot but be a source of serious alarm for the world's peoples, particularly now that an agreement has been reached on the USSR's initiative on Soviet-U.S. talks on a complex of nuclear and outer space weapons, that a real opportunity is opening to resolve the tasks of curbing the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space. The peoples expect from the United States a responsible and serious attitude to the talks, the wish to conduct a constructive dialogue at them, search for decisions on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security.

PRAVDA Review 24 February

PM261201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 85 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Prozhogin "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Necessary and Possible

Elections to the organs of Soviet power are being held in our country today. They are the direct and graphic expression of the people's political will. During the election campaign Soviet people primarily nominated representatives of the Leninist party, our society's leading force, as their candidates. This fact alone graphically reaffirmed the working people's support for CPSU policy and was new testimony to the indissoluble unity of party and people.

The election meetings of working people provided an opportunity for summing up the results of the work that has recently been done in the country and outlining what needs to be done in future.

The fulfillment of our creative plans is directly linked with the cause of maintaining and strengthening world peace. Moreover, under modern conditions preventing a new world conflagration means preserving life on earth.

The creation of the community of socialist states was a great benefit for the cause of peace and international security. Strengthening and expanding their collaboration in all spheres, the socialist community states consistently uphold the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence in the international arena. Thus, acting together, they have prevented the United States and its allies from disrupting military-strategic parity -- the approximate equality of forces -- to their advantage, which is a most important factor in maintaining peace. This parity will continue to be protected.

"The core of our foreign policy today is, of course, the struggle to end the arms race that has been whipped up by imperialism and to remove the threat of a world nuclear war," Comrade K.U. Chernenko stated in his speech addressed to voters.

The new Soviet-U.S. talks are called upon to play an important part in the cause of improving the international situation. As is well known, the sides have stated that they are embarking on the talks in order to prevent an arms race in space and end it on earth.

They also agreed that the questions of space and nuclear arms would be examined and resolved together, as an interrelated whole. This is absolutely necessary for things to succeed. Herein lies the main sense of the agreement that was reached on holding talks.

The USSR's intentions in regard to the forthcoming talks have been exhaustively set out by Soviet leaders. Agreement is absolutely necessary and entirely possible. It is necessary because otherwise the world will slide increasingly rapidly into the arms race, and the threat of war will grow. It is possible because it only requires respect for both sides' rights and legitimate security interests and the desire not to strive to violate the prevailing equilibrium of forces. That is the Soviet approach.

The entire world is commenting on Comrade K.U. Chernenko's statements with the liveliest interest, attaching immense importance to them. The statements show the

goodwill of the Land of the Soviets. This is seen and highly assessed by all peace-loving people in the world.

The Most Militarist Doctrine

So how are people overseas preparing for Geneva? Many people are asking this question, not without alarm, and that is no accident.

Let us recall the AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY magazine's interview with Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, who is entrusted with the implementation of the program for the militarization of space, known under the name "star wars." In the interview he announced that the work entrusted to him is progressing so quickly that the first tests of space weapons will be carried out much earlier than planned -- in 1987. This same Abrahamson, AP reports, expressed confidence that the "star wars" plan would be approved by Congress, despite objections from those who believe that it would mark a violation of concluded treaties or who hold the opinion that the plan is simply not feasible.

The general's revelations were repeated by Michael Burch, U.S. assistant secretary of defense for public affairs. He reported that, beginning in 1987, it is planned to conduct experiments pertaining to the "star wars" program during two space shuttle flights a year. He specified that these experiments were to "check capabilities for target detection, tracking, and acquisition" in space.

Thus, judging by these two statements by Pentagon spokesmen, Washington has decided to drop its own ruse, which it originally used to calm a public alarmed at the White House's intention to transfer the arms race to space. Until recently they were giving assurances that it was a question of purportedly harmless "scientific research and experimental design work" that was far from practical implementation. But now it has been announced that they could go over to the practical experiment phase in 2 years' time.

One other myth previously used to lull public opinion, whereby the "star wars" program is allegedly nothing more than a trump card held by the Americans in the game of diplomacy, is now being dispelled by the U.S. President himself. Speaking the other day at a White House meeting with a group of scientists, he stated: "The strategic defense initiative is not a trump card at the talks. It is a historic program in the interests of our national defense and the maintenance of world peace, and we intend to carry it out."

Hardly anyone will be deluded by the now usual Washington rhetoric whereby "star wars", that is, plans for aggression, is termed a "defense initiative" and the space weapons intended to implement these adventurist plans are allegedly intended to strengthen the cause of world peace.

The essence of the White House incumbent's statement was assessed in the press as evidence that the United States intends to continue to implement the program for space militarization irrespective of progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks.

In this connection a legitimate question arises: How serious and honest is Washington's attitude to the forthcoming Geneva talks?

If they are calculating on ensuring military superiority over the Soviet Union and conducting talks "from a position of strength," these attempts, while being entirely futile, may, however, really undermine the possibility of reaching agreement.

The Soviet Union has warned the U.S. Administration directly and unambiguously that the implementation of its schemes concerning space would mean that there could be no question of any reduction, let alone elimination, of nuclear weapons. Moreover, it would remove any barrier to a further arms race in all directions.

Here one should return once again to the pseudopeace-loving phraseology that Washington resorts to so often. Apart from false terminology intended to mask the aggressive essence of the "star wars" program, they continue to stubbornly cling to the big lie, alleging that space weapons will virtually make nuclear weapons useless and that space militarization will mark the end of the nightmare linked with the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. From this utterly fallacious premise they draw the equally false conclusion that the use of space for military purposes will lead if not to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, at least to substantial reductions of them.

These "arguments" do not stand up to criticism. One need only ask why, in that case, in aiming to implement the program for space militarization, the United States, far from curtailing its programs for nuclear weapons -- strategic, medium-range, tactical, and others -- is stepping them up still further?

The truth is that the U.S. space plans constitute the most militarist of all the doctrines that have come out of Washington. The implementation of this doctrine would be aimed at winning military superiority for the United States, inflicting a nuclear strike against the enemy, and escaping unpunished by hiding behind an anti-missile "shield" stationed in space. It is obvious that the futility of these calculations, based on the premise that, given the implementation of the U.S. plans for space militarization, the Soviet Union would be incapable of providing an appropriate response and ensuring the security of its country and its allies, does not alter the aggressive essence of the doctrine.

The militarist U.S. course is causing increasing concern in the world. Sometimes dissatisfaction with the adventurist ways of U.S. policy is also expressed by certain U.S. NATO partners. The West German newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, publishing a selection of reports from various countries criticizing the "star wars" program, writes that the "U.S. plans are being disputed even within NATO."

Forced to take account of the growth of discontent and misgivings with regard to its line of behavior in international affairs, Washington decided to couple the announcement that it would push ahead with the "star wars" program with widespread publicizing of its imaginary merits. The U.S. Administration has launched an "almost unprecedented propaganda campaign aimed at convincing the Europeans of the merits of an ABM system," London's FINANCIAL TIMES writes about these "traveling salesman" efforts. "Wherever you go in Europe now, the merits of this idea are being discussed everywhere: at public demonstrations, in private conversation, and in ministries and departments."

It must be stated that some of the closest U.S. allies are also involved in the campaign. An example of that was British Prime Minister M. Thatcher's speech in Washington to a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. There she stated that Britain was ready to do its bit at the research stage of the U.S. "star wars" program. Statements in the same spirit have been made by FRG Chancellor K. Kohl and Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone.

What can be said about this? If certain politicians in the capitalist world suppose that in this way they will succeed in rectifying the economic situation in their countries and easing the pressure on their national currencies from the dollar they are mistaken. At the same time they are undertaking a heavy responsibility.

History is now posing the question of mankind's future, and more acutely than ever before. We now need courage and farsightedness on the part of all state leaders more than ever.

24 February TV Roundtable

LD242242 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 24 Feb 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, APN political observer; Nikolay Ivanovich Yefimov, first deputy editor in chief of IZVESTIYA; and Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Text] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades! I would like to open our discussion of the state of affairs in the world by stressing that history is now raising the issue of the future of mankind in a very acute way; and under these conditions the core of our country's foreign policy -- as was pointed out in Comrade Chernenko's preelection speech -- is, of course, the struggle to end the arms race that has been imposed by imperialism, and to remove the threat of world nuclear war. It is precisely for this purpose that our country has put forward the proposal for new talks with the United States in order to prevent an arms race in space and to put an end to the arms race on earth. As the Soviet leader noted, differences in the views of the sides on the issues to be discussed are now great. This is obvious to everyone. There is no shortage of gloomy forecasts condemning the talks to failure in advance, but we do not share them, Comrade Chernenko said.

Abroad, universal attention has been attracted by the outline, contained in the speech, of the Soviet side's intentions in connection with the forthcoming talks. This, in the view of the majority of foreign observers, has confirmed once again the Soviet Union's sincere desire for successful and fruitful talks, and for an accord based upon equality and equal security of the sides.

[Yefimov] The majority of our listeners have obviously familiarized themselves from the newspapers with the Soviet Union's intentions in connection with the forthcoming talks. Nevertheless, they are so important that we must recall them once again today. In the first place, the Soviet Union is not striving to acquire any unilateral advantages over the United States and the NATO countries; it is not striving for military superiority over them. We do not have any need of that since we have no intention of threatening them or imposing our own will upon them. We want to live in peace with them and to maintain normal, good relations.

Second, we want an end to the arms race, not a continuation of it. It is for this very reason that the Soviet Union is also raising the issue of such initial steps as a freeze on nuclear arsenals by both sides; a halt to further deployment of missiles; and so on. Using the talks for opposite purposes, in order to justify and to disguise the further buildup and deployment of means of mass destruction in our consideration is an immoral and vicious thing, the deception of the peoples, and a crime against them.

Third, we want a real reduction in the armaments that have been built up, as a beginning the destruction of a significant part of them instead of the creation of more and more new weapons systems, whether in space or on earth, whether offensive means or allegedly defensive ones. In this our ultimate goal is the complete destruction of nuclear weapons everywhere.

[Beglov] It seems to me that it would also be right to note here the fact that the Soviet Union's foreign policy platform, which has again been set out in such an authoritative manner in the past few days, has running through it from beginning to end the call to all peoples and to other governments to unite efforts against the common mortal enemy, the threat of world nuclear disaster.

Events of the past few weeks show how correct Comrade Chernenko's words are about the way in which we are acting together with all the world's peace-loving forces in the cause of strengthening peace and universal security. Thus Andreas Papandreou, the Greek prime minister, during his recent visit to Moscow, described as particularly important and encouraging the fact that the USSR holds a positive attitude to the declaration by the leaders of the six states on questions of disarmament. Many observers -- in particular the newspaper NEW WAVE, published in India -- stress that of all the great powers it is only the Government of the Soviet Union that has supported with all its heart the Delhi Declaration. A similar positive response by the world has been evoked by Comrade Chernenko's replies to the leaders of the Argentinian organization, The Appeal of 100 in the Name of Life, and also to the appeal by the Treaty Now antiwar organization in northern Europe. It is being stressed everywhere that the Soviet Union is filled with resolve to continue to do all that is necessary to remove the threat of nuclear disaster and ensure universal peace. At the same time, and in the light of the reaction to Comrade Chernenko's preelection speech, international observers note that the Soviet Union is not simply expressing its solidarity with the antiwar movements and the call made by people of common sense, but that it is going further than the simple expression of solidarity. In the many concrete initiatives of the Soviet Union, in the steps we have taken, including those initiatives that you have just been talking about, Nikolay Ivanovich, our country is either putting these issues, these measures, on the agenda of multilateral and bilateral talks -- and this includes the agenda of the Geneva talks -- or these measures have already been adopted by the Soviet Union on a unilateral basis. In particular there are such actions as the formal pledge by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and the call for the United States and the other nuclear powers to follow this example.

Of course there would be much more optimism in the world if other nuclear powers, and primarily the United States, as one of the major nuclear powers, were to follow these actions and these initiatives. Here, of course, it is understandable why there is so much alarm and concern by the international public when it looks at the way the United States is acting in this field. They are now talking about the so-called nuclear allergy. It would be interesting to analyze this manifestation in greater detail. American leaders are inclined to call this manifestation, so to speak, a disease, because in their eyes it threatens NATO unity and the other alliances where matters are decided

by the United States. But this is a healthy reaction by the world public, a healthy reaction to what the United States is doing in building up the nuclear arms race, in planning in its new budget the production of new nuclear warheads and the means for delivering these warheads, but also in imposing nuclear weapons upon other countries. The events of the past few weeks express particularly vividly this feeling of protest and this healthy reaction and indeed this rebuff to these attempts against the security of other peoples through the imposition, by various means, of the nuclear potential and the imposition of the so-called U.S. nuclear presence in every direction.

[Sobolev] It is very important for the success of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. talks that the leaders of the United States approach these in a serious and honest way, that they renounce senseless notions of military superiority over the Soviet Union and holding talks from a position of strength. Comrade Chernenko's speech contains a call for abandoning attempts to impose upon the Soviet Union the kind of agreement that would unilaterally bind its hands in the strengthening of its defense, but that would open wide the doors for the implementation of the record military programs mapped out by Washington.

This week the attention of commentators has been attracted by the Pentagon announcement that in two years' time experiments are going to be carried out under the star wars program during flights by the shuttle spacecraft, involving the testing of aiming devices and guidance systems.

All this is to be done 2 years earlier than previously planned. If this takes place it will be a violation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty of 1972 limiting antimissile defense systems, as an observer of the American ABC television company remarked. One might also recall the recent reports carried by THE WASHINGTON POST and THE NEW YORK TIMES about the plans by the selfsame U.S. war department concerning maneuverable and possibly armed spy satellites and strategic missiles capable of changing their trajectory in order to mislead the enemy. All this, too, is preparation for the notorious star wars. As we see, the talks have not yet begun; their purpose is the prevention of the militarization of space, and yet the U.S. Defense Department is officially stating that it intends to transfer this very same militarization into the practical sphere in the very near future. I would also like to note that it is no coincidence that these Pentagon plans have been made public. The ruling circles of the United States are developing a very extensive propaganda campaign advertising the so-called strategic defense initiative of President Reagan, and the Pentagon plans that we have mentioned, apart from anything else, have been published for propaganda purposes, in order to nullify the arguments of the critics of the star wars program. What do the critics say? They point out that in addition to its political and strategic flaws, the strategic defense initiative also has purely technical flaws. For example, it elements, deployed in orbit, are extremely vulnerable. They. too, have to be protected against strikes before they are able to start knocking out missiles. So. the Pentagon is hurrying to support those who are advertising star wars and is demonstrating to its fellow countrymen that in this respect, too, everything has been provided for. Why am I speaking about the propaganda? I am speaking about the propaganda because in singing the praises of star wars official Washington is taking into consideration a psychology widespread among Americans and is trying to create in them the hope that if they are unable to take cover behind two oceans, as was the case in the past, then they might be able to do so behind a strategic shield: Keep America safe, and don't worry at all about what happens anywhere else.

[Yefimov] A few days ago I had a telephone call from an elderly lady who has been a reader of IZVESTIYA for a long time. She lived through the last war and lost many of

those who were close to her during that war. She asked me the following question: Are we doing the right thing, at a time when we are on the threshold of new Soviet-U.S. talks, in drawing attention to the various things that are being said by figures in Washington, even things that are extremely anti-Soviet, even remarks that are extremely malicious? Would it not be better to turn a blind eye to this and thereby try to create a more favorable climate for the forthcoming talks? she asked. Of course, what lies behind this lady's words is the breadth of the Russian soul, the peace-loving nature of our people, the memory of the sacrifices made in the last war and concern about the future. Yes, a very high level of responsibility rests upon us, upon the present generation, that of preventing a new world conflagration, as is stressed in the speech by Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. In a difficult international situation the Soviet Union is displaying calm, firmness, and restraint. But it would not be right to keep silent about what is being said, -- and this is the main thing -- about what is being done or what is being undertaken in Washington. A newspaper has an obligation to report this and to call a spade a spade. Here is one example you have already mentioned, Vitaliy Sergeyevich: Last week the American General Abrahamson -- not a rank-and-file general, but the man responsible for the implementation of the star wars program, the favorite creation of the American military and industrial complex -- said in an interview given to the journal AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY that the testing of space weapons will begin 2 years earlier than had been planned. Is it something we can fail to report? Can we fail to comment on such a statement? Among other things IZVESTIYA wrote that three conclusions are suggested in this connection:

First of all, the U.S. is already carrying out practical work on preparing space militarization. Secondly, this work is being done at a stepped-up pace. Third, only 2 years remain before the transition from scientific research and experimental design work to the actual launching of space weapons into orbit around the earth.

What is left, then, one may well ask, of those assurances pouring out from Washington that supposedly the strategic defense initiative as the star wars have been called there -- announced by the U.S. President in March 1983 -- is being undertaken exclusively within the framework of scientific research? Well, all that is left is the fact that such assurances from the very beginning contained a plain attempt, unconcerned about credibility, to stupefy public opinion at home as well as abroad, to outwit the partner in the forthcoming talks, and thus achieve -- without much political cost -- the final objective: the use of space for its own diktat. In other words, they want to impose on us a new spiral in the arms race, one that is even less predictable in its consequences, and even more dangerous for the fate of the world. We cannot fail to speak out about this.

[Beglov] There is a second side to the matter that is probably understandable and clear to our listeners. The Soviet Union cannot be an accomplice in any such diplomatic process that could serve as justification and camouflage for further stepping up of the deployment of mass destruction systems. Washington is well aware of the sharply critical attitude of the Soviet Union, as well as the overwhelming majority of governments and public figures, towards the U.S. Administration's plans to present the world with, so to speak, a fait accompli with regard to implementing the programs for space militarization. This would merely open the floodgates for further continuation of the arms race, as has been abundantly reiterated here. This is not only our position. Taking a look at the worldwide poll of who is for or against the U.S. star wars plan, from what has been said recently, one can see that all sober-minded politicians go along with us, with the Soviet position. Take for instance Palme, the prime minister of Sweden, who stated: The arms race must not extend into space. In my view it is illu-

sory to talk about space weapons being able to defend the earth from nuclear threat; creating such weapons will only lead to a new spiral in the arms race. Therefore, I understand the position of the Soviet Union on this issue. Or take, for instance, the statement from leaders of the FRG Social-Democratic Party [SPD], and Vogel, the leader of the SPD group in the Bundestag, who said: For the West Europeans this is essentially a question of conscience now, a question of the fate of their policy in the future. If they fail to say "no" to the U.S. plans to militarize space, then Western Europe will lose forever its independent voice on issues concerning the fate of peace or war. So many observers compare Moscow's position, the position of the Soviet Union, including the latest authoritative statements made by Comrade Chernenko and his preelection speech at home, on the one hand, with the statements and proclamations, so to speak, made on the other hand by certain Western leaders such as Reagan himself, or, say, Margaret Thatcher, the British head of government. In a speech to the U.S. Congress this week, she permitted herself to become indentified with the most decrepit dogmas of the cold war, to the extent, really, that she gave in to some degree to Washington's current attempt to break the strategic parity and undermine the disarmament process through adventurism in space -- not completely identified, it is true; only half-way, half-heartedly, but nevertheless, for the sake of allied solidarity she stated that she gives her blessing at least to research in this field, although with the proviso that the question of testing and deploying these systems should be made the subject of talks.

[Sobolev] In assessing the special adherence, as they say in Washington, of the U.S. Administration to the star wars program, I think one must also take into account the financial side. It was calculated by Poke, assistant director of the Federation of U.S. Scientists in Space Research [name of organization as heard] initial research phase for the implementation of the notorious strategic defense initiative will require 50 percent more money than was spent on all U.S. military research in the field of missile technology between 1954 and 1983. The initiative is to bring in a total of about $1 trillion for the U.S. military-industrial complex, according to current estimates. In time such estimates usually turn out to be strongly on the conservative side. Can you imagine the prospects for U.S. generals and their contractors?

In his annual address to the country, President Reagan promised the Americans a new revolution of hope. Insofar as during the new financial year the Pentagon is to deprive civilian departments of approximately a further $30 billion, it is understadable who can cherish any particularly joyful hopes. According to a U.S. Congress committee report, 164 out of the 169 corporations that form the country's military industry are making an annual profit in the range of 50 to 200 percent of their capital. Three corporations made a profit of over 500 percent, and one of them over 2,000 percent. Such wonders are accepted in the U.S. without surprise. Taking into account that the military companies sell the Pentagon hammers at $400 a piece and coffee machines at $7,000 each, one may guess that their profits could be even more significant. Besides, these profits are not taxed. The Internal Revenue Service announced that the largest of the Pentagon's contractors, despite their phenomenal income, are finding loopholes in the tax laws. Here is a fact to make you ponder, incidentally, by whom, how, and in whose interests those laws are drafted: Boeing, a military giant, has not contributed a cent to the country's coffer since 1980; Lockheed Aircraft, since 1979; Grumman Corporation, since 1976; and General Dynamics, since 1975. This last company thus saved over $500 million. So you can imagine what revolution of hopes these companies expect from the President's new strategic initiative.

[Yefimov] It must be said that in this they reckon they will be able to secure for themselves some technological leap forward, and overtake the Soviet Union, just as they reckoned in 1945 when they started atomic diplomacy, and they have repeatedly resorted

to the same thing in the years since. It would appear that past experience has taught them nothing.

[Beglov] If they think in the U.S. that the Soviet Union will sit back and wait for the U.S. to complete its research and to straddle space, so to speak, in the military sense, well, they are undoubtedly making a very serious mistake indeed. Our country will not remain inactive in the face of these dangerous plans and will do everything that is necessary in order not to permit the achieving of superiority over it. This is contained in the warnings we have made more than once. It is time for Washington to listen to this, too.

[Yefimov] As it happens, I was talking recently with the ambassador of a leading Western country -- the conversation was of a confidential nature, so I shall not name him. He said -- commenting on U.S. policy in the sphere of star wars -- that the Americans clearly underestimate the potential of the Soviet Union, as well as its economic, material, and intellectual resources. In this connection I cannot refrain from quoting Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko's speech: Any such attempts -- and he had in mind the attempts to overtake the Soviet Union -- are quite without a future, but they are capable of undermining the possibility of an agreement, an agreement that is expected by the peoples of our countries and all peoples wishing for lasting peace and a calm, happy, life.

[Beglov] This space scenario of world politics, so to speak, contains a point related to the prospects, the future of mankind. Is mankind, including the great powers, going to learn lessons from the experience of the past, including the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism, the unity of action among peace-loving states that resulted in this victory? This is the real issue, at a time when many statements by Western leaders place the emphasis rather on the points of confrontation, on contrasting the two systems, on the impossibility of their coexistence in this world, and hence the lack of restraint for adventurist ideas like the star wars idea. Comrade Chernenko's speech at the preelection meeting drew attention by accentuating the need to remember these lessons and the experience of productive cooperation, including the cooperation of the 1970's; and the need to mobilize the resources of foresight, courage, and goodwill in order to ensure common action for the sake of guaranteeing a lasting prospect of peace for the whole of mankind. This is the real issue.

[Yefimov] The preelection speeches by the Soviet leaders show the main principles of our position exactly, and they are notable for their profound confidence in the rightness of our struggle for peace, and in its fairness and its moral quality. Understandably, not everything depends on us alone. But as regards our foreign policy course, it is stable; it is not determined by any last-minute considerations, but by the peace-loving nature of our society itself, where no one is materially interested either in preparations for war or in waging it. Disarmament is the ideal of socialism, Lenin once said, and these words expressing one of the most important peculiarities of our system have acquired even more topicality over the years.

U.S. 'Deception' Condemned

PM261511 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Feb 85 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences S. Kulik: "Deliberate Deception: That Is the Thrust of the Propaganda Campaign Unleashed in the United States Around the 'Star Wars' Program"]

[Text] The peace-endangering and costly White House "initiative" -- the creation of a broad-scale ABM system with space-based elements -- is being accompanied by a ferocious propaganda campaign and loud publicity. Both represent shameless speculation on man's psychologically natural desire to find protection against the all-destroying power of nuclear weapons. President Reagan claims that his program, which in the United States itself is termed the "star wars" program, aims to protect the U.S. population from a massive nuclear strike. How? "We intend," Defense Secretary Weinberger explains, "to engage in the development of a reliable system which would virtually neutralize all (read: Soviet -- S.K.) missiles" And Keyworth, the President's science adviser, is expatiating on some desire of his boss to achieve "a new stability based on making nuclear weapons obsolete."

You listen to these explanations and it is as though Reagan's plan were an alternative, and not, as it really is, an addition to the offensive nuclear arms race. It is under this propaganda guise that official Washington is presenting the ABM program in order to enlist the support not only of politicians but also of the U.S. public. The first thing that is apparent is the obvious contradiction between, on the one hand, expatriations on an "alternative" and, on the other, the forces buildup of the first-strike nuclear potential which is continuing in the United States.

The drafting of the program for the militarization of space has not hampered the implementation of the program to build up the offensive strategic triad -- the creation of MX ICBM's, sophisticated nuclear-powered missile-carrying submarines, and B-1B and Stealth bombers. For instance, the Alaska -- the seventh nuclear-powered submarine, equipped with 24 sophisticated Trident missiles -- was launched in January. At the same time, first-strike Pershing II and cruise missiles continue to be deployed in a number of West European countries.

Under these conditions you can hear in Washington itself admissions which are totally at variance with the White House incumbent's propaganda directives. It was Keyworth again who was obliged to contradict himself: Nuclear weapons, he says, "will never disappear. They will continue to exist and to cause fear." One of the officials responsible for the "star wars" program, Cooper, director of the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects Agency, admitted that "in the foreseeable future" he "can see no possibility of obviating the need for offensive missiles through the implementation of any ABM program."

And so, in accordance with the U.S. Administration's real designs, nuclear missile weapons and ABM weapons are designed to be mutually supplementary. In this connection it is appropriate to recall what Reagan said in his "star wars" speech in March of 1983. "I am well aware," he said at the time, "that defensive systems...create definite problems and obscurities. If they are combined with offensive systems, they can be viewed as a factor promoting an aggressive policy." That is the main point. It is highly notable that U.S. official propaganda now prefers not to mention these words from the President's speech.

The White House is placing its main emphasis on a different "trump card," an irresistible one, in its opinion.

It ascribes to ABM defense with space-based elements the potential for providing an "effective defense" for the U.S. population against a massive retaliatory nuclear strike. And this, frankly, profoundly phony thesis has been used and is being used to the utmost for the most implausible hypocritical and speculative arguments. Thus, it is being persistently suggested to the public that the U.S. "antimissile umbrella" will lead to the easing of the threat of a nuclear apocalypse.

But here too there has been a blunder. Many eminent Western scientists and specialists, including in the United States, argued persuasively that no scientific or technical ploys, no expenditure, can lead to the creation of an absolutely reliable ABM system with or without space-based elements. "The existence of space defense," Hart, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated, "will not provide the shield of which some people are dreaming. Rather, it will create a new arena for nuclear war and new opportunities and means for initiating such a war."

The commissions created by the administration under the chairmanship of Fletcher and Hoffman have been instructed to refute these and similar conclusions. A White House spokesman hastened to describe the reports prepared by the commission which, incidentally, have been classified, as evidence of "the possibility of implementing the President's plans." But, it emerged that the "secret" stamp concealed something else, quite far removed from the White House incumbent's "plans."

According to Western press reports, actually not a single one of the reports directly mentioned the possibility of gaining "absolute protection" for U.S. territory. On the contrary, Fletcher said that the concept of "absolute protection against nuclear weapons" does not exist at all.

But even that is not all. THE WASHINGTON POST reported that the conclusions of the Hoffman commission contain an important premise: In view of the unfeasible nature of creating a "reliable shield" for the country as a whole, it is "expedient" to create a limited ABM system for defending U.S. military complexes.

This, it turns out, is the real aim of the commission created so to speak as the "voice" of the White House itself: to cover U.S. offensive nuclear missile weapons. But what do Pentagon specialists think on this score? In the spring of 1984 the U.S. Senate held its first special hearings on Reagan's "defense initiative" which were addressed by defense under secretaries Ikle and DeLauer, Pentagon Advanced Research Projects Agency Director Cooper, and other high-ranking officials. The results of the hearings were summed up by the U.S. publication ARMS CONTROL TODAY: The President's initiative is designed to implement "limited" tasks and to defend not the U.S. population but "our missile silos," that is, first-strike offensive nuclear missile weapons.

After that the White House, despite tremendous efforts, did not succeed in halting what was literally an avalanche of testimony from high-ranking officials to the effect that it is possible to create only a "limited" ABM defense. General Abrahamson, responsible for fulfilling the "strategic defense initiative," began to cite as an argument in favor of creating this ABM defense its 25 percent or even 50 percent efficiency. On the basis of these admissions the U.S. press noted that this approach refutes publicity ploys regarding the creation of a system designed to "defend population centers and render nuclear weapons obsolete."

Thus there was revealed the unseemly picture that THE WASHINGTON POST accurately described as deception -- deception geared to misleading millions of Americans in order to seek approval for a sinister design: securing for offensive nuclear weapons a "space shield" under the cover of which it would be possible to attempt, while counting on impunity, to use these weapons for a surprise first strike.

"Well, what's so bad about defending missile silos?" representatives of the administration are asking disingenously, attempting to wriggle out of an awkward situation. Something not merely bad but even fatal is, with reason, seen in it by another U.S. paper -- the ST LOUIS POST-DISPATCH -- for example. The creation of such an ABM system would signify the preparation of the technical base for nuclear warfare, which in turn would make it possible to speak of nuclear war as "conceivable." "From here," the newspaper concludes, "it is but a step to 'legitimizing' the political decision to unleash a nuclear conflict."

It is no accident that well-known U.S. politicians and experts like Brzezinski, Jastrow, and Kampelman are making it clear that the aim of creating even a limited ABM defense with space-based elements should be the "neutralization" of a Soviet retaliatory strike.

That is the real worth of the hypocritical arguments that armaments in space will help "disarmament on earth." It is impossible now to resolve the nuclear arms problem in isolation from the prohibition of space armaments. Questions of space and nuclear armaments are organically interconnected and it is in a package that they should be viewed and resolved at negotiations. As is well known, the USSR and the United States have agreed that such negotiations will begin 12 March. The Soviet Union has frequently stressed that the aim of the talks should be not deception of the other partner and of public opinion, but the question for mutually acceptable solutions according with the interests of peace.

"We oppose the extension of the arms race into space so keenly," Comrade K.U. Chernenko stressed, "not because we would not be able to respond to these plans of Washington's. If we are compelled to do so, we will do everything, as has already happened frequently in the past, to protect our security and that of our allies and friends."

U.S. Commitment to Space Arms

LD22222 Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 22 Feb 85

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev.

At a press conference on February 21 President Ronald Reagan declared again that the United States will continue being engaged in "research" toward a large scale anti-ballistic missile system with the elements of space basing. It follows from his words that Washington will be prepared to negotiate and discuss the deployment of the ABM system only if the U.S. research does produce the possibility of such a weapon. This shows again that the U.S. Administration is striving to avoid the implementation of the Geneva agreement at the Soviet-U.S. talks on space and nuclear arms that are to start on March 12.

Following this general and apparently, fundamental provision by the President, high-ranking representatives of the administration laud his "strategic defence initiative". And every one is doing this in his own way, being little concerned as to how 'explanations' given by one tally with the 'explanations' given by another. And they produce such trump cards that cause amazement even of seasoned legislators on the Capitol Hill.

This was strikingly shown by special hearings in the Senate Armed Services Committee. Publicizing "star wars" U.S. Under Secretary of Defense Fred Ikle, in a fit of militaristic euphoria summed them up as the core of the United States long-term policy, as the best hope for a "safe future", as a key to ending the competition in the sphere of offensive systems. According to him, they, allegedly, open the door to a long-term nuclear strategy which is in keeping with the United States moral and political values.

Getting carried away, Fred Ikle forgot that, when trying to reassure the public, representatives of the U.S. Administration and the President himself usually assert that the programme of "star wars" is only a "research" and that it may lead, and may not lead to the deployment of ABM system with elements of space basing. The under secretary of defence said outright that the U.S. Administration is convinced that the ABM system will in the long run be deployed, that it is quite feasible. Moreover, according to Fred Ikle the implementation of the programme will be started early in 90's from the creation of a partial defence system aimed at protecting U.S. missiles and that later, well into the next century, a full-scale system for the protection of cities will be created.

The under secretary of defence, apparently, is reading the statements and listening to pronouncements of the President not attentively enough. So he reveals the real aims of the "strategic defense initiative". And the main "agrument" advanced with the aim of concealing the danger of peace presented by the "initiative" is that a large-scale ABM system will, allegedly, protect the entire territory of the USA. But, according to Fred Ikle, it is missiles that will first of all be protected so that it should be possible to threaten and blackmail from under a missile shield the other side. This is where the "moral and political values" lie according to the under secretary of defence. How cynical the assertion of the Pentagon's representative is to the effect that already the initial stages of the ABM development on the way to its full deployment will consolidate stability.

How can stability be consolidated? For the other side will be compelled to seek the possibilities to compensate for the disruptions of the military-strategic balance, and a new stage of the arms race will be launched with all the consequences to follow.

As to the Geveva talks the under secretary of defence said outright that, contrary to earlier argeement, the USA is not going to decide at these talks the question of the prevention of the militarisation of space. It will be insisting on the discussion of the question of the correlation between offensive and defensive armaments and the ways of transition to the deployment of the ABM systems. Quite natural in this connection was a question of Senator Carl Levin, as to what the United States will be discussing at the talks if the administration is not going to discuss any restrictions on the research in the "strategic initiative" and is not going to publicly give it up.

Indeed, it is clear that the implementation of Washington's designs with regard to space would mean that any reduction, moreover elimination of nuclear weapons is out of the question. And the objective of the talks should be the working out of effective arrangements aimed at the prevention of the arms race in space and its termination on

earth, the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, the consolidation of strategic stability. The Pentagon has no wish to decide the first of these problems, in view of this, will be objectively impossible.

Is it not in vain that the U.S. delegation is now being packing to go to Geneva, if it brings along a clearly obstructionist stand which presupposes not a serious, effective dialogue, but "working out the code" for the stepping up of the arms race, its spread to near earth space? This is a futile, empty and harmful occupation.

Reagan Cited

PM251621 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent report: "R. Reagan's Speech"]

[Excerpt] Washington, 22 Feb--President R. Reagan has confirmed the U.S. intention to forge on with the development and implementation of plans to militarize space, fraught with a new mortal threat to mankind.

Addressing a news conference in the White House, he made it plainly understood that Washington is thinking by no means of "research" but of specific plans for deploying and using space weapons. "I have frequently stated that if, as a result of our research, it emerges that there is an opportunity for creating such weapons...in that case I will be ready...to discuss the deployment and use of such weapons." Reagan made it clear just as frankly that the United States does not intend to discuss these questions in a constructive spirit during the Soviet-U.S. talks which begin in Geneva on 12 March and which, according to the agreement that was reached, should encompass the whole complex of problems connected with nuclear and space armaments. It is clear from his statements that the United States would like to separate or totally remove space armaments from the context of the talks.

The President's stance, announced only a little over 2 weeks before the start of the Geneva talks, cannot fail to cause bewilderment. After all, Washington knows well that only the scrupulous observance of the accord which has been reached can make the talks promising. Washington's persistent refusal to renounce the chase for the specter of military superiority through space militarization is alarming all peoples of the world.

Reagan announced "a decision within a few months" regarding the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty, which as is well known, the United States has refused to ratify, while constantly alleging that it is observing its main provisions. Reagan has made it clear that the "forthcoming decision" will mean the United States' total disregard of SALT II. This step would be fully in keeping with the administration's course toward building up ever new types of offensive armaments.

Reagan's statements during the news conference confirm that Washington is still in the grips of the unrealizable dream of disrupting the existing strategic parity with the aid of the frenzied buildup of offensive weapons alongside the pushing through of "defensive" space armaments within the framework of stepping up of the first-strike potential.

Weinberger Hit on ABM Treaty

LD011604 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 1 Mar 85

["Is Mr Weinberger for the Observance of the ABM Treaty?" -- TASS headline]

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

In recent days Capitol in Washington has turned into an arena of a heated discussion between the warlike hawks of the U.S. Administration, who are doing their utmost to drag through Congress a programme for star war preparations, and the so-called owls, or moderates, who argue that Reagan's 'strategic defence initiative' may sharply upset stablility in the world and for at least several years put off the prospect of reaching agreements with the Soviet Union.

Addressing the House Armed Services Committee, General Brent Scowcroft, former presidential national security advisor, stressed that Reagan's plans to deploy an ABM system would strongly complicate talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, which are scheduled to start in Geneva on March 12.

The general, who has recently headed the Committee on Strategic Forces of the USA and won by his activities the favours of President Reagan, told congressmen that the actions of the current administration jeopardised the treaty of 1972 on the limitation of ABM systems and might thus undermine the whole process of arms control. In his recently published articles the general stressed that the creation by the United States of a large-scale ABM system would only increase tensions in the world and invite countermeasures from the Soviet Union.

Addressing the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger described General Scowcroft's arguments as "quite irrelevant," and said that the Reagan administration intended to carry on the programme of star war preparations, as, he claimed, it feared that the Soviet Union would renounce the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems and create its own anti-ballistic missile defense. The Pentagon chief even claimed that the star wars programme would help reach agreement in Geneva.

It is apt to recall that Weinberger, who is nowadays so pathetically concerned about the implementation of the ABM Treaty, described only a few months ago this treaty as a pseudo-agreement on arms control and insisted that the USA should refuse to observe its provisions.

As the campaign to advertise the American star wars preparations plans is becoming increasingly vociferous and importunate, representatives of the U.S. Administration are ever less inclined to observe even elementary logic in their arguments, ever more often make conflicting statements, disavow their own statements and slogans.

As far as Weinberger's claims about a "salutary impact" of star wars on the course of preparations on the limitation and reduction of weapons are concerned, in this connection one shall recall the Soviet Union's warning that the implementation of Washington's plans as regards outer space would imply that any reduction, to say nothing of scrapping of nuclear weapons, would be out of the question.

SDI, ABM Testing Violates Accords

LD270950 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 27 Feb 85

["Who Sabotages Commitments?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 27 TASS -- "The USA has set out to undermine the agreement reached with the Soviet Union earlier on the limitation and reduction of weapons, through evading them and at times directly violating them," the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes.

"The USA has proclaimed the so-called 'strategic defence' programme and is thus torpedoing the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile defence (ABM) systems, which was concluded for an indefinite term," the newspaper stresses. "Thus, in particular, it is planned to deploy a large-scale ABM system with outer space based elements, which is directly prohibited by the agreement."

On June 10 last year, a "Minuteman" missile was launched from the U.S. Vandenberg base in California. Over the Pacific it was intercepted by a missile of the same type launched from Meek Island in Kwajalein archipelago. The latter was specially reequipped for ABM purposes. Such tests are in conflict with the U.S. commitments under the Soviet-American treaty.

Contrary to the commitment not to deploy ABM complexes in the country's territory the Pentagon put up in the bases in Beale (Pacific coast) and Otis (Atlantic coast) radar stations of the "Pave Paws" type, which ensure a radar coverage of a larger part of United States territory.

"The USA signed the SALT-2 treaty in the summer of 1979, but refused to put it into effect. Yet Washington has committed itself to 'refrain from actions' undermining that agreement", the commentary says. Yet by starting the deployment in Western Europe of Pershing-2 and long range ground-based cruise missiles, the American side has violated the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty, planning to evade the treaty through other state of states [as received] or in any other way and to make commitments in conflict with the treaty.

While agreeing by word of mouth with the principle of equality and equal security, the USA is doing its utmost to ensure that there is no equal security." [quotation marks as received]

"In 1974 the USSR and the USA signed a treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests to the threshold of 150 kilotons. Washington has not ratified that treaty, but committed itself to comply with it," the newspaper points out. Yet instances when the American side exceeded the threshold have been registered. This was accompanied with a discharge of radio-active substances into the atmosphere, which is a breach of the treaty of 1963 banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water.

They in the Pentagon do not conceal that the USA has started implementing a programme for a sharp build-up and modernisation of weapons. Hence the USA does not ratify the treaties signed earlier and evades talks on complete and general ban on nuclear weapons tests." [quotation marks as received]

Said to Undermine ABM Treaty

LD041919 Moscow TASS in English 1843 GMT 4 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

Carrying on with preparations for "star wars" and announcing its intention to deploy a large-scale anti-ballistic missile defense system with space-based elements, the Reagan administration is undermining the 1972 Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty), the agreement of unlimited duration. In the opinion of all objective experts, the treaty is one of the most effective agreements on the limitation of the arms race and averting the threat of nuclear war. The ABM Treaty closed reliably a very dangerous and expensive channel of the race in anti-ballistic missiles arms and systems and prohibited the parties to the treaty from transferring to other states or deploying ABM systems or their components limited by the treaty outside the national territory.

However, Washington is jeopardizing the Soviet-U.S. treaty of 1972 not only with its plans, programs and broadly advertized statements concerning the intention to turn space into a scene for testing and deployment of ABM systems. The United States has already embarked on the realization of its plans. At the present time it contradicts both the spirit and the letter of that important agreement. Carrying out intensive work to develop mobile radar stations for ABM use, developing multiple warheads for ABM missiles, the U.S.A. breaches Article V of the ABM Treaty.

Article VIII of the treaty makes it obligatory for the parties to the agreement to destroy or dismantle ABM systems or their components located outside the areas specified in the treaty. By deploying pave paws [as received] radar stations for radar support of the ABM defense of a bigger part of the U.S. territory, by going outside the limits of the permitted zone, the U.S. side seriously violates that article clearly and unequivocally formulated by the 1972 treaty.

The U.S. testing of intercontinental ballistic missiles Minuteman for giving them the anti-ballistic missile capability comes as a breach of the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the limitation of ABM systems.

Trying to undermine and then bring to nought the ABM Treaty of unlimited duration, Washington is working toward torpedoing the entire precess of limitation and reduction of nuclear arms. The record of the present U.S. Administration in the field of the still operating agreements, including the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, continuing U.S. violations of the agreements reached call into question assurances made by Washington officials concerning their intention to restore the reputation of the United States as a reliable partner in the negotiations.

CSO: 5200/1012

SPACE ARMS

ALLIED ATTITUDES TOWARD SDI EXAMINED

Strauss Support of SDI Hit

LD251756 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 25 Feb 85

[Text] Moscow February 25 TASS -- TASS commentator Lev Aksyonov writes:

The chairman of the Christian-Social Union (CSU) of West Germany Franz-Josef Strauss who spoke in Munich came out for the active participation of West European countries in the U.S. program of "star wars". According to Strauss, West Europeans should not continually grumble when Americans set themselves new tasks. The Bavarian politician said that the strategy of nuclear intimidation could not be eliminated by the "round dances" of participants in the anti-war movement. In the opinion of Strauss, only the appearance of new armaments can remove the threat of the utilization of nuclear weapons.

According to his blundering logic, only the stepping up of the arms race can lead to the removal of the threat of a thermonuclear conflict. Urging to intensify the arms race, Strauss expresses the aspirations of the revanchist circles of West Germany which strive to create the material basis for the implementation of the plans of the revision of post-war political realities on the continent.

On the other hand, being an obedient executor of the will of the military-industrial complex of West Germany which firmly entrenched itself in Bavaria, Strauss tries to bring pressure to bear on those West European countries which met with concern and misgivings the U.S. plans of the transfer of the arms race to outer space. These include, in the first plac, such NATO member countries as Belgium, Denmark, Holland and France.

The appeals of Strauss which are militaristic by their nature should be regarded also as an attempt to exert pressure on the population of West Germany itself. The unprecedented scope of the anti-war and anti-missile movement in that countries vividly shows that millions of ordinary West Germans are aware of the real threat coming from the whipping up of the arms race by the NATO leaders.

By supporting the "star wars" program, Strauss deliberately ignores the obvious fact that for densely populated Western Europe the spreading of the arms race to new spheres is fraught with most serious consequences. However, logic could hardly be called a characteristic feature of the Munich leaders. The "space card" of the CSU leader is dramatically at variance with the interests of West Germany and its citizens.

FRG Science 'Militarization'

LD261101 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 26 Feb 85

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS -- TASS news analyst Aleksey Grigoriyev writes:

Five chairs of aircraft and space research at the Technical University of Munich have long since become scientific branches of such military concerns as Messerschmitt-Belkow-Blohm (MBB), Morten-und Turbinenunion (MTU), Krauss-Maffei and others. This report of the magazine FRONTAL was featured at one time by all newspapers of the Federal Republic of Germany. But it revealed only the tip of an iceberg.

The militarisation of West German science is closely linked with the intensive muscle-building by the military-industrial complex and the growth of arms manufacture and arms exports, now topping an astronomical figure of 8.6 billion marks a year. Another, still more alarming, factor has appeared lately: "The strategic defence initiative" proclaimed by the U.S. President was received with great interest both in the Bonn corridors of power and at the offices of Bavarian and Ruhr military concerns.

This was especially made clear at the recent international conference of the Wehrkunde military-scientific society in Munich where Washington made an all-out effort to seduce its West European allies with a space-based anti-missile defence system. Properly speaking, the Americans did not have to seduce their West German hosts in Munich, for Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Defence Minister Manfred Woerner and Bavarian Prime Minister Franz-Joseph Strauss actually subscribed Reagan's plans for "star wars". Strauss, speaking in his characteristic manner and turning everything upside down, even described this programme as -- "space for peace". Chancellor Kohl said that Bonn was prepared to cooperate in carrying out these plans and urged other NATO partners to do the same. "I insistently recommend you not to miss this chance", he stressed.

The chancellor's reservations or explanations by Peter Boenisch, an official representative of his government, do not change the matter. Bonn may say, of course, that it has no intention of joining alone in the U.S. plans and that it has "not been invited so far" to do so.

It may refer to the White House's promises that a space-based anti-missile defence system will allegedly make nuclear weapons unnecessary and allegedly deliver mankind forever from the nuclear threat. The fact remains a fact and it was noted in Munich. "It's terrible that the efforts of talented scientists and engineers should be devoted to the development of arms whose purpose is to destroy this planet", Egon Bahr, a prominent figure in the Social Democratic Party of Germany, said at the conference.

Roland Yogt, parliamentary representative of the Greens party on disarmament questions, deputy of the Bundestag, added: "The fact that Kohl calls for cooperation in the development of American space-based armaments show irrefutably the government's complete subordination to the United States".

The militarization of science in West Germany was started long ago, just as its cooperation with the United States and other NATO countries in the development and manufacture of new armaments. West German monopolies, especially the symbiosis of its two leading concerns, Messerschmitt-Belkow-Blohm and Krauss-Maffei, are well in a position to participate in the preparation of "star wars". These gentlemen will not

miss the chance offered by the U.S. President and approved on the Rhine. Bonn, eager to become a co-owner of space arms, still more dangerous ones than ground-based nuclear weapons, is trying to enlist the cooperation of other NATO members, Italy in particular, in this field. So, first a Washington-Bonn axis in space and then a Bonn-Rome axis?... Axes established at one time with a similar aggressive purpose were broken forty years ago. Forty years. Not long ago to be forgotten [as received].

SPD Opposes FRG Support of SDI

LD261730 Moscow TASS in English 1634 GMT 26 Feb 85

[Text] Bonn February 26 TASS -- The leadership of the West German Social Democrats has demanded that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stop supporting American "star wars" plans. The Presidium of the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] board said in a statement here, in particular, that the American programs for further militarizing outer space threaten to destabilize the military equilibrium between East and West and usher in another round of the arms race, which is at odds with the vital interests of the European nations.

The leadership of the leading opposition party of West Germany called on the Bonn government to back the idea of freezing the nuclear arsenals and banning the testing of nuclear as well as space arms.

Italians Demonstrate Against SDI

PM041209 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 85 First Edition p 5

[Reportage by special correspondents G. Zafesov and V. Mikhaylov: "Italians Against 'Star Wars'"]

[Excerpts] Venice, 3 Mar--In recent days the sky over Venice has been turned upside down, as it were: The rain is pouring down incessantly, and a cold wind is blowing from the sea.

Despite the bad weather, many thousands of people have come to this city today from different ends of Italy to participate in a mass demonstration for peace and disarmament organized on the intitiative of the Italian Communist Party [PCI].

The demonstrators' words echo an article published the previous day in the newspaper L'UNITA, in which the PCI organ evaluates the upcoming Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States as a positive step toward preventing the disastrous consequences that might result from the creation of an arms system for "star wars." "The spread of nuclear rivarly into space activates the processes of miltiarization," the newspaper writes, "and increases the danger of war."

Reflecting the opinion of Italian Communists, L'UNITA urges European governments, including the Italian Government, to promote the creation of a climate of trust which would have a favorable effect on the course of the upcoming talks. Italian Communists urge the Italian Government to set an example and refuse the new deployment of American missiles in Comiso, planned for this spring.

The demonstrators filled Venice's largest square with three thousands-strong columns. Above their heads were the slogans: "No to 'star wars' and missiles!" "Ban nuclear weapons!" "Let only peaceful stars shine in the sky!" "Space must serve peace, not war!"

In conclusion there was a large rally at which PCI Secretary General A. Natta delivered a speech.

Italy's broad public is displaying ever greater alarm in connection with the plans being nurtured by the U.S. Administration to wage "star wars," he said. The idea of the militarization of space must be rejected by Italy and other West European countries.

Italian CP Document on Peace

PM251027 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "In the Fraternal Parties": "PCI Leadership Document"]

[Text] Rome, 23 Feb -- New, exceptionally great efforts must be made today in the struggle for detente and disarmament an Italian Communist Party [PCI] leadership document issued here on the problems of peace says. The PCI leadership, it notes, has adopted a decision to organize a mass meeting of supporters of peace in Venice on 3 March on the threshold of the Soviet-U.S. talks.

Italian Communists positively assess the decision to hold talks in Geneva. The implementation of these first steps was also promoted by the concern expressed by the peoples of the world, the wide mobilization of peace-loving forces, and the activity of political parties and public organizations.

The document particularly notes that "the destructive consequences that could ensue from the creation of 'star wars' arms systems mustr not be underestimated." In this way the nuclear arms race would be extended into space, thus expanding the process of militarization and increasing the danger of the accidental outbreak of war. In addition, the document points out, there would be an unprecedented increase in military spending and an expansion of the military-industrial complexes. This turn of events runs counter to the needs of social and economic development in the world, especially for the poorest and most backward countries, where millions of people are dying from hunger and epidemics.

The PCI leadership pointed to the importance of the EEC countries' contribution to the process of achieving an accord on questions if disarmament and detente. In the Italian Communists' opinion, tremendous significance would be attached to an Italian Government decision to postpone the siting, planned for spring, of new American nuclear missiles at Comiso (Sicily), where the first missiles are already in operational readiness, and to refuse any new commitments concerning the American naval base in Maddalena Island. In the present situation, it is noted in conclusion, the PCI leadership issues an appeal, especially to young people, to develop the peace movement even more widely.

Danish Ministers Support Space Arms

PM061301 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Mar 85 Second Edition p 3

[A. Bessonov "Rejoinder": "Trying To Steal the Applause"]

[Text] The Paris newspaper LE MONDE once noted that Danish Foreign Minister U. Ellemann-Jensen often says: "If I had a majority in parliament..." As we know, the present Danish Government does not have a majority in the Folketing (parliament) on foreign policy issues. The opposition, which does have a majority, is called "anti-missile" and "antinuclear." It is the opposition that has adopted resolutions committing the country's government to abstain from financing the siting of the new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe and to proclaim Denmark nuclear-free not only in peacetime, but also in the event of a "crisis situation" and even in wartime. All those resolutions irritated the Pentagon and NATO Headquarters in Brussels, where Denmakr has long been nicknamed the "sick child of the bloc."

Consequently the representatives of Denmarks's bourgeois government have to seek out every convenient opportunity to justify themselves in some way to their partners in the aggressive bloc and to assure the Americans and all NATO members that they personally had no part in it, that it is all the fault of the "troublemakers in the Folketing." They did such a good job in this respect that they find themselves again precariously in the minority.

For example, when speaking in Rome recently, Ellemann-Jensen stated that Denmark and the entire NATO bloc were obliged to provide finance for the Pentagon's space arms program. Naturally, such support was correctly received in Washington. In Denmark, however, a scandal erupted. The foreign minister's position has nothing in common with the views of the majority of the population or of parliament -- their legitimate representatives, Folketing deputies explain. And in fact many of the Danish minister's colleagues in the West European capitals, who are usually zealous in their support of militarist programs, did not understand Ellemann-Jensen on this occasion.

Then Danish Defense Minister H. Engell joined in, probably in envy of his neighbor on the government front bench. Aware that the latter had already "bagged" the space arms program, Engell decided to support the Pentagon in another "interesting venture" -- chemical weapons production. To this end he recently published an article under the highly significant title "Chemical Weapons Should Prevent Chemical War" in the Danish newspaper JYLLANDS-POSTEN. After noting for decency's sake that the present aim is to "remove all these weapons from the planet by imposing a global ban on their production, stockpiling, and use," the defense minister concluded paradoxically that the West...needs a certain amount of chemical weaponry. Furthermore, he advocated that they should be produced and adopted on the NATO scale. It is to be supposed that this was applauded in the Pentagon...

Japan's Efforts in Space Militarization

PM251028 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Feb 85 p 3

[Article by I. Mikhaylov: "Dangerous Alliance"]

[Excerpts] The joint plans to militarize space gave a particularly ominous tinge to the cooperation between the U.S. and Japanese military. Washington has in recent years been keeping a close watch on its Far Eastern partner's successes in the science and technology spheres. It was decided to make use of the achievements of Japanese scientists and engineers--particularly in creating lasers and developing microprocessors--and their inventions in aviation and space technology when the latest weapons systems are produced in the United States. It was also decided to involve Japanese specialists in work on building the crew module for an American press orbiting system. The latter is intended to play a key role in America's "star wars" program.

In January the Japanese Government approved plans to use space technology for the military department's needs. Eight leading Japanese industrial corporations are engaged in active research in this sphere. Mitsubishi heavy industry, for example, is building rocket engines, Hitachi and Ishikawajima-Harima heavy industry have signed a contract to produce rocket components, and Nissan is concerned with rocket assembly.... It is also noteworthy that each of the Japanese companies has an American partner. Toshiba, for example, cooperates with General Electric and Mitsubishi Electric with Ford Areospace. All eight corporations, as the Hong Kong magazine ASIAWEEK notes, are involved in building the crew module for the American orbiting station. And Japanese specialists recently also began building the H-2 two-stage missile, which the American military is also planning to use in its space militarization program.

The activity of Nakasone's Conservative government openly flouts the resolution adopted by the Japanese parliament in 1969 which provides for the exclusively peaceful use of space. But it is clear that the country's ruling circles are stubbornly seeking to ignore the peace provisions of the Constitution, the three non-nuclear principles, and the parliamentary resolution. Moreover, despite opposition protests, the Japanese Cabinet has made the decision to appropriate 168 million yen in fiscal 1985 (beginning 1 April -- I.M.) to fit Japanese warships with equipment capable of receiving signals from the American Fleetsat military satellite.

The present scale of U.S.-Japanese military cooperation aimed at militarizing space automatically brings the past to mind. On 15 August 1945 an address by Emperor Hirohito was broadcast by radio to the Japanese armed forces. An announcer read out the following statement: "We have lost. But this is only temporary. Japan's mistake lay in not having enough material resources, scientific knowledge, or armaments. We will rectify this mistake." These words sound particularly disturbing in our space and nuclear age.

There have been many tragic periods in Japan's history when the military embroiled the country in armed conflicts. The most terrible for the Japanese people was the last war, when millions of people died and Japan became the first country to experience the horrors of the atomic bomb. The arms race, including the space arms race, in which the United States is involving Japan more and more actively, poses a grave threat to the whole of mankind.

Nakasone Statements Hit

OW180955 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 16 Feb 85

[Report by Tokyo correspondent Pavel Potapov]

[Text] Prime Minister Nakasone holds that Japan should cooperate more actively with the United States in realizing the latter's space programs and pursuing undisguised military purposes. In answering questions from JSP Dietman Toshiharu Okada at the budget committee session of the House of Representatives, Prime Minister Nakasone stated that Japanese scientists and technicians may directly participate in research on President Reagan's "star wars" program. He said that if the United States should seek Japan's direct participation in the program, Japan would grant its request just as it did when the United States requested exchanges in advanced technology.

U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger recently stated that the United States would seek assistance from Japan and Western Europe in realizing the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). It was no coincidence that Prime Minister Nakasone made his remarks, sounding as if he were responding to Secretary Weinberger's statement. The Pentagon makes no effort to conceal its intention of using Japan's latest achievements in science and technology to realize its program of militarizing space and shifting part of the expenditures on Japanese taxpayers. On the other hand, the Japanese Government does not mind appropriating enormous amounts for financing such a research program, and has become more enthusiastic in urging the general public to believe that Japan should play a more positive role in implementing this research program.

According to the Pentagon's strategy, large orbital complexes will be used as basic elements in the defense against missiles. In 1984, the Nakasone administration already stated that it would provide to the United States all the technology needed for constructing such large orbital complexes. Furthermore, Japan has undertaken projects to develop and construct orbital modules, one of the basic parts of orbital complexes, at a cost of $1.2 billion to the National Treasury, an amount double of what it spends annually for space research.

By taking advantage of its direct participation in the U.S. space programs, Japan also intends to work out and promote a space military program [Uchu gunji keikaku] of its own. The Defense Agency has already obtained the right to use Japan's space communications satellites currently in orbit for its own purposes, and a plan for constructing large spy satellites has been launched.

The democratic forces in Japan have called on the Nakasone cabinet to strictly adhere to a Diet resolution forbidding the use of the results of space research for military purposes and to definitely reject the involvement in the U.S. military plans, which would involve Japan in the Pentagon's reckless adventures in space. This is because the militarization of space--the "star wars" program--will give impetus to a practically unrestricted arms race and at the same time nullify all the existing major agreements on restricting the arms race.

CSO: 5200/1024

SPACE ARMS

SPANISH MAGAZINE CITES SOVIET LASER EXPERT

PM211619 [Editorial Report] Madrid CAMBIO 16 in Spanish 11-18 February 1985 carries on pages 95-96 an 1,800-word Silvia Llopis interview with Soviet laser expert N. G. Bazov, who is quoted as follows:

"The problem with using lasers as weapons is how to concentrate the energy over very great distances. When the focal ratio between the diameter of the lens and the distance of the objective is equal to one it is possible to achieve deep penetration into the material, but if the ratio diverges from this the distortion of the image is very great and therefore the energy created by the laser beam is dispersed. With a 1-kw laser it is possible to perforate a 10cm-thick steel place when the distance is small, but to achieve the same effect over distances of hundreds of kilometers the laser powers required are very high.

"To build a laser capable of concentrating energy on a target at great distances is possible--I am not saying otherwise--but it would take years of work and millions of rubles, and the focusing system would cost as much again. It must be borne in mind that the largest Soviet telescope has a lens only 6 meters in diameter--that of the United States, 4 meters--and for the present we can only build lenses 20 meters across.

"Furthermore, the ability to destroy missiles fired from one country to another is not 100-percent effective. And the consequences of a war are so great that it is not worthwhile. Thermonuclear explosions affect not only the locations at which they occur. If such explosions were to take place in Europe other countries would suffer the consequences, too. And if the missiles were to be intercepted in space the same would happen--the radiation would fall to Earth all the same and it would be impossible to say which part of the Earth would be safe. I hope I do not have to work on that."

CSO: 3598/92

SPACE ARMS

UNNAMED GENERAL URGES FRENCH 'STAR WARS' EFFORT

PM071053 Paris LE MONDE in French 6 Mar 85 pp 1, 4

[Article by Hoplites, "pseudonym of a general officer on the active list": "France and 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] Over the past 3 months the French have at least begun to discover the implications of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) introduced by President Reagan on 23 March 1983 and known popularly as "star wars."

As usual, the Kremlin immediately resorted to the delaying tactics that served it so well in connection with the enhanced radiation weapon--the "neutron bomb" that provided the best means of consigning the Warsaw Pact's armored corps to the scrap heap before it could move off. Now the aim is a similar one: to preserve the stock of Soviet ballistic missiles, whose very existence terrifies the public, mobilizes pacifists and irritates governments.

Now President Reagan's strategic initiative--whether or not it takes the form of an operational device--will have the effect of reducing the threat to Western cities and forces. The credibility of an SS-20 "surgical" strike intended to disarm Western Europe would indeed be much smaller. To keep the pressure on us it will be necessary to resort to nonballistic trajectories, cruise missiles, and aircraft and to protect the offensive force. All this will take time, effort and money....

For 20 years the nuclear deterrent granted us adequate intellectual reassurance: it was an insurance policy against adversity for the strongest. Space wars will oblige us to reappraise ideas, plans and forces. One can already see the havoc wrought by the combination of fear and intellectual shortsightedness. Actually, some people did say that the nuclear deterrent had only 20-30 years left; and they were promptly recruited by the advocates of the policy of the hare, according to whom it was important to do nothing as long as the tortoise was proceeding slowly... "Everything's fine, ma'am," the French sang in 1939. Who could have thought that 6 years later nuclear mushroom clouds would make Los Alamos, Hiroshima and Nagasaki famous?

The Manhattan Project (the construction of the atom bomb decided on by Roosevelt at Einstein's insistence) clearly demonstrated the Americans' ability to rise to the challenge, as did John Kennedy's later decision to send a man to

the moon: It took 7 years. Of course, some time elapsed between the first nuclear weapons and operational strategic forces, but if we now have a deterrent force it is because the French have tried relentlessly since 1944 to make up for their lags. Any delay or lag now will weigh heavily in 20 years' time.

Are we to believe that disarmament accords will permit us to spare the necessary efforts to remain in the arms race in space? Let us make no mistake: Any negotiations on disarmament or arms control will strengthen joint Soviet-U.S. domination. We will not gain anything. The Soviets only sign an agreement when they can derive unquestionable advantages from it. Arms control accords, and particularly SALT, have merely confirmed the weaponry ceilings that the United States and the Soviet Union have been willing to offer each other.

If we await the outcome of future negotiations on space disarmament we will waste another 5 years and the door to the technologies of the future will be irremediably closed to us. Be that as it may, by the year 2100 other states will have equipped themselves with nuclear weapons and at least elementary strategic forces. Rather than risking an exchange of nuclear weapons, would it not be better to have the means to protect our four or five major cities and our nuclear arsenal?

As with all innovations the expensive part is the research and the first step. We must immediately mobilize our research and innovation capabilities and our intelligence services to keep abreast of space wars. Europe will follow if France, Britain and the FRG do not give up. As in all real European achievements, it is up to us to take the first step...time is short and will become increasingly short.

The nuclear energy commission has completed its task. We now need a space technology commission. Our future strength and independence will depend on our mastery of space technologies--whether in telecommunications, intelligence, or defense. We have tarried too long already. Compared to the Soviets and Americans we are just tortoises: We must get moving right away.

CSO: 5200/2514

SPACE ARMS

RPR SPOKESMAN'S NUCLEAR ARMS POLICY ANALYZED

PM071627 Paris LE FIGARO in French 6 Mar 85 p 2

[Article by General Etienne Copel: "We Have Too Many Tactical Weapons"]

[Text] Francois Fillon, deputy for La Serthe, who was appointed RPR defense chief at the Grenoble congress, is only 30 years old. He was trained in military questions by Joel le Theule, is aware of the fact that some of our doctrine and structures are old, and seems determined to quickly shake up a lot of old dust.

His first offensive relates to tactical nuclear weapons--the battlefield weapons and those in the immediate rear. The attack was launched in an article published in LE MONDE and was continued in LA REVUE DES DEUX MONDES. The criticism is strong. Very strong: "Although ambiguity is part of deterrence, it cannot be a cover for an empty doctrine." It is a doctrine which "refers, like a catechism, to the notion of a final warning and which survived 10 May [reference to President Mitterrand's election in 1981] unscathed."

So what is this "catechism" which has survived for 20 years? Its origin lies in the laudable idea that France should reject any form of nuclear battle. It must refrain from sending two bombs or shells, receiving four in return, and sending back eight.... So, to avoid starting escalation, our doctrine stipulates that we should launch all our tactical nuclear weapons at the same time from a distance of several hundred kilometers from the front. This single strike--a "final warning"--is intended to show our intention to open nuclear fire on enemy cities if our vital interests are threatened. From this viewpoint, Mr Hernu's decision to describe our tactical nuclear weapons as "prestrategic" seems very logical.

Francois Fillon, who is aware that political deterrence can only be effective if the military threat exists and is realistic, analyzes the role of our tactical weapons in the two main "hypothetical cases": whether a nuclear battle between the Soviets and Americans has or has not started in Europe. In the first case he stresses that our "few tactical warheads would not add any weight to the thousands which the alliance has"; in the second case he asks the fundamental question: "Is it conceivable that the French Government might shoulder the responsibility of launching a nuclear battle on its own which would certain lay waste the FRG?"

The opening of nuclear fire--even if it is tactical--is an extremely serious action. Francois Fillon is obviously aware of that. He does not say that it is totally inconceivable, but he is shocked by the scale of the warning. If the aim is to fire a warning shot, why do we need to kill hundreds of thousands of friends on the western and eastern sides of the Iron Curtain? The East Germans, Poles and Czechs may be living under Soviet domination, but that does not make them enemies.

This criticism of the excessive quantity of tactical nuclear weapons which we have, has already been made, very logically, by J.P. Chevenement: "The existing number of French tactical nuclear weapons already far exceeds what is necessary for a warning shot, in other words to show our determination to defend our territory."

Making the Doctrine More Flexible

Basically the criticism is not leveled so much at the "cathechism" as at the inadequacy of the means to carry out the doctrine. For once it is not a matter of deploring the lack of means but of pointing to a surfeit! Indeed, the greater the number and variety of tactical nuclear weapons in the Army (the Pluton missile and shortly the Hades missile) and the Air Force (the AN 52 missile and shortly the ASMP air-to-surface missile), the more the single strike doctrine becomes ineffective, harmful and even unacceptable.

It becomes ineffective because the bigger the strike, the longer it takes and the fewer aggressors there are under the bombs when they explode.

It becomes harmful because adopting a nuclear posture and waiting for the decision to use nuclear weapons increasingly hinder the First Army's movements and the flexibility with which the Air Force can be used.

It becomes unacceptable because a growing number of friendly civilians would be slaughtered merely in a warning shot.

In view of this, it is not surprising that Francois Fillon should "regret the launching of the Hades program, which is too far advanced to be stopped, and hope that the Mirage 2000 N-ASMP program will be reexamined." He envisages halving this latter program and proposes that the remainder be converted, according to the Air Force's wishes, into ground support of air defense aircraft. In fact what he is proposing is not a reduction in tactical nuclear weapons but a scaling down of their increase.

In addition to this it will also be necessary to give the doctrine some flexibility. We must envisage a warning shot which would really be a warning and not a massacre. We must make provision for tactical reprisal strikes aimed at deterring the enemy from making a nuclear attack which would be limited enough not to definitely imply a U.S. nuclear response.

We must also undoubtedly decide to put neutron weapons into service since they are far less harmful to civilian populations than our existing weapons, and, consequently, much easier to use defensively on your own territory.

It Is Not Too Late

Thinking on tactical nuclear weapons cannot, of course, be divorced from other defense problems, particularly financial problems. It is already clear that the military programming law cannot be fulfilled. Of course this will not be the first time this has happened. Budgets are what they are, and the cost of offensive equipment (tanks, aircraft, ships) is constantly increasing. But the "lag" is likely to be very considerable this time: probably more than 1 year.

So, should we be content to allow the programs to be "spread out" or should we make choices? As Francois Fillon points out "the instinctive response of any structure is to conserve." The military structure is probably even more conservative than most others, because it does not have to account for itself economically at the end of each month. It only really has to account for itself if there is a war. It is often too late!

It is late now, but it is not too late. It is not too late to consider the new threats, change doctrines, or alter choices. In the opposition and in the majority I have observed that there is a growing number of young political officials who want to renovate our defense system. They want to make it less cumbersome, less centralized, and more dynamic. They want to improve military service and the sense of civic duty. They are seeking realism and rejecting dogmatism.

Francois Fillon has just expressed some of his thoughts. We should thank him. Let us hope that the others will succeed in extending the debate; that they will be able to unite for action. Defense is not a right-wing or left-wing issue. It is either good or bad.

CSO: 5200/2514

SPACE ARMS

GROMYKO 'VEILS WARNING' ON U.S. ARMS

AU261855 Paris AFP in English 1847 GMT 26 Feb 85

[Excerpts] Rome, 26 Feb (AFP)—Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko, on a visit to Italy, delivered a veiled warning today that increased Italian-Soviet trade would be difficult to attain as long as Rome supported U.S. arms policy. Mr. Gromyko, on his first trip to a NATO country that has received U.S. nuclear missiles since 1983, spoke after talks with Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti. He was meeting later with Prime Minister Bettino Craxi.

Mr. Gromyko said Italy was a "serious partner", and that the Soviet Union was willing to develop links with Italy in all fields. But, he added, in a reference to the United States, "if one wishes to listen to all kinds of advice, most of it from outside Italy, it will be difficult to expect an increase in trade."

Mr. Gromyko said he had stressed in the talks that responsibility for installation of U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles rested "as much with states that push others to accept the missiles as with those who have accepted." Italy has been among the NATO countries urging Belgium to carry out its commitment to deploy cruise missiles. Italy itself has accepted 112 cruise missiles at the Comiso military base in Sicily. West Germany and Britain have also deployed Euromissiles under a 1979 NATO decision whose implementation in 1983 caused the Soviet Union to walk out of disarmament talks in Geneva. U.S.-Soviet arms talks resume next month.

On the U.S. strategic defense initiative, Mr. Gromyko called on Italy to "make its voice heard against the launching of the arms race in space." Mr. Andreotti responded by simply repeating the hope that the Geneva talks would prevent the extension of the arms race.

Mr Gromyko said the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. arms negotiations, which open in Geneva on March 12, would be "difficult" but that his country was ready to work towards a mutually acceptable accord. He said his government was ready to "honestly" play its part in the road to arms agreement, and hoped the United States was prepared to do likewise.
Mr. Gromyko, in an allusion to the U.S. plans for a space-based defence system, said that even before the disarmament talks began there was a clamour in the United States for an increase in armaments. He said people must defend themselves against leaders who, "like sleep walkers, march on the edge of the abyss without realising it."

For the Geneva talks to succeed, the sides would have to accept equality in armaments as an "indispensable condition."

SPACE ARMS

FOREIGN MINISTRY COMMUNIQUE ON GROMYKO'S VISIT

LD272257 Rome Domestic Service in Italian 2130 GMT 27 Feb 85

[Text] At the end of the talks which the Soviet foreign minister held in Rome with Italian leaders, the Foreign Ministry issued a communique in which the points where their news coincided were summarized.

Both sides, the Foreign Ministry note reads, reaffirm their will to exert efforts to improve confidence and cooperation in relations between states, particularly in Europe, to work to eliminate the danger of war, and to strengthen peace.

As for the imminent American-Soviet talks in Geneva, the sides positively assessed the fact that the object of the negotiations will be a set of questions concerning space and nuclear weapons, strategic and medium-range weapons, and that all such questions will be considered unresolved in their interrelation. [sentence as heard]

Further hints on the issue of space weapons were made: The sides reiterate that their ultimate objective is general and total disarmament under efficient international control. This will require that space is used solely for peaceful purposes and the total and general elimination of nuclear and all types of weapons.

CSO: 5200/2504

SPACE ARMS

L'UNITA VIEWS CRAXI STANCE ON SPACE ARMS

PM041637 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 1 Mar 85 p 1

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The Gromyko-Andreotti talks had the positive result of a final communique which takes up and supports the formulations adopted in Geneva in January by the U.S. and Soviet foreign ministers. The fact that this stance has been maintained despite President Reagan's pressures and turnabouts over "star wars" is no small matter and is to be appreciated. But we must state equally frankly that it is not a great deal either and, in particular, that it is not consistent with the gravity of the problem faced. The Italian Government has not yet issued a decisive "yes" to the "space wars" project but it does not yet dare say "no." It is still vacillating, expressing sometimes anxieties, sometimes affected optimism. At the same time an interview with the prime minister in THE NEW YORK TIMES informs us that Craxi is to ask the United States (where he arrives today) to take account of Soviet concerns regarding the burning issue in order to avoid blocking the incipient dialogue.

Clearly we are dealing with a stance that is certainly not extremist nor one of submission to the major ally (it remains to be seen, however, whether it endures). Nevertheless, these are weak and indefinite stances which therefore carry little bargaining clout. Their first shortcoming lies in the absence of an independent assessment of the burning issue. The government and its experts would seem never to have discussed and examined the issue, despite its importance. The second shortcoming also stems from a delegation to "someone else." The hope is that "someone else" will discuss the matter and that "someone else' will reach an agreement on space weapons, while the European countries work on marginal issues, with no initiatives of their own of any substantial political impact. The third shortcoming seems to us the most serious: What does it mean to say that Craxi will draw Reagan's attention to Soviet anxieties about the militarization of space? It is not only the USSR that is worried about it and there are no partisan Soviet interests at stake? The problem of weapons in space is a source of general anxiety for everyone and is "in itself" a danger and a threat to international relations as a whole, and to peace or war worldwide. In other words, the prevention of an arms race in space is not something that favors one power and harms another. It is simply a stance in line with the general interest of the world and therefore of Italy and Europe.

Unless these basic ideas are clear the Italian Government's initiatives and stances will lose even their initial vagueness and lapse rapidly into an alignment with the U.S. will. Is this not what happened with the missiles too? Did we not proceed from the "cancellation clause" and eventually reach the present situation? In this instance, however, there is an aggravating factor, because Reagan's space plans do not even have the excuse of a Soviet SS-20. So we wait with curiosity to hear what Craxi actually says in Washington.

CSO: 5200/2510

SPACE ARMS

U.S. SDI WILL ACCELERATE ARMS RACE, UPSET PARITY

LD021816 Prague CTK in English 1633 GMT 2 Mar 85

[By Richard Hajsky]

[Text] New York March 2 (CTK correspondent) -- The "star wars" project of President Ronald Reagan is by no means defensive as he presents it. Its prime purpose is to enhance the nuclear first-strike capability of the United States, which would greatly increase the danger of nuclear confrontation.

Equally false are Reagan's assertions that the space system would protect the United States against a Soviet first strike. It is a well-known fact that the Soviet Union pledged not to use the nuclear weapon as first which the United States has refused to assume a similar obligation.

At the present stage, the "star wars" project means a qualitatively new level in the arms race. Since the Soviet Union made it clear that it will not permit the United States to gain military superiority over it, failure to reach agreement on the halting of the "star wars" project would compel it to catch up with the United States also in this respect.

According to the agreement on the agenda of the Geneva talks, space weapons are to be discussed in parallel with strategic nuclear missiles and intermediate-range missiles, but President Reagan insists that the U.S. "research" in the field of space weapons cannot be a subject at the talks.

At the same time, he does not try to conceal that by the project for militarization of space, the United States wishes to improve its bargaining position in Geneva, and be able to force the Soviet Union to make unilateral concessions.

Such an attitude is apt to jeopardize the Geneva talks from the very outset. Discussion on reduction of strategic weapons cannot be separated from negotiations of space weapons the role of which is to be to destroy strategic missiles.

Reagan also falsely asserts that the United States must carry out its "star wars" program in view of an alleged "Soviet threat". He fails to take into account the hundreds of proposals submitted by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, concerning arms control and disarmament, and the Soviet pledge on no first use of the nuclear weapon.

Moreover, the Soviet Union called on the United States to agree to a complete freeze of nuclear weapons which the U.S. Administration rejected, just as another Soviet initiative calling for the banning of the deployment of nuclear weapons in outer space.

CSO: 5200/3003

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SPADOLINI COMMENTS ON EUROMISSILES, SDI

AU021425 Rome ANSA in English 0810 GMT 2 Mar 85

[Text] (ANSA) Rome March 2 -- Italian Defense Minister Giovanni Spadolini claimed Friday that NATO's decision to deploy intermediate range missiles in Europe made possible the resumption of U.S.-Soviet arms control talks beginning March 12 in Geneva. Sapdolini made the comment at the inauguration of the 66th course of the NATO defense college here. NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington was also on hand for the opening session.

"This is a moment of great hopes but also open fears. The resumption of the Geneva disarmament talks has proven that all the prophets of catastrophe were wrong," Spadolini said only 24 hours after the departure of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko from Rome.

The Italian official said that when Italy, Britain and West Germany decided to deploy Euromissiles, there were those who said it was the beginning of "an irreversible contrast with the Soviet Union. He added that the Soviet foreign minister just left Rome, capital of one of one of the countries that deployed cruise missiles.

Spadolini acknowledged the "objective difficulties" of the Geneva negotiations but pointed out that "U.S. officials intend to pursue the talks with utmost commitment and good will." In a reference to the Reagan administration's proposed Strategic Defense Initiative (also known as the "star wars" program), Spadolini said, "it is in everyone's interest to avoid that a goal for the distant future could prevent or obstruct an agreement on the atomic danger looming over humanity."

CSO: 5200/2506

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOCIALISTS COUNTRIES', NATO CDE STANCES CONTRASTED

PM051018 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 85 First Edition p 3

[Captain 2d Rank V. Kuzar article: "NATO-Style Concern for Security"]

[Text] The opening of the current session of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe [CDE] has been marked by new constructive initiatives on the part of the socialist community countries. The USSR delegation submitted to the Stockholm conference for its consideration "the basic provisions of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military forces and the maintenance of relations of peace." A few days later, the Bulgarian delegation leader, on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the GDR, and the USSR, presented to the forum's participants a working document on the question of limiting the scale of military exercises.

The submission of these and other initiatives by socialist countries is yet another graphic example of their desire to really get down to specific and businesslike talks in Stockholm, rather than merely paying lip service to them. It is quite clear, for example, that a treaty envisaging a binding renunciation of the use of both nuclear and conventional force would allow a substantial reduction in the military danger and the removal of the threat of world war.

After all, this is what the peoples of Europe and the whole world expect from the conference, and such decisions would fully meet their hopes and aspirations. For example, (P. Erikson), secretary of the Swedish National Peace Defense Committee, assessing the new Soviet move in Stockholm, stressed that it paves the way for the creation of real confidence and a lowering of the dangerous level of military confrontation on the continent. The NATO capitals, however, think altogether otherwise. They would like to pass off the disclosure of the structure and daily activity of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries, the legitimizing of espionage, and the achieving of unilateral advantages as measures building confidence and security. And while wanting to obtain "openness" about military activity right "up to the Urals," the Atlanticists leave aside the main American forces, which are situated in the United States itself, and their numerous bases surrounding the Soviet Union.

This NATO-style "concern for security" is expressed in the so-called concept of "transparency." Bloc spokesmen have for almost a year now been trying to get it through the Stockholm conference.

Every kind of "argument" has been advanced by them in an attempt to justify it. The backers of "transparency" claim; for example, that it is to all intents and purposes a most effective and universal guarantee for the prevention of war. Or they claim that the socialist countries' failure to assent to it stems from their "unwarranted propensity for secrecy in the military sphere," "excessive suspiciousness," and so forth.

It turns out that espionage under the guise of "openness," rather than limitation of military activity, the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, and the halting of the arms race, is to protect the world from misfortune.

No, the NATO stance has different aims. Specialists note, and not without justification, that the desire to obtain information about the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and its allies is inextricably bound up with the bloc's aggressive preparations: with the siting of American first-strike nuclear weapons in Europe; with the adoption of the strategic concept known as the "Rogers plan," which envisages the delivery of pinpoint strikes on installations deep inside the territory of Warsaw Pact countries; and with the beginning of large-scale production of superaccurate conventional weapons with a destructive force that is scarcely inferior to that of tactical nuclear wapons.

There are very good grounds for this claim. Nevertheless, NATO spokesmen continue to reduce the idea of strengthening the peoples' security merely to narrow military and technical measures, without linking them with large-scale steps of a political and international legal nature. This is also shown by the proposals already submitted to the conference by the NATO countries. They do not help the progress of its work; they distract attention from the really dangerous kinds of military activity and lead to the examination of unnecessary minor detail about the daily life of units and formations in military garrisons.

Not only do the measures proposed by the NATO countries affect only insubstantial military problems of confidence-building and security, but they contain provisions deliberately designed to be unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Therefore, they are clearly not intended to achieve accords. The NATO countries' stance at Stockholm bears essentially no relation to the conference's mandate, which envisages that confidence measures be built on "the basis of equality of rights, balance, reciprocity, and identical respec for the security interests of all participating states."

CSO: 5200/1015

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

DELEGATE TO STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD011807 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Text] Stockholm March 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports:

Speaking at the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe which is under way here, member of the USSR delegation Ve. Kutovoyi has called upon the NATO countries to come over to businesslike consideration of the socialist countries' important proposals that Europe be delivered from chemical weapons. Attainment of an accord at the Stockholm forum on the withdrawal of those weapons from European soil, and on non-deployment of chemical armaments where they are not present now -- as the initial step, would help lessen the danger of military confrontation, consolidate confidence.

The proposal that Europe be delivered from chemical weapons, stressed the Soviet representative, acquires special topicality in connection with the dangerous plans of the American Administration to launch broad-scale production of a new generation of chemical weapons -- binary ammunition intended for subsequent deployment in West European countries, which is the cause of profound concern of the public of those countries.

The attention of the participants in the conference was drawn to the pronouncement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Konstantin Chernenko that with a view to removing the chemical threat which hangs over the European Continent the Soviet Union will "be doing the utmost to promote establishment in Europe of a zone free from chemical weapons and would be ready to undertake the obligation to respect the status of such a zone, including within the framework of the steps that could be agreed upon between the sides concerned and that would really lead to the mentioned goal."

CSO: 5200/1015

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. ACCUSED OF BLOCKING CHEMICAL ARMS BAN

LD012106 Moscow TASS in English 1942 GMT 1 Mar 85

["Behind the Smokescreen of Peace Rhetoric" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 1 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The Reagan administration is planning to spend 1.3 billion dollars on a chemical rearmament of the USA under the budget for the fiscal year 1986 alone. In the course of the hearings in U.S. Congress, the representatives of the Pentagon do no conceal the intension of the White House to start full speed ahead the production of the latest chemical weapons for the destruction of people under the signboard of a "renewal" of the destruction of people under the signboard of a "renewal" of the chemical weapons stocks. This Washington's policy fully attunes to the large-scale programme for the buildup of weapons by the administration in all directions, including the star wars preparations.

It has been repeatedly reported in the United States press that the combat chemicals on the stocks of the USA are enough to destroy every living thing on earth many times over. One cannot help asking why it should be necessary to accumulate ever new types of the brutal weapon. The answer is simple enough: The U.S. Administration it out to ensure for itself military superiority, by basing itself chiefly on the means of mass destruction of people.

On the other hand, the tactics of the White House shows that as soon as the American leaders declare by word of mouth for a "cut" in a certain type of weapon, they simultaneously start speeding up the manufacture of other, even more brutal weapons of mass destruction. As a result, Washington is incessantly building up its arsenals of chemical, nuclear and conventionaly weapons.

As is known, the Geneva protocol of 1925 outlawed the chemical weapons as a brutal means of mass destruction. The Soviet Union has been one of the first to commit itself to observe all provisions of that international document. A different stand has been taken by the USA. Only fifty years later, it ratified the protocol, after stockpiling large quantities of chemical weapons.

Nowadays, while declaring by word of mouth for a ban on chemical weapons, the U.S. Administration is blocking under all sorts of far-fetched pretexts the attainment of an international agreement on that issue. The USA is evading bilateral talks and agreements on that issue. The USA is evading bilateral talks and agreements with the

USSR on the prohibition of chemical weapons and elimination of their stocks. The Soviet-American talks on that issue, which were started in 1976, were broken off in 1980 through the fault of the USA. Washington remains silent also on the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty member-states on ridding Europe completely from the chemical weapons, which would be an important step on the way toward a radical resolution of that problem.

This stand is not fortuitious, as simultaneously Washington is stepping up the production of chemical toxic agents of the new generation (binary) and intends to increase almost two-fold the total stocks of chemical weapons. Also visible here is the notorious line of the USA -- while talking of its striving for peace, Washington is at the same time continuing a buildup of its war potential.

CSO: 5200/1017

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

SCANDINAVIAN NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE ISSUE SUPPORTED

PM251201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 85 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent M. Kostikov dispatch: "Non-Nuclear Status for Northern Europe"]

[Text] Helsinki, February -- A broad response in the political and social circles of the northern European countries and a wave of press, radio, and TV commentaries have been evinced by the reply of K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the appeal from the northern European "Treaty Now" organization, which opposes the nuclear arms race and advocates peace, stability, and international cooperation in the region, and above all the declaration of northern Europe as a nuclear-free zone.

The creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe is an urgent question. The majority of the Nordic countries' population are demanding concrete moves from their governments and parliaments in this direction. Dozens of peace organizations and antiwar movements, including "Treaty Now," and hundreds of trade unions and groups have united under the common slogans "No to nuclear weapons" and "Nuclear-free zone for the north."

Last year the parliaments of the Faroe Islands and Greenland (part of Denmark with internal autonomy rights) declared their territories nuclear-free zones. A meeting was held in Copenhagen between representatives of the Nordic countries' public who are advocating the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. Figures from political parties, the trade unions, women's youth, religious organizations, unions, peace movements took part in it. The meeting examined the entire range of questions, including questions of international law, linked with this problem. A conference of the Cooperation Committee of Nordic Social-Democratic Parties and Trade Unions held in Oslo at the start of 1985 discussed the question of holding a forum of parliamentarians from the region's countries which it is planned to hold in the Danish capital this fall, on the problem of creating a nuclear-free zone.

U.K. Kekkonen, outstanding Finnish politician and former Finnish president, was so right and wise then, long before NATO's 1979 missile decision, he referred to the danger of northern Europe's involvement in the arms race process, spoke precisely for that reason of the need for talks to prevent this threat, and substantiated and developed the idea of a nuclear-free zone for northern Europe.

There are several reasons for this. The realistic nature of the very idea is attractive, as is the fact that its implementation would promote the strengthening of security and the peaceful development of each of the Nordic countries, both the NATO

members -- Denmark, Norway, and Iceland -- and neutral Sweden, and Finland, which has a 1948 treaty on friendship, cooperation, and mutual aid with the USSR. Second, the creation of a nuclear-free zone with corresponding guarantees from the nuclear powers over its status would reinforce in international law the current de facto non-nuclear position of all the northern European states.

The increased attention being devoted to the idea of a nuclear-free north is a reflection of the mounting alarm of the Nordic countries' publics in connection with the U.S. and NATO course of accelerated preparations by West Europe for a nuclear war and the intensification of militarist preparations in Norway, Denmark, and Iceland.

The continuing siting in West Europe of U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles creates a fundamentally new military-strategic situation on the continent, fraught with serious danger for the present comparatively peaceful situation of the Nordic countries and for their security.

The appearance of new U.S. nuclear missiles in direct proximity to the Nordic countries makes the threat of the use of their airspace to launch these weapons, which are targeted on the USSR and its allies, real and sinister. According to figures from military experts, the flight trajectories of these missiles -- be they ground-launched from Britain, for instance, or sea-launched from the Norwegian Sea -- will pass over the territory not only of the Scandinavian NATO members, but Sweden and Finland, too, thereby attracting immense danger. It was not accident that, speaking at the celebrations to mark the 25th anniversary of the "Passikivi Society," Finnish Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen stated that talks between the Nordic countries on the formation of a nuclear-free zone are necessary as a consequence of the new threat created by cruise missiles.

The opponents of the creation of a nuclear-free zone cite the fact that the north is allegedly nuclear-free, since Norway and Denmark have officially stated their refusal to site nuclear weapons and foreign military bases on their territories in peacetime, and Finland and Sweden have none. However, the creation of a nuclear-free zone, the Nordic countries' peace-loving public is noting, would place certain political and juridical barriers in the way of nuclear adventures and would make it possible to strengthen the region's security.

There have recently been more and more cases testifying to the buildup of U.S. and NATO block militarist preparations in the region. Thus, for instance, U.S. heavy military hardware, including artillery pieces that could be used to fire nuclear and neutron charges, are being stockpiled in Norway. According to a secret agreement concluded in 1974 and recently made public, Norway's ruling circles have granted the Pentagon eight "reserve" airfields for USAF nuclear-capable planes. Norway's naval bases are being adapted to receive U.S. missile-carrying submarines. U.S. militarist preparations are also being cranked up on Danish and Icelandic territory. The construction of control complexes for U.S. nuclear missiles in under way.

The Nordic countries' public is also alarmed by the provocative nature of the military exercises by NATO's mobile forces in northern Norway near the borders of Finland and the USSR.

The Soviet Union is interested in ensuring that on its borders and throughout the region the foundations of peace are firmly stable and people do not live in fear of nuclear annihilation. That is why the USSR does not only sympathize with the idea of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe but is prepared to promote its establishment.

The Soviet Union's policy is fully consonant with the noble aspirations of the movement in support of the creation of nuclear-free zones. The USSR has unilaterally adopted the commitment to no first use of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union will not use nuclear weapons against states that renounce the production and acquisition of these weapons and do not have any on their territory. Moreover, the Soviet Union has put forward a concrete program of measures of eradicate the nuclear threat in general by way of radical restrictions and reductions of nuclear weapons leading to their complete elimination.

The mounting pace of the U.S. and NATO military machine increases, in the eyes of millions of proponents of a nuclear-free north, the urgent need to stop up efforts opposing the dangerous militarist preparations, above all in translating the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone into a practical solution. The creation of a nuclear-free northern Europe and the ensuring of lasting peace in the region would reflect extremely positively on the security of the countries participating in it and would remove them from the zone of mounting nuclear threat. Indisputably, the northern Europe example could have a fruitful influence on the situation in Europe as a whole.

Unlike the United States, our country has supported the initiative on turning northern Europe into a nuclear-free zone from the very start. This was reaffirmed in K.U. Chernenko's reply to the appeal from the "Treaty Now" organization. The Soviet side stated once again the USSR's readiness to act as guarantor of the nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, to examine the question of certain essential measures to be taken with regard to the part of its own territory adjoining the zone, which would promote the strengthening of its nuclear-free status, and to discuss with interested countries the questions of giving the Baltic Sea nuclear-free status.

The Soviet Union does not make these steps conditional on positive attitudes to the nuclear-free zone from the Western Powers, although, naturally, the importance of the creation of the zone would be more complete for all its participants if similar commitments were also undertaken by the NATO nuclear powers.

This position of the USSR, a great power and direct neighbor or the Nordic countries, is seen in the region as a weighty factor in favor of a nuclear-free north, in support of strengthening the foundations of peace, and to the benefit of detente in the region. It was received with satisfaction by the Finnish leadership. The USSR's readiness to promote the proclamation of a Nordic nuclear-free zone has also been highly assessed by Swedish Prime Minister O. Palme.

The task of creating a nuclear-free zone could be considerably furthered even now if the ruling circles of the Scandinavian NATO members -- Norway, Denmark, and Iceland -- rejected their "wait and see" position and participated in the dialogue without reference to the United States but guided by their own peoples' desires and their countries' security interests.

Undoubtedly, resolving the question of a nuclear-free north is first and foremost a matter for the countries of the region themselves. There are many difficulties in the way, linked mainly with the U.S. course of hostility to the idea of a nuclear-free north. However, even within the Scandinavian countries themselves there are influential forces opposing the idea of a nuclear-free north.

Certain Scandinavian politicians, primarily from the NATO countries, try to hitch the problem of declaring northern Europe a nuclear-free zone to the resolution of a whole series of other international problems concerning nuclear arms. In particular,

they strive to link the question to the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks, although it is in no way part of their objectives. The problems of creating nuclear-free zones, including a zone in northern Europe, are, as K.U. Chernenko has noted, subject to independent resolution, which would open new opportunities for strengthening confidence and reducing tension both in Europe and in the whole world.

The idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe enjoys the support of millions of Swedes, Finns, Danes, Icelanders, and Norwegians. Their will dictates the adoption of specific steps to implement it.

CSO: 5200/1014

NUCLEAR TESTING

CALL MADE FOR TOTAL NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

PM261431 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by B. Serov: "Urgent Issue: To Place Nuclear Weapon Tests Under a Treaty Ban"]

[Text] The upcoming Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on space and nuclear arms must be put on the right road, and a favorable atmosphere must be created for them. One of the immediate steps which could be taken for this is to resolve the question of totally ending nuclear weapon tests. The creation of new varieties of nuclear weapons and the qualitative improvement of existing varieties are connected with such tests. The emergence of new weapon types and systems threatens to destabilize the strategic situation. At the same time, the elaboration of agreements on the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms is hampered. Therefore the ending of corresponding tests is essentially the key problem in the matter of the practical limitation of the production potential for new models of nuclear bombs and warheads. This measure would be an effective means of reducing the already great danger hanging over mankind and a means of cutting short the nuclear arms race.

Let us point out in passing that, because the testing of nuclear weapons is attended by great unproductive expenditure, its abandonment would make it possible to transfer substantial funds to development purposes. And, taking account of the fact that experimental nuclear explosions can pollute the environment and pose a danger to people, their cessation would also contribute to solving the global ecological problem.

A routine conference to examine the working of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, which was validated on 5 March 1970, will be held this year. In signing that treaty the parties to it adopted a pledge to hold talks in a spirit of goodwill on effective measures to end the nuclear arms race. One such measure was to be a ban on nuclear weapon tests.

It should be recalled that back in the fifties the mass movement for an end to dangerous experiments with nuclear weapons arose in various countries and began to gain strength. From the very beginning the Soviet Union was in the vanguard of that movement. Alone among all the nuclear states, it resolutely and firmly advocated ending nuclear arms tests. As a result, certain positive steps were taken in this direction. Thus, the 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water limited the potential for developing the most powerful new types of these weapons -- which also substantially reduced a dangerous source of radioactive pollution of the environment.

It is an authoritative and weighty agreement: Some 111 states are now parties to it. However, not all nuclear powers have subscribed to the treaty (China and France have still not signed it). Underground tests have also remained outside a treaty ban, and yet they make it possible to continue the modernization and buildup of nuclear arms.

The 1974 Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests could also have been a positive step. According to it, underground explosions with a yield of more than 150 kilotons are banned. It also provides for a limit on the number of tests. Another treaty, one on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, which rules out the possibility of their use to improve nuclear weapons and envisages a verification system elaborated in detail, was concluded between the USSR and the United States in 1976. The last two treaties were signed but have not been ratified, because the United States is still delaying their validation on farfetched pretexts.

On our country's initiative, talks began in 1977 between the USSR and the United States (Britain joined them later) with a view to concluding a treaty on the total ban of nuclear weapons tests. A considerable distance was traveled. Many important points were agreed upon. It seemed that the pen was poised to sign the treaty, as it were. The sharp U.S. shift toward stepping up war preparations, however, resulted in the talks being broken off by the Western participants at the concluding stage.

The prospect of ending nuclear weapon tests does not suit the present U.S. Administration. Hoping to achieve military superiority over the USSR, it perceives a test ban as a serious obstacle to implementing the program for a further buildup of its nuclear arsenal. Washington does not even hide the fact that it will continue tests in order to create new types of nuclear weapons and increase their lethal power, as if the colossal stocks already in existence are still inadequate and their destructive potential still too small. The U.S. underground nuclear test program is being stepped up. New warheads are being perfected at a Nevada test site, and various combat hardware models are being tested for resistance to nuclear explosion.

To camouflage (very clumsily, incidentally) its negative attitude to a test ban, the United States usually refers to difficulties of verification. But these difficulties have been invented, and they are perfectly solvable on the basis of the existing proposals of the USSR and other countries. Incidentally, H. York, head of the U.S. delegation at the tripartite talks, which began in 1977, once admitted that the existence of political will would help to reach a verifiable agreement in less than 6 months. Even now the possibility of concluding such an agreement is acknowledged by certain U.S. politicians. Thus, B. Boxer and N. Mavroules, member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, recently submitted for examination a draft joint resolution of both its houses which addressed to the President a demand to end nuclear weapons tests for a period of time and to begin talks on totally banning them.

The overwhelming majority of the world's states demand a ban on text explosions of nuclear weapons in all environments and for all time. Their will has been reflected in a number of UN decisions. However, the United States ignores them despite the fact that it is one of the parties to the 1963 Moscow treaty and adopted a pledge under the treaty to be guided by the desire "to achieve an end to all test explosions of nuclear weapons forever" and "to continue talks to that end."

The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the problem of banning nuclear weapon tests can be solved. Moreover, as Comrade K.U. Chernenko pointed out, it is one of the most easily solvable problems. Our country proposes accelerating the elaboration and conclusion of an international treaty for a total ban on nuclear weapon tests -- for which practical talks should be urgently begun at the Geneva disarmament conference.

Seeking to accelerate progress on this path, the USSR submitted the "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on a Total Ban on Nuclear Weapon Tests" for examination to the UN General Assembly and the disarmament conference. This document takes account of everything positive achieved over the course of many years of discussing this problem. It also reflects the views of many states, in particular on questions of monitoring observance of the future treaty. This document is a good basis for quickly reaching an accord.

To create favorable conditions conducive to the elaboration of a treaty, the USSR also proposed that all nuclear powers, by way of displaying goodwill, declare a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, starting on a date agreed upon among them through to the conclusion of the treaty itself.

A radical solution to the problem of a total ban on nuclear weapons tests would also be promoted by the implementation of certain interim measures leading up to the planned goal. Thus, the Soviet Union has repeatedly declared its readiness to ratify on any day -- on a mutual basis -- the treaties concluded with the United States on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, and to resume the tripartite talks between the USSR, the United States, and Britain.

The question of prohibiting nuclear weapons tests rightly occupied a priority place at the 39th UN General Assembly Session, too. The overwhelming majority of states at the session advocated their immediate and unconditional cessation. But once again, as in previous years, the United States and its closest partner -- Britain -- voted against this.

The problem of prohibiting nuclear tests must be gotten out of the blind alley. The states which refuse to participate in talks on this problem or sabotage its resolution assume serious responsiblity before the whole world.

CSO: 5200/1018

END