283088

JPRS-TAC-85-020

26 July 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

19980722 109

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10
158
A08

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-85-020

26 July 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

GENERAL

USSR's Bogdanov Attacks U.S. Attitude to Arms Curbs
(Radomir Bogdanov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 27 Jun 85) 1

Soviet Journal Assails U.S. Stance in Various Disarmament Fora
(Y. Tomilin; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 5, May 85) 4

USSR: Avoiding Nuclear War Overrides Class, National Interests
(Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 4, Apr 85) 13

Soviet Quarterly Survey: Geneva Talks, SDI, CDE, MBFR, ANZUS
(T. Panova, et al.; Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTHNOSHENIYA, No 4, Apr 85) 21

PRAVDA Weekly Review Views U.S. Arms Policies
(Boris Orekhov; Moscow PRAVDA, 7 Jul 85) 31

Weekly Talk Show on U.S. Nuclear Subs, Space Militarization
(Boris Andrianov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 23 Jun 85) 34

Trident's D-5; Alaska Submarine 34
SALT II Treaty 35
Militarization of Space 36

Soviet Colonel Contrasts U.S., Soviet Records on Arms Control
(Moscow World Service, 16 Jun 85) 40

TASS Reports East-West Nuclear War Colloquium
(Moscow TASS, 29 Jun 85) 42

Kennedy, Arbatov Cited 42
Meeting Ends, Attendees Noted 43

Soviet Parliamentary Delegation Discusses Arms Issues in France
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 29 Jun 85) 44

Soviet-Hungarian Communique Discusses Arms Issues
(Moscow TASS, 8 Jul 85) 46

Antinuclear Physicians Meet in Budapest
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 30 Jun 85; Moscow TASS, 1 Jul 85) 48

Gorbachev Message 48
Appeal to Gorbachev, Reagan 49

PRAVDA Reports End of Socialist International Meeting
(Moscow PRAVDA, 21 Jun 85) 51

USSR's Tikhvinskiy Reviews Book on Scientists' Role in Peace Struggle

(S. Tikhvinskiy; Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 4, Apr 85) 52

Briefs
USSR-Italy Talks 59
Soviet-Spanish Consultations 59

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: Responses to Gorbachev 'Reassessment' Threat Assailed
(Various sources, various dates) 60

State Department Statement 60
More on State Department 61
PRC, U.S. Media Reaction 62
Western Media Commentaries 63

Moscow: Talks 'Essential' but U.S. Must 'Review Position'
(Moscow Domestic Service, 8 Jun 85) 64

TASS Cites Interview With Italian Premier on Moscow Trip
(Moscow TASS, 28 Jun 85) 66

SPACE ARMS

Soviet Economist Denies Benefits of SDI Technical Spinoffs
(N. Karasev; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 3 Jun 85) 67

Moscow Paper Interviews Dutch Figure on SDI, INF
(Mikos Racz Interview; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 23, 16-23 Jun 85) 71

FRG Editorial on Participation in Eureka, SDI
(Wilfried Hertz-Eichenrode; Bonn DIE WELT, 31 May 85) 72

Reportage on Visit by Vice President Bush to FRG
(Hamburg DPA, 25 Jun 85) 73

Meetings in Bonn 73
Discusses SDI 73

FRG Research Minister Discusses Guidelines on Eureka
(Hamburg DPA, 25 Jun 85) 75

U.S. Senators Discuss SDI With FRG Officials
(Hamburg DPA, 1 Jul 85) 76

GDR CDU/CSU Defense Export on USSR Space Weapons
(Juergen Todenhoefer Interview; Hamburg BILD, 14 Jun 85) 77

Dutch Foreign Minister Discusses SDI With FRG's Genscher
(Hamburg DPA, 30 May 85) 78

FRG Officials on European Role in SDI
(Hamburg DPA, 22 Jun 85) 79

FRG Ministers Meet French Counterparts, Discuss SDI
(Hamburg DPA, 26 Jun 85) 80

Chinese Premier, FRG Official Discuss Eureka, SDI
(Hamburg DPA, 15 Jun 85) 81

FRG Scientists Ask Kohl To Decline SDI Role
(Hamburg DPA, 3 Jul 85) 82

FRG Foreign Minister Interviewed on EEC, Eureka, SDI
(Hans-Dietrich Genscher Interview; Mainz ZDF, 20 Jun 85) 83

FRG CDU/CSU Chairman Views 'Star Wars' Research
(Alfred Dregger Interview; Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network,
23 Jun 85) 87

FRG Government To Decide on SDI in Fall
(Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 26 Jun 85) 88

EEC Spokesman Characterizes SDI as 'Huge Industry Subsidy'
(Eberhard Wisdorff; Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT, 6 Jun 85) 89

Belgian Defense Minister Denies 'Readiness' for SDI Cooperation
(Vienna ORF, 21 May 85) 91

Dutch Parties Debate SDI, Eureka
(Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 20, 21 Jun 85) 92

CDA Rejects SDI 92
Defense Minister Responds 93

Technological Reasons Against Dutch SDI Participation
(Walter Zegveld; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 10 Jun 85) 95

Danish Folketing Debates SDI Research Involvement
(Thorkild Dahl; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 15 May 85) 99

Norwegian Government Wins Storting SDI Debate by 1 Vote
(Einar Solvoll; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 5 Jun 85) 101

Norway's Foreign Minister Discusses USSR Relations, SDI
(Olav Truygge Storvik; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 11 Jun 85) 103

France's Dumas Promotes Eureka During Visit to Norway
(Cathrine Lochstoer; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 15 May 85) 105

French PS, Norwegian Labor Party on Eureka
(Gunnar Selgard; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 3 Jun 85) 107

Norwegian Labor Party on Storting SDI Debate
(Editorial; Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET, 5 Jun 85) 108

Norwegian Analyst Views SDI Impact on West Europe
(Johan Jorgen Holst; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 5, 6 Jun 85) 110

European Security 110
Further Comment 112

Norwegian Commentary on NATO Meeting, SDI Research
(Editorial; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 24 May 85) 114

Norwegian Editorial Urges 'Plain Speaking' on 'Star Wars'
(Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET, 28 May 85) 116

Czechoslovak Paper Hits Kohl's Support of SDI
(Juraj Bydzovsky; Bratislava PRAVDA, 30 May 85) 118

Vietnam Opposes Militarization of Outer Space
(Hanoi VNA, 25 Jun 85) 121

SALT/START ISSUES

Moscow Explains Why U.S. 'Circles' Oppose SALT II
(Moscow International Service, 18 Jun 85) 122

Further Criticism of Reagan Policy on SALT II
(Various sources, various dates) 125

'Fierce Attack' on SALT II, by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov 125
'Seeking Pretext' To Abandon Treaty 125
'Undercutting' SALT II 126

'Bound To Destroy Treaty' 126
'Purposeful Course of Undermining' 127
House Poseidon Decision 127

IZVESTIYA: Pentagon Sees B-1 as 'Trump Card'
(B. Ivanov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 1 Jul 85) 129

U.S. Accelerating Production of 'First-Strike' B-1, D-5, MX
(Moscow World Service, 9 Jul 85) 130

Moscow Stresses Tie Between SALT II Compliance, SDI
(Moscow in English to North America, 6 Jun 85) 131

Briefs
TASS Reports Midgetman Contract 133

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Briefs
Turkey Deploys U.S. Missiles 134

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

Soviet Gen Tatarnikov: NATO Verification Proposals Unacceptable
(Moscow PRAVDA, 29 Jun 85) 135

USSR: NATO Opposes 'Ambitious' Proposals
(Vladimir Katin; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 2 Jul 85) 136

Soviet Delegate Speaks on Exchanging Military Data
(Moscow TASS, 1 Jul 85) 137

TASS Reports Advance Notification Proposal by Hungary
(Moscow TASS, 21 Jun 85) 138

USSR: Comments on End of Summer Session
(Moscow TASS, 5 Jul 85; Moscow Television Service,
5 Jul 85) 139

Grinevskiy Cited 139
Bloc's 'Moral Success', by Valentin Zorin 140
NATO Countries Main Obstacle, by Valentin Gubernatorov 140

Prague on Lack of Progress at Stockholm Talks
(Prague Domestic Service, 6 Jul 85) 141

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

New Zealand Dailies Report Opposition's ANZUS Suggestion
(Various sources, 20, 22 May 85) 143

McLay's Way To 'Defuse Breach' 143
Lange: McLay's Call 'Staggering' 144
Editorial Supports McLay 145

Wellington Response Cautious to White House Letter
(Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 23 May 85) 147

New Zealand Paper on U.S.-PRC Ship Visit Failure
(Editorial, Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 20 May 85) 148

New Zealand Expects Pacific Forum Okay on Nuclear-Free Zone
(Karen Brown; Wellington THE EVENING POST, 20 May 85) ... 150

GENERAL

USSR'S BOGDANOV ATTACKS U.S. ATTITUDE TO ARMS CURBS

PM271020 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jun 85 First Edition p 1

[Radomir Bogdanov "International Review": "Dangerous Illusions"]

[Text] R. Reagan's Republican administration has been in power 5 years, and throughout this time the situation in the world has remained complex -- more than that, dangerous. It is no secret that it has become so as a result of the policy pursued by Washington.

According to figures from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, military spending on our planet reached the astronomical sum of $820 billion in 1984. This astronomical buildup was occasioned by the fact that since 1980 U.S. arms spending has risen by 40 percent! It is by no means an accident that the Pentagon budget is 10,000 times (!) greater than appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which is called upon under U.S. law to implement arms limitations and reductions.

The facts attest that the present U.S. Administration is oriented toward a continual buildup of the U.S. strategic offensive potential in the hope of acquiring the potential for a disabling [obezoruzhivayushchiy] first nuclear strike. Under these conditions it is actively working to destroy the treaty system that restrains the nuclear arms race. Recently the U.S. Administration has been feverishly studying scenarios for putting an end to the restrictions imposed by the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty. This treaty, as is well known, enshrined the approximate military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States. It also laid the foundations for a substantial lowering of the level of this equilibrium.

The scenario of continued observance of the SALT II treaty provisions by the U.S. side was rejected out of hand, and for entirely understandable reasons: The treaty in no way fits in with the administration's military-strategic plans. President Reagan's 10 June statement on U.S. policy with regard to existing treaties and agreements in the strategic arms limitation sphere attests to the U.S. side's gradual slide out of the treaty and its discarding of the limitations envisaged by it one after another. Of course, given the domination of extremist elements in the administration, Washington would prefer a direct and overt renunciation of its commitments under the treaty. However, the White House considered this a risky step, since it could not entirely ignore international public opinion. In order to reduce the scale of the moral and political damage it started seeking a formula which would obscure the true meaning of Washington's decision. Thus, when announcing his intention to withdraw a Poseidon submarine from combat service when the U.S. Navy receives the next modern Trident nuclear submarine, the President stressed that this is a one-shot measure and does not mean that he will take similar action in the future. However, this is by

no means the sole decision of this type. The United States has left in its wake a long trail of the most blatant violations of international agreements and accords in the arms limitation sphere.

In an attempt to camouflage its actions aimed at undermining these agreements and accords, the Reagan administration is resorting to a method it has long since rehearsed -- making clearly farfetched accusations against the other side. The intention is to undermine public confidence in the USSR as a partner in the talks and thereby show the futility of further dialogue with the Soviet Union.

The organizers of the slanderous anti-Soviet campaign are counting on the shortness of human memories, endlessly repeating: "The Russians cannot be trusted." The reply to this, and it is a convincing one, can only be provided by the facts. These include, for instance, the joint U.S. Defense Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff, State Department, and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency document submitted to Congress in June 1980, which states that the Soviet Union has observed the 14 arms control agreements signed since 1959. THE NEW YORK TIMES recently wrote caustically that it is hardly worth thinking, as the Reagan administration is trying to suggest to Americans, that the "line of U.S. presidents from Nixon and Ford to Carter wanted or was able to cover up violations (of treaties -- R.B.) on the part of our most difficult adversary."

It is the Soviet side that has every reason to question not only the sincerity of the incumbent U.S. leaders as regards arms limitation and reduction, but in general their observance of fundamental Soviet-American treaties. A serious blow to trust in the U.S. stance was dealt by the U.S. Senate's refusal to ratify three important nuclear arms control agreements, including the SALT II treaty. The frustration of this treaty's ratification gave the United States a free hand in the massive deployment of long-range cruise missiles. As a result, a new category of strategic weapons, of which there are already thousands, has emerged. Trust in the U.S. leadership has also been shaken by the decision to deploy U.S. medium-range nuclear means in West Europe in circumvention of accords reached on SALT II in the hope of obtaining unilateral military advantages. It is typical that the circumvention plan was hatched and implemented while the SALT II talks were in progress. The program for the creation of strike space means and of a large-scale system of so-called ABM defense coupled with the buildup of strategic offensive arms is also aimed at smashing the strategic balance and attaining U.S. military superiority.

Acting in circumvention of the SALT II treaty, people in Washington now claim that a second new type of ICBM -- the SS-25 missile -- has supposedly appeared in the Soviet Union. Yet the President is well aware that no second new type of Soviet strategic missile exists. The old SS-13 missile, which is being modernized strictly in accordance with the SALT II treaty, is being portrayed as a "new" missile. The false accusations are needed in order to reserve for the United States the "right" to breach one of the key treaty provisions and create as well as the MX missile another strategic missile, the Midgetman. Such is the methodology of forgery to justify preprogrammed breaches of the treaty. Announcing his administration's stance toward the SALT II treaty, the President warns that Washington in no way intends to call a halt to its destructive work. It intends to amputate vitally important SALT II provisions as they become an obstacle to the planned programs for the creation and buildup of strategic arms. The actual departure from adherence to the treaty is used as a pretext to speed up the implementation of these programs.

According to data cited in THE WASHINGTON POST, there is no influential member of the U.S. leadership who advocates firm observance of the treaty obligations. A particularly

furious attack against the treaty is mounted by leaders of the Pentagon, the Department of Justice, the CIA, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Agency director K. Adelman not only does not advocate the establishment of arms control, but actually criticizes all existing agreements in this sphere.

Having taken the path of reneging on pledges that have been made, people in Washington must clearly understand the consequences to which the stance taken by the White House as regards the SALT II treaty leads. The TASS statement draws the U.S. side's attention to the fact that it should not delude itself that it "will be allowed to determine arbitrarily which obligations will be observed and which will not. To expect the other side to go along with such a line on the part of the United States is a dangerous delusion."

CSO: 5200/1284

SOVIET JOURNAL ASSAILS U.S. STANCE IN VARIOUS DISARMAMENT FORA

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 5, May 85 pp 102-110

[Article by Y. Tomilin]

[Text] The threat of nuclear war has been looming most ominously over the past few years. And today it is not only the fate of modern civilisation but the preservation of man as a biological species that is at stake.

The growth of the nuclear threat was caused by the United States' attempts to achieve military superiority through the accelerated development of new nuclear arms. Pershing 2 and cruise missiles targeted on the USSR are still being deployed in Europe. MX and Midgetman ICBMs, Trident 2 ballistic missile submarines, B-1B and Stealth bombers, and air-, sea-, and ground-based long-range cruise missiles are all being manufactured. The US Administration plans to increase the number of nuclear warheads in its arsenal to 20,000 by 1990.

These new types of weapons are highly accurate and fast, some are capable of approaching a target unseen, hitting it unexpectedly, and can be swiftly targeted or retargeted. All this indicates that a first-strike potential is being built up. At the same time preparations are under way in the United States for using outer space for military purposes. The Strategic Defense Initiative, as it is called in the USA, envisages the development of a large-scale anti-missile system using space-based elements. Though the "initiative" is presented as "defensive", it is clearly aggressive and is designed to strengthen the offensive potential of the USA, and give it military superiority. Its purpose is to create a space shield from behind which a first nuclear strike could be delivered with comparative impunity. The very capability for making such a strike could also be used by the United States to exert political pressure and for blackmail.

The building of an anti-missile defence system which is being contemplated in the USA would greatly destabilise the military strategic situation, raise the arms race to a higher and more dangerous level and considerably increase the nuclear threat.

In the American plans for achieving military superiority much prominence is given to chemical weapons. A new type of these weapons, known as binary weapons (so called because they include two relatively harmless components which form a toxic agent of immense power as they interact on their way to the target), has been developed in the USA and is now ready for production.

The level of military confrontation in Europe, especially in Central Europe, remains high, and the deployment by the United States of the latest nuclear missiles there makes the region still more explosive.

●

In the present international situation, tense as it is, a positive response was evoked throughout the world by the understanding reached between the USSR and the USA in January this year on the subject and purpose

of Soviet-American talks. This understanding offered an opportunity for a thorough and productive discussion of the problems related to the prevention of an arms race in outer space and ending it on the Earth. Special mention should be made of the fact that the joint Soviet-American statement issued on that occasion said that in the long run the talks, just like the efforts to limit and reduce arms in general, should bring about the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere.

The talks which started on March 12 in Geneva cannot be viewed as a continuation of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons and on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe held until the end of 1983. The present talks are entirely new, being based on an essentially new approach, according to which problems concerning nuclear and space weapons are being discussed comprehensively, in their interrelation. This new approach has been adopted because these types of weapons are closely interrelated.

Previously, the sides believed it would be easier to reach agreement through separate negotiations on strategic arms and on medium-range weapons. But then it became obvious that it was no longer possible to hold talks and reach agreements on strategic arms unless the problem of medium-range weapons was solved. The point is that the US medium-range weapons deployed in Western Europe are, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, also strategic weapons, for they can reach targets in Soviet territory. At the same time, neither strategic nor medium-range weapons can be considered separately from space arms. The construction by the USA of a space anti-missile system would upset the strategic parity and destabilise the strategic situation as a whole.

Back in 1972 the USSR and the USA arrived at a clear understanding of the fact that in conditions of parity in strategic offensive forces, an additional buildup of the defence potential by either side would be tantamount to building a pre-emptive nuclear strike potential. The logic of nuclear confrontation is such that the creation of a ramified anti-missile system pursues aims that are far from defensive and are an element of the course towards military superiority. To restore the upset balance the other side would be compelled to respond by building up its own strategic potential or its offensive forces, or by complementing them with defence means. In any case, this would set off an unrestricted arms race.

When the Soviet Union and the United States signed the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the interim agreement on measures limiting strategic offensive arms in 1972, both sides recognised the inter-relationship between offensive and defensive strategic systems. It was therefore stipulated in the Treaty that effective measures on limiting anti-ballistic missile defence would be a substantial factor in restricting the strategic offensive arms race and would lessen the danger of a war in which nuclear arms would be used.[1]

Today, the proponents of "star wars" in America are trying to prove that in the present conditions new technical possibilities for creating more effective anti-missile defence systems break this inter-relationship. In actual fact this inter-relationship between strategic offensive and defensive arms does not disappear, it exists objectively.

In order gradually to develop new space weapons without arousing public outcry, and make the world face an accomplished fact, official US spokesmen allege that it is merely "intensive research" and "development of modern technology" that is being carried out in the field of "strategic defense". On this basis they assert, firstly, that there is as yet no real threat of an all-embracing ABM system being deployed, and, se-

---

[1] *The Soviet Union in the Struggle for Disarmament. A Collection of Documents*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, pp. 111-112 (in Russian).

condly, that the United States is not violating any of its commitments on arms limitations, above all those envisaged under the ABM treaty. It is common knowledge that research and development are part of any project. It is also obvious that R&D are conducted not merely for theoretical purposes but for finding real technical ways of realising an idea most rationally and effectively. Therefore, references to the research stage of the process change nothing. The Soviet Union cannot just sit and wait until it learns what this US "research" leads to. Since this presupposes necessary measures of response, the US "research" is programming the arms race. In an interview with NBC, a US television company. in September 1984, former US Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, arguing with Caspar Weinberger, the present incumbent, who was trying to prove that total defence against Soviet missiles could really be created, said that he also believed in American scientists but was not so sure about the Soviet ones and considered they would take measures of response.

An all-round ABM system with space-based elements can be made operational only at the cost of cancelling the ABM treaty. Art. 1 of this treaty envisaged that "each party undertakes not to deploy ABM systems for a defence of territory of its country and not to provide a base for such a defence".[2] Art. 5 says that the parties pledge "not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based".[3]

To ensure the success of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva the sides should, above all, abide strictly by the understanding reached in January this year. At present, the pattern of the talks corresponds to their subject and aim. Considering the close inter-relationship of space weapons, strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range nuclear arms, each side is represented at the talks by one delegation, which is subdivided into three groups, one dealing with space problems, another with strategic nuclear weapons, and the third with medium-range nuclear arms. At times the delegations comprising all the groups meet to examine the situation as a whole and to tie all the three components together into a single complex.

The USSR is doing everything necessary for the goals of the new Soviet-American talks to be achieved. Agreement is absolutely necessary and quite possible. It is necessary because the world would otherwise be sliding faster and faster down the path of the arms race, and the threat of war would be growing. Agreement is quite possible because all that needs to be done for it to be reached is to respect the rights and legitimate interests of the security of both sides and not to seek to upset the existing balance of strength.

●

The Soviet-American talks on space and nuclear arms, which are being held at the initiative of the Soviet Union, are at present the only two-way channel along which an agreement on arms limitation can be reached. There are also a number of multilateral forums in which the Soviet Union takes an active part, and at which disarmament problems are discussed.

On February 5 this year the Conference on Disarmament (Committee on Disarmament until 1984) began its latest session in Geneva. Under its status, it is a cohesive multilateral organ of disarmament negotiations. Among the items on its agenda are problems of preventing nuclear war

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 112.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

and the militarisation of outer space, limiting and reducing nuclear arms until they are completely eliminated, achieving a complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, prohibiting and eliminating chemical weapons, banning radiological weapons, and preventing the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

In accordance with present-day practice, the agenda of the conference is drawn up on the basis of recommendations put forward by the UN General Assembly. One of the resolutions adopted at the initiative of Argentina proposes that the Conference on Disarmament should, as a matter of top priority, begin talks with a view to reaching agreement on corresponding practical measures to prevent nuclear war and, for this purpose, set up a special committee at the start of its sessions in 1985. Similar resolutions were adopted by the General Assembly in the preceding two years. The Soviet Union, other socialist countries and also the non-aligned states have worked persistently for the implementation of this recommendation. However, no special committee was set up because Western states, above all the USA, were opposed to the idea.

An obligation by nuclear states to refrain from being the first to use nuclear arms could become an important measure for preventing nuclear war. As is known, the Soviet Union has already assumed such an obligation.

At the initiative of the GDR and other socialist countries the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly called on those nuclear states which have not yet done so to consider the question of assuming an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In the same resolution the General Assembly recommended that the Conference on Disarmament consider the possibility of drawing up an international legally binding document registering the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear arms. At the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly the Soviet delegation expressed the opinion that such an obligation could be registered, for instance, in a convention. The obligation, of course, could also be assumed unilaterally by each individual state, which would be the shortest way requiring no special talks or coordination.

If the call to follow the USSR's example and refrain from the first use of nuclear weapons were at last responded to by the states which have not yet done so, it would be tantamount to renouncing the use of nuclear arms. This problem could also be solved if a convention banning the use of nuclear arms were signed by all nuclear states. This proposal, advanced by India, and the text of the draft convention are now being considered by the Conference on Disarmament.

The question of a complete and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests has been on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament for many years now. The UN General Assembly has insistently recommended on several occasions that the Conference on Disarmament start talks to draw up and sign a relevant agreement. The 39th Session in 1984 again urged the Conference to begin talks without delay in order to draw up such an agreement and, to this end, to set up a special committee authorised to conduct the talks. However, the United States, which intends to go ahead with nuclear arms testing in order to effect its nuclear programmes, has come out against the idea of setting up such a committee, as well as against the talks.

Amongst the priority items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament is the question of preventing the spread of the arms race to outer space. On this issue, too, the General Assembly proposed that the Conference should set up a special committee for holding talks on signing an agreement—or agreements—preventing an arms race in outer space in any form. No progress, however, has so far been made here, again because of the negative stance of the USA. Incidentally, the USA was

5-911 (англ.)

the only country to abstain at the 39th Session during the voting on a resolution containing such a recommendation. As many as 150 countries voted to hold talks on preventing an arms race in outer space.

The UN General Assembly also addressed to the Conference on Disarmament two recommendations on disarmament and on reducing nuclear weapons until their complete elimination. But no progress has been made here either because of the negative stand of the USA. As a result, the Conference on Disarmament at present concentrates on just one problem: the prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons.

●

The Soviet Union considers the prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons a major task. As a result of the persistent efforts of the USSR and other socialist countries at the talks held within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, definite progress has been made in recent years in reaching agreement on a number of major issues pertaining to the prohibition of chemical weapons, and it is now possible that a corresponding international convention will be signed. Evidence that the USSR is interested in an early solution to this problem is provided by the numerous proposals it advanced during the talks, above all the draft of the basic provisions for a convention banning the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and envisaging their liquidation, thus offering a carefully thought-out basis for understanding. (The draft was placed before the Conference on Disarmament for consideration about two years ago.) The Soviet Union has developed this initiative by advancing constructive proposals which take due account of the progress of the talks and of the positions of the other member states.

No progress has been made at the talks entirely through the fault of the United States. Bent on building up chemical weapons and manufacturing new types of such weapons, such as binary ones, the present US Administration is erecting ever newer obstacles to solving this extremely important problem. The drawing up and signing of an international convention banning chemical weapons can be sped up only if all the countries taking part in the talks, above all the USA, display a constructive and businesslike approach to them.

A successful solution of other outstanding problems, too, would no doubt be made easier if all the participants were to display political will and a constructive approach. Among these problems are a "preventive" prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction by reaching a comprehensive agreement or through separate accords; the prohibition of radiological weapons; and the adoption of effective measures to ensure a safe development of nuclear power engineering.

Socialist and many non-aligned countries have often expressed dissatisfaction and concern over the fact that a perfectly abnormal situation has taken shape at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. This many-sided organ of the talks is in fact incapable of performing its chief mission, which is to hold talks on a large number of top-priority problems connected with the curbing of the arms race and achieving disarmament, towards which it is directed by the decisions of the UN General Assembly.

As distinct from the Conference on Disarmament, which concentrates on global arms limitation and disarmament problems, two other multilateral forums—the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and the Vienna Talks on the Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe—are formally regarded as regional talks. But it is quite obvious that their successful consummation would certainly help to improve the situation and safeguard peace and security not only in Europe but elsewhere in the world, too.

The tense international situation today dictates the need for confidence-building in the political and military spheres. The peoples of Europe and the whole world therefore have good reason to pin great hopes on the Stockholm Conference which resumed its sessions on January 29 this year. The success of the Conference can be ensured by an equal approach to the discussion of both political and military confidence-building measures and by combining large-scale political measures with technical military ones.

Regrettably, the delegates of the NATO countries who are seeking unilateral advantages, are in fact obstructing the elaboration of mutually acceptable agreements and are instead trying to impose on the Conference a discussion of their own programme of poorly concealed espionage, which they plan to conduct in those regions and areas of military activity which interest NATO most. While trying to introduce an extensive series of measures aimed at "screening" the USSR's military activities in the entire European part of the Soviet Union up to the Urals, they have not so much as mentioned in their proposals any measures pertaining to the territory of the United States, where the main body of the NATO military machine is to be found. Besides, the Western proposals evade the discussion of a limitation of military exercises. The NATO countries have "overlooked" the independent activity of their air forces and navies and have conveniently "forgotten" to extend control measures to the transportation of their own troops.

The aim of the proposals advanced by the delegations of the Soviet Union at the Stockholm Conference is to increase trust and understanding between states and prevent nuclear war. They envisage the adoption by nuclear states, following the USSR's example, of obligations to refrain from being the first to use nuclear weapons; to conclude an agreement on the mutual non-use of armed force and maintain peaceful relations among states; not to increase, and to reduce military spending; to remove chemical weapons from Europe; to assist in creating nuclear-free zones in various parts of Europe; to draw up additional confidence-building measures elaborating on the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act; to limit military exercises and to give advance notification of large-scale military exercises of land troops and air forces and navies; and to give notification of large troop movements.

Wishing to facilitate the earliest possible progress at the conference and displaying a readiness to go over to practical negotiations, the Soviet delegation presented a working document entitled The Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Non-Use of Armed Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace as the Conference resumed its work this year. It explains that the pivotal provision of the treaty would be a commitment not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against one another, that is, not to use armed force against one another at all.

An important area where progress along the path towards a long-awaited agreement would help improve the situation not only in Europe but also in the rest of the world are the Vienna Talks on the Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe (the latest round began on January 31 this year). Although the talks are now in their twelfth year, they have not yet led to the elaboration of mutually acceptable agreements. A basis for such an agreement, marked by a sensible and practical approach to solving the problem, was offered by the socialist countries in June 1983 in the draft agreement on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments and related measures in Central Europe.

In essence, this approach means that the sides should give up the "data debate"[4] which has long been used by the West as a brake on the Vienna talks and start an actual reduction of troops and armaments in Central Europe, to bring them down to an agreed equal lower level.

The proposals put forward by the socialist countries provide for a prompt reduction, as the first step, of a certain part of the armed forces and armaments of the USSR and the USA in Central Europe, by way of mutual example, and a subsequent freezing of the levels of the armed forces and armaments of all the countries directly participating in the talks, a reduction that would remain in force until a comprehensive agreement is reached.

The draft agreement says that all the states directly taking part in the talks should assume an obligation to reduce, within three years of the agreement's coming into force, their land forces in Central Europe, so that ultimately the total strength of the military personnel of each side should be reduced to an equal level of 900,000 officers and men, including up to 700,000 ground troops, and 200,000 servicemen in the air force.

The draft agreement provides for control over the reduction of not only foreign but also national troops and effective enough verification of the numbers of military personnel after the reductions.

On February 14 this year, wishing to give a fresh impetus to the talks, the delegations of Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Poland and the USSR (the socialist countries which participate directly in these talks), proposed the Draft Basic Provisions for an Agreement on Initial Reduction by the Soviet Union and the USA of Ground Forces and Armaments in Central Europe and on the Subsequent Non-Increase of the Level of the Opposing Sides' Armed Forces and Armaments in the Region.

Within one year of the agreement's coming into force the ground troops of the USSR and the USA in Central Europe would be reduced by 20,000 and 13,000 respectively in whole combat units, complete with their standard weaponry and materiel, up to 10 per cent of these reductions coming in the form of individual servicemen.

The draft agreement also envisages that, following the reduction of Soviet and American troops, all the signatories to the treaty should assume a commitment, on a collective or national basis, not to raise the level of their armed forces and armaments in Central Europe throughout the term of the agreement.

As well as using national technical means of inspection, practical measures for implementing the treaty have been proposed, such as an exchange of lists of reduced and withdrawn units, notification of the start and end of practical reduction measures, and the setting up by each

---

[4] "Data debate": the Western countries, calling into question the official data on the armed forces of the socialist countries, advance exaggerated data on their numerical strength, backing these up with unfounded "arguments".

side, for the period during which forces would be withdrawn, of three or four observation posts through which the withdrawal would be effected.

The draft also suggests that talks on subsequent larger reductions should be continued. The proposed agreement would come into effect on the day of its signing and would be valid for three years. The draft agreement is based on the pattern of reductions and the approach to them outlined in the initiatives put forward by the socialist countries in February and June 1983.

The new initiative by the Warsaw Treaty countries is constructive and practicable. It takes into account a number of the elements of the stand of the Western participants, making it possible to achieve the first tangible result at the Vienna talks within a brief space of time.

The USA and its allies, on the other hand, evade a solution of cardinal issues directly related to lowering the level of confrontation in the centre of Europe, in particular, the reduction of arms and the limitation of air force personnel and the scope of military exercises.

●

The Soviet Union also consistently supports the idea of talks on those aspects of the limitation of armed forces and armaments which have not yet been discussed.

Thus, it believes that the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces should become a permanent element of international negotiations and agreements. Proceeding from this principled concept, the Soviet Union has proposed on many occasions that this problem be solved on the global and the regional level. The Soviet Union has also come out for the solution of yet another problem—the limitation of international sales and deliveries of conventional arms (which are estimated at tens of billions of dollars). Proposing a resumption of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of the arms trade, which were unilaterally discontinued by the USA, it believes that here, too, progress can be achieved by multilateral efforts, and also agrees to other states participating in the discussion of this problem.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union, the limitation of conventional weapons would be greatly facilitated if the process were to continue of banning or limiting the use of specific types of conventional arms which can be regarded as excessively dangerous or having indiscriminate effects. The USSR was among the first to sign and ratify the international convention and three protocols to it, which came as the first practical result of the multilateral talks in this sphere. Unfortunately, the delay of the ratification of the convention by a number of states, above all the USA, Britain, France and other militarily strong countries, prevented the convention from becoming an effective instrument of arms limitation. The 39th Session of the UN General Assembly in 1984 called upon all states which have not yet ratified the convention to do so immediately.

Yet another problem which can and should be solved through multilateral talks is the limitation of naval activities and naval armaments. The Soviet stand on this issue was expounded in the letter from Andrei Gromyko to the UN Secretary-General of April 6 last year. Having expressed a readiness to take part in the talks recommended by the 38th UN General Assembly Session on the limitation of naval activities, the limitation and reduction of naval arms and the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans, specifically to the busiest waterways or those areas where a conflict is most probable, the Soviet Union has advanced a number of practical considerations on this score which could form the basis of these multilateral talks.

The sides could agree, for instance, to take urgent measures on refraining from an expansion of naval activities in regions of conflict or tension.

The Soviet Union takes a flexible position with regard to choosing a forum for negotiations on this problem. Considering it a possibility to hold them within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, it is also prepared to study the possibility of separate multilateral talks on the whole range of relevant problems. Here the UN Commission on Disarmament could also be of use. The resolutions of this body—although it is not a negotiating but a deliberative body—could not only have a moral influence in favour of holding the talks but could also offer useful recommendations concerning practical measures to be taken for an effective limitation of naval activity and naval armaments.

Multilateral efforts could also be of practical use for increasing security, confidence and stability in some regions and ocean areas, be it the Indian, Atlantic or Pacific oceans, the Mediterranean, or the Persian Gulf.

The convocation of an international conference on the Indian Ocean has been impermissibly delayed, although the situation there cannot but cause serious concern. The Indian Ocean has increasingly been turning into an arena of military tension since the United States stepped up its militaristic activity there and established the Central Command (CENTCOM), whose zone of operation covers a vast area in Southwest Asia including 19 countries, and a large part of the Indian Ocean. Such actions cannot be regarded other than as a direct threat to the security, independence and sovereignty of all countries in the region.

The Soviet Union, which has always supported non-aligned countries' proposal that the Indian Ocean be declared a peace zone, believes that the convocation of a conference on this problem in the first half of 1986, as envisaged in a resolution of the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly, would be a major step towards realising the idea of creating such a peace zone.

Insistently demanding that real measures be taken to restrict the arms race and achieve disarmament in close relationship with the solution of problems concerning world economic and social development, the Soviet Union sees reduction of military spending as a most promising way of achieving this aim.

Seeking to bring this problem out of deadlock, the Warsaw Treaty member countries came up with a new initiative in 1984, proposing that they and the NATO states begin practical talks on a mutual non-increase of military spending and its subsequent reduction.

Regrettably, the USA and its allies have not agreed to cut back their military budgets, which are set to grow at giddy rates until the start of the next century. This unwillingness is disguised by an imitation of activity, as has often been the case in the past. They have been making various proposals assessing the "military efforts and potentials" of states and, instead of reducing the military budgets, deliberately complicated research is being undertaken in their comparability.

Supporting the use of any possible channels of negotiations, the Soviet Union is doing all it can to strengthen the foundations of world peace, eliminate the threat of war and achieve first the limitation and then the liquidation of arms, above all nuclear ones. This is the goal of its constructive and realistic initiatives.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye," 1985
English Translation Copyright: Progress Publishers 1985

CSO: 5200/1060

GENERAL

USSR: AVOIDING NUCLEAR WAR OVERRIDES CLASS, NATIONAL INTERESTS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 17-32

[Excerpts] In the actual historical situation of the final quarter of the 20th century the "interests of mankind" concept merits the most serious attention. Does it have a right to existence at all and what is its real meaning with respect to the sphere of international relations? How is it correlated with such traditional categories as national, state and class interests? How are human interests specifically reflected in the foreign policy concepts and practice of different sociopolitical forces and world politics as a whole?

The proposition concerning the possibility of the rapprochement and concurrence even of the interests of different classes in tackling certain common tasks in the sphere of international relations was embodied in the notion of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, which was formulated by V.I. Lenin and which has exerted the profoundest influence on the world politics of the post-October era. Examples are sufficiently well known: dozens of specific agreements between the USSR and individual capitalist countries in the prewar years, the experience of the anti-Hitler coalition in World War II, the Soviet Union's cooperation with other states within the UN framework and bilaterally and so forth.

Today, however, it would appear appropriate to put the question: is it possible when analyzing the content of world politics to confine ourselves to the categories of class, state and national interests? After all, it is in our time that the deep-lying trends of the internationalization of social development enriching the content of world politics are manifesting themselves particularly strongly.

The upsurge of the production forces under the conditions of the scientific-technical revolution and the profound qualitative shifts in the alignment and correlation of social forces in the world arena have engendered a number of problems of a global scale in whose solution all social strata, all peoples and mankind as a whole have an objective interest. It is these

problems which are occupying an increasingly pronounced place in interstate relations. Both in terms of significance and degree of direct interconnection with the sphere of foreign policy and international relations the problem of preventing nuclear war undoubtedly emerges at the forefront here.

It is well known that scientific-technical progress, which is opening to mankind new opportunities for penetrating the secrets of nature and the increasingly full satisfaction of people's diverse requirements, has resulted through the fault of imperialism primarily in the appearance of qualitatively new, nuclear, weapons and other types of weapon of mass annihilation. As a result there have been profound changes not only in the strategy, tactics and nature of military operations but also in the social parameters of war and its possible consequences. And this cannot fail to be reflected in the content of modern world politics.

Whereas throughout all past centuries wars were considered the most effective means of achieving this foreign policy goal or the other and an inalienable attribute of interstate relations (and which at times objectively promoted social progress), in our time a war involving the use of nuclear weapons would inevitably entail the loss of hundreds of millions of people, profound material, social and spiritual regression and the devastation on a gigantic scale of the material and spiritual values of civilization. Such a war, although its outbreak would be the result of continuation of the certain policy of a certain class, is incapable of securing the achievement of any political goals whatever. It would, furthermore, put an end to any politics and, possibly, the very existence of mankind.

We shall quote in this connection the opinion of Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Fifty thousand nuclear warheads are stockpiled in the world, which constitutes in TNT equivalent three and one-half tons of explosive per person. One warhead is capable of causing damage many times greater than the effect of the American bombing of Dresden or the Hiroshima explosion. If all 50,000 are exploded simultaneously, life on Earth will vanish, intelligent life, at least."*

As competent experts testify, the mass detonation of nuclear warheads would be accompanied by radioactive fallout; the following would be a consequence of this: the persistent contamination of vast territories and expanses of water, the clouding of the atmosphere, a general cooling of the Earth's surface (a "nuclear winter"), partial destruction of the stratosphere's ozone layer and a sharp increase in the ultraviolet irradiation of the planet's surface fatal for living beings.**

It is also appropriate to cite the conclusion concerning the influence of a large-scale nuclear conflict on the biosphere at which 40 prominent American biologists arrived in 1983: "It is obvious that merely the influences on

---

* IZVESTIYA, 30 October 1983.

** See J. Schell, "The Fate of the Earth," New York, 1982, p 94.

ecological systems as a result of a large-scale thermonuclear war could be sufficient for the destruction of existing civilization, in the Northern Hemisphere, at least." As if summing up the scientific investigation of the possible consequences of nuclear war, the well-known American scientist C. Sagan asserts with complete conviction: "In view of the scale of the potential losses, no political declarations and no technical guarantees will be capable of sufficiently ensuring preservation of the human race."*

Under these conditions the prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe becomes not only a prerequisite of the preservation and normal functioning of individual states and social systems but also the primary condition of the very existence of human society.

Formulating the law of the development of human history discovered by K. Marx, F. Engels once emphasized the "simple fact that people first of all have to eat, drink and have shelter and clothing before being in a position to engage in politics, science, art, religion and so forth...."** It may be added to this today that before eating, drinking and having shelter and clothing, people must first of all ensure the preservation of the human race. The solution of all the remaining questions--economic, social, political, ideological and so forth--ultimately depends on this. This thought was expressed distinctively by A. Einstein: "Man must first ensure his own survival; only then may he ask himself the question as to what type of existence he prefers."***

The universal interest of mankind, regardless of the class, national and other differences dividing it, in preventing nuclear war assumes in our time the significance of an objective category consideration of which is an essential condition of a realistic foreign policy. And here the interests of the socialist states, the workers movement and other revolutionary forces of the present day fully coincide with the interests of all mankind for removal of the danger of such a war is an essential prerequisite of further successes of socialism and communism and social progress as a whole. But the prevention of nuclear war cannot fail to correspond in a certain sense to the objective interests of bourgeois states also and the bourgeoisie as a class inasmuch as such a war threatens the existence of capitalism as a system and is fraught with the danger of the physical destruction not only of the working people but the exploiters also.

Thus as distinct from the past, when the peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist states was based on the temporary, partial coincidence of their interests (frequently on the part of bourgeois states, of a market-determined nature), under the new conditions it is a question of the objective, long-lasting common interest of all states and all social strata in preventing nuclear war, that is, the interests of mankind as a whole (whether these new realities and objective interests are sufficiently reflected in the consciousness and political practice of different classes and states is another matter).

---

* FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Winter, 1983/84 No 2, p 274.

** K. Marx, F. Engels "Works," vol 19, p 350.

*** Quoted from "Problems of War and Peace. Critique of Contemporary Bourgeois Socio-Philosophical Concepts," Moscow, 1967, p 253.

The formation of interests common to all mankind is connected not only with preventing nuclear war, although it is this task which occupies the central place under current conditions. The appearance of a number of new problems of a global scale such as providing the planet's growing population with food, the rational distribution of fuel and raw material resources, the exploration of new energy sources, space and the oceans and environmental conservation operates in this same direction. Their solution demands the joint efforts of the entire world community. The connection of the said problems with the interests of mankind as a whole is obvious. It is not fortuitous that in examining the scientific criteria of the highlighting of global problems the Soviet experts V.V. Zagladin and I.T. Frolov point primarily to the fact that such problems "essentially affect the interests of all mankind and in the long term the future of all mankind also. It may be said in this sense that global problems are of a general nature."*

The growing role of interests common to all mankind ultimately reflects the objective and natural trend of the internationalization of social life. What is new, however, is not so much the very appearance of such interests as the direct and, it may be said, dramatically serious "incursion" of this category into interstate relations, the insistent need for and practical possibilities of the realization of the interests of mankind in the sphere of world politics and their complex interaction with the categories of class, national, state and, at times, narrow-group interests traditional for this sphere.

A correct understanding of the scale and depth of the changes in the world which have already occurred and which are gathering pace increasingly and mankind's common destiny and determination of ways of removing the dangers threatening it are a categorical imperative of our day. But it is the very nature of recognition of the realities of the nuclear age and the very approach to the most urgent general task of the prevention of nuclear war (and to other global problems also) in foreign policy strategy and practice which reflects with full force the contrast of the class nature and class interests of the socialist and capitalist states and progressive and reactionary political parties and politicians.

The consistent policy of the USSR and its allies aimed at preventing nuclear war and ensuring peaceful coexistence combined with the appearance of realistic trends in the policy of the West's ruling circles began to produce tangible practical results in the sphere of world politics. The first, fundamentally important steps on the path of a quest for joint solutions of urgent international problems of a global scale were the Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in Three Media (1963), the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty(1968) and the Treaty Banning the Deployment on the Seabed and Ocean Floor and in the Interior Thereof of Nuclear Weapons and Other Types of Weapon of Mass Destruction (1971). The Treaty on Antarctica (1959), which enshrined its demilitarization and neutralization, could also serve as an example of the fruitfulness of such an approach.

---

* V.V.Zagladin, I.T. Frolov, "Global Problems of the Present Day. Scientific and Social Aspects," Moscow, 1981, p 6.

The forced revision by the West's ruling circles of certain tenets of the cold war together with other domestic and foreign policy factors contributed to the positive development of bilateral relations between socialist and capitalist states throughout the latter half of the 1960's-first half of the 1970's. This experience showed that neither the contrast of socioeconomic systems nor differences in ideology serve as an impediment to cooperation for the purpose of preserving and consolidating peace.

The community of states' long-term interests in the sphere of international security formed the basis of the detente process, which developed successfully at the start of the 1970's on a bilateral and also on a multilateral level besides. Graphic confirmation of this were the convening and successful completion of the historic Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in which 33 European states and the United States and Canada participated. Referring to their wish "to cooperate in the interests of mankind," in the Final Act of the conference its participants drew up generally acceptable principles of interestate relations corresponding to the requirements of peaceful coexistence. The Final Act also reflected the spread of the problems of interstate relations to such spheres as the environment, power engineering, transport and humanitarian exchange.

The struggle against the arms race and the threat of nuclear war and for the solution of other present-day global problems is attracting the increasingly great attention of the participants in the nonaligned movement. This is distinctively refracted in particular in the developing countries' demands concerning a reorganization of international economic relations.

The interests of mankind are also being reflected to an ever increasing extent in UN activity. This is attested by, for example, such documents which it approved in the 1970's as the Declaration on Strengthening International Security, the Resolution Renouncing the Use of Force and Banning the Use of Nuclear Weapons and the Convention Banning the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological, Biological and Toxic Weapons and on Their Destruction and also the results of the UN General Assembly special disarmament sessions. Special attention is merited by the adoption as a result of many years of work of the Law of the Sea Convention, which speaks directly of the "interests and requirements of all mankind," while the area of the seabed and ocean floor and the interior thereof beyond the confines of national jurisdiction, as, equally, the resources thereof, are regarded as "the common inheritance of mankind".

As a whole the 1970's were marked by pronounced progress in the recognition and practical realization in international politics of the vital interests of mankind. Of course, such a development of events, which afforded a prospect of a limitation of the race in arms, a reduction therein, the removal of the threat of nuclear war and the peaceful coexistence of all states in the solution of global problems common to all mankind, by no means signified a change in states' class nature and their foreign policy. But whereas, as noted, the basic--class and national--interests of the socialist states do not diverge in principle from the interests of mankind as a whole and socialism's foreign policy is aimed at their practical embodiment, things

are different in respect of capitalist states. The selfish interests of monopoly capital here frequently prevail over the interests of the broad people's masses and interests common to all mankind. The socially conditioned inconsistency of the forces and figures who operate from realistic positions and the impact thereon of market-determined factors engendered by the struggle of different groupings within the ruling class are also reflected here. The attempts to make the solution of problems of limiting the arms race, which are of vital importance to mankind, dependent on the "behavior" of the USSR in this part of the world or the other (the notorious "linkage" concept) may serve as an example. Extreme reaction's avowed nonacceptance of detente and peaceful coexistence in general, bellicose anti-Sovietism and appeals, based on nuclear blackmail, for a "crusade" against socialism represent a direct threat to the interests of the peoples.

Influential circles of the monopoly bourgeoisie discern in the achievements of detente, a reorganization of international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the approach to problems of world politics with regard for the interests of all mankind a threat to their class privileges, political positions and hegemonist aspirations. Such was the underlying class motive of the "antidetente" operation which unfolded in the West in the latter half of the 1970's and which has continued through today. The most dangerous manifestation of the selfishness and egotism of the reactionary circles of present-day imperialism has been the U.S. Administration's policy of adding a further twist to the arms race spiral dictated by the endeavor of the biggest monopolies to obtain guaranteed high profits and hopes for the achievement of military superiority as the principal instrument of the struggle against world socialism, the peoples' national liberation movement and their own capitalist competitors also. The possibility of a reorganization of international relations in accordance with the realities of the nuclear age and the interests of mankind, connected with detente, has proven to be unrealized through the fault of American imperialism.

The historically necessary and objectively urgent process of the formation, recognition and realization in world politics of interests common to all mankind develops, as can be seen, by no means automatically and rectilinearly. Its tempo largely depends on the subjective factor, on the coursee and outcome of the struggle between the social and political forces which contribute to it and those which impede it and attempt to turn it back even. This was confirmed as forcefully as could be by the international-political events of the start of the 1980's.

The threat to mankind created by Washington's policy is giving rise to the growing resistance of the healthy forces of mankind. The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries and their joint peace-loving policy are a conscious and consistent fighter against the nuclear danger, staunch defender of the vital interests of mankind and main guarantor of the preservation of peace in the world. New confirmation of this was the Soviet Union's important initiative which led to the understanding concerning the subject and goals of the Soviet-American negotiations on questions of space and nuclear arms, which will be studied and tackled in interconnection. Strict observance in the course of the impending negotiations of the accord

that has been reached in all its parts could ensure progress on the way to a halt to the arms race, removal of the threat of nuclear war and ultimately the liquidation of nuclear weapons, as the vital interests of the peoples of the world demand.

The people's masses are playing an increasingly significant part in the struggle for the salvation of mankind. This is convincingly attested by both the scale of the present antiwar movement and the breadth of the spectrum of social forces participating therein (political parties, trade unions, women's and youth organizations, scientists, the church and so forth). "The unprecedented mass and political awakening of the past 2 years," O. Palme, chairman of the Independent Disarmament and Security Commission and leader of Sweden's Social Democratic Party, observed in 1982, "has given rise to a new community concerned with problems of peace and security. People are no longer looking at nuclear war as something remote and unreal. They are feeling the burden of military spending as a result of cutbacks in health care programs, lost jobs and lost hopes of progress. They now know precisely what will happen in the event of war to the cities and suburbs where they live and what will happen to their near ones and dear ones and all whom they love. They are aware (often more clearly than many professional experts) of the entire shakiness of the premises of mutual 'deterrence'. This mass consciousness has already become a considerable political force whish has succeeded in influencing the course of events."

The United States' premeditated departure from the principles of detente and arms limitation, which has been particularly pronounced since the start of the 1980's, is causing disquiet not only in the broad masses but also in the ruling circles of a number of Western states. Thus in March 1983 the British weekly THE OBSERVER considered it necessary to remind Reagan that in the nuclear age no great power can ensure its security at the expense of another. "The survival depends on ensuring universal security. This joint interest and actual need are independent of their ideological differences." In a report submitted to the FRG Bundestag the well-known SPD figure H. Ehmke emphasized with good reason: "In the era of weapons of mass annihilation both sides must come to terms with the fact that survival can be ensured only together with the other side and not in defiance of it." Finnish Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen formulates his view of the problem of international security thus: "Each country's national interests coincide increasingly with the common interests of mankind. Peace and international security are indivisible. We all live in one and the same biosphere and enjoy the same natural resources. We are essentially all passengers of a single spaceship. International interdependence grows with every passing year. No people can close their eyes to this and pursue merely their own goals contrary to the interests of other countries." Prominent figures in the United States itself who in the past held high federal office like C. Vance, R. McNamara, G. Smith and G. Kennan are also critical of the foreign policy doctrines and actions of the Reagan administration, under which the militarist-hegemonist claims of American imperialism have enjoyned the most concentrated expression.

Political realism, a readiness for honest negotiations and joint actions in the name of preservation of the human race itself and a growing understanding of the need to put mankind's common vital interests above particular interests and above the disarmaments which divide people are the prerequisite of successful struggle for removal of the threat of nuclear catastrophe. It is this that determines the consistent and scrupulous policy of the Soviet Union--one of peace and progress--which was confirmed with new force at the special CPSU Central Committee plenum in March 1985. "Never before has such a terrible threat hung over mankind as in our day," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said. "The sole reasonable way out of the situation is the countervailing forces' understanding concerning an immediate halt to the race in arms--primarily nuclear--on Earch and prevention thereof in space."*

---

* PRAVDA, 12 March 1985.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

CSO: 5200/1059

SOVIET QUARTERLY SURVEY: GENEVA TALKS, SDI, CDE, MBFR, ANZUS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEXHDUNARODNYYE OTHNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 78-97

["International Survey" by T. Panova, M. Strezhneva, Yu. Fedorov: "Current Problems of World Politics (2 December 1984-1 March 1985)"]

[Excerpts] Graphic confirmation of the peoples' aspiration to peace and their resolve to halt the slide toward the abyss of catastrophe were the results of the UN General Assembly 39th Session, which ended in December 1984. This international forum adopted many constructive documents aimed at moral-political condemnation and the prevention of nuclear war, a curbing of the arms race and the prevention of its spread to new spheres, primarily space.

Even the most aggressive and avowedly militarist representatives of imperialist forces cannot in our time fail to take stock of the peoples' will to peace. The unprecedented upsurge of antiwar sentiments in the West, including the United States itself, pressure on Washington on the part of its NATO allies supporting negotiations with the USSR and a departure from the confrontation being imposed on the socialist countries, the emphatic protests of nonaligned states against the arms race and the nuclear danger and, finally, the economic and social consequences of the policy of an unchecked arms buildup, which are being perceived increasingly by the United States--these are the entirely objective factors to ignore or deny which is becoming increasingly costly in both the direct and indirect senses of the word.

It was precisely under their impact that the U.S. Administration, albeit very reluctantly, responded to the USSR's initiative concerning new Soviet-American negotiations on the entire set of questions concerning space-based and nuclear arms--strategic and intermediate-range--in their interconnection. The corresponding agreement was reached at the start of 1985.

Through the stormcloud of tension which had built up in the world shone a bright ray of hope. And the fact that it cut through the gloom of confrontation at the start of the year imparts to these hopes special meaning and significance.

1. In the Key Area

A meeting was held 7-8 January 1985 in Geneva 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 U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz. After 2 days of very complex, intensive, but at the same time frank conversation agreement was reached on the holding of new Soviet-American negotiations, the suggestion concerning which had emanated from the Soviet Union. The joint statement says that the subject thereof will be the set of questions concerning space-based and nuclear arms--strategic and intermediate-range--and they will all be examined and tackled in interconnection, what is more. The purpose of the negotiations, the document emphasizes, will be the formulation of effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space and a halt thereto on Earth, nuclear arms limitation and reduction and the strengthening of strategic stability. Ultimately the negotiations, like efforts in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction in general, are to lead to the liquidation of nuclear weapons entirely and everywhere.

The path to the negotiations was not easy. Many difficulties created by Washington had to be overcome. The main one, which has not been removed completely even now, are the U.S. Administration's attempts to impose an absolutely unacceptable format and structure of the negotiations which fail to correspond to the realities of the current strategic situation. The White House sought in every way possible to circumvent the problem of space and to prevent discussion of questions of averting its militarization. In other words, the U.S. leadership endeavored to confine itself merely to the types of arms on which negotiations, broken up in the past by the actions of Washington itself, have already been conducted. But these attempts failed. Ultimately in the course of the conversations on 7-8 January in Geneva the American side was forced to consent to recognition of the fundamental fact that questions of space-based and nuclear arms are indivisible and should be discussed and tackled in a package. It is this package approach which constitutes the fundamental novelty of the present negotiations compared with preceding negotiations.

The USSR's approach to the Geneva negotiations is well known. "...We do not aspire to the achievement of one-sided advantages over the United States and the NATO countries and to military superiority over them," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized. The Soviet Union desires a halt to and not a continuation of the arms race. It desires a real reduction in stockpiles of arms and the destruction, for a start, of a considerable proportion thereof and not the creation of increasingly new weapons systems, whether in space or on Earth. It was these aspirations which dictated our country's formulation of such questions as a freeze of nuclear arsenals and a halt to further missile deployment. In short, it is a question of the implementation of a number of initial steps capable of facilitating in practice the holding of the negotiations and bringing nearer the achievement at them of positive results. Our ultimate goal here is the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere in the world and the complete elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union and its leadership have emphasized repeatedly that our country comes to the negotiations with serious and honest intentions. It expects such an approach from its partner also. Any attempts to impose on the USSR an agreement which would tie its hands in questions of strengthening its defense and simultaneously open wide the doors for the realization of Washington's military programs of unprecedented scale are futile. They can only undermine the possibility of agreement being reached. And military-strategic parity will be preserved by the collective efforts of the socialist community. So it was before, so it will continue to be.

However, the reports being received from Washington testify that the supporters of a militarist policy in the U.S. Administration and outside it have by no means laid down their arms. Many statements have been made in the American capital on the threshold of the start of the negotiations giving rise to doubts concerning the United States' readiness to abide by the letter and spirit of the understanding reached in Geneva. In addition, manifestly at odds with it, militarist circles are stepping up the preparations for "star wars". Thus Gen J. Abrahamson, who heads the organization of work on realization of the notorious SDI, declared that the first test of antimissile technology in near-Earth space will take place in 1987--2 years earlier than the scheduled time. He reported that two such tests would be conducted annually.

The draft military budget for the 1986 fiscal year, which was submitted to Congress by the R. Reagan administration at the start of February 1985, contains plans for the deployment of strategic offensive arms which, if realized, would mean the United States going far beyond the ceilings of the limitations on MIRV's ballistic missiles established by the SALT II Treaty. The United States has deferred to this June the latest test of the ASAT antisatellite system originally planned for March, but is not abandoning either this test or, even less, the development of space arms as a whole. None of this by any means fits in with the goals and tasks of the Geneva negotiations but corresponds entirely to the aggressive plans of the U.S. Administration.

Disclosing the true intentions of militarist circles, an antiwar organization uniting representatives of U.S. academic circles issued a statement which, inter alia, sets forth the possible scenario of the use of space-based combat systems. "Killer satellites," the document says, "will put out of action the enemy's early warning system. Then hydrogen bombs will be exploded over its cities, which will put communications systems out of action. Fifteen minutes later Trident missiles will destroy the launch silos. Thirty minutes later MX missiles will wipe out everything else. Then ABM systems with space-based components will shoot down any missiles which might have survived the first strike."

Of course, our country has sufficient means for frustrating the realization of this insane scenario. However, the deployment of space arms will have extremely dangerous consequences for the whole world. The start of an arms race in space will reduce to nothing all that it has been possible to do on Earth in the sphere of nuclear arms limitation. There could be no question of any reduction, not to mention liquidation, thereof. Besides, the militarization of space would spur the arms race in all its dimensions,

shake the strategic stability and undermine international security. The Soviet leadership has plainly warned the U.S. Administration of this.

The hopes which the world community links with the new Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva explain the very close attention with which the most varied political forces and movements throughout the world followed the slightest nuances in the speeches of responsible statesmen and also the mass media on the threshold of 12 March--the day of the opening of the negotiations. And certain singularities of the tone and content of pronouncements and publications which appeared throughout January and February in the United States did not escape here the gaze of observers adhering to far from identical political positions.

The negotiations had still to begin, but the United States was emphasizing every conceivable difficulty, problem and obstacle in their way. Of course, it would be wrong to deny the complexity of the negotiations. But the constant emphasis of these difficulties has assumed a special meaning in the light of certain other facts. It was accompanied primarily by the American side's avowed attempts even prior to the start of the negotiations to impose a categorical style of attitude both toward the negotiations themselves and toward the partner--the Soviet Union. Thus addressing members of the House Appropriations Committee in the U.S. Congress, President Reagan declared that he had instructed the members of the U.S. delegation in Geneva "to get up from the table and return home" if they are unable to conclude a "good agreement" with the USSR. Precedents of what the true meaning of such rhetoric could consist are sufficiently well known.

Nor could we fail to be alerted by the fact that on the threshold of the negotiations the American side made persistent efforts, which were particularly unscrupulous in terms of the methods and means employed, whose purpose was to sow doubts as to the USSR's fidelity to commitments adopted earlier and to unswerving observance of agreements and accords which had been arrived at. A new twist to this slanderous campaign was begun in the United States around the administration's regular "report" to Congress concerning the Soviet Union's alleged "violations" of its international commitments.

The unsubstantiated and groundless nature of such accusations have been stressed by the Soviet side repeatedly and emphatically, particularly in a memorandum issued on 30 January and in a TASS statement of 21 October 1984. They wre also emphatically rejected in a submission of the USSR Embassy in Washington to the U.S. Department of State, which was carried in the Soviet press on 28 February 1985. The American side, the document says, has no moral or formal right whatever to represent itself as the custodian of agreements, a scornful attitude toward which has in recent years been an integral part of the policy and practical actions of the United States.

The policy of undermining the indefinite 1972 Treaty Limiting ABM Systems; refusal to ratify the SALT II Treaty and the 1974 Treaty Limiting Underground Nuclear Tests; the concentrated use of American chemical weapons, which have claimed many tens of thousands of lives in various parts of the world; the brazen flouting of commitments in respect of the Final Act of the

All-European Conference--such is the "service record" of the United States, which cannot fail to elicit the question--on the large, fundamental plane--of the conscientiousness of Washington's attitude toward adopted international commitments. No propaganda exertions can change or "cancel" these indisputable facts. What we have is the manifest hope of the U.S. Administration of poisoning the atmosphere surrounding the negotiations in Geneva from the very outset and complicating the practical, constructive examination of the problems to be solved at them.

Meanwhile the peoples are expecting from the negotiations real results. The protests of peace-loving forces are being stepped up even more and numerous meetings and demonstrations and collections of signatures to appeals for an end to the nuclear recklessness are being conducted in many countries. The plans to transfer the arms race to space are causing particular anxiety throughout the world.

Many foreign, including American, press organs are criticizing the insane "star wars" ideas. "The present administration's plans to extend the arms race to space are capable of bringing mankind to the brink of self-annihilation," THE WASHINGTON POST, for example, wrote. "President Reagan's so-called 'star wars' proposals, which provide for the creation of superweapons and their deployment in space, give rise to the possibility of unforeseen, but catastrophic consequences."

The international community has emphatically condemned the militarization of space. On the initiative of the Soviet Union the UN General Assembly 39th Session examined as important and urgent the question "The Use of Space Solely for Peaceful Purposes, for the Good of Mankind". On 12 December 1984 some 150 UN members approved a resolution which contained an appeal for the "adoption of immediate measures to prevent an arms race in space in the interests of maintaining international peace and security."

The Delhi declaration, which was adopted by the heads of state and government of six nonnuclear countries representing different parts of the world: India, Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, Greece and Sweden, had extensive international repercussions. It attaches particular significance to the task of preventing the militarization of space, which, the document notes, should be used for the general good of mankind and not as a future battlefield. "For this reason," the authors of the document declare, "we call for a ban on the development, testing, production, deployment and use of all types of space weapon. An arms race in space is connected with tremendous expenditure and is fraught with the danger of serious destabilizing consequences. It also jeopardizes a number of arms limitation and disarmament agreements." In other words, the declaration, which is signed by most authoritative political leaders, unequivocally condemns the R. Reagan administration's attempts to acquire the space potential of blackmail and pressure and the "star" instrument for the achievement of world hegemony.

The problems of space-based and nuclear arms--despite all their undoubted significance--do not exhaust the manifold questions of the struggle for a lessening of the military danger. January saw the completion of a year since the start of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures,

Security and Disarmament in Europe. At the start of December 1984 the conference adopted a proposal of neutral and nonaligned countries concerning the creation of two work groups. They are to specifically examine measures of confidence building and security in Europe both in the political and military spheres on an equal basis. This decision corresponds to the fundamental idea put forward by the USSR concerning the fact that a combination of political and military confidence measures is essential for the success of the conference.

The opening of the latest round of the Stockholm forum was marked by an important new initiative of socialist diplomacy. At the very first plenary session the Soviet Union submitted for the conference's examination the document "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace". The USSR's proposals provide primarily for the assumption by all participating countries of a commitment not to be the first to use against another either nuclear or conventional arms and, consequently, not to employ military force against another at all.

Such a commitment assumed by subscribers to the treaty would mean that, first, they would renounce any use of military force, which is incompatible with the goals and principles of the UN Charter, against another subscriber-state, particularly invasion or an attack on its territory; second, they would not threaten the security of internationsl sea, air and space communications traversing expanses to which no one's international jurisdiction extends. The commitment not to be the first to use military force would also extend to third countries.

This initiative was underpinned by other proposals of socialist states aimed at reinforcing the atmosphere of trust and security in Europe. Delegations of Bulgaria, the GDR and the USSR submitted for examination by the conference a working document on the question of limiting the scale of military exercises. Its essence is that the conferees not conduct--independently or in conjunction with other states--military exercises in a total strength of over 40,000 men in Europe and in the adjacent sea (ocean) area and airspace. The sociaist countries' proposal proceeds from the fact that it is difficult to distinguish large-scale military exercises from the preparatory stage of the deployment of armed forces for combat operations, even more under conditions where in the exercises conducted by NATO hundreds of thousands of servicemen are involved. The establishment of limits on the numbers of troops participating therein would undoubtedly limit the scale of military activity in Europe and thereby contribute to a strengthening of security on the continent.

Thus from the very start of the latest session of the Stockholm conference the socialist countries presented specific and precisely formulated proposals both in the political and the military spheres. Their realization would make it possible to appreciably improve the atmosphere in the European region, where the armed forces of two military-political alliances are directly contiguous.

What is the West's response to the socialist states' initiatives? The NATO countries are continuing to defend the so-called "transparency" concept which they put forward at the start of the conference. They submitted a document on an exchange of preliminary plans of states' military activity in Europe. This proposal does not, however, lead to a reduction in the level of military confrontation on the continent and represents nothing other than the latest attempt to legalize the collection of intelligence information on the military potential of the USSR and its allies.

The 35th round of the Vienna talks on limiting armed forces and armaments in Central Europe began at the end of January. At these talks, which have been under way since the fall of 1973, the socialist countries have consistently advocated a lowering of the level of military confrontation at the heart of the European continent. The Western participants, however, are occupying an unconstructive and unrealistic position and declining practical steps which would make it possible to reduce the armed forces and armaments here.

Endeavoring to move the talks from standstill, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and the CSSR submitted on 14 February for discussion by their participants the draft "Basic Provisions of an Agreement on the Initial Reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of Ground Forces and Armaments in Central Europe and the Subsequent Nonaugmentation of the Levels of the Sides' Armed Forces and Armaments in this Area".

The purpose of the socialist states' proposal is in 1 year from the time of the agreement taking effect the ground forces of the USSR and the United States being cut back by 20,000 and 13,000 men respectively in combat troop units together with their authorized arms and combat equipment, and up to 10 percent of such reductions being effected in terms of individual servicemen, furthermore. The draft agreement stipulates that upon completion of the reduction all states party to the agreement would undertake on a collective and national basis not to increase the level of their armed forces and armaments in Central Europe during the life of the agreement.

The document contains specific proposals with respect to monitoring compliance with the agreement. Together with national technical means of supervision it proposes an exchange of lists of the units being cut back and withdrawn, notification of the start and completion of practical measures with respect to the cutback and the creation by each side for the period of the withdrawal of the forces being cut back of three-four observation posts via which such supervision would be exercised.

The document proceeds from the fact that following the signing of such an agreement the talks would continue, having as their subject further, larger-scale reductions of armed forces and armaments for the purpose of achieving equal collective levels of the sides' armed forces in Central Europe up to 900,000 men, including up to 700,000 ground forces. This initiative of the socialist community countries takes account of a number of elements of the Western participants' position. Its implementation would make it possible to achieve the first tangible result at the long-standing talks in the Austrian capital.

Soberly evaluating the degree of dangerous tension in the world, socialist diplomacy is at the same time tireless in seeking out and showing to the international community any possibilities of lowering this tension and of a change toward a constructive solution of urgent problems of world politics. "What is needed for this," the participants in the latest session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee in Berlin observed, "is a transition to a policy of realism and practical interaction in tackling the tasks confronting the peoples of Europe and other continents. Serious and equal dialogue between states with different social systems and negotiations whereat the sides recognize their high responsibility and aspire to positive results are essential."

3. The Capitalist World: In Labyrinth of Contradictions

Incidentally, the sides' different aspirations are not preventing at this stage a deepening of the American-Japanese "rapprochement". In the course of the negotiations Nakasone declared his "understanding" of the SDI advanced by Reagan. This declaration, like the support for the plans to deploy new American nuclear missiles in West Europe which the Japanese prime minister expressed earlier, confirms Tokyo's readiness to subordinate its policy to Washington's global strategy.

This policy is encountering strong opposition within the country. A real explosion of anger greeted, for example, Nakasone's forced admission that there exists on Japanese territory a system of American strategic communications stations virtually enabling the Pentagon to regard Japan as a forward position for waging nuclear war in the Western Pacific and the Indian Ocean.

Japanese ruling circles' attempts to circumvent the existing constitutional limitations on the growth of military spending are being treated with manifest satisfaction in Washington. Speaking in parliament on 28 January, Nakasone left open the question of whether the defense budget for 1985 would exceed the existing limit of 1 percent of GNP. Officially the bill on defense spending for 1985 confirmed by the government in December constitutes 0.997 percent of the planned GNP. However, government officials declare that it will exceed the 1-percent limit if the resources for an increase in servicemen's pay are included.

The strengthening of the American-Japanese partnership is being followed with alarm on the other side of the Atlantic. Business and political circles of West Europe are highly disturbed by the prospects of the development of cooperation between the United States and Japan in the sphere of science and technology, where the West European monopolies are inferior to their main rivals.

It has to be acknowledged that in 1984, when both the U.S. economy and its currency--the dollar--were on the crest of a cyclical upturn, the United States was able on the whole to trample beneath it both the world capitalist economy and, in particular, the economy of West Europe. This fact explains to a considerable extent the apparent ease with which Washington has

up to now been able to compel the other NATO members to abide in military-political questions also by a policy so manifestly contrary to their own, fundamental interests. However, this situation cannot be considered irreversible. Actions of the United States which do not take into account the interests of West Europe or even, as is the case on some issues, are prepared to sacrifice both these interests and West Europe itself increase the potential for discontent on this side of the Atlantic--both in the broad people's masses and in a certain part of the ruling circles. This is confirmed by a number of circumstances.

Thus the United States is endeavoring to obtain from West Europe and also Canada and Japan a promise to cover from 20 to 25 percent of the cost of the program to create the Columbus permanent orbital space station, whose launch is planned for 1992. Considering the cost of the project--a key element of the Reagan administration's space plans--there is undoubtedly a practical point to such calculations. Incidentally, the mere fact of these calculations testifies that the United States is beginning to feel an increasing need for the allies and their support for realization of the planned programs of militarist preparations. It is not a question of this, however. We have to agree with the opinion of R. Walther, chairman of the FRG Bundestag's Budget Commission, that the Americans are interested not so much in the allies' financial participation as in determining the directions of the West European countries' scientific research. In other words, in determining the limits of their future economic possibilities. And also, we would add, political possibilities. All this has to be understood by politicians of capitalist countries.

U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger made a trip in February to a number of West European states to indoctrinate the allies disturbed by Washington's plans and practical actions. Commenting on the goals of the tour, the French weekly (PUEN) wrote: "The Americans are endeavoring to strengthen relations with the allies prior to the resumption (opening of new--Author) of negotiations with the Soviet Union in order to appear to the leaders of the Kremlin as undisputed leaders in the West." If the visit indeed pursued such a goal, the U.S. secretary clearly failed to achieve it.

As far as Washington's SDI--the "star wars" plans--is concerned, the United States has been able here to win "understanding" on the part only of a few NATO partners. The hurried readiness to do the United States a good turn on this issue displayed by FRG Chancellor H. Kohl is explained both by Bonn's claims to the role of the United States' most loyal ally and the hopes of West Germany military-industrial concerns to at least some extent warm their hand in participation in realization of the American plans and gains access to the corresponding technology. Similar considerations also evidently dictated the British Government's position on this question.

On the other hand, the U.S. Administration is having to encounter instances of direct and open resistance to its aggressive policy on the part of states allied to the United States in accordance with this treaty or the other.

Thus at the end of January the Greek Government declared that it would not consent to any modernization of the U.S. nuclear arsenal on Greek territory

and would refrain from taking part in NATO maneuvers in the Mediterranean. In mid-February A. Drosoyiannis, alternate Greek minister of national defense, reported, addressing journalists, that his country had demanded that NATO conduct no more military maneuvers in the Aegean area.

A scrupulous position has been occupied by New Zealand's Labor government, which has banned calls at the country's ports by U.S. warships carrying nuclear weapons or nuclear-powered ships. Despite the concentrated pressure on the Wellington government on the part of the United States, the former's position on this question remains invariable, which has already led, inter alia, to cancellation of the Sea Eagle-85 maneuvers, which were planned within the framework of the ANZUS bloc for March 1985. Western observers have evaluated this fact as the biggest row in the bloc's 34-year history, threatening its very further existence. It has to be mentioned in this connection that there has been a marked growth in this bloc recently of antinuclear sentiments, about which our roundups have already written. It is not surprising that Washington is displaying every sign of a readiness to go as far as it wishes in putting pressure on the New Zealand Government. THE NEW YORK TIMES quotes an unnamed high-ranking representative of the U.S. Administration: "If we (Washington--Author) do not succeed in bringing the allies under control on the question of ships' visits and the deployment of nuclear weapons, they will start running one after the other."

CSO: 5200/1059

GENERAL

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW VIEWS U.S. ARMS POLICIES

PM081919 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[Boris Orekhov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] The year of the 40th anniversary of the great victory has entered its second half. The brass-band sounds of festive military marches have died in the May air. Also behind us is 22 June--the day of the summer solstice and of bitter memories for us. Yes, the memory of the terrible events of the war years lives in the heart of every Soviet person. Nothing will be able to destroy it. The lessons of World War II remind people how important and necessary to them peace is. The people who live today are particularly acutely aware that peace has especially great value nowadays, when a new world war would mean catastrophe for mankind.

Relations between the USSR and France are at present on the whole enjoying an upswing and have good prospects. In the present complex international situation the further development and consolidation of links between the two countries in all spheres, and above all in the political sphere, assume growing significance. Trade, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural relations are developing stably. At the same time, considerable reserves exist for their expansion and deepening.

But if we are to talk of Soviet-U.S. relations, they are at present at the stage when it is being determined not only what direction their development will take in the future but also what direction development in the world as a whole will take. Mankind is confronted with a choice: either an arms race in every direction and a growth of the danger of war, or a strengthening of universal security and a more durable peace for everyone.

Hence, the hopes which the world public is pinning on the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in November are understandable. If this meeting takes place, UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar declared, it will undoubtedly promote the improvement of the international climate. He expressed the expectation that this meeting would be able to relax the climate and create a favorable atmosphere for the solution of the many problems which one has occasion to encounter daily. The UN secretary general expressed the wish that all countries, especially the strongest, should at last begin serious negotiations on disarmament issues. Such negotiations, in his opinion, must include the question of the nonmilitarization of space and could put an end to this problem. The thoughts expressed in this statement are to a certain extent typical if one acquaints oneself with the reactions to the news of the scheduled meeting in Geneva.

Serious impetus obviously needs to be given at a high political level to Soviet-U.S. relations. And it would be good to conduct matters in such a way so that everyone -- our peoples and other countries -- may be able to see that the policy courses of the USSR and of the United States are oriented not toward enmity and antagonism, but toward the quest for mutual understanding and peaceful development.

The telegram which the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sent to the U.S. President on the occasion of the American national holiday, Independence Day, contains an appeal to the United States to join us in efforts to strengthen peace and international security. It expresses the hope that the Soviet Union's readiness for stable, constructive relations with the United States will be duly reciprocated.

New Sacrifices to the Ogre of War

Really, it is hard to count on success in the matter of improving relations between any two countries without reciprocity. And it is right here that we cannot overlook definite facts.

Let us familiarize ourselves with the chronicle of recent days.

It has been reported from Washington that the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress has approved the allocation of $292 billion to the military department in the next fiscal year. Commentators point out here that the sum allocated by the House of Representatives is slightly less than that approved by the Senate (which voted to allocate $302.5 billion to the pentagon). Despite this, however, the administration has persuaded Congress to satisfy practically all its requests in the military sphere.

The Pentagon is getting funds for the construction of an additional number of MX missiles (21 of these missiles are already in production) and new missile-carrying Trident submarines and for the production of cruise and Pershing II missiles. Approximately $2.5 billion will be spent on work on realizing the "star wars" program.

The official ceremony of the handover of the first B-1 strategic bomber to the U.S. Air Force has taken place at an air force base in Nebraska. According to the Pentagon's plans, in only 3 years' time the fleet of these nuclear weapon carriers is to number no less than 100 machines, each of which is capable of carrying as many as 30 cruise missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

The production of experimental models of the new Midgetman mobile ICBM and the holding of flight tests are being prepared. The Pentagon has just concluded contracts for this work with the well-known Martin Marietta Corporation. It is planned to conduct the first flight tests in 3 years' time and to commence the missiles' combat deployment in 7 years' time.

As we can see, waves of militarist intoxication are increasingly shrouding the United States.

Special mention should be made of the "star wars" program. Within its framework the U.S. military department recently granted contracts for the development and construction of two of the latest types of ground radar stations to the Westinghouse Electric and Raytheon Corporations. The stations are regarded as one of the chief components of the space offensive arms system.

The attempt to militarize space is fraught with unpredictable consequences and is the most serious threat to peace today. Individual politicians in the West are endeavoring to convince the public that it is not at all a question of shifting the arms race to space but only of a new stage of research, which will almost in itself lead to a reduction in nuclear arms and exclude nuclear war from the life of society.

Such a thesis is not new. As long ago as 1892, addressing a pacifist congress in Switzerland, the arms magnate Alfred Nobel, who was well known in his time, said: "It is possible that my dynamite manufacturing plants will put an end to war more quickly than your congresses. On the day that two army corps find themselves in a position to destroy each other in a few seconds, civilized mankind will renounce in horror the very idea of war."

The prophecy has not come true. Since then mankind has lived through two world wars. And to suggest to people today that a new, space twist to the arms race spiral will deliver them from the threat of nuclear war is to deceive them in a most shameless and unscrupulous way.

Space must serve peace. The Soviet Union declares most definitely that it will not be the first to march into space with weapons. It will make every effort to persuade other countries, and the United States in particular, not to take such a fateful step, which would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and give a boost to an uncontrolled arms race in all directions.

CSO: 5200/1046

WEEKLY TALK SHOW ON U.S. NUCLEAR SUBS, SPACE MILITARIZATION

LD231937 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 23 Jun 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program presented by Boris Andrianov, foreign policy commentator of All-Union Radio; with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board of NOVOYE VREMYA, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of KOMMUNIST WEEKLY]

[Excerpt]

[Andrianov] Good day, comrades. Taking part in our meeting at the round table today are Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, the member of the editorial board of NOVOYE VREMYA weekly, and an international observer of KOMMUNIST Vidim Nikolayevich Nekrasov.

Dear listeners, we are witnesses of the enormous efforts of our party and government aimed at speeding up the country's social and economic development. The highest meaning of this noble aspiration is to continuously increase the welfare of the people, to create more and more favorable conditions for the harmonious development of the personality of each individual. We understand very well that in order to solve all of these difficult and wide-scale problems it is very important to preserve peace on earth. It is this which determines our country's policy on the international arena. By all their deeds the Soviet people demonstrate deep interest in peace. However, we soberly assess the situation in international affairs and we see that the situation in the world now is extremely complicated; even more so it is extremely dangerous.

Trident's D-5; Alaska Submarine

[Nekrasov] From Washington this week, as from a cornucopia, reports were pouring out about new military actions and the latest dangerous steps in the arms race.

Thus, the House of Representatives of Congress recently voted for the allocation of almost half a billion dollars for the new D-5 nuclear missiles for the Trident submarines. This is the implementing of the Pentagon's plan to commission in the next few years 24 such submarines, which has been approved by Reagan, and each of these submarines is to be armed with 24 D-5 missiles which are being spoken about in the decision of the House of Representatives. By the way, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote about these missiles: The Trident II missiles -- as it called those D-5 missiles which are launched from submarines -- are intended first and foremost to enable the United States to carry out a preemptive attack on the Soviet Union in the case of crisis.

In this connection THE WASHINGTON POST correspondent continued: In spite of all the statements that U.S. nuclear weapons are designed to deal a counter-strike, the real U.S. plans for waging war leave the possibility for the United States, if war is unavoidable, to inflict a mass first strike on the Soviet Union. Well, it is impossible to put it more clearly. It means these are plans to attack our country, and the American newspaper confirms what we have always been talking about -- aggressive plans of American militarists.

[Andrianov] The American press recently reported on the forthcoming launch of the first nuclear submarine of this class in August this year. For some reason it has been called Alaska.

[Nekrasov] Last week much was written about this submarine in connection with the question of the American attitude toward SALT II. This question is also noteworthy but for now I would only like to note that Tridents, together with the plans for deploying MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, equipping of the U.S. Navy and Air Force with long-range cruise missiles and also the continuing deployment of Pershings in Western Europe -- all of this taken together clearly confirms that the American militarists with the support of the White House, as previously, are striving to implement their plan to achieve military superiority over our country. Well, to return to the Washington legislators: The same week they also voted for the allocation of financial resources for the creation of and preparations for the production of one of the most barbaric varieties of chemical weapons: binary charges of nerve-paralyzing toxins. The U.S. war department also last week declared that literally in a few days' time the U.S. Air Force will be equipped with a new strategic B1-B bomber, which is designed to be armed with nuclear missiles. By the autumn of next year the first squadron of these bombers will be formed. Altogether the construction of approximitely 100 of such gigantic bombers is being planned.

SALT II Treaty

[Andrianov] All these reports about the feverish activity of the militarists across the ocean throw extra light, as it were, on the true meaning of the decision announced by Washington -- and announced with great pomp -- to adhere, at least to the end of the year, to the provisions of the strategic arms limitation treaty, SALT II, which in fact was never ratified by the United States. The hyprocisy of the attitude taken in the U.S. capital to this issue is becoming evident.

[Nekrasov] Yes, and this is in fact connected with the Alaska submarine which we mentioned earlier. The forthcoming launch of that nuclear missile-carrying submarine would mean a direct violation of the conditions set in the SALT II treaty, since the number of ICBM's belonging to the United States would exceed the limit allowed by the treaty. Under the circumstances Reagan -- after a week's hesitation -- decided to dismantle one of the older-type Poseidon submarines so as not to exceed for the time being the set overall limit of missile numbers.

As you will understand, this was not a decision of principle to observe the treaty, but a desire not to formally violate its conditions. However, it is quite clear that in implementing its program to rearm the submarine fleet, Washington will again come up against this same question, and in the near future, too. No, those observers, both in the United States and other countries, who view the White House decision as nothing but a maneuver are right of course. We should recall that at first the United States refused to ratify the treaty, but under pressure of public opinion said it would adhere to its conditions. Then it cast aside the protocol attached to the treaty which limited long-range cruise missiles with any type of basing. Now they are under-

mining the very foundations of the treaty. What the West Berlin WAHRHEIT says in this connection is right: "The Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty has long been a thorn in the flesh of the Pentagon strategists, since it is a big obstacle in the path of building up the U.S. first-strike potential.

[Volskiy] In this connection, Vadim Nikolayevich, it is worth mentioning that America's allies in the North Atlantic alliance are far from delighted with Washington's intention to break the SALT II treaty once and for all.

[Nekrasov] The business over the treaty and the reports about the new steps taken by the United States in the area of the arms race throw extra light too, on the state of affairs at the Geneva talks. To be more precise, they show that Washington's stance at the talks and its reluctance to talk specifically about renouncing the militarization of space are rooted in its continued desire to pursue its same old unconstructive course.

[Andrianov] I would say that this stance of Washington's, particularly in light of the initiatives that have been put forward by the Soviet Union to make it easier to hold fruitful talks, looks particularly unconstructive -- one that leads, I would say, to an impasse. The United States has just not given a positive reply to our proposal to introduce a joint moratorium on the creation of space weapons for the whole duration of the talks, or to the proposal to freeze nuclear arsenals.

[Nekrasov] Meanwhile, those proposals are still the subject of lively discussion today throughout the world and are viewed as a very important and positive step by the Soviet Union which could promote the successful continuation of the talks.

Militarization of Space

[Andrianov] In connection with what you were just saying, Vadin Nikolayevich, about the militarist ambitions of the Washington Administration, I should like to draw your attention to a fresh fact. At the beginning of this week the United States launched a Discovery spacecraft. It's one of four such spacecraft in the Americans' "shuttle" series. The name shuttle means that they can be used several times: In other words, after returning to earth, the craft is given the necessary repairs and is again prepared for launching. I should point out that initially the entire shuttle program was managed by civil administration -- NASA. The chiefs of that administration asserted that the shuttle spacecraft was conceived for transporting very heavy freight into space for scientific purposes. It soon became clear, however, that that was far from the way things were. When the Americans launched the first spacecraft in that series, which was called Columbia, 4 years ago, the crew were given the assignment of checking out during the flight the sights for a laser weapon. It turns out that from the very start it had been decided to involve the shuttles in the U.S. militarist machine which is now aimed at creating space strike weapons.

[Volskiy] Indeed, Boris Vasilyevich, we have frequently said, and said correctly, that the United States has promoted the militarization of space to the level of state policy. But, from what you have been saying, it is obvious what is behind this and what in practice it hides. I shall cite a further statement. It was made by Colonel Jack Lousma, commander of one of the shuttles. He said literally the following -- that space is a place from which one may keep the whole world in awe. The interesting thing is that this was said with the forthrightness of a loud-mouthed soldier. Indeed, there is a directive that is undoubtedly known to the colonel -- a directive that is a combat instruction of the U.S. Air Force and is called "Military Space Doctrine". We have already spoken of it during one of our roundtable meetings, but I shall remind you again of part of this docu-

ment, which is indeed an official document, where it states outright that the United States is adopting a course aimed at securing superiority in space. If we compare this with what the colonel commander of a shuttle craft has said -- namely, that space is a place from which one may hold the whole world -- then any further comment on this would, as people say, be superfluous.

[Nekrasov] I would like to add to this thought a few things stated in the aforementioned instruction. It says, for instance, that space is a place where the U.S. Air Force can carry out or support all its actions and tasks, as well as provide the potential for waging protracted military actions. This document, which is intended purely for internal use but which has been made public in the American press, also contains clauses which state more precisely the importance of the special systems that the Americans are now declaring that theyintend to create in space. Such systems, the instruction states, can ensure the hitting of targets on the ground or in space. As the saying goes, all the I's have been dotted.

[Andrianov] It is openly a matter of space facilities performing combat functions of space strike weapons. The implementation of such dangerous schemes is not simple, of course. One first of all needs for this the ensuring of mass military penetration into space. Indeed, the Pentagon reached the unequivocal conclusion that the shuttle spacecraft should serve as one of such means. It is symptomatic that in their striving to get into space around the earth the American military have more and more openly crushed the programs for the peaceful conquest of space. This was reflected in particular in the changes that have occurred in NASA's leadership. According to Senator Proxmire, the Reagan administration has militarized NASA. James Beggs has been appointed director of this department. Previously, he held the post of vice president in the General Dynamics Corporation, which is one of the Pentagon's main contractors. It emerges that the present head of NASA is at home in military circles, while Begg's deputy is even more at home. After all, former U.S. Secretary of the Air Force Mark has become deputy director. It must be supposed, too, that it was by no means a fortuitous occurrence that soon after this there appeared President Reagan's directive aimed at further subordinating space work in the United States to military goals. The directive makes the provision that the construction of a new, larger reusable spacecraft of the shuttle type should now be carried out jointly by NASA and the U.S. Air Force -- that is by the direct customer for and user of shuttle spacecraft. Indeed, according to WASHINGTON POST reports, although the present shuttle craft are formally in the hands of the civil administration, for 10 years they will be used at least 8 times each year by the military.

[Volskiy] Indeed, Boris Vasilyevich, the ABC television network has testified directly that the reusable space craft are an important element in the "star wars" program, which, as you know, provides for the creation of a large-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements. I think it is not fortuitous that these self-same shuttle craft we have been speaking about are performing missions of an exclusively military nature.

Take, for example, the flight that was made in January this year by the same Discovery spaceship that was launched this week.

[Andrianov] Five months ago, you will remember, that flight took place in conditions of the strictest secrecy and fully under the supervision of the Pentagon. Moreover, the military struck such fear into journalists that they preferred to keep silent in case they were accused of divulging a military secret. Nevertheless, it emerged that the crew of the Discovery spacecraft had launched a reconnaissance satellite into near-earth space to gather espionage data about our country. In the view of THE NEW YORK TIMES, that flight demonstrated as never before the long-term shift in the American space program. The nature of the shift is that military flights are replacing civilian flights. In

turn, the NBC television network pointed out that the Pentagon will shortly cross the border line separating a capability to conduct espionage from space and a capability to wage combat actions there. There are serious grounds for such a conclusion. During that same January flight, the crew of Discovery conducted experiments under the program code-named (Tillrobey). The essence of the program is to test apparatus designed to detect missiles and other objects in space. This testifies to the fact that the development of one of the elements of the space-based antimissile complexes is taking place. Incidentally, the Pentagon itself appraised that flight of the Discovery spacecraft as an important step in implementing the program for the militarization of space that was proclaimed by Washington.

[Nekrasov] Indeed, the present flight by the Discovery spacecraft is the focus for particular attention by the U.S. military; after all, the latest experiment was being conducted aboard the spacecraft in the creation and trying-out of components of a large-scale antimissile system with space-based elements. This was reported by the American UPI agency, which quoted a spokesman of the organization in charge of implementation of the White House's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

[Andrianov] This department is headed by Lieutenant General Abrahamson. Indeed, in an interview given the ABC television network, he himself admitted the particular importance of the experiments on which the crew of the Discovery spacecraft have been engaged this week. Since this military figure is in charge of the "star wars" program, it emerges that it is a matter of testing weapons that are intended for deployment both on earth and in space. According to Gen Abrahamson the weapons in question are laser weapons. At any rate, the purpose of the experiment was roughly speaking as follows: to create the possibility for rays from powerful lasers stationed on earth to be reflected from mirrors in space and be able, as a kind of reflected light beam, to eliminate warheads or missiles.

[Volskiy] True; however, it is reported that the first such test shot was unsuccessful. When the space shuttle was passing over the Hawaiian Islands a laser ray was beamed in the direction of Discovery from the military base on the Island of Maui. However, at that moment, through a wrong command from the ground, the space ship was incorrectly oriented in space, and for that reason the ray did not strike the prismatic mirror installed aboard Discovery. The point lies not even in this failure, but in the fact that experiments of this kind are being conducted more and more vigorously.

[Andrianov] On this subject THE NEW YORK TIMES has said that, judging by everything, Reagan does not want to give up the "star wars" concept. Moreover, the same thing is shown too by the facts. After all, the Pentagon makes no secret of the fact that its scientists are working on technology for the creation of weapons using gas lasers, ray weapons, electro-magnetic fast-firing cannons, and a great deal more. All of this could be used both against missiles and also against other objects in space, in the atmosphere, and on the ground.

The aforementioned Gen Abrahamson has openly boasted in the American magazine AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY of the successes of his department. Implementation of the program to create an antimissile defense with space-based elements is advancing in the United States at such a fast pace, Abrahanson said candidly, that the first tests of space weapons from onboard a reusable shuttle craft are now being scheduled for 1987 -- that is, 2 years earlier than planned.

Four months ago the President of the United States signed a National Security Council directive on the use of the shuttle program for military aims; official Washington has

thereby made a blatant stake on this space hobby-horse. According to Washington's calculations, it should carry out all of their program for the militarization of space, envisaging the creation of first-strike weapons there, the turning of near-earth space into a combat action zone. Built into these schemes is the prospect for a sharp increase in the threat of a truly global all-destroying military conflict.

CSO: 5200/1284

GENERAL

SOVIET COLONEL CONTRASTS U.S., SOVIET RECORDS ON ARMS CONTROL

LD161929 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] The threat of total extermination of civilization is obvious, but who is to blame for the continued arms race? An answer from our military affairs observer, Colonel Lev Semeyko.

[Semeyko recording heard in Russian, fading into announcer's translation] I'd like to begin by making a statement which might seem a paradox: The Soviet Union does not take part in the arms race; indeed if the purpose of the race is to be first at the finish--that is, to get the upper hand--the Soviet Union does not take part in such a race. And that is borne out by history itself.

Back in 1946 the Soviet Union advanced in the United Nations a draft of an international convention on banning nuclear weapons. It proposed to destroy in 3 months' time all stockpiles of atomic weapons, both already produced and yet unfinished. However, the United States and the West on the whole had rejected the draft. What that has led to is well known, there are now over 50,000 nuclear warheads in the world and the number of nuclear powers has gone up to five. Besides, some 20 more countries can have or develop their own nuclear weapons. But if at the start of the nuclear era several atom bombs possessed by the United States were destroyed and nuclear weapons were banned there would have been nothing of this today. That alone shows that the historical responsibility for the start of the nuclear arms race lies with the United States, says Lev Semeyko.

The Soviet Union has stated repeatedly that it would not permit any superiority over itself in the military field, perhaps that is one of the reasons for the continuing arms race?

[Semeyko recording heard in Russian, fading into translation] If you take a look at the facts, says Lev Semeyko, you'll see that the Soviet Union never sought to be first in developing this or that weapon. It has only been catching up with the United States. That isn't because it is technologically weaker than the United States. Simply, the Soviet Union is in principle against whipping up the arms race.

It was the United States that was the first to produce the intercontinental bombers in the middle of the 50's. The Soviet Union deployed such bombers only

at the end of the 50's. The same with the nuclear submarines, the United States started deploying them several years earlier than the Soviet Union. And another example, by the end of the 60's the United States was the first to begin equipping its intercontinental ballistic missiles with multiple, individually targetted warheads. The Soviet Union was forced to develop those systems as well, but did that only in the middle of the 70's, the same with the long-range cruise missiles. And the last example, the so-called strategic defense initiative of President Reagan: it is based on the same frist-strike policy and is directed against the Soviet Union as well as many other countries.

So the United States seeks military superiority and weapons, in our age, the age of nuclear weapons, to solve international problems militarily. As for the Soviet Union, its objectives are quite different. It is compelled to build an adequate military potential in order to keep a balance between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries. In other words, the Soviet Union has a defense strategic objective, it does not seek military superiority.

As far as the struggle for disarmament is concerned, the Soviet Union is indeed in the lead. Since the end of World War II says Lev Semeyko, the Soviet Union came out with more than 100 proposals aimed at ensuring disarmament and strengthening world security. The Soviet Union is ready to limit or reduce any weapons, provided there is a political will on the part of the United States and its allies in that respect. Unfortunately, so far there is no such will. Of course, continues Lev Semeyko, some might say that today it is not enough to simply make declarations; there should be practical steps.

Well let's again take a look at the facts. A Soviet moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles is in effect since 7 April of this year and will continue to be till November. Besides, other reciprocal measures in Europe have been suspended. Incidentally this is the second Soviet moratorium; the first was announced in March of 1982. In effect at present is also another unilateral Soviet moratorium--this is on the testing of antisatellite weapons. Aren't those practical steps? And the fact that the Soviet Union has reduced a number of carrier rockets in the European part of its territory--isn't that proof of the Soviet Union's wish to stop the arms race? And another gesture of goodwill is the pledge made by the Soviet Union at the United Nations 3 years ago; the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

If all nuclear powers made such a commitment the cause of peace would gain tremendously, the more so since the Soviet Union and its allies are offering the NATO and other countries to sign an agreement on not being the first to use military force against each other, and that means not using either nuclear or any other types of weapon.

CSO: 5200/1289

GENERAL

TASS REPORTS EAST-WEST NUCLEAR WAR COLLOQUIUM

Kennedy, Arbatov Cited

LD292245 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 29 TASS -- The central issue of the main discussion in the concluding day of the international colloquium "Nuclear War, Threat of the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Their Consequences" was the problem of "The Arms Race: A View From the West and From the East." Senator Ted Stevens and the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy Richard Perle defended the Western approach or, to be more exact, the aggressive policy pursued by the White House. They tirelessly repeated false accusations against the USSR. R. Perle said that the U.S. would not give up the development of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" program.

Kenneth Galbraith, well-known American scientist and diplomat, came up with the criticism of "nuclear theologists," as they are called in the U.S., who have played such an important part during all these years in the whipping up of the arms race. He denounced the "anti-Soviet rhetoric" and urged the U.S. ruling circles to promote the taking of concrete steps aimed at putting an end to the arms race.

Senator Edward Kennedy expressed conviction that the complete banning of nuclear tests would be a major step towards slowing up the arms race and creating a favourable climate for the reduction of military arsenals. Carl Sagan, a well-known American specialist, exposed full impracticability of the "star wars" program.

Analyzing the 40-year-long history of the nuclear arms race -- from its beginning to the present days -- Academician Georgiy Arbatov from the USSR stressed that the Soviet Union had not started the arms race and had never wanted it. As for the U.S., it has taken up as a working instruction the assumption that relying on its military might, America can and should shape world political and economic systems at its own liking. Under the cover of profuse talk about the conducting of "research" on the "star wars" program the U.S. is beginning today a qualitatively new state in the development of the military technology, a new round of the arms race unprecedented by its scope. The Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear and space weapons and the existing treaties can become the first victims of this process. Thus, the "star wars" program is also a powerful mine laid under the whole process of the limitation of armaments and, at the same time, a powerful generator of the arms race which destabilizes the military and political situation in the world.

The arms race cannot be won, the Soviet scientist stressed. The security problem can be resolved only by political means.

Meeting Ends, Attendees Noted

LD292301 Moscow TASS in English 1959 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 29 TASS -- The international colloquium "Nuclear War, Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Their Consequences" ended its work here today. For three days the lively exchange of views on questions connected with the limitation on the arms race and with disarmament was going on at the hall of the international conference centre of Geneva. It was attended by a number of prominent scientists from European, Asian, African, North and South American countries. Reports of the Soviet participants in the colloquium -- the vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences Ye. P. Velikhov, Acadmician G.A. Arbatov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences An.A. Gromyko and the deputy head of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace, Against the Nuclear Threat A.A. Kokoshin were heard with much interest.

Summing up the results of the colloquium, Sadruddin Aga Khan, president of the "Bellerive group" that organized the colloquium, pointed out that the discussion was useful and that it would promote the realization by the world public of the urgent need to take effective measures for removing the threat of a nuclear war, of consolidating peace and stability.

CSO: 5200/1046

GENERAL

SOVIET PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN FRANCE

PM011507 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Joint Report on the Stay in France of the Delegation of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Chambers"]

[Excerpts] A delegation of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, led by Stepan Chervonenko, member of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, member of a committee of the Parliamentary Group of USSR, and head of a CPSU Central Committee department, and also including USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies Georgiy Zhukov, Anatoliy Logunov, Sergey Losev, and Vladimir Mikulich was in France 24-29 June at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the National Assembly of the French Republic.

The delegation held talks in Paris with the delegation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the French National Assembly, which included commission chairman Claude Estier, Andre Bellou and Roger Julien, deputy chairman of the commission; Veronique Neiertz and Guy Vadepied, members of the commission's bureau; and Deputies Lydie Dupuy, Francois Michel D'Harcourt, Jacques Blanc, Claude Marcus, and Louis Odru, members of the commission representing various French parties.

There was an in-depth exchange views on a wide range of questions pertaining to the most pressing problems of international politics that have a direct influence on the course of world development, including efforts to safeguard peace and security, the need to curb the arms race and achieve disarmament, and also various aspects of Soviet-French bilateral relations.

Both sides noted that the world is now going through a very complex period, which is characterized by heightened tension, the increased danger of war, and failure to solve many major problems of the present day. Despite differences in the evaluation of some problems, both delegations stated with satisfaction that there were quite a few areas where there was a concurrence of views, and, first and foremost, there was joint striving to do everything possible to avert war.

They declared themselves in favor of promoting efforts to terminate the arms race and for maintaining the balance of forces at the lowest possible level.

Both delegations strongly opposed the plans to spread the arms race into outer space and declared themselves in favor of reaching an accord on preventing militarization of outer space within the shortest possible time. An attack weapon of any type, if deployed in outer space, would seriously destabilize the strategic situation and undermine the prospects for limiting and reducing armaments as a whole. The development of international cooperation in the exploration of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes would meet the interests of security on earth.

The parliamentarians noted that an improvement of the situation in Europe would suit the goals of the general improvement of international affairs. They stressed the need to promote mutual understandings and build confidence in Europe, which could be facilitated by constructive progress in the work of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament. The Soviet Union and France, which at one time did a lot to establish and deepen detente in Europe, can make their contribution to honoring the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act.

CSO: 5200/1046

SOVIET-HUNGARIAN COMMUNIQUE DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES

LD081815 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 8 Jul 85

["Soviet-Hungarian Communique"--TASS headline]

[Excerpt] Moscow, 8 Jul TASS--The USSR and the Hungarian People's Republic are irrevocably determined to promote in every way the unity, cohesion and cooperation of the countries of the socialist community which exerts an ever-increasing influence on the entire course of world developments, say a joint Soviet-Hungarian communique on the results of the visit of Peter Varkonyi, a member of the Central Committee of Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, minister of foreign affairs of Hungary, to the USSR.

Eduard Shevarnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., and Peter Varkonyi held talks during which the sides expressed serious preoccupation with the present international tensions which were a result of the scaled-up activities of forces of reaction and imperialism, primarily, U.S. imperialism, which followed the course toward achieving military superiority, undermining the existing military and strategic balance, grossly interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign countries and peoples and aggravating confrontation in all planes. Particularly dangerous are U.S. plans to turn space into an arena of military competition, its attempts to draw its allies into the effort to develop attack space weapons. The deployment of U.S. first-strike nuclear missile weapons continues in Western Europe, and revanchist quarters trying to call into question the results of the Second World War and the post-war development have scaled-up their activities.

The sides expressed the firm conviction that, despite all the complexity of the existing international situation, there were realistic possibilities to curb forces of imperialism, bring about a radical change in the course of developments and revive the process of detente.

The dependable way of doing that is to develop relations between the states with different social systems, an honest and constructive dialogue based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. The Hungarian side voiced satisfaction over the agreement reached on the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and expressed the hope that the meeting would promote the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations and the general situation in the world.

In the opinion of the sides, of great importance for the lessening and the ultimate elimination of the military threat would be the attainment, given the strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security, of positive results at Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on the complex of questions of space and nuclear arms, strategic and intermediate-range, which should be considered and resolved in their interrelationship. The Soviet Union confirmed its preparedness to achieve mutually acceptable accords by advancing its concrete peace initiatives which evoked a positive response in the world. Hungary whole-heartedly supports the Soviet Union's constructive proposals and the efforts made by it to ensure the success of the talks in Geneva.

The sides stressed the importance of an early beginning at the Stockholm conference of talks on substance, of adopting at that forum of concrete and mutually acceptable decisions on major confidence-building measures in the political and military fields. The signing of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of the relations of peace would have a big positive effect on the situation in Europe and the whole world.

The U.S.S.R. and the Hungarian People's Republic actively come out in favor of observing fittingly the 10th anniversary of the signing in Helsinki of the Final Act of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe.

CSO: 5200/1046

GENERAL

ANTINUCLEAR PHYSICIANS MEET IN BUDAPEST

Gorbachev Message

PM021444 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Unidentified IZVESTIYA correspondent report: "Averting the Threat of Nuclear War"]

[Text] Budapest -- The Fifth International Congress of the "World Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement has opened here at the Palace of Congresses. More than 1,000 scientists and physicians from many countries are taking part in its work. The Soviet delegation is headed by Academician Ye.I. Chazov.

The congress participants warmly greeted a message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which says:

"Allow me to wish all the congress participants -- medical scientists, doctors, and medical workers -- great successes in their efforts aimed at preventing the threat of nuclear war.

"In the Soviet Union the noble activity of the movement meets with understanding and support. We share the goals put forward by the doctors of protecting mankind from the danger of the arms race on earth and in space. Your congress is being held under the slogan of cooperation, not confrontation. I am in complete agreement with these goals and want to stress that the Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to save the world from the outbreak of nuclear war.

"I am sure that the movement's participants, together with the hundreds of millions of people who oppose the nuclear madness, will be able to preserve peace on earth and ensure reliable security for the present and the future generations."

The prominent representatives of the most humane profession who laid the foundation of the movement of physicians for the prevention of nuclear war and expanded it to a worldwide scale performed a great deed, J. Kadar, general secretary of the MSZMP, stressed in his address at the opening of the congress. The participants in your movement are linked by an aspiration, worthy of respect, to do everything possible to avert the nuclear catastrophe which is threatening people's lives, civilization, and mankind's existence.

Hungary, together with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, takes part in elaborating joint peace initiatives. We are advocates of banning nuclear weapons and strive to ensure that the security of the interested sides is implemented at the lowest possible level of armaments. We believe that disputes can be resolved by means of talks. We hope that the Soviet-U.S. talks being held in Geneva will bring success, J. Kadar said.

The congress participants were addressed by the cochairmen of the "World Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement, Ye.I. Chazov (USSR) and B. Lawn (United States). They stressed the increased danger of nuclear war and the need to take urgent measures to prevent it and expressed special concern at the plans for transferring the arms race to space.

W. Brandt, chairman of the Socialist International, addressing the plenary session stressed that maintaining peace is not simply a political or scientific question, but a fundamental task that prompts the world's peoples to cooperate.

B. Kreisky, president of the Vienna Institute for Questions of Helping Developing Countries, and other prominent politicians also spoke at the opening of the congress.

Appeal to Gorbachev, Reagan

LD011657 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 1 Jul 85

[Text] Budapest July 1 TASS -- Further progress in the exploration and use of outer space for peace depends in a large measure on whether an end is put to the arms race and its spread to outer space is prevented. Those who strive for "star wars", undermine the very possibility of putting an end to the arms race. This was stressed by representatives of various states, who addressed the Fifth International Congress of the Movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War", which closed here today.

Academician Yevgeniy Chazov, head of the Soviet delegation, urged scientists and workers in culture, lecturers and engineers, architects and builders to put, together with medical men, their signatures under a call for ending the dangerous stockpiling of the nuclear weapons on earth and the attempts at deploying mass destruction weapons in outer space. He expressed confidence that this will meet with support from the whole peace-loving mankind.

Prevention of nuclear war, Professor Bernard Lawn (USA), stressed in his concluding address, is the main issue of the present. The implementation of the "star wars" plan put forward by the U.S. Administration would lead to a dangerous build-up of the arms race. Outer space shall not be turned into an arena of military operations. It should become an area of peaceful cooperation of the USSR, the USA and other states.

The participants in the congress adopted an appeal to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States. The appeal says, among other things, that arms race in outer space will sharply increase the threat of a world-wide nuclear conflict. The programme for eliminating the nuclear threat, which has been put forward by physicians of the world, accords with the wishes of all people on earth.

It provides for a sufficiently verifiable freeze on the production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons and means of their delivery with their subsequent balanced cuts and, in the long run, scrapping of the nuclear weapons. It also provides for excluding the first use of nuclear weapons in any armed conflict. Welcoming the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons, the delegates to the congress believe that there is an urgent need for new efforts. We proposed as the first step, the appeal says, that a moratorium by introduced on all nuclear blasts. Such a moratorium should remain in force until a treaty is concluded on a general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

The congress has also adopted a message to Javier Perez de Cuellar, U.N. secretary general. The message says, among other things, that assistance in further enhancing the role and effectiveness of the U.N. as an important instrument of strengthening peace, security and international cooperation meets everybody's interests.

CSO: 5200/1046

PRAVDA REPORTS END OF SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL MEETING

PM281019 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Results of Socialist International Bureau Session"]

[Text] Stockholm, 20 Jun -- The Socialist International Bureau session being held in Bommersvik, near Stockholm, has ended. Over 30 delegations from social democratic and socialist parties were taking part.

K. Sorsa, chairman of the Socialist International Consultative Council on Disarmament, delivered a report on disarmament and arms control. He gave a high assessment of the USSR's decision to impose a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe. I believe, K. Sorsa noted, that the Soviet initiative should be given a positive response.

K. Sorsa gave an account of the visits by the Socialist International's Consultative Council on Disarmament to Moscow and Washington during which, he noted, the discussion centered specifically on the need for progress at the Soviet-U.S. nuclear and space arms talks in Geneva. The lack of such progress would mean a further undermining of strategic stability and an increase in the number of new and more complex arms systems. "The talks must not be used to cover up the arms race. Peace and stability can only be ensured by disarmament, not by new types of weapon," the speaker stressed.

In the resolution on disarmament, the participants in the session stress the importance of the accord reached by the USSR and the United States in January to examine questions of space and nuclear arms -- strategic and medium-range -- as a package at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. The commitment should be observed, the document says. "The Socialist International," the resolution notes, rejects the Strategic Defense Initiative and other similar concepts and believes that no country should take part in their implementation."

A resolution on the stuation in Latin America criticized the U.S. Administration's embargo and other economic sanctions against Nicaragua.

At a press conference, Socialist International Chairman W. Brandt said that one of the most important results of the session's work was the reaffirmed decision to hold a Socialist International conference on disarmament in Vienna next October.

CSO: 5200/1046

USSR'S TIKHVINSKIY REVIEWS BOOK ON SCIENTISTS' ROLE IN PEACE STRUGGLE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 135-139

[Academician S. Tikhvinskiy review: "Most Important Mission of Science"]

[Excerpts] Physicists, medical men, biologists, ecologists, oceanologists and others whose sacred duty it is to show to people the entire danger of the nuclear madness have a great role. The overwhelming majority of these specialists explains convincingly that the use of weapons of mass annihilation will have an irreversible impact on man's entire environment and on man himself as a biological species. No less important a task is interpretation of the problems of war and peace from the viewpoint of the regularities of world-historical development. It is essential to reveal the actual causes of the menacing situation currently taking shape in international relations, have a clear idea of the correlation of socio-class forces in the world and seek and pave practical ways toward the prevention of a universal confrontation. The joint and selfless efforts of scientists of all specialties both in the sphere of the natural and social sciences are needed for tackling these interconnected and interconditioned tasks.

A striking example of such cooperation of Soviet scientists is the activity of the Scientific Council for the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament, which was set up a few years ago by the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, the State Committee for Science and Technology Board and the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace Presidium. The fundamental scientific research conducted by the council, the results of which are reflected in the series of publications "Peace and Disarmament. Scientific Research,"* is of great scientific and sociopolitical interest. The latest of them, which came out in 1984, has elicited extensive comment among the scientific community. Top Soviet scientists and political and public figures appear on the pages of this publication.

The book opens with an introductory article by Academician B.N. Ponomarev, candidate of the CPSU Central Commitee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which is devoted to scientists' responsible role in

* "Mir i razoruzheniye. Nauchnyye issledovaniya. 1984" [Peace and Disarmament. Scientific Research. 1984], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1984, p 431.

strengthening international security and preventing nuclear war. The articles of the collection, which belong to the pens of Academicians P.N. Fedoseyev, Ye.P. Velikhov, N.N. Blokhin, V.A. Legasov, A.V. Fokin and others, describe in detail the horrifying picture of a global war, into which any conflict involving the use of atomic weapons would inevitably grow. The American "local" nuclear war concept is refuted convincingly, and the contradictoriness and harmfulness of the said proposition, which creates the illusion of a "way out of a hopeless situation" affording an opportunity for the allegedly "prudent" use of weapons of mass destruction, but in actual fact pushing in the direction of an unchecked nuclear arms race are shown (p 70).

The value of the work in question is not only that it provides an authentic portrayal of the likely consequences of the use of weapons of mass destruction. The collection contains an in-depth characterization of the sociopolitical forces which are capable of opposing the forces of militarism and reaction and championing the cause of international security.

At the center of the authors' attention is an interpretation of the struggle being waged by the international workers movement headed by its combat vanguard--the communist parties, which are the most consistent defenders of the right of all peoples and sovereign states to a peaceful life. "A most important event of recent decades and even, more precisely, of recent years," the book emphasizes, "has been the truly unprecedented scale of the antiwar protests of the international working class and its political parties" (pp 123, 141).

The serious Marxist-Leninist analysis of the most important problems of the workers movement contained in the work shows that constant attention to international policy is organically inherent in the working class.

Communists of the most varied countries are actively in the vanguard of resistance to the reactionary antipopular foreign policy of the bourgeoisie, the highest and most serious manifestation of which is war. International social democracy also is joining increasingly often and on an increasingly extensive scale in the struggle against the military danger.

The collection distinguishes the main directions of the communist and workers parties' international activity to ensure security in the world and remove the threat of war. The first direction which is emphasized is the tremendous significance which is attached to communists' scientific analysis of the essence of the international situation and the nature of the tasks ensuing therefrom. The second is organizational activity aimed at mobilizing communists in the plane of ensuring their broadest possible participation in the antiwar struggle. And the third is the stimulation of activity in the broad masses and the utmost support for the antiwar movement.

The expansion of the scale and increase in the number of participants in the antiwar movement are leading to the increased diversity of its forms and the appearance of new organizations. The authors of the collection explain these new features also by the interweaving and merger of the working people's socioeconomic and antimilitarist demands. Militarism stimulates the growth of such negative social phenomena as the slowing of the rate of economic

development, inflation, structural unemployment, currency crises and so forth, which are reflected most disastrously in the working people's living standard. The book cogently reveals the groundlessness of the myth concerning the "salutory" influence of military spending on the economy.

A characteristic feature of the antiwar movement in the West is the deepening cooperation between scientific research establishments and the working people's professional organizations in the study of the social and other consequences of the arms race. This, in turn, is contributing to the intensification of the antinuclear protest and its participants' more profound recognition of the goals and tasks confronting them.

It is symptomatic that religious figures also are joining the struggle for peace increasingly extensively, to which, in particular, the article by Pitirim, archbishop of Volokolamskiy, "Preserving the Sacred Gift of Life" testifies. It says that many believers, "addressing the concerns of all mankind, have put at the center of their social assertiveness the most important present-day problem--the defense and preservation of peace." This problem, the author emphasizes, "has assumed worldwide significance in recent decades. It has enlisted in its solution the outstanding minds of the present day and captured the broadest strata of the population" (p 154).

The strengthening of the forces of peace supporters is all the more important at present, when the militarist policy of the most aggressive imperialist circles is creating an exceptional threat to universal security.

The collection in question makes a concise, but impressively profound analysis of U.S. foreign policy taken in its historical development. Both in the past and today commonsense in Washington's international actions has frequently given way to "extreme irreponsibility, emotions, conceit, hatred and the temptation to use technological innovations" (p 164). It is indicative that barely liberated from colonial domination as a result of the American revolution, the new ruling class which took shape in the country immediately adopted a policy of expansion and on the eve and at the outset of the 20th century made the transition to the accomplishment of global seizures. Essentially each decade, each year of the present century has demonstrated a constant strengthening of the "power" trends in the United States' international policy and the increased pretensions of its ruling circles to exercise the "leading" role in the world. "The case of the R. Reagan administration," the book emphasizes, "is particularly ominous inasmuch as it manifests a combination of various constituting factors": there is here American monopoly forces' hope for a return of former or, at least, the retention of their present positions in the world, preservation of the system of obtaining superprofits at the expense of the developing countries, the desire to amortize domestic social destabilization under the conditions of a reduction in the living standard of the bulk of the population and ideological prejudices (p 165).

At the center of American foreign policy strategy is nuclear blackmail and the aim of achieving hegemonist, imperial goals. This expresses the socio-class interests of the predominant monopoly groupings, which at the frontier of the 1980's switched abruptly from a policy of detente to a policy of confrontation and the spurring of tension. The reasons for this, as the collection's material

graphically shows, are rooted in the nature of the interests of an influential part of the economic, military and political elite of the United States, which sensed that the conditions of detente mean a loss of profits from military supplies, make a policy of plunder in the developing countries more difficult and reduce the authority of the cult of strength, to which the rulers of the United States have become so accustomed" [no opening quotes] (p 176).

The current situation in the world is the result of the confrontation of two diametrically opposite approaches to the central problem of world politics--that of war and peace--a confrontation unprecedented in its seriousness. Contrary to all scientific calculations and considerations of commonsense, Washington politicians are constructing their concepts of the use of nuclear weapons on the basis of the United States allegedly being capable of "depriving the Soviet Union of the possibility of having recourse to an all-devastating retaliatory strike" (p 192). They remain in the grip of ideas of the past and ignore the fundamental and in principle irreversible fact of the military-strategic balance of forces in the world. As the work shows, the USSR, on the other hand, proceeds from the fact that the global nature of the military danger objectively predetermines a global community of interests in preventing universal destruction (p 182). Accordingly, this dictates the objective need for adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence for all states. The entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries is geared to consistent defense of the interests of detente and peace and the sovereign rights of each people. This has been corroborated by each practical step of the CPSU and the Soviet Government throughout the existence of our state and by the specific measures in the foreign policy sphere which are being adopted at the present time.

The recent UN General Assembly 39th Session confirmed anew the consistency and purposefulness of the USSR's foreign policy and its resolve in the defense of world civilization against nuclear conflagration. A readiness for the sake of this to interact with all states and social forces which recognize the need for practical steps to ease international tension and a readiness to use all available levers, including such a one as the United Nations, are a distinguishing feature of the approach of the CPSU and the Soviet Government to international affairs. Two initiatives presented by the USSR at the last session concern problems currently at the center of world politics. The first concerns the nonmilitarization of space, its use for the benefit of mankind and opposition to the "star wars" program planned by the Pentagon. The second proposal concerns the impermissibility of a policy of state terrorism and any actions aimed at undermining the sociopolitical system in sovereign states. This is particularly urgent today, considering that the present Washington administration has adopted as a rule not only systematic political interference in the internal affairs of other states but also direct acts of aggression. The predatory attack on Grenada and the incessant interventionist activity on Nicaragua's borders are graphic confirmation of this.

Despite the considerable growth of aggressive and militarist trends in the international policy of imperialism, which is inevitably leading to a lowering of the threshold of nuclear war, there has been in parallel a strengthening of the positions of the peace supporters, the socialist community, the international workers movement, the antiwar movement of broad public circles and other social forces. This permits us to hope that wisdom will ultimately prevail in international affairs over nuclear madness and that it will be possible to achieve a turnabout from hostile confrontation toward the constructive cooperation of states with different social systems. As the material of the collection in question testifies, this proposition is not a pious wish. It is underpinned by actual events, which give us grounds for hope. The book investigates in detail the progress and results of the Madrid meeting of representatives of participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (November 1980-September 1983), which showed with full force the viability of the joint efforts of countries with opposite social systems in support of peace and cooperation (p 212). What is particularly important is that its successful completion was achieved in spite of the sharp exacerbation of the international situation and the unconstructive position of the U.S. delegation. In the summary document of the meeting in Madrid its participants expressed the resolve to make detente a more effective and viable process, seek solutions to unsettled problems only by peaceful means, curb the intensifying arms buildup and strengthen trust and security in interstate relations. It was possible for the meeting to achieve positive results only thanks to the scrupulous and at the same time flexible position of the USSR and the other socialist countries and support on the part of the neutral and nonaligned states. This indicates once again that ensuring international security and a halt to the arms race are possible only in persistent struggle and via the surmounting of the obstacles being erected by the aggressive forces of imperialism.

The cohesion and unity of all progressive and peace-loving forces at all levels of social life is a factor without which prevention of the nuclear danger is impossible. Soviet social scientists and specialists in the sphere of the natural sciences recognize fully the importance and urgency of this task and are contributing in every way possible by their works and their organizational activity to its accomplishment.

The knowledge and experience and great authority of scientists enable them to make an impressive contribution to the cause of saving mankind from nuclear catastrophe. This explains their increased responsibility in the modern age and considerable role in defense of the gains of human civilization and world culture. Pointing out the source of the military threat, uniting their efforts with the efforts of the foreign progressive scientific community, actively participating in the worldwide antiwar movement and mass meetings, gatherings, congresses, collections of signatures and peace marches and supporting the numerous federations which exist in the West of scientific workers who expose the explosive political plans of ruling imperialist circles, scientists of the USSR are performing their national and international duty. The book shows convincingly that Soviet scientists are profoundly attached to the cause of peace; they know, Academician B.N. Ponomarev writes in an introductory article to the collection, that "the CPSU and the Soviet state will

never use the fruits of their labor to the detriment of the cause of peace and the interests of the peoples. The USSR Academy of Sciences headed by its president. A.P. Aleksandrov, is marching in the front ranks of the defenders of peace" (p 24).

In completing the description of the collection it should be mentioned with satisfaction that, besides the scientific-analytical part, the publication includes an important section illustrating the activity of Soviet public organizations in the sphere of peace and disarmament (the Association of Soviet Lawyers, the USSR Youth Organizations Committee, the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, the Soviet Peace Foundation and others). The book also publishes a number of fundamental Soviet party-government documents of the last 2 years on questions of peace and disarmament, the texts of the summary document of the Madrid meeting and UN General Assembly declarations and resolutions and material disclosing Soviet scientists' struggle for peace. A brief bibliography on problems of peace and disarmament completes the collection.

The third installment of the "Peace and Disarmament" series is not only of a scientific-analytical but also reference-bibliographical nature. I would like to emphasize the comprehensiveness and multifaceted nature of this publication, which makes it exceptionally useful not only for professional international affairs scholars but also for VUZ students and all those with an interest in international problems.

At the same time it seems to us that the collection could have been supplemented by a special section illustrating the great organizational activity of the social scientists, primarily historians, aimed at mobilizing the scientific community in defense of peace and for the cohesion of all forces of the antiwar movement. In particular, a striking example of the efforts made by Soviet humanities scholars in this field was the international scientific conference "Ideas of Peace and Problems of Europe's Security: History and the Present Day," which was held 30-31 May 1984 in Moscow. This forum was organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World History and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, and scientists of the socialist countries and their colleagues from Great Britain, Greece, the FRG, Switzerland, Sweden and Finland took part. The appeal adopted at the conference emphasized that scientists are vested with particular responsibility for the cause of the preservation of peace. The delegates called on all the world's scientists and all people of good will to multiply efforts to save the world from the threat of war.

I believe that the confidence may be expressed that in new installments of the collection its editorial board and group of writers will pay considerably greater attention to an analysis of the considerable amount of work which Soviet social scientists are performing in the plane of strengthening and developing the antiwar movement and enhancing its effectiveness. As a whole, however, the publication in question provides us with an actual example of the contribution which scientists can make to the cause of consolidating peace and the struggle against militarism and aggression, tirelessly exposing the antihumane bourgeois foreign policy and military-strategic concepts aimed at

disorienting the peoples, counteracting the attempts of reactionary forces to split and weaken the antiwar movement and showing the grim consequences of nuclear war. Profound, sincere concern for the historical destiny of human civilization and awareness of their involvement in the peoples' struggle for peace are distinguishing features of the high civic spirit and truly scientific position of Soviet scientists, which is clearly and precisely expressed in the book in question.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

CSO: 5200/1059

GENERAL

BRIEFS

USSR-ITALY TALKS--Moscow, 25 Jun (TASS)--Soviet-Italian political consultations were held at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 24 and 25 June. Views were exchanged on questions of arms limitation. The sides also discussed the state of affairs at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. Taking part in the consultations were member of the Collegium of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR V. F. Petrovsky, the coordinator of the Political Department of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Giancarlo Danovi, and other senior officials of the foreign ministries of the two countries. Giancarlo Danovi was received by Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR N. S. Ryzhov. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 25 Jun 85]

SOVIET-SPANISH CONSULTATIONS--Moscow, 2 Jul (TASS)--Soviet-Spanish political consultations took place at the Soviet Foreign Ministry on 1 and 2 July, during which the sides exchanged opinions on a wide range of international problems. The issues discussed included, in particular, those of universal security, detente and disarmament as well as international cooperation in social, economic and legal fields. The consultations involved V. F. Petrovskiy, a member of the Collegium of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR, Yu. M. Rybakov, head of the Treaties Department of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR, F. Villar, director-general of the Board of International Organizations and Conferences of the Spanish Foreign Ministry, J. L. Xifra de Ocerin, Spain's ambassador to the USSR, and other high-ranking officials of the foreign ministries of the two countries. F. Villar and J. L. Xifra de Ocerin were received by N. S. Ryzhov, a deputy foreign minister of the USSR. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 2 Jul 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1046

USSR: RESPONSES TO GORBACHEV 'REASSESSMENT' THREAT ASSAILED

State Department Statement

LD282103 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 28 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The exhaustive characteristic given by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech in Dnepropetrovsk to the United States' obstructionist stand at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms caused a fit of irritation in Washington. The State Department issued a special statement in which it attempted to place the blame at the wrong door by making groundless assertions that the blocks on the road to achieving agreement are put by the Soviet Union, not by the United States.

The State Department is "astonished" by Mikhail Gorbachev's words that the United States is carrying on an immense programme of the intensive development of ever new types of weapons of mass destruction, that the U.S. programme to militarise space is blocking the way to agreements in Geneva, that the Soviet Union just cannot allow the talks to be used by the United States anew as a decoy, as a cover for military preparations.

The State Department declares that the Soviet Union gives a "distorted characterisation" of the Geneva talks. The U.S. foreign policy department even doubts the Soviet Union's "seriousness in the talks" and "its readiness to implement the agreement reached in January between Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Gromyko establishing the objectives of the new talks."

But the State Department brushed aside its "astonishments" and "doubts", actually recognising the United States' unwillingness to promote progress at the talks. It confirmed Washington's intentions to "engage in a constructive discussion" of its plans of the militarisation of space, that is, to seek agreement not on the prevention of the spread of the arms race to space but on the creation of a sort of a code of rules for conducting it.

A spokesman for the State Department also testified to the violation by the United States of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the objectives of the talks. Having heard his statement, one of the journalists asked the explanation why the United States is criticising the Soviet Union for the linkage of the question for defensive and offensive arms, though precisely such an agreement was reached by Andrey Gromyko and George Shultz. In answer to this the spokesman of the State Department said that the United States meant only a "conceptual interrelationship" of offensive and defensive arms and definitely not the linkage of the progress on any of the three directions of the talks with the progress in other spheres.

The spokesman for the State Department naturally preferred not to mention facts about the continued intensive development of armaments by the United States under the cover of the talks. These facts are obvious, however. Even the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, the journal that fully supports the U.S. Administration in questions of military and foreign policy, recently described the U.S. stand at the Geneva talks by declaring that the United States is determined to maintain and even speed up the rates of arms build up on a huge scale of its strategic potential while both superpowers are conducting talks on arms reduction. The U.S. Administration is firmly determined to show that the talks will have no effect on the build up of U.S. strategic forces on land, in the air and at sea until superpowers achieve agreement on large-scale arms reductions.

The journal has not mentioned one substantial factor that going by the U.S. stand at the Geneva talks, the United States is not striving to achieve agreement. Quite the contrary, it is blocking the road to agreement by its programme of "star wars" for the purpose of creating a pretext for actually endless and uncontrolled spiralling of the arms race.

More on State Department

LD290756 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 29 Jun 85

["Washington: Hypocrisy and Lack of Constructiveness"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev: Washington did not like the assessment of the American position at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments, made by the Soviet Union. The U.S. State Department, in a fit of irritation, called it "distorted" and expressed its "astonishment." In fact, what really causes astonishment is the State Department's official statement on the issues. The statement totally distorts the real state of affairs, everything in it is put upside down.

It follows from the statement that it is not the United States, but the Soviet Union which fails to comply with the January agreement on the objectives and subject of the talks. It seems that they in the State Department have "mislaid" the joint Soviet-American statement of January 7-8 this year, or think that the world public have forgotten its content and may be easily deluded. It is, probably, counting on this latter that the State Department declares that the USSR "has sought unilaterally to impose preconditions, linking discussion of nuclear arms reductions to prior U.S. agreement to Soviet demands that we (USA -- ed.) abandon research under the Strategic Defense Initiative." So, in the opinion of the State Department, the demand, recorded in the joint statement, that all issues "be considered and resolved in their interrelationship" has now turned into a "unilateral precondition". The U.S. Administration thus shows utter disregard for its own commitments.

In a bid to justify Washington's unconstructive position, the State Department declares that the United States meant "conceptual interrelationship" between offensive and defensive weapons. Hardly anyone, however, can be deluded by a vague phrase of this kind. It is obvious that the interrelationship between strategic and defensive arms is of a paramount objective character and circumventing it may only be directed at disrupting the strategic parity. The United States should better not hope that the Soviet Union will agree to any reductions of its nuclear systems of retaliation at a time when Washington is accelarating its programe of "making obsolete" Soviet nuclear armaments by carrying out the "star wars" programme.

The U.S. Administration was also "offended" by the remark that the programme of space militarisation blocks the way toward agreements in Geneva. The State Department mentions the "constructiveness" and "flexibility" of the U.S. position at Generva. All this implies the discussion of the American "star wars" programme and "rules" for developing space-based strike weapons. But the January agreement provides for the elaboration of measures for preventing an arms race in outer space. The U.S. position at the talks can aptly be described as open sabotage of the consideration and solution of the issue of preventing the arms race in outer space.

Washington is using all means to push through and legalise its programme of militaristic near-earth space with a view to gaining military strategic superiority. It is high time that Washington drastically reconsiders its position at the Geneva talks and abandons the attempts to use them as a cover for military programmes. If Washington adopted a more sensible stance, the negotiators at Geneva would discuss far-reaching, really radical reductions of nuclear stockpiles by the two sides. Should the American Administration continue its present policy, the Soviet Union will be compelled to reassess the current situation with due account of all its integral elements.

PRC, U.S. Media Reaction

PM010819 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS 27 June roundup: "Following a Course of Peace and Creation"]

[Excerpts] While implementing an impressive program for accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, the Soviet Union makes tremendous efforts to uphold peace and protect the earth against nuclear catastrophe and resolutely advocates the prevention of an arms race in space and the ending of the arms race on earth. That is the leitmotiv of the broad international reactions to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's speech in Dnepropetrovsk.

The Soviet leader, the Chinese news agency XINHUA reports, stated that the USSR intends to actively promote the full overcoming of the negative patch in Soviet-Chinese relations, and stressed that he is confident that this will ultimately happen. He said: "I think time has shown both sides that neither of them gains from disunity, still less from unfriendliness and suspicion."

M.S. Gorbachev warned that the Soviet Union will have to reassess the whole situation if the United States drags out the Geneva talks, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. This statement is the most serious warning so far that the talks could be wrecked because of the U.S. plans which are widely known as the program of preparations for "star wars." The CPSU Central Committee general secretary described the U.S. program as a blank wall barring the path to the attainment of corresponding agreements in Geneva. Moscow states that it cannot again allow the talks to be used to divert attention and provide a cover for military preparations, the aim of which is to ensure U.S. strategic superiority and a line of world domination. The Soviet Union also stated that it will not allow the United States to use trade to interfere in its internal affairs.

The U.S. news agency UPI, for its part, notes that, as M.S. Gorbachev stated, Washington is using the Geneva talks as a cover for building up U.S. military potential, which is aimed at inflicting a nuclear strike on the Soviet Union; the attainment of serious accords apparently does not enter into U.S. plans. At the same time, the U.S. press published a statement by a White House spokesman from which it is clear that the Washington administration intends to continue to implement militarist programs and step up the arms race.

Western Media Commentaries

LD272235 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Text] The speech of Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev delivered in Dnepropetrovsk is in the center of attention of foreign news agencies and press today. Most of the comments on it stress that the Soviet Union has once more displayed its firm determination to put an end to the arms race. There appeared to be, however, some commentators in the West who were trying to misrepresent the position of the Soviet Union by asserting that the Soviet Union is threatening to disrupt the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. Aleksandr Druzhnin, political observer of the All-Union Radio and Central TV comments on this:

Is is difficult to imagine that there can exist a cruder or more unscrupulous distortion of the Soviet position. The fact is, the speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev says it clearly -- the Soviet Union is ready to discuss an agreement on not only putting an end to the arms race, but also on their reduction in the largest possible scale, including universal and complete disarmament. The constructive Soviet proposals directed at saving the world from the threat of a military catastrophe prove it to any reasonable person that it is really so. In order to reach this end, the Soviet Union has among other things volunteered to participate in the Geneva talks. Well, and what was the position occupied in Geneva by our counterparts? The Americans have not so far put forward any serious proposal on curtailing the arms race. Moreover, everything points to the fact that curbing this race does not in the least correspond to their intentions. Indeed, how can one seriously strive to prevent the arms race in space -- this is exactly the task posed before the Geneva talks -- and at the same time, sparing neither resources nor great sums of money, to mount up the effort in militarization of space? The United States is planning to spend $500 million on realization of the program to create first strike space weapons which official Washington modestly calls the Strategic Defense Initiative and which was appropriately named the "star wars" program by vast masses of people. There are probably not many native people who would be ready to believe the assurances of the Washington politicians about the subject matter being scientific research in the sphere of the military use of space. The military and industrial complex of the United States has never before invested such colossal sums of money into creation of the most up-to-date weapons, and it will not let the "star wars" program be shelved. Thus, the "star wars" plans create a real danger of a military conflict; they are aimed at changing the military balance in favor of the United States, and at obtaining the military superiority to over socialist countries.

Isn't it clear, therefore, that under such conditions the Soviet Union cannot permit the Geneva talks to be used as a blind for concealing dangerous military preparations? The Soviet Union is ready for carrying out talks in Geneva.

However, the American program to militarize space plays the role of a blank wall standing in the way of reaching an accord. Whether it is going to be removed depends of course on those who erected it, evidently trying to evade constructive and fair talks.

CSO: 5200/1045

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW: TALKS 'ESSENTIAL' BUT U.S. MUST 'REVIEW POSITION'

LD081101 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Jun 85

[Excerpt] Now, as usual on Saturdays, we present replies to listeners' questions on international topics. At the microphone is Bronislav Myakota, political observer:

First a letter relating to the Soviet-American talks in Geneva: Vladimir Ivanovich Gerasimov, a veteran of the Great Patriotic War, from the town of Yegoryevsk, Moscow oblast, asks: Does it make sense to conduct talks with the American side?

Here there cannot be two views. It is essential to conduct talks. There is no other way. All opportunities must be explored to deflect from our planet the menace of the destruction of a nuclear conflagration.

The Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva were begun on the initiative of our country. The attention of the world public is now fixed upon them. The peoples link their hopes for a peaceful future with the negotiations and await tangible results from them. This is understandable. The development of the world situation has reached an extremely dangerous point. This has come about as a result of the aggressive, adventurist policy of the Reagan administration. The United States is stepping up the arms race and wants to extend it into space. This is being done in order to secure U.S. supremacy over the world of socialism, and, with the aid of crude force, to turn back the course of historical events.

U.S. policy is evoking growing disquiet in the world. In various countries, the demand that urgent measures be taken to avert a further slide toward nuclear disaster and to resolve this question through businesslike negotiations and mutually-acceptable agreements is ringing out with growing insistence. The Soviet side has set forth specific proposals on all aspects of the talks, but, regrettably, the first round of the Geneva talks showed that the United States is departing from the original accord to consider three components--space armaments, strategic armaments, and medium-range nuclear weapons--as organically interconnected. Such a stance cannot lead to success at the negotiations. For this reason, the need to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth demands a resolute review of the U.S. position, with a view to a constructive, businesslike approach.

The successes of the Geneva talks requires mutual political good will to achieve accord, with strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security. Despite the complex and tense world situation and the difficulties at the Geneva talks, we retain a sober optimism, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed. Our country hopes that common sense, political realism, and a sense of responsibility for a peaceful future will prevail.

CSO: 5200/1289

TASS CITES INTERVIEW WITH ITALIAN PREMIER ON MOSCOW TRIP

LD282111 Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Rome, June 28 TASS -- Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi gave an interview to the magazine REALTA SOVIETICA, in which he touched upon a number of aspects of his visit to the Soviet Union and talks with Soviet leaders. Bettino Craxi stressed, in particular, that the visit he had paid to Moscow together with Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti was not a formality but a useful and important event because of the exceptionally constructive spirit in which urgent problems of interest to both sides had been discussed.

The meeting in Moscow, Craxi noted, was his first acquaintance with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The almost 4-hour-long talk between the two leaders enabled Craxi "to get the impression which is highly positive. I appreciated the frankness and precision with which Mikhail Gorbachev approaches problems and his decisive and direct style, which has no room for rhetoric."

Craxi noted that a considerable portion of the conversations he had had in Moscow had been devoted to the East-West dialogue and the Geneva talks. Acute crises in the Middle East and in Central America were also reviewed.

Touching upon the Geneva talks, the Italian prime minister noted that every effort should be made to promote the climate of mutual understanding. An approach envisioning cooperation should be assetted in Geneva. It is necessary to take account of the relationship between the three areas of the talks, the relationship recognised and included in the Soviet-U.S. accord. That is why, Craxi said, the talks should advance in all the three areas simultaneously.

As regards Soviet-Italian economic relations, Craxi noted the need for balanced mutual trade. He stressed that major possibilities of the two economies had not been exhausted in this respect. There are numerous areas in which important talks are under way and they can yield positive results to mutual benefit.

Craxi also touched upon problems of European cooperation and said that he had noted in Moscow an interest in the establishment of relations between the EEC and the socialist countries participating in the CMEA. He favourably commented on the CMEA's latest proposals, saying that "they could provide the basis for fruitful talks."

CSO: 5200/1305

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ECONOMIST DENIES BENEFITS OF SDI TECHNICAL SPINOFFS

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 3 Jun 85 pp 1-5

[Article by N. Karasev, candidate of economic sciences: "False 'Gains': Space Wars Cause Earthly Concerns"]

[Text] In recent time the world has heard a lot of talk about the "star wars" plans announced by the U.S. administration. Since people intuitively feel their danger, the authors of the schemes of battles in outer space seek to reassure public opinion by deception, to make it believe that these plans are harmless scientific research which, in addition, allegedly brings about technological and economic gains.

This is not a new ploy. The advocates of virtually all American military programmes claimed and continue to claim that military research projects are inevitably accompanied by a spin-off effect, i.e. the use of war technology in civilian production.

Experts in the United States itself convincingly show that such claims do not bear scrutiny. Even the Pentagon staffers admit, for example, that about 90 percent of the total volume of the research and development work done in the sphere of military-aviation production cannot be applied in civilian industries because of its narrow specialisation.

Besides that, according to American economists, the benefits of the partial employment of military-technological advances in civilian economy are incomparable with the enormous losses which capitalist society suffers as a result of the militarisation of economy and science. There are hardly any reasons to doubt that the gains by the civilian sectors from the military programmes would have been more dependable and less costly if funds of such a scale had been spent directly for civilian purposes, well-known American economist Mansfield writes. A special report, prepared by the U.S. Council on Economic Priorities late last year, contains a similar estimate.

Evidently, herein lies the most important factor of evaluating spin-off as a whole. But today the most active advocates of "star wars" are again portraying its effect as one of the main arguments in favour of space militarisation. And they are doing this on the basis of pseudo-scientific reasoning.

Lavish use is made, for instance, of playing up the results of the economic analysis of the influence of American space research, first of all the Apollo

programme, on the economic growth rate in the country, which was made in the 1960s and 1970s. This analysis led to the conclusion that each million dollars channeled into research carried out by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) results in an economic increment to the tune of 24 million dollars within eight years.

Such hyperbolisation of gains was so obvious that the authoritative institutions and scientists regarded the calculations of this sort as a joke. A literal interpretation of this conclusion means that if NASA does not receive anything for research and development, output in the United States will drop, the General Accounting Office of the U.S. Congress wrote ironically. It turns out that the entire growth of the national product and many other things are dependable only if they are based on NASA's research exercises, it went on to say.

But if we leave irony alone and agree that American space research, carried out in the 1960s and 1970s, has really resulted in tangible gains, this fact cannot at all be accepted as an argument in favour of the current studies within the framework of the preparations for "star wars." Peaceful space research projects should be clearly distinguished from military ones. Though the activity of NASA in the previous two decades was not completely isolated from the U.S. military preparations, it focused on multiplying new fundamental knowledge of the earth and near-earth space. It is clear that this knowledge was of great use for the American economy and at the same time convincingly proved the great profitability of space research for peaceful purposes.

The research projects within the framework of the realisation of the notorious "strategic defence initiative" are of an altogether different character. As the American press noted in March 1985, reality is such that almost all NASA projects aimed at peaceful studies of space have been discontinued in the past few years. For instance, the proposals to study Halley's Comet and a number of planets of the solar system, including Jupiter's atmosphere and the sun itself, as well as many others have been buried. And all the resources "released" in this way are concentrated on military efforts.

Most of American experts, among them prominent ones, are convinced that this process does substantial scientific and economic damage first of all because of the highly specific content of this work and its results. The U.S. press carries reports that within the preparations for "star wars" the Pentagon researchers are working on technology including gas lasers, beam weapons and electronic-magnetic rapid-firing guns. A sum of 26,000 million dollars has been allocated for their development in the next five years. According to the most modest calculations, the production of such items will cost over one trillion dollars.

K. Sagan, the greatest living U.S. astronomer, was recently asked what this trillion dollars could do for peaceful space exploration. His reply surprised many people. He said that with today's technology that sum would suffice to organise a manned mission to Mars, establish a permanent manned station on the moon, launch unmanned probes to study the sun, have a permanent

laboratory on a near-terrestrial orbit, and channel the remaining hundred of billion of dollars into social programmes.

A recent paper issued by the U.S. Council on Economic Priorities says that the technology of space weapon production, which is being currently developed by the Pentagon, could not be used for peaceful pursuits without major and expensive retuning.

It has become clear of late that many results of current military space research projects will apparently never become public knowledge, and, hence, will not be used for economic purposes. At the beginning of the year U.S. Defence Secretary C. Weinberger issued a directive prohibiting the scientists on the Pentagon payroll to disclose any information on military technology. Conspicuously, the directive was published and commented on by the magazine AEROSPACE AMERICA focusing on the various aspects of "star wars" preparations. The list of technology closed to the public took 700 pages. It is not concealed that new technology for space militarisation holds the main place on the list.

Another aspect of the adverse effect which military space research is exerting on the nation's science and economic activity is a massive diverting of skilled research personnel, notably scientists and technologists, from pressing social and economic tasks to suit Washington's reckless designs.

According to the U.S. National Science Foundation, in 1984, 110,000 experts in aeronautics, astronautics, electronics and computers were directly involved in military projects. With the present trends in the space weapons race persisting, in 1987 the corresponding figure will exceed 150,000. American economists say with alarm that this occurs at a time when the market of talents in the national economy shows an expressed downward trend. In 1981, of the 351 U.S. industrial firms, surveyed by the National Science Foundation, half had every second electronics and systems analysis job unstaffed. The proportion of enterprises short of seventy five percent of such professionals reached 60 percent of 1983 and 67 percent in 1984.

Much of the blame for this goes to intensive militaristic research. A recent study by F. Lichtenberg of Columbia University has shown that an increase in governmental spending per 100 scientists and technologists engaged in military research undercuts industrial firms' possibility to finance 39 experts in commercial technology development.

The U.S. Big Business is also greatly worried by the aerospace sector pumping the top quality manpower, under the influence of "star wars" preparations, from other industries. G. Opel, who heads the International Business Machines Board of directors, said that, as a result, the United States might lose thought which is the most necessary instrument to consolidate international positions in the years to come.

The advocates of "star wars" allege that research cannot be controlled or banned. This allegation does not hold water either. A look at the situation around the Strategic Defence Initiative shows that the main and probably the

sole pusher of this programme is the American administration which disregards a fairly strong opposition at home and in NATO. Dr Ionas, the research leader of the military space project, admitted that his biggest headaches are connected with resistance on the part of Congress, public opinion, and America's allies. These difficulties, the interested official said, are due to the programme being pretentious and expensive. Well said.

This is how the spin-off effect of the "star wars" plans looks like. The alleged advantages the advocates of these plans promise the U.S. economy and technology prove to be a soap-bubble intended for the uninitiated.

(PRAVDA, June 3. In full.)

CSO: 5200/1252

SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW PAPER INTERVIEWS DUTCH FIGURE ON SDI, INF

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 23, 16-23 Jun 85 p 5

[Interview with Mikos Racz, vice president of the Netherlands Committee for European Security and Cooperation, by Vladislav Trapeznikov: "A Space Version of the Marshall Plan"]

> [Text] "From the point of view of many Netherlanders and many other Europeans for that matter, Reagan's 'star wars' programme could very well be called 'the space version of the Marshall Plan,' with the aid of which the USA wants to subordinate Europe not only militarily, but politically, too," Miklos Racz, vice president of the Netherlands Committee for European Security and Cooperation, said to an "MN" correspondent in Moscow. He went on to say:

The antiwar, antinuclear movement in the Netherlands unites several hundred organizations, 15 of which are national. The movement dates back to the mid-70s when the USA was going to deploy neutron bombs. At the time 1.2 million people signed the petition against the N-bomb, after which the government had to take an antineutron stand. The movement's success also lies in the fact that many of the Netherlands' churches are taking part in it. It was to a great measure thanks to them that 500,000 people marched in the 1983 manifestation against nuclear weapons in The Hague. The campaign planned for September-October this year which is demanding from the government a categorical refusal to deploy US cruise missiles in the Netherlands will be a major event in the country. We expect to collect about a million signatures.

CSO: 5200/1042

SPACE ARMS

FRG EDITORIAL ON PARTICIPATION IN EUREKA, SDI

DW311203 Bonn DIE WELT in German 31 May 85 p 2

[Editorial by Wilfried Hertz-Eichenrode: "Who Is Convinced by Einstein's Ideas, Who Is Not"]

[Text] The letter in which Helmut Schmidt strongly advises Chancellor Kohl against FRG participation in President Reagan's SDI project has found considerable public attention. This is not surprising because Schmidt had connected his fate as chancellor with counterarmament and in this way proved that he personally is not susceptible to temporary challenges, not even to his own party. However, what would be the consequences if Kohl were to follow his advice?

An analysis must be based on the assumption that no one can make the United States return to the situation prior to the U.S. President's television speech of 23 March 1983, when Reagan announced SDI. In concrete terms it is a research project. However, it also is a political decision which can at this point not be called a decision on principle because, naturally, the research result cannot be anticipated.

In addition, the United States is in a position to carry out the research program alone. A world power has set its own priority, and nobody can prevent the priority from being fulfilled. With or without the Europeans, the SDI will be advanced to a point where testing and deployment can be decided upon. This also would be the moment for Washington to negotiate with Moscow, so as to bring the tests into line with the ABM treaty (anti-ballistic missile treaty) of 1972. In this respect Washington has committed itself to its allies.

This is the state of affairs that cannot be influenced by Bonn and on the basis of which the chancellor will make a decision. Kohl must consider the predictable effects of the SDI on the friendship with the United States, on the many partnership within NATO and Europe, as well as on decision processes in international crisis situations.

Basically, the Federal Government has at best tactical but no substantial alternatives. As when Konrad Adenauer decided on the irrevocable ties with the West, the Federal Republic now has to consider the basic prerequisite of its existence: External security has absolute priority as a precondition of freedom -- with the security and freedom of Berlin ranking first because it is most exposed. Both security and freedom cannot be had without the United States. To this extent the FRG is dependent.

From this it follows that if Helmut Schmidt argues that FRG participation in SDI also is not advisable because Mitterrand rejects the project and our close relations with France are of extraordinary importance, this can only be correct with the essential reservation that our decision for France must by no means affect the U.S. protective function. France cannot replace the superpower United States in the FRG calculation of survival.

CSO: 5200/2678

SPACE ARMS

REPORTAGE ON VISIT BY VICE PRESIDENT BUSH TO FRG

Meetings in Bonn

LD250807 Hamburg DPA in German 0739 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 25 Jun (DPA) -- U.S. Vice President George Bush started his political talks in Bonn this morning. He first met with CSU Chairman and Bavarian Minister President Franz Josef Strauss.

Bush, who is on a European tour, will stay in the capital for 1 day. His discussions were orginally to have centered on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). However, the numerous terrorist attacks recently have placed the fight against international terror at the top of the talks.

After lunch with Chancellor Helmut Kohl (CDU), meetings with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) and SPD leaders Willy Brandt, Johannes Rau, and Hans-Jochen Vogel are planned for this afternoon.

After a courtesy visit to Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker and a press conference in the evening, Bush wants to fly on to The Hague.

Discusses SDI

LD251712 Hamburg DPA in German 1553 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn 25 Jun (DPA) -- The combating of terrorism and research into the SDI defense system were the main topics in Chancellor Helmut Kohl's talks with U.S. Vice President George Bush. This was confirmed by Bush at a news conference today. The Europeans were invited, as they have been previously, to cooperate "in one form or another."

The setting up on their own of a European defense against short- and medium-range missiles would also be welcomed and would not disturb the United States, Bush stressed. The U.S. is still discussing the matter: "We ourselves are still trying to establish whether research under the umbrella of government agreements or direct agreements between private firms are better."

Terrorism and the situation of the U.S. hostages in Lebanon was a further focus of Bush's talks in Bonn. The vice president ducked a question on the possibility of military intervention by the United States and pointed to the worldwide condemnation of the hostage-

taking. Bush also pointed to the improvement of security measures at airports and to an incrased exchange of information between the allied and friendly countries.

Following the talks between Bush and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the Foreign Ministry merely said that the exchange of views had been limited "exclusively" to the combating of terrorism. The President's Office named as the topics of the meeting between President Richard von Weizsaecker and Bush "questions of FRG-U.S. relations and of the alliance." At his news conference the vice president said of FRG-U.S. relations: "We could wish for nothing better."

Bush told the press that in his talk with SPD representatives, differences of opinion had not been cleared up. He believed in the usefulness of such meetings, however, which hopefully this time, too, had further reduced the differences. He was willing to continue them at any time. SPD Chairman Willy Brandt, who was accompanied by his deputy, Johannes Rau, and parliamentary party chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel at the meeting with Bush said afterwards that the differing standpoints on the SDI had been "explained more clearly".

Bonn was the second stop on the U.S. vice president's European visit. This evening he intends to fly to The Hague.

CSO: 5200/2678

SPACE ARMS

FRG RESEARCH MINISTER DISCUSSES GUIDELINES ON EUREKA

LD251346 Hamburg DPA in German 0953 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 25 Jun (DPA) -- The Federal Government looks forward to the development of application-oriented technologies through European research cooperation (Eureka). Minister of Research Heinz Riesenhuber (CDU) made this clear in a statement distributed by his ministry on 25 June, after the Cabinet committees on research and European politics had discussed the preliminary guidelines for the Eureka concept under the leadership of Chancellor Helmut Kohl on 21 June.

In the activities preceding the Milan EC summit which begins on 28 June, at which technological cooperation will be an important point on the agenda, FRG-French talks on this subject will take place in Bonn on 26 June.

The research ministers of both countries have been included in a round of foreign and defense ministers' talks which will include security questions.

Riesenhuber stressed that cooperation must be aimed at tasks which help strengthen the ability of the European economy to compete, transcend the capabilities of individual West European states, and are of benefit for the Federal Republic. This is not directed against participation in the U.S. SDI research program. Eureka should make possible a boost for civil technology by way of joint research programs, the development of common norms and infrastructure, or the improvement of the process of allocating public contracts to European enterprises. As possible main themes of research and development, the minister named the development of supercomputers, as suggested by France, and the overcoming of transborder problems of highly toxic waste. Eureka should be open for the EC states as well as for other Western European countries. In individual projects attention must be paid to the appropriate participation of industry, including sharing the costs.

The fundamental Eureka concept, and the question of financing are to be clarified in detail over the next few months according to Riesenhuber. His statement points out that there is already varied European cooperation in science and technology, such as joint space activities and cooperation of enterprises and science in the field of nuclear physics. About DM4.5 billion will be available this year for joint European research establishments.

CSO: 5200/2678

SPACE ARMS

U.S. SENATORS DISCUSS SDI WITH FRG OFFICIALS

LD011611 Hamburg DPA in German 1459 GMT 1 Jul 85

[Text] Bonn, 1 Jul (DPA) -- Deputy SPD floor leader Horst Ehmke and several other Social Democratic deputies held a 90-minute talk on disarmament with U.S. senators on Monday. The U.S. politicians, among them Patrick Moynihan, Sam Nunn, and Charles Mathias, belong to a group of senators observing the Geneva negotiations on the limitation of strategic weapons.

It was stated after the talk that both sides agreed with the assessment that the Geneva talks are presently stagnating. The Americans, it was noted, defended the U.S. space arms program, about which the SPD politicians raised reservations. The senators pointed out that there was clear politial support for the appropriate research in the United States, while at the same time, a dividing line had to be drawn between this research and the development of the necessary space weapons. The members of the Senate group also met with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Defense Minister Manfred Woerner.

CSO: 5200/2678

SPACE ARMS

GDR CDU/CSU DEFENSE EXPORT ON USSR SPACE WEAPONS

DW140913 Hamburg BILD in German 14 Jun 85 pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report on interview with Juergen Todenhoefer, CDU/CSU "disarmament expert": "Star Wars" -- 'GDR' Involved Long Ago"]

[Text] Moscow is secretly preparing its own "star wars" and the "GDR" is very much involved. NATO has the appropriate Soviet secret documents in hand. This was disclosed by CDU/CSU defense expert Juergen Todenhoefer to BILD.

Juergen Todenhoefer said: "On 26 April 1985 at the summit in Warsaw, Soviet Defense Minister Sokolov commissioned his East bloc colleagues with research tasks involving a space defense system. The "GDR" was told, among other things, to produce supplies in the fields of photographic electronics (laser), measuring techniques, and fine mechanics. Another primary supplier is the CSSR."

Todenhoefer said with indignation: "It is a political scandal. While Western Europe is quarreling over whether to participate at all in space weapons research, Moscow has been acting for a long time and is now pushing the research work it began 10 years ago with the help of its alliance partners. It is particularly impudent that at the same time the United States is accused of wanting to militarize space."

CSO: 5200/2678

SPACE ARMS

DUTCH FOREIGN MINISTER DISCUSSES SDI WITH FRG'S GENSCHER

LD302021 Hamburg DPA in German 1543 GMT 30 May 85

[Text] Bonn, 30 May (DPA) -- On the sidelines of the FRG president's state visit [to the Netherlands], in Amsterdam today FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and his Netherlands counterpart Hans van den Broek had a detailed discussion about the possibilities of technological cooperation in Europe. The French Eureka initiative was "acknowledged positively" by both ministers, the FRG Froreign Ministry announced. In addition, the two ministers promised to keep each other constatly informed about the discussion in their countries regarding the U.S. SDI project. As far as possible, a coordinated West European reaction to the U.S. offer of participation in the research program must be achieved.

CSO: 5200/2684

SPACE ARMS

FRG OFFICIALS ON EUROPEAN ROLE IN SDI

LD 221536 Hamburg DPA in German 1335 GMT 22 Jun 85

[Excerpt] Hamburg, 22 Jun (DPA) -- Lothar Spaeth, the minister president of Baden-Wuerttemberg and deputy CDU chairman, said on Saturday after his 5-day visit to the United States that he believes the United States is no longer interested in government participation by the European alliance partners in the U.S. plans for antimissile defense in space. This view has been endorsed by the SDI working party in Washington which has been coordinated by the chancellor's foreign policy adviser, said Spaeth's secretary of state, Matthias Kleinert, when questioned by DPA. The United States wants only political support for their plans.

Spaeth noted a change of views in the United States since last February, when government cooperation was still under consideration. Now Spaeth has the impression that only cooperation by firms is at issue. At present an agreement on the free exchange of research findings can no longer be achieved without becoming dependent on the United States. The leading European industrialized countries must finally rouse themselves into keeping pace with U.S. research.

Meanwhile FDP Chairman and Federal Economics Minister Martin Bangemann, on Saturday strongly demanded participation by the European NATO partners in the U.S. SDI plans. Bangemann said at a congress of Bavarian Liberals in Bayreuth that there is a danger of one-sided domination by the United States in this sphere. The view that peace is made more secure by increasing numbers of missiles is a dangerous mistake. The Federal Government will take part in the U.S. plans on condition that this occurs in association with the other European countties. The information flow should not just run from Europe to the United States, but also the other way round. Moreover, said Bangemann, "a wall of fire should be put up between the research into, and establishment of this system."

CSO: 5200/2679

SPACE ARMS

FRG MINISTERS MEET FRENCH COUNTERPARTS, DISCUSS SDI

LD261455 Hamburg DPA in German 1357 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 26 Jun (DPA) -- FRG, and French ministers met in Bonn this afternoon at the invitation of Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) to discuss security policy. Genscher and his French counterpart, Roland Dumas, as well as the FRG and French Defense Ministers Manfred Woerner (CDU) and Charles Hernu, respectively, intended to talk particularly about the assessments and consequences of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI].

Before this ministers' meeting, the FRG and French foreign ministers met with the research ministers of the two countries, Ministers Heinz Riesenhuber (CDU) and Hubert Curien to prepare closer cooperation on a joint technology cooperation project. The definition of the French initiative Eureka will be among the important topics at the European summit conference in Milan, which begins on Friday [28 June]. Because of this summit, the regularly scheduled FRG-French ministerial talks were moved up.

In Riesenhuber's view, Eureka will provide an impetus for civilian technology. The emphasis on development could affect supercomputers or methods to deal with highly-poisonous waste brought across borders. Government circles stressed in Bonn on Wednesday that in any event, Eureka is regarded as an open enterprise that is not limited exclusively to EC members.

Informed sources did not rule out the possibility that the ministers are talking about the military project for a joint reconnaissance satellite. This satellite, which is intended to make the West Europeans more independent of U.S. reconnaissance results, could, however, cost up to DM10 billion in the course of the next 8 to 10 years. A financing system is not yet prepared.

The Foreign Ministry added this evening that the ministers had agreed to implement the Eureka program. The two research ministers said that possible research projects must be worked out on a political, technical, and industrial basis, step by step. Possibilities include industrial, market-oriented large-scale projects -- for example in information technology -- for the solution of joint problems in environmental protection and agriculture, and large-scale infrastructure projects, such as rapid transport systems.

CSO: 5200/2679

CHINESE PREMIER, FRG OFFICIAL DISCUSS EUREKA, SDI

LD151427 Hamburg DPA in German 1329 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Konstanz, 15 Jun (DPA) -- During a 3-hour talk with Baden-Wuerttemberg Minister President Lothar Spaeth, today, Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang expressed clear interest in a stable Europe and intensive cooperation between the PRC and Europe. This was stated today by the Baden-Wuerttemberg government spokesman, Secretary of State Matthias Kleinert, in Konstanz. Zhao and Spaeth traveled there from Stuttgart by special train.

Kleinert reported that in the exchange of views between Spaeth and Zhao, European and international questions were discussed, including Eureka and the Strategic Defense Initiative research programs. Both the sides stressed the particularly friendly atmosphere at the talks.

CSO: 5200/2678

SPACE ARMS

FRG SCIENTISTS ASK KOHL TO DECLINE SDI ROLE

LD030921 Hamburg DPA in German 0844 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] Munich, 3 Jul (DPA) -- In an open letter to Chancellor Helmut Kohl, 350 scientists from the Munich Max Planck Institute, the two Munich universities, and other scientific institutes in the Munich area declined to cooperate in the planned U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative(SDI). They gave as their reason the view that the SDI dimensions correspond to the introduction of new inercontinental missiles and destroy all hopes for disarmament.

The letter, published on 3 July, goes on to say that even the construction phase would have a destabilizing effect and increase the probability of a first strike. The scientists consider it irresponsible for a huge potential of scientific and financial resources to be taken away from remedying and investigating unemployment, Third World hunger, and environmental policy.

CSO: 5200/2679

SPACE ARMS

FRG FOREIGN MINISTER INTERVIEWED ON EEC, EUREKA, SDI

DW211203 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 2005 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Interview with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher by correspondents Horst Schaettle, Jochen Schweitzer, and Gustav Trampe in Bonn -- live]

[Text] [Schweitzer] Mr Genscher, the FRG's reputation has suffered somewhat [because of the FRG agriculture minister's veto on farm prices at the EC meeting in Luxembourg]. Was this necessary?

[Genscher] I do not believe that this veto was easy for anybody. Also, we should not ignore what [Finance Minister] Stoltenberg has said about the special burdens that we have imposed on our country's farmers and their families over the past few years. This formed the background for the decision. I attentively listened to many critical words from other EC countries about this veto. I think this criticism will provide a sort of encouragement for the European Council in Milan because I now proceed from the premise that all those who were critical of this veto will support the view with us in Milan that in the future treaties will be applied as they stand, -- that is, that we can dissociate ourselves from the so-called Luxembourg dissension that was after all no compromise, as it is occasionally called. What I mean to say is that all parties involved are prepared to carry out majority decisions. This will make it possible for us to balance interests in such a way that no one will have any need to revert to a policy of vetoes.

[Schweitzer] Mr Genscher, is it not true that some qualitative changes have occurred in Europe during the past few months? The FRG and France, Kohl and Mitterrand, have formed the driving force of this community. Mitterrand announced a great European initiative, but hardly anything is heard of it anymore. There has been considerable discord since the world economic summit over the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] and the attitude toward the United States over economic issues. Is the European partnership between Bonn and Paris, which once wanted to push Europe ahead, still intact?

[Genscher] It is intact, and Milan will also show that the two of us are the driving force. Let me only cite two particularly important examples. Eureka has been often discussed. We think it is necessary because it is our conviction that Europe must pool its technological possibilities for research and development. We cannot afford to use our resources in parallel projects and thus waste them. For this reason, the Eureka idea represents European self-assertion. The jobs of tomorrow will depend on Europe's competitive capabilities vis-a-vis the United States and Japan in the top areas. We will also jointly advocate implementation of what has been written in the report on the technology community compiled by the commissioners of the heads of state

and government. It is necessary for us to finally put a halt to the European practice of ordering nationally. Each country orders its own products even if another country has better and less expensive products to offer. We must all work to Europeanize ordering practices. The FRG and France will say this in no uncertain terms in Milan.

Mr Stoltenberg has drawn attention to the impediments inherent in different technical norms, impediments that must be overcome. Under this situation, we do not need any customs because these different standards indeed effect protection for the domestic market. What I am talking about are things that do not cost money, but will even save money. The same is true, by the way, for Eureka. Once we cease making parallel developments and instead proceed jointly in research, this will mean proper use of funds.

Another topic was quite timely today during the meeting between the FRG and French defense ministers -- support for a joint security policy and for a defense community between the FRG and France. This has been developing since 1982 when President Mitterrand suggested that consultations between the foreign and defense ministers actually be held, as envisaged in the FRG-French treaty. France and the FRG are getting together in a new way in their security policies. What is important for us as politicians is that we make clear to our citizens what this really means for European security and for the European pillar in the Western alliance. The United States is interested in having a single solid pillar in Europe instead of many small pillars. All those in Europe who point their fingers at the United States and say that they are not prepared to accept our security interests ought to point their fingers at themselves and say: Have we actually ever been capable of jointly defining our security interests and looking after them? Let me tell you that there is a great deal to be done there. Our two governments are aware of their responsibilities for progress in Europe. You may rest assured that the Federal Government and the French Government will go to Milan together and not separately.

[Schaettle] Perhaps you might be going to Milan even more closely together, Mr Genscher, if the irritations following the world economic summit had not occurred and if the FRG side perhaps had more clearly defined what our interests are vis-a-vis the United States -- let me mention SDI, which we cannot discuss here in detail -- and if it had defined what the European interests are. From the outside, one receives the impression that the FRG's position advocates a little bit of Europe and a little bit of the United States.

[Genscher] I do not know, Mr Schaettle, what was discussed here earlier. As you know, I had to speak in parliament before I came here. If you refer to the SDI, then I must say that Eureka, the European technology association, would also be necessary if there were no SDI; if the U.S. President had never promulgated this program, Europe nevertheless would have to merge technologically. This is a matter that stands all by itself. And of course, new questions ultimately demand new answers. And we did give such a joint answer, for example, in Lisbon concerning a highly central question of international security policy; the Europeans said that we deem it necessary that the SALT II treaty be further applied. It was a good sign of European-U.S. dialogue and also of U.S.-European consultations that this statement by the Europeans wielded some weight in the decision-making process in Washington when the U.S. President decided in favor of continued application of that treaty, a decision which we welcome.

This means that wherever the Europeans find their way together, wherever they muster the strength and realize that they must jointly define and advocate their position, they will have an open-minded partner in the United States. I am saying this because European identity, which is growing in our European Community but also among the European partners of the alliance, does not constitute a burden to the alliance but

a strengthening factor. I must directly add here, though, that notwithstanding all we do in Europe, we must think beyond the bounds of the community. Our Spanish friend [Marcellino Oreja] as the general secretary of the European Council spoke on behalf of the European Council. I might say that we have to go even a bit farther, because Europe stands for much more. Europe extends from the Atlantic up to the Urals. We must always bear this in mind if we refer to Europe and view our identity. We here in the free part of Europe have the important mission of polling our forces so that this democratic Europe can retain its convincing force.

[Schweitzer] Let us revert to everyday life in Europe, Mr Genscher, to what the citizen concretly gets to feel and learn about this Europe. Where are the very small-scale yet important decisions that affect everybody in every country? For instance, where is the European passport? Why are the European drivers' licenses not mutually recognized? Why is it that a German driving here with a Belgian license is punished? The right to settle and all these small steps, the nonrecognition of the diplomas, all that effects the individual in the community much more -- why is there no headway in that respect, why is so little happening, really, in this Europe of the citizens, despite big commissions?

[Genscher] You know that the chancellor has made it his personal concern to abolish the border controls. I think that this is an important step. It worked faster than many people would have expected. To me this is important and really tangible progress.

Now we must transpose this from one field to the next. There will be cases that will be more difficult, for instance, the recognition of vocational certificates because the training systems are somewhat different. Nevertheless, it must be done, so that Europe becomes tangible [erfahrbar], and if you allow me to revert once more to the technological field, it also includes opening the research institutes more widely to scientists from other states of Europe, and vice versa, so that Europe really will be able to grow as a unit. I can only underscore what you are saying, because Europe indeed does not depend on decisions on market regulations alone. As important as technological progress is, Europe also lives and depends directly on tangible progress.

[Trampe] You spoke of the hour of truth, Mr Genscher; will it be a bitter truth in Milan? Will great expectations not be disappointed?

[Genscher] I hope that this will not turn into a bitter truth. Yet, it must be the hour of truth in the sense that everybody says either yes or no to what is necessary for creating the European union, to an intensified cooperation in foreign and security policies, to the question concerning majority decisions, to the strengthening of the rights of parliament -- we have the second, directly elected parliament -- to the creation of the continental market, to the questions concerning technological cooperation.

In principle we are in favor of a government conference without any changes. We have but one concern, namely, that nobody might get the idea to say: We will discuss all this here in Milan, and then we will institute a government conference in order to avoid saying yes or no while still in Milan. This would be nothing but a funeral committee for the European Union. We do not want any part of that. What we deem necessary are clear decisions in Milan, and if these clear decisions justify additional conferences on their implementation, then the Federal Government will indeed approve a government conference at the end of the Milan European Council. But please, do not get the idea that the easy solution will be just talking a bit and then saying: Let us now have a government conference, and expecting that this government conference will be better capable of making decisions than the heads of state and government.

This cannot be in the spirit of Europe. It would be a postponement, in fact it would be a funeral of the idea of the European Union. We will have no part of that.

This is what I meant by the hour of truth that needs to be rung in Milan. I think, and this has been said here quite justly, quite a few steps can be taken in Milan [words indistinct]. Basically it is possible to start the European Union in Milan, if one wants to do it. We will ask everyone in Milan whether they want it.

CSO: 5200/2678

SPACE ARMS

FRG CDU/CSU CHAIRMAN VIEWS 'STAR WARS' RESEARCH

DW241329 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0905 GMT 23 Jun 85

[Interview with CDU/CSU caucus Chairman Alfred Dregger by correspondent Donat; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Donat] Let us touch on the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] issue. The FRG foreign minister simply rules out FRG participation in the U.S. research program without the participation of other European states. Are you of the same opinion, or have we lost interest in the SDI after the talks that have taken place in the United States?

[Dregger] I consider this issue important. Nobody can predict the positive results of research work. However, both world powers deal with such research. If an antimissile system is implemented 100 or 50 percent, then it will basically change Europe's strategic situation. Therefore, the Europeans must reckon with such a possibility in their common efforts. However, I want to stress that this must take place in close cooperation with our great Atlantic ally. Naturally, we need here in Europe defense against specific European dangers. These are the short-range systems with a range of 150 km; the Soviets already have 700 of them. A new grey zone threatens to come into existence in this connection. This also applies to planes and cruise missiles. However, this specific European threat is part of the overall threat of the alliance. Therefore, precautions against specific European threats should be studied in consultation with the United States.

[Donat] Does that mean that you believe that a European system with only European efforts cannot be implemented without the United States?

[Dregger] I would consider that foolish in any case. First, it would be an extraordinary strain on the European forces. In addition, we would have to reinforce our conventional defensive capability. Our financial means are limted. I also consider it wrong with regard to the policy toward the alliance. Everything that strengthens cohesion beyond the Atlantic serves our security. We must closely cooperate with Paris, and also with Washington. That is the policy pursued by the FRG since Konrad Adenauer. It alone has preserved peace for us and saved our liberal system.

CSO: 5200/2679

SPACE ARMS

FRG GOVERNMENT TO DECIDE ON SDI IN FALL

DW261031 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 26 Jun 85 p 2

[Report signed "FY": "Kohl: SDI Can Be Morally Substantiated"]

[Excerpt] Bonn, 25 Jun -- Chancellor Kohl aims to conclude an agreement with Washington to ensure that civil exploitation of the knowledge achieved in the SDI program with the help of European firms will not be limited to the United States. Kohl said this on Tuesday to the CDU/CSU Bundestag caucus. At the same time, he announced that the Federal Government will make a clear decision on the SDI research program this fall. Kohl said that the SDI program can be morally substantiated. He considers this an important statement with regard to the further development of the project. The chancellor said that it would be desirable if Europe participated in the SDI program. At the same time, he pointed out that almost all European countries have firms holding preliminary agreements on the SDI. One such firm is the French Matra company, he said.

CSO: 5200/2679

SPACE ARMS

EEC SPOKESMAN CHARACTERIZES SDI AS 'HUGE INDUSTRY SUBSIDY'

Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT in German 6 Jun 85 p 9

[Article by Eberhard Wisdorff: "EEC/Technology Community--Fear of Censorship by the Pentagon/The SDI Program Is Viewed in Brussels as a Huge Industry Subsidy"]

> [Text] HANDELSBLATT, Sat/Sun, 1/2 June 1985. Brussels. The U.S. research program for defensive space weapons (SDI), aside from a future military achievement, represents a huge technological-political and industrial-political subsidy and for that reason alone requires a quick European reply.

According to reliable information, the European Economic Community [EEC] Commission in Brussels will proceed on this assumption when it submits its proposals for the technology policy of the community around the middle of the month, which at the end of June are then to be one of the main topics during the discussions of the heads of state and government in Milan. Other stages of the debate over the SDI program are the conference of the NATO foreign ministers at the middle of this week in Lisbon and possibly an exchange of opinions by the EEC research and industry ministers who will meet in Luxemburg early in the week.

On the periphery of the concluding talks in Brussels on joint research and technology policies, the impression predominates that, aside from strategic or military considerations, SDI must be viewed as the culmination of a purposeful effort by the United States during the past 5 years to remain or become Number 1 in all fields of modern technology. A numerical expression of these efforts is the doubling, in real terms, of the U.S. defense budget in recent years to $40 billion (1985/1986 budget). In addition, the ratio of research results usable for both military and civilian purposes is steadily increasing, as are the spin-offs usable for civil purposes.

The German vice president of the EEC Commission, Karl-Heinz Narjes, who is now responsible for research, said in a speech in Guetersloh, that today modern armament systems cover nearly all disciplines of the natural and engineering sciences. For that reason, statements are being heard in Brussels such as: "The whole thing has the dimensions of a huge industrial

subsidy." Even if SDI turns out to be a failure or a disarmament miracle takes place, a total of 10 to 15 years of subsidization must be taken into account.

This assessment in Brussels is coupled with substantial doubts regarding the equitable participation of Europeans. The United States is interested neither in money nor in a voice in decision-making, but in "brains." There are instances enough of defections through offers of high salaries. The question of military secrecy is increasing in importance. Since in certain top sectors there are only a few dozen researchers, an overly rapid exodus could literally paralyze European research.

In this connection, reference is made to the already known practice of the United States to deny access to scientific symposia to non-American researchers. European manufacturers, as well, when they participated, were less sure that they would have access to know-how than formerly, since they had to reckon at all times with "a sort of Pentagon censorship."

While it is assumed that the resistance within the EEC to an independent technology community patterned after the French Eureka model has lessened, it is a question now primarily of the details of the proposals which Commission President Jacques Delors will submit before the summit in Milan.

The EEC is carrying out its own research at its centers in Ispra (Italy), Karlsruhe, Petten (Netherlands), and Geel (Belgium). In addition, it is promoting projects through contracts with Institutes, universities and enterprises, by sharing usually 50 percent of the costs. Under the code name COST, it is working together on an international basis with 19 countries. And it coordinates programs at the EEC level.

The nuclear fusion project JET in Culham near Oxford is viewed as an example of a big research success. Both with respect to research results and management, it is tops. The project has the special legal structure of a common enterprise on the basis of the Euratom treaty, and in addition to the EEC, which bears 80 percent of the costs, it includes Sweden and Switzerland among its members. Cited as another positive example is the Esprit program for the advancement of modern information technology, in which the EEC and the enterprises involved in the individual projects each bear 50 percent of the costs.

"The flexible structures will permit any solution," it is claimed in Brussels. There is great skepticism only of a technology agency outside the EEC, which as viewed by Brussels would make cooperation immensely more difficult. Decisive for the penetrating power of the pending commission proposals is whether success is achieved in developing decision-making procedures without veto power, and a healthy management--like that of JET, for example--is assured. Hovering above everything, naturally, is the question of funding of the European technology commission, which the chiefs of state must resolve.

12689
CSO: 5200/2663

SPACE ARMS

BELGIAN DEFENSE MINISTER DENIES 'READINESS' FOR SDI COOPERATION

AU212017 Vienna ORF Teletext in German 2003 GMT 21 May 85

[Text] Brussels -- Belgium Minister of Defense Vevren today denied that Belgium was ready to cooperate in work on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. The U.S. Defense Department spokesman Burch had said in Brussels yesterday that Vevren had shown to Defense Minister Weinberger a readiness for cooperation. Vevren today said: "Many people mistake their wishful thinking for reality."

CSO: 5200/2681

SPACE ARMS

DUTCH PARTIES DEBATE SDI, EUREKA

CDA Rejects SDI

PM251316 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 20 Jun 85 pp 1,3

["Own correspondent" report: "Chamber Majority Opposed to Netherlands Participation in SDI"]

[Text] The Hague, 20 Jun -- Through its defense specialist De Boer, the Christian Democratic Appeal [CDA] Second Chamber group this morning spoke out against Netherlands participation in the Stratetic Defense Initiative [SDI].

The People's Party for Freedom and Democracy [VVD] is in favor of participation, preferably within the framework of a joint West European group. The Labor Party [PvdA] and the small left-wing parliamentary groups are opposed to the SDI.

De Boer argued that the West European countries could better tackle the development of advanced technology themselves and then at a later stage "on the basis of an equal exchange" swap the results with the United States. He said that he could see no advantage in contracts "or more probably subcontracts" to West European industries from the United States within the framework of SDI.

De Boer made no statement on whether Netherlands participation in the SDI is desirable for purely political reasons. In a section of his speech he said: "Leaving aside the question of what political view we take of SDI, for reasons of the technological and economic survival of West European countries, it is not advisable for them to allow themselves to be harnessed to the SDI cart, not collectively, and definitely not individually."

The CDA spokesman based his rejection of the U.S. invitation to participate in SDI "on the lessons that have been learned from more than 35 years in NATO." He said that for years the United States has not been interested in West European material. De Boer said "There is no reason to assume that there will now suddenly be absolute reciprocity in the exchange of research results and absolute equality in any further development and production."

VVD spokesman Voorhoeve pointed out that the Netherlands share in the SDI project "would necessarily be modest." Only if the West European nations succeed in organizing joint participation would they become an influential participant, he said. Voorhoeve expressed support for the efforts of Foreign Minister Van den Broek to coordinate the European approach within the framework of the Western European Union.

The CDA and the VVD are positive about Eureka, the French plan for the establishment of a European technology program. PvdA spokesman Ter Beek described Eureka as a "better alternative" to SDI because it directs itself largely to the same area as SDI and links well with the results achieved by the European Space Agency. Ter Beek rejected the suggestion that the PvdA is creating an obstacle in foreign policy by rejecting SDI. This suggestion, voiced in the past by Foreign Minister Van den Broek, "is not acceptable to us," said Ter Beek, recalling that last year the Second Chamber passed a motion calling for an agreement banning the development, testing, and deployment of arms intended for use in space.

At a NATO ministerial meeting in Estoril, Portugal 2 weeks ago Foreign Minister Van den Broek said that it would be a few months before a decision can be made on Netherlands participation in the U.S. SDI research.

Defense Minister Responds

PM251341 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 21 Jun 85 p 3

[Unnamed "own correspondent" report: "De Ruiter Skeptical About SDI Participation"]

[Text] The Hague, 21 Jun -- Defense Minister De Ruiter takes the view that "there must not be too great expectations" of Dutch participation in the SDI, the U.S. research program into ABM space defenses. De Ruiter said this yesterday in the Second Chamber, where the issue was the subject of a debate.

De Ruiter argued that the United States would like to win political support for SDI with an eye to the arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union in Geneva. However, he warned against too great expectations.

"If the government were to decide to participate such a decision would primarily be a kind of lubricant to promote the signing of SDI contracts by interested companies," De Ruiter said.

Of the $26 billion earmarked for SDI over 5 years, $1 billion will be spent outside the United States, De Ruiter said. De Ruiter said "Thus this is $200 million per year, divided among the NATO nations, Israel, Japan, and a countless number of companies, including subsidiaries of U.S. enterprises. Thus the Netherlands share will be limited." According to De Ruiter the chances of comprehensive technology transfers from the United States to other countries must not be overestimated either, because the United States wants to work on a quid pro quo basis.

The idea that "anyone who carries out a small part will have a say in the whole project" is rejected by Washington, according to De Ruiter. Within the framework of SDI the United States wants to obtain "technology for payment." According to the minister, if technology "which you can only use once" is traveling in one direction only -- to the United States -- this is an "important counterindication." A European approach to technological development is therefore "perhaps to be preferred from the national viewpoint," De Ruiter said.

Replying to the rejection of SDI as a strategic concept by the left-wing party groups in the Chamber Foreign Minister Van Den Broek argued that a "final conclusion" on the SDI can be reached "only after a period of years," given the many uncertainties attaching to the research program. He said that conclusions could be expected from the Western European Union at the end of June on a package of principles "which the European nations might perhaps establish as preconditions for SDI participation."

The Second Chamber will have an opportunity to air its views on this package, he promised.

Van den Broek reiterated that participation within the framework of a European group -- the Western European Union has seven members, including the Netherlands -- is aimed at securing "as much influence as possible" in what he described as the step-by-step evaluation of SDI. For his part Minister De Reuiter said that participation "does not bring with it any right to exert special influence on the development and deployment of strategic defense systems."

PvdA spokesman Ter Beek said at the end of the debate that the government is "less than enthusiastic" about possible future Netherlands participation in SDI, that there is "no trace of enthusiasm" within the CDA and that Minister De Ruiter "simply did not want to say 'no' right away." He called for the strengthening of the ABM treaty, which bans antimissile missiles.

Here Ter Beek lent support to a motion from CDA Deputies De Boer and Frinking which called for the strengthening of the ABM treaty. Minister Van Den Broek interpreted strengthening as observance. Van den Broek expressed reservations about the Engwirda (Democrats 1966) and De Vries (PvdA) motion which the Chamber adopted in February. The motion called for an agreement banning the development, testing and deployment of space weapons. There will be votes on these motions next week.

CDA Deputy De Boer repeated his reservations about Netherlands participation in SDI. He advocated a joint European approach. De Boer said "Western Europe would do better to approach such technological research itself, rather than leave the decision on participation in such research and its advantages to the United States." "The $200 million that this would cost we can find ourselves," the CDA spokesman said.

CSO: 5200/2681

SPACE ARMS

TECHNOLOGICAL REASONS AGAINST DUTCH SDI PARTICIPATION

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 10 Jun 85 p 8

[Article by Walter Zegveld, director of TNO [Dutch Central Organization for Applied Scientific Research] Policy Studies and Information Group: "Europe Facing Choice Between SDI and Eureka: Dutch Participation in SDI Not Advisable for Technological Reasons"]

[Text] In view of the world-wide interest that has developed concerning the role of technology in economic development, there is increasing manipulation of industrial and technological considerations as an important element in providing a foundation for a positive decision on participation in SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative]. The Eureka program proposed by the French government--to be implemented within the European framework--is included in this, without there being the question of foreign policy and military considerations.

I will pursue here a number of industrial and technological aspects of potential participation in the SDI program.

[1] The position of the United States in industrial and technological regards is strong. The balance of payments for patents and the like showed a surplus in 1983 of approximately 24 billion guilders (compared to a negative balance for the Netherlands of 600 million guilders). Yet there is concern being shown in the United States about the future position in comparison with Japan especially, and to a lesser extent with a number of European countries, including the FRG. The indicators that give the relative technological position put it quite plainly.

Japan's specialization coefficient for technologically advanced goods (one measure of relative position) rose in the period from 1963 to 1980 from 0.56 to 1.41. The American figure dropped over the same period from 1.29 to 1.20, the European figure from 1.02 to 0.88. The Council of Economic Advisors in its report of April 1985 displayed concern about the position of American technological development. Earlier, during the Carter administration, proposals were developed concerning a policy of innovation, and with the coming of the Reagan administration initiatives were taken towards improving the technological position.

The American position is in part influenced by the internationalization of technology: the much more rapid spread of technology compared to the 1950s and 1960s, for example.

American multinational concerns currently export to their foreign businesses the technology for 75 percent of development projects. American multinationals also currently export some 10 percent of their research and development abroad, compared to 2 percent in 1960. Given the declining interest in accepting patents in a number of rapidly developing areas (chips), there is a trend towards international joint ventures, in development as well as in production and marketing. All this will further affect the U.S. position.

Export

[2] The American Department of Defense plays an important role in the area of technological development. Pentagon expenditures for research and development amount to approximately 100 billion guilders a year, about 15 times the total Dutch effort in this area. Approximately 13 percent of all engineers and scientists in the United States work for the Department of Defense. In the past, the Pentagon talked about both civilian and military applications of the technology supported by the Department and about being assured of a production apparatus that can fulfill military needs. However, in recent years, there has been more frequent talk about civilian applications of technology and the importance of having a competitive advantage over other countries in general and Japan in particular.

This is how it was possible to hear the following statement from Dr Richard De Lauer, assistant secretary of defense for research and engineering, made in February 1983 to representatives of the American semiconductor industry: "The nth generation computer development program in the United States is in response to the fifth generation computer development program supported by the Japanese government." The American program to which Dr De Lauer alludes is formally called "Strategic Computing and Survivability."

In light of an objective such as this, the American Department of Defense can subsequently in a number of respects be compared to the Japanese MITI [Ministry of International Trade and Industry].

Restrictions

One of the Reagan administration's salient measures is the imposition of restrictions on the export of technology. This activity is strictly defined by the Pentagon.

Three developments are of importance here: American governmental control over the export of "dual-use" technology (with both commercial and military applications); access to research programs supported by the government, including access to patents; and other restrictions in the area of technology transfer.

These measures must be seen in light of the determination of the administration in Washington to restore the military and industrial-technological leadership

position of the United States and to further expand it. Here it is of importance that for several years, and in a number of areas, civilian technology has developed further and is assuming a leading position with respect to military technology.

The tightening of control over technology transfer is not only intended to hamper the direct export of militarily relevant technology to the Soviet Union, but also points to a conscious obstruction of technological transfer within the Western bloc.

Brain Drain

One important point in light of the above is the degree of access to technological (SDI) knowledge and the degree of freedom in commercial applications of research results that is to be afforded to potential European partners in the SDI program.

An article in the WASHINGTON POST on 3 May 1985 indicated that access to the program in a broad sense would not be granted in the case of European participation in SDI. The Germans are keeping in mind that participation in SDI will result in German research personnel being detailed to the United States. In this context, the possibility arises of a brain drain in those areas of knowledge relevant to the SDI program.

That this is not something new in the 1980s is obvious from the fact that approximately 60 percent of all current post-graduate students in the United States in the area of technology are foreigners, and that about half of them will stay to work in the United States after completing their studies.

Apollo Area

[3] In terms of scope, the SDI program is comparable to the Apollo project of the 1960s. The Apollo program, as put into effect by the Kennedy administration in 1961, aimed to put astronauts on the moon and bring them safely back to earth before the end of the 1960s. The implementation of the Apollo project involved approximately $20 billion.

Herbert Hollomon, undersecretary for science at the Department of Commerce during the Kennedy administration, conducted a number of studies at the time on the opportunity costs of the Apollo program. One thing that is clear from these studies is that in the United States in the 1960s, there was a sharp shifting of engineers and scientists from the traditional industrial sectors to space technology, that salaries for university graduates in the disciplines required for space technology rose sharply, and that partly for that reason, the competitive position of traditional industry came under heavy pressure.

On cooperation between the United States and other countries in the area of space, it can be noted that the Americans have systematically refused to launch foreign satellites with commercial applications, reason enough for European countries to develop their own launch capability. NASA was, however, prepared to launch satellites with scientific objectives.

Demand

[4] Questions are commonly raised concerning the effectiveness of the military route for industrial and technological development. Determinants of a country's potential for renovation are not limited to technology. It is a question of the relationship between technological capabilities, the industrial structure and the scope and structure of market demand. Insights in innovation processes reveal complex interaction between market demand and the possibilities of technology.

A concrete example of an unsuccessful commercial development stemming from defense programs is the development of computer-guided machine tools for the U.S. Air Force.

In spite of very extensive support programs, the position of the German, and especially of the Japanese, computer-guided machine tool industries is very strong on the international market in relation to the American position. The role of NASA has indeed been successful in the area of developing commercial telecommunications satellite systems. Nevertheless, it must be said that its military and civilian applications are practically equivalent.

NASA went to great pains to make manifest the so-called spinoff of the Apollo program. The many studies conducted on this, including the one at the University of Minnesota, indicate that this spinoff was only moderately deemed a success. In addition, there is the waste that turns up in military development programs, which has recently been publicized in the United States.

Assuming the desirability of Europe not lagging behind technologically in a number of new technological areas, an extra effort is required. Based on purely industrial and technological motives, participation in SDI is not advisable. The problems with secrecy in the transfer of knowledge and civilian applications are great, the inefficiency of following the military route for commercial application is quite considerable and the danger of a brain drain is clearly present. Possible participation in SDI appears to be justified only on the basis of primarily foreign policy or alternately military considerations, whereby the above-mentioned objections of an industrial and technological nature still apply in their entirety.

Based on purely industrial and technological considerations, it is advisable to implement the necessary developments in a program that is not primarily military, as experience in Japan, Sweden and the FRG has shown. The previously mentioned drawbacks scarcely play a role within the European non-military framework. Priority must be given to setting up the Eureka project proposed by France, or to an EEC program next to ESPRIT and RACE in the area of information technology, or alternately in optics technology.

12271
CSO: 5200/2666

SPACE ARMS

DANISH FOLKETING DEBATES SDI RESEARCH INVOLVEMENT

PM201900 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 15 May 85 p 9

[Thorkild Dahl report: "Prime Minister: Footnotes Not in Our Interests"]

[Text] "Neither the matter nor Denmark's interests are served by our simply adopting protesting stances. At future NATO meetings the government will work for a joint text in which there is no need for Denmark to dissociate itself in a footnote. A footnote would be an admission of defeat," Prime Minister Poul Schlueter (Conservative) said yesterday at the end of the Folketing's second debate on space research programs -- "star wars" -- in which the Social Democratic Party, the Socialist People's Party and the Left Socialists amended the previous resolution and ordered the government to dissociate itself from the deployment of arms in space and all research and development work on such arms within NATO and all other relevant international organizations. During the debate the prime minister said that Denmark will decline the U.S. invitation to participate in the U.S. space research program. The Folketing debate was raised by the Social Democrats, because at a NATO ministers' meeting Defense Minister Hans Engell supported a communique text which lent support to the U.S. space research program in the light of the fact that the Soviet Union has been researching a comparable project for several years. "The majority in the Folketing takes the view that Denmark is opposed to all research into space weapons. If such a text is placed on the table in NATO, there must be a footnote," Social Democratic Security policy spokesman Lasse Budtz said during the debate.

It is probable that as early as next week Denmark will be faced with adopting a position on the U.S. space research program, when NATO's defense ministers meet in Brussels and again at the beginning of June at the meeting of foreign ministers in Lisbon. During the debate Prime Minister Poul Schlueter was unwilling to give a firm promise of Danish footnotes. "Danish participation in international cooperation has always been based on the premise that we want influence, want to influence the outcome and not simply give a formal demonstration of our views. The government cannot yet -- before we know the agendas for NATO's meetings -- promise Danish footnotes," Poul Schlueter said. Socialist People's Party chairman Gert Petersen expressed the hope that "the U.S. President will find himself encircled by footnotes," while Liberal Party security policy spokesman Ivar Hansen was strongly critical of the Social Democratic Party for "having been busy the last couple of years discussing Danish security policy with left-wing parties which do not stand behind Denmark's security."

After the debate and the adoption of the resolution the Social Democratic Party is again ready to take part in the work in the Folketing temporary security policy committee, Lasse Budtz said, and BERLINGSKE TIDENDE has heard that after a 2 month

interruption the committee will probably be summoned to meet again at the end of the month. "I hope that there will come a day when the main feature of Danish security policy will again be an established unity between the government parties and the Social Democratic Party," Prime Minister Poul Schlueter said, expressing support for the wish that the Folketing committee will soon resume its endeavors to create peace surrounding security policy. The amended Folketing resolution was passed with the votes of the Social Democratic Party, the Radical Liberals, the Socialist People's Party and the Left Socialists, while the Progress party and the Free Democrats voted against it. The government parties abstained. The prime minister said that the government parties voted against and made their position clear during the first debate in March, but "we are now refraining from voting, because the matter has reached the end of the road in parliament."

CSO: 5200/2684

SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN GOVERNMENT WINS STORTING SDI DEBATE BY 1 VOTE

PM131113 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 5 Jun 85 p 5

[Einar Solvoll report: "Dramatic War of Nerves"]

[Text] The government survived by a one-vote majority the showdown in the Storting yesterday on the U.S. space research program. After the vote Prime Minister Kare Willoch told AFTENPOSTEN that the government would have found it impossible to comply with instructions to the government contained in the Labor Party proposal, which was voted down by 75 votes to 74. Rebels in the Christian People's Party and the Center Party, in addition to Wenche Lowzow who recently resigned from the Conservative Party, voted against the government parties on this security policy issue. On the other hand the Christian People's Party's Hans Olav Tungesvik, who has voted with the opposition on this issue in the past, did a turnabout. This will be the last time a security policy issue will divide the Storting straight down the middle in the present electoral term, and Prime Minister Kare Willoch expects the majority for the government's line to be greater in the next term, if there is a nonsocialist election victory.

The debate dealt with a motion from the Socialist Left Party's Stein Ornhoi that Norway should dissociate itself from all planning and development of weapons systems for use in space. The target of his motion was thus the U.S. plans for research into space weapons to counterbalance the development that has been taking place in the Soviet Union for many years. The Norwegian Government has expressed concern about the prospect of a new arms race in space, but at the same time it has also said that Norwegian authorities will not advise the United States against engaging in research in this field. However, the Labor Party thought that Norway should oppose this and in the vote the Labor Party position received the support of all the opposition parties and also that of Lars Velsand and Ragnhild Q. Haarstad of the Center Party, Johannes Vagsnes and Per J. Husabo from the Christian People's Party, and former Conservative Wenche Lowzow. Hans Olov Tungesvik, traditionally one of the Christian People's Party's rebels, changed his vote and thus saved the government majority.

Before the vote there was a dramatic war of nerves about whether the government would win a majority. The Progress Party's Carl I. Hagen spoke several times asking the prime minsiter to make the matter a vote of confidence and thus force the rebels in the government parties to their knees. But Prime Minister Kare Willoch followed the whole debate from his seat in the chamber without speaking -- well aware that his government had only a one-vote majority. After the dramatic vote, the prime minister told AFTENPOSTEN that he did not make the matter a vote of confidence in the government because he assumed that every member of the government coalition would know that it would be impossible for the government to comply with the instructions to which the Labor Party motion would amount if adopted.

"It would have meant Norway's asking the United States to halt its research in the space weapons field regardless of whether the Soviet Union continues its development in this field. And that would involve the risk that the Soviet Union could achieve technological superiority which could threaten the West's security," the prime minister stressed, adding that all that we would then have achieved would have been to mark a division within NATO which the Soviet Union could use in its propaganda war and consequently help to weaken the West's negotiating strength in the disarmament talks with the Soviet Union.

What are the prospects of a security policy majority after the election?

"I am counting on the security policy majority being secure, and it will be at least as great as it is now if we win the election. If we lose and the Labor Party wants to follow its foreign policy line, that could do quite far-reaching damage to our involvement in NATO cooperation and also to the alliance's ability to protect our interests," the prime minister said.

"We have gotten our way," Socialist Left Party leader Hanna Kvanmo said immediately before the vote, after the government party rebels had spoken in justification of their voting intentions. And her party colleague Stein Ornhoi said that he was reasonably content to be able to note that the government is pursuing its security policy on the basis of votes from the Progress Party. He said that both Herald Synnes and Hans Olav Tungesvik of the Christian People's Party should reread their old speeches on security policy, given the way they now intend to vote on the present issue.

The question of Defense Minister Ander C. Sjaastad's statements in NATO in comparison with what he later said in the Storting was a central issue in the debate, and opposition leader Gro Harlem Brundtland said that the Labor Party's criticism has become no less sharp as time has passed. She said that space weapons programs could be a serious obstacle to negotiations on medium-range missiles and other strategic arms. "There is a danger that this could create divisions and become a difficult and contentious topic within the alliance in the future too," she said.

Conservative Party parliamentary leader Jo Benkow pointed out that ever since the end of the sixties the Soviet Union has been carrying out a series of tests with a type of satellite designed to destroy other satellites. The Soviet Union still has the world's only operational antisatellite system, Benkow said, expressing amazement that the left-wing is so one-sidedly concerned about what people in the West want to do, while at the same time closing their eyes to the Soviet Union's strength in this area. "What is worst of all -- from the alliance's viewpoint too -- would be for the United States to pretend that the Soviet Union's activities were not taking place and then in a few years' time have to record that the Soviet Union had a fully developed system," Jo Benkow said.

CSO: 5200/2677

NORWAY'S FOREIGN MINISTER DISCUSSES USSR RELATIONS, SDI

PM130832 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 11 Jun 85 p 18

[Olav Truygge Storvik report: "Broader Knowledge of Soviet Union Needed"]

[Text] Yesterday the Norwegian Foreign Policy Institute marked its 25th anniversary with a one-day conference which scrutinized Norwegian foreign policy in the years leading up to the end of the century. The conference was opened by Storting Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Jakob Aano, and a number of speakers led by Foreign Minister Svenn Stray analyzed the long-term basis for Norwegian foreign policy.

In his address the foreign minister said that there was particular need for a climate of research in Norway with broader knowledge of the Soviet Union, Norway's most important neighbor. "It is desirable that there should be greater involvement in this field than there has been in the past," Stray said. "In the years to come Norway's relations with the Soviet Union will be characterized by firmness combined with openness. Such a policy has also been NATO's line toward the Soviet Union since the sixties," he said, pointing out that there is continuous discussion within the Western alliance about the strategy to be pursued in relation to the Soviet Union -- discussion which is characterized by a desire for a large degree of openness.

Relations with the Soviet Union assumed a central place in Stray's address. "The country has learned historical lessons which make it feel encircled," Stray pointed out. "This has led to the development of an attitude which people in the West tend to characterize as overinsurance through investment in military power."

But even though the Soviet Union might feel itself encircled, the foreign minister said that it must be relatively clear that unilateral disarmament measures by the West cannot be recommended. "We have learned the lesson that such measures by the West do not lead to the desired effect in the East," he said. "On the contrary, it is probably the case that the Soviet Union becomes even less flexible in its approach if it achieves advantages without having to make any concessions in return."

The foreign minister stressed that technological developments now make disarmament and arms control negotiations very complicated. "The U.S. SDI research program will bring with it new technological possibilities which will be of great military importance," he said. He does not think that it is possible to halt this research. "But it ought to make both superpowers understand that there are dangers in modern technology which can affect everyone. Such an understanding should also lead to a recognition of the need for more stable military conditions," Stray said.

"Developments within the EEC mean that Norway must face many challenges in the years to come. The European Community is characterized by two types of development," he said. "On the one hand, the number of members is being increased through new members joining the Community. On the other hand, there is a process of review taking place within the EEC which is deepening cooperation in both the political and economic fields. These are processes which cannot fail to have consequences for Norway. The EEC is Norway's most important trading partner, and Norway is increasingly becoming an important energy supplier to the EEC. If we are left too much on the sidelines of the processes that are underway major difficulties for our industry and commerce will be created," Stray said. "Norway should therefore adapt itself to the regulations and standards agreed by the EEC, for in the final analysis the consideration of agreement among the EEC's own member countries weighs heavier than regard for Norway. To exert any influence in this situation Norwegian views must be made known as early as possible to EEC bodies," he said.

Stray welcomed the trend toward the discussion of security policy questions within the Western European Union. He said that there is a clear need to strengthen the European side of security policy cooperation. "This will be important in the slightly longer term in particular, since we cannot take it for granted that the United States will be willing to carry as large a share of the defense burden as hitherto," he said. "The security policy discussions within the framework of the Western European Union could therefore perhaps enable the European nations to play a greater role in Western defense cooperation. On the other hand, this development must not lead to greater polarization in Atlantic cooperation," Stray warned. "From the Norwegian viewpoint it would be most unfortunate if a polarized dialogue developed between the Western European Union and the United States, but at present we have seen no tendency toward this."

Storting Defense Committee Chairman Knut Frydenlund stressed trends in international politics different from those stressed by Stray. In Frydenlund's view the major trends are first and foremost the continuing internationalization and the spread of power, particularly in the economic field. "These are forces which will affect Norway's situation and confront us with new dilemmas in foreign policy," he said.

Frydenlund is concerned with the way in which these forces combined with nonexistent or less than effective regulatory systems in the world community are leading to uncertainty. He said that Norwegian security policy should make a greater contribution to detente in Europe and greater openness in East-West relations. "The policy of detente from the sixties should be reactivated."

CSO: 5200/2677

SPACE ARMS

FRANCE'S DUMAS PROMOTES EUREKA DURING VISIT TO NORWAY

PM171046 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 15 May 85 p 9

[Cathrine Lochstoer report: "French Initiative for Common Front on Technology]

[Excerpt] "The Europeans must come together in the work for their technological future and create their own high technology expertise equal to international competition," French External Relations Minister Roland Dumas said yesterday at a press conference in Oslo at which he presented the French Eureka project.

Dumas stressed that Eureka will be a civilian program, unlike the U.S. SDI space project but also said that the Europeans, if they each say "yes" to the U.S. offer of involvement in SDI, could easily become manufacturers under licence under the United States.

At present France is engaged in an intense campaign to collect European support for its technological cooperation project, and Dumas's short visit to Norway should probably be seen in this context. Monday [13 May] Dumas held talks with Prime Minister Kaare Willoch and Foreign Minister Svenn Stray, before traveling to Stavanger Tuesday to pay a visit to the plant of the French oil company Elf Aquitaine there.

The whole international situation was a theme of the talks with the Norwegian Government. But questions relating to Europe including Eureka, were discussed in particular detail, Dumas said. The French external relations minister said that Norway is very interested in the Eureka project. According to Dumas, the government has established its own study commission which will evaluate the project. This has not been confirmed by Norwegian sources.

Eureka cooperation is aimed primarily at France's "natural cooperation partners," that is, the other EEC nations but countries outside the EEC are also welcome to take part, Dumas said.

In June, French Minister of Research and Technology Hubert Curien will travel to Norway at the head of a large delegation, according to information given to AFTENPOSTEN. Eureka will be the central theme of talks during the visit.

At the press conference Roland Dumas said that he considers Norway to be a very active country in Europe and pointed to the Norwegian involvement in the Council of Europe and EFTA. He said that the Norwegian and French analyses of the international situation are identical, but admitted with reference to relations with the United States that it is possible that the two countries attach importance to different factors, without going into the matter in greater detail. Dumas outlined to Prime Minister Kaare Willoch President Mitterrand's views as presented at the recent Bonn economic summit.

Dumas did not spend much time on economic relations between Norway and France, but said that the negative trade balance seen from the Norwegian viewpoint could become less lopsided by expanding cooperation to include more areas than it does today. In particular, France's involvement in Norwegian oil and gas exploitation affects the trade balance between the two countries, Dumas said.

CSO: 5200/2677

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH PS, NORWEGIAN LABOR PARTY ON EUREKA

PM071051 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 3 Jun 85 p 8

[Gunnar Selgard dispatch: "Labor Party Backs Eureka"]

[Text] Bonn, 2 Jun -- The French proposal for European technolotical cooperation, the so-called Eureka project, was the dominant theme when representatives of the social democratic parties of some NATO nations met for consultations in Bonn at the weekend.

"At the meeting there was very strong support for Eureka," [Norwegian Labor Party deputy chairman] Einar Forde said. Forde and Torbjorn Jagland represented the Norwegian Labor Party.

The French delegation gave a detailed account of the project which is intended as a European alternative to President Reagan's proposal of research cooperation linked to the U.S. plan for the development of a space weapons system (SDI).

The meeting was arranged by the so-called Scandilux group, which consists of the three Benelux countries and Norway and Denmark. The British Labor Party, West Germany's SPD, and the French PS are linked to the group. The group does not reach any decisions, but holds informal talks on current foreign and security policy issues.

Forde said that in the Norwegian Labor Party the mood is in favor of Norwegian participation in Eureka and that this positive mood will not weaken after the briefing given by the French. Forde will report to party bodies on the briefing and the discussions at the Scandilux meeting.

The group was also given a fresh briefing by Willy Brandt after his recent visit to Moscow and the talks he held there with party chief Mikhail Gorbachev. In the light of Brandt's briefing the delegations were left with the impression that Moscow does not expect any breakthrough at the Geneva disarmament negotiations in the near future, according to information given to AFTENPOSTEN.

CSO: 5200/2680

NORWEGIAN LABOR PARTY ON STORTING SDI DEBATE

Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET in Norwegian 5 Jun 85 p 4

[Editorial: "On Reagan's Side"]

[Text] There are some things that do not quite match between President Reagan's "strategic defense initiative," the so-called Star Wars program, and the Willoch government's presentation of that program. Actually, there are a lot of things that do not match. First, for example, we hear that it involves a purely American defense program, which we cannot be involved in. Then we hear--most recently from Defense Minister Sjaastad yesterday in the Storting--that the defense program is expected to lay a basis for the use of "much of the most advanced technology of the future," in the civilian arena as well, and that we are currently under the risk of falling behind in important areas within the civilian sector.

At the same time, one Conservative speaker after another has been standing up in the Storting and telling us that Star Wars is actually a response to something that the Soviets have been working on for some time now (Jo Benkow). Defense Minister Sjaastad says that Moscow wants to halt the American Star Wars program "because they--the Russians--want to keep their near-monopoly in that area." Foreign Minister Stray takes it even a step further. He says: "American research on weapons in space is necessary, in order to prevent possible destabilizing developments which can threaten the security of the Western nations."

Benkow, Sjaastad and Stray either are not telling as much as they really know, or are speaking on subjects of which they are ignorant. The three gentlemen could begin, for instance, by asking themselves why Ronald Reagan, not much more than six months ago, presented his Star Wars program as something unique and revolutionary, which he could even consider sharing with those who didn't know much in the field, namely, the Soviets? The argument that our leading Conservative politicians are now using in the Storting is in reality the argument that the Americans did not come up with until after it became obvious how widespread the European opposition to the Star Wars program was.

What has happened in actuality is that we Norwegians have been totally subjugated under the policies of the Reagan administration. It does not help when the spokesmen for the Willoch government in the Storting get insulted

when the opposition refuses to believe that Defense Minister Sjaastad has actually passed on the negative reactions of a majority of the Storting to Star Wars--at the same time as U.S. Defense Minister Caspar Weinberger clearly stresses that the program has "full support" in NATO. The way the Norwegian government has behaved throughout this whole affair is first of all--let us cite Knut Frydenlund on this--unworthy of Norway's great 635-year tradition of foreign policymakers. Moreover, it is a fatal position to take. We can read every day in the American press how skeptical American senators keep trying to convince themselves of the Star Wars program by referring to the "strong support" the program has among the U.S. allies.

This is, despite everything, more serious--because it has such far-reaching consequences--than the fact that the politicians of the Christian People's Party, who at bottom are probably the closest supporters of Social Democracy in issues of significant ethical import, have once more abandoned their moral principles in favor of their consideration of four government posts.

9584
CSO: 5200/2659

SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN ANALYST VIEWS SDI IMPACT ON WEST EUROPE

European Security

PM131109 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 5 Jun 85 p 2

[Foreign Policy Institute Director Johan Jorgen Holst article: "SDI And Security in Europe"]

[Text] SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, has created problems for Europe and in U.S.-West European relations. The conflicts which have arisen contain paradoxes and contradictions.

The Americans and Europeans are talking at cross purposes, largely because the decisions have been made without consultations and without feeling for the broader political contexts. The danger to NATO is to be found first and foremost in the circumstances that SDI is a long-term program of which no one knows the outcome. As a result, the conflict could be lasting and intense.

The U.S. initiative reflects a constant dilemma for the United States: How can we break out of the paralysis that is a consequence of mutual deterrence? Is there no solution other than threatening the other side into a position of restraint and reticence? The dilemma is all the stronger for a state which has assumed the responsiblity of defending Western Europe against the exercise of Soviet power. But it is easy to get lost inside this dilemma.

The superpowers' capacity for mutual annihilation is a fact and not a political goal. To the extent that this fact exists and no clear way out can be seen, the political goal must be to stabilize the situation so that accidents, failures, and incorrect assessments are not allowed to trigger off the catastrophe. The goal must also be to identify common interests through negotiations and understandings and then build on them with the aim of preventing the spread of the arms race and reducing armaments. Thus the system of mutual deterrence will gradually be interwoven with a system based on the concept of joint security and will be changed as a result. But there is no chance of drastic changes in the short term.

The nations of Europe are painfully aware of the grip that mutual deterrence has on security policy. SDI is an expression of unilateralism, the desire to break the bonds of mutuality. The Europeans fear that this will lead to increased competition and insecurity.

SDI is an example of how attempts are made to use technology to solve political problems It goes without saying that solutions to arms problems will also require technology, but

this technology must be an element in a political strategy. A major reason for European opposition to SDI is probably the lack of a long-term and clear U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union. SDI appears to be some kind of replacement for such a policy. This does not have a reassuring effect on a Europe which has to share a continent with the Soviet Union.

The debate on SDI has taken on an abstract quality for several reasons. First, there is no one who is able to say anything sensible and definite about what the program will lead to. Many paths will be tested, but no one knows what will prove possible. Second, the arguments for SDI have been conducted on an abstract, philosophical plane where people are discussing the desirability of breaking with the system of deterrence, without making it look likely that this will be possible with the means to be investigated. Third, attention is given to a distant and uncertain future at the expense of the tasks close at hand. The Europeans fear that East-West relations will be relegated to the refrigerator.

Concern over East-West relations is due to a large extent to the fact that the arms control negotiations are standing still and that existing agreements are in the process of being hollowed out and put under pressure. The SALT II agreement was never ratified, but both sides have observed its terms. It runs out at the end of 1985, and both sides will break its limits in the course of the fall if they introduce the new arms that will then be ready without withdrawing other weapons.

The 1977 ABM defense agreement is under great pressure. The U.S. wants to raise the agreement for revision to make room for SDI. The Russians have undertaken a modernization of their ABM systems around Moscow and erected radar systems which seem to conflict with the agreement. Both superpowers are engaged in advanced research on high energy lasers and other "beam weapons." Of course, the two sides ought in principle be willing to evaluate what in overall terms would be a desirable and stabilizing arrangement of strategic forces. But from the European viewpoint it is worrying that at a time when the whole system of arms control and restraint is in the danger zone one of the few agreements that exist should be weakened.

Assessments of the probable outcome of SDI are many, and the U.S. Administration is far from united on the matter. The "moderate" spokesmen claim that the outcome will probably be some defenses against offensive arms rather than a compact shield for the whole United States.

This ought, it is claimed, to calm the Europeans because it will strengthen the guarantee. But things can look different to the Europeans. If one assumes that the United States will go in this direction, the Soviet Union will do so too. This means that it will be impossible to direct strategic weapons against hardened military targets, so that these will instead be targeted on cities. First, this will be a paradoxical result of a program intended to break with the evil demands of mutual deterrence. Second, it could lead to the weakening of confidence in the U.S. guarantee. We would be back to the question of whether the United States would be willing to sacrifice New York for Munich. Third, it could increase the danger of the battlefield use of nuclear arms in Europe as a replacement for their strategic use. This too does not have a reassuring effect on Europeans. The U.S. claim that SDI also aims to provide protection for Western Europe against ballistic missiles (some studies indicate 85 percent). Thus Europe would remain vulnerable to systems which could be expanded under the pressure from SDI, such as aircraft and cruise missiles, for example.

The U.S. has offered Western Europe and Japan cooperation in the development of technology under SDI. The reaction has been stiff and partly critical. Washington has

a credibility problem, since the same forces now making this offer are those which most forcefully tried to limit the transfer of advanced U.S. technology to other Western nations because of fears that it would find its way further east. They have also reversed the obligingness which was developed under the Carter administration in the two-way traffic in arms cooperation between the United States and Western Europe. The ABM treaty forbids the transfer of ABM equipment to third countries. Fears that SDI will turn into a one-way traffic based on subcontracts are considerable in Western Europe.

But what is more important is that SDI has landed in West European politics in a destructive manner. It confronts West Germany with a choice that is creating paralysis in Bonn and tensions in West-West and East-West relations -- the choice between the United States and France. The rest of Europe derives no benefit from the Federal Republic's having to face such an insoluble dilemma. The alliance policy formulated in the sixties and seventies had as its goal precisely the adaptation and harmonization of Ostpolitik and Westpolitik, European policy and Atlantic cooperation . This fine-patterned mosaic is in danger of being smashed by SDI, because the Federal Republic is being forced to choose between SDI and the French civilian Eureka program, while at the same time the further development of Ostpolitik is running into the disagreements surrounding SDI which are piling up at the Geneva negotiations.

Further Comment

PM131410 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 6 Jun 85 p 2

[Foreign Policy Institute Director Johan Jorgen Holst article: "The Whole of Europe Must Be Protected"]

[Text] An important result of the conflict surrounding the medium-range missiles in Europe. the SS-20's and NATO's "two-track decision" was greater recognition in both Eastern and Western Europe that there exists a common European interest in protecting the whole of Europe from the effects of continued nuclear rearmament. This recognition embraces both supporters and opponents of the two-track decision . In addition to creating increased insecurity and decreased stability, new rounds of the arms race could help to confirm and reinforce the division of Europe. This prospect is also an important part of the opposition to SDI in Europe. The conflict surrounding the medium-range missiles also led to a sort of exhaustion in Europe. People needed a breathing space to create calm surrounding security policy and a new balance in the relationship between state and society on the subject of defense measures. From the West European viewpoint SDI was an unfortunate gambit at an unfortunate point in time.

The Europeans are not opposed to all research into possible defense systems against ballistic missiles. First, it is impossible and undesirable to ban research in general and to verify the observance of such bans. Second, a contribution is made to confidence in arms control agreements if one assures oneself through research of a reasonable insight into how far the other side could have progressed, and gains an overview of the state of technological developments. But this does not mean that research can and should be set free.

Here, there are three problems with SDI. First, it is a research program consciously aiming to investigate the question whether something already banned under the terms of an international agreement (the 1972 ABM treaty) is possible. Second, it has been made clear that if it proves to be possible to develop effective missile defense systems people will want to deploy them (and make changes in the ABM agreement). Thus

SDI contains considerable pressure against the ABM agreement. Third, SDI embraces research which aims at developing weapons which would have to be deployed in space.

Space is part of mankind's joint inheritance and is also among the last "common lands" on and around our planet. (the seabed, Antarctica, space). Out of regard for international order, we should, consequently, attach importance to preventing the deployment of arms in space. It may seem doubtful whether it will be possible in the foreseeable future to develop space-based antimissile weapons, but SDI could well lead to the development of new antisatellite weapons. These could threaten satellites making a contribution to surveillance, communications, or navigation and consequently undermine stability. What is even more important is that such developments would mean an expansion of the arms race into space with undreamed-of repercussions for international peace and security.

CSO: 5200/2677

SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN COMMENTARY ON NATO MEETING, SDI RESEARCH

PM3013@7 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 24 May 85 p 2

[Editorial: "NATO and Space Weapons"]

[Text] When NATO defense ministers met this week the topic which is of particular concern to all of them at present was hardly mentioned at all. They carefully avoided raising the subject of space weapons. This was despite the fact or perhaps more because of the fact that space weapons are the major burning question which could develop into high explosives within the alliance if they are not dealt with carefully.

At the alliance's defense planning committee something highly unusual happened and talks which had been planned to last 2 days were cut by half, to 1. What was uppermost in the participants' minds was left to one side -- whether the West European nations should say "yes" or "no" to President Reagan's invitation to take part in a research program into space weapons. As a result, it looked as if the ministers had nothing to talk to each other about.

Some will say that this is sweeping the problems under the carpet. It does at least show that the alliance partners do not at present wish to bring things to a head, because disagreement on space weapons has been growing recently, not only between the United States and several European countries, but also within certain countries. By preventing disagreement from emerging clearly at this unsuitable point in time, the members of NATO can hope to win time to work toward a solution acceptable to all.

Officially, the majority of European governments have given their support to the space weapons program with greater or lesser reservations, on the condition that what is intended is purely a research program. Unofficially, the same governments are worried that Reagan's wholehearted backing of space weapons will torpedo an agreement on arms limitations in Geneva between the two superpowers, and, at the same time, set off a new arms race. With a little skill the Russians could use the space weapons issue as a lever with which to create increased antagonisms within NATO.

President Reagan's administration has not been lucky with the presentation of its plans. At first the space weapons protject was announced from the White House without any prior consultations with the allies. Then the Washington leadership expressed strong irritation when objections were voiced by its alliance partners, such as when British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe allowed himself to illuminate the weaknesses attaching to the space weapons project in a speech. Nor was there much evidence of diplomatic finesse when Defense Secretary Weinberger demanded a response within 60 days from individual European nations to the invitation to take part in the space weapons research program.

Nevertheless it ought to be possible to overlook the Reagan administration's lack of psychological understanding of its European allies and to keep in mind something which has to be an important consideration: For a considerable time now the Soviet Union has been engaged in comprehensive research into military activities in space. If the United States and the West were to impose on themselves a ban on all research in this field this would lead to an imbalance in the Soviet Union's favor. That would be difficult for NATO to live with.

CSO: 5200/2680

SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN EDITORIAL URGES 'PLAIN SPEAKING' ON 'STAR WARS'

PM311341 Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET in Norwegian 28 May 85 p 4

[Editorial: "Need for Plain Speaking"]

[Text] Whereas Defense Minister Anders C. Sjaastad takes the view that it is going too far to speak of a NATO crisis, his ministry under secretary, Oddmund H. Hammerstad, goes a step further and totally rejects any suggestion of such a crisis.

We will refrain from choosing a name to describe the state of affairs within the alliance, but what happened at the defense ministers' meeting in Brussels last week cannot possibly be taken as a sign of the alliance's health.

Two days had been set aside for what everyone was expecting to be a hectic round of meetings between NATO's defense ministers. After 1 day they had talked themselves out -- and went home again. The reason was that no one dared raise at the official meetings the topic which they were all talking about outside the conference halls -- President Reagan's plans for "star wars".

In all of the NATO nations there is great, if varying skepticism about these plans. In some places, such as West Germany, Reagan has received almost enthusiastic support from Federal Chancellor Kohl, while other more insightful West German politicians merely shake their heads.

Other governments, including Norway's, are saying a sort of "yes, well" to the research program but are -- naturally -- opposed to "star wars" in practice and therefore opposed to the idea that the research should make the transition to the actual use of the weapons in question. Such a distinction is, in fact, impossible to make, because such a colossal research effort is bound also to have practical consequences. It is not without reason that the respected Institute for Strategic Studies in London has said that President Reagan's plans for an arms buildup in space will increase the risk of nuclear war.

In light of all this one would have thought that the NATO defense ministers would have had a lot to talk about in Brussels -- among the European ministers, and there would not least have been a need for plain speaking between the West European defense ministers and Reagan's emissary, Defense Secretary Weinberger.

NATO is an alliance between democratic nations and its purpose is to defend the Western democracies. We view plain speaking as a prerequisite if the alliance is to function as intended. Subservience and servility toward the superpower in the

alliance does not belong in NATO. Such a state of affairs should be reserved for a very different military alliance in another part of Europe.

We encourage the Norwegian Government to take these questions very seriously. It is alarming to see the Conservative Party exploiting such fundamental problems in part of the Norwegian election campaign. The same problems raised in the Norwegian debate are also to be found in the debates in all the other NATO nations.

The reason why it is of vital importance that this matter is raised seriously and in the greatest earnest is that the "star wars" program could become an element which could completely destroy the new attempts now being made in Geneva to bring about an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on arms limitations. Millions of people in Eruope -- in the East as in the West -- cherish the burning hope that the negotiations will this time produce results and that disarmament negotiations are not once again synonymous with a new arms race.

The European governments in NATO understand this far better than do Reagan and Weinberger. Therefore they have an important mission in explaining this to them. Last week in Brussels they failed. Next month NATO's foreign ministers are meeting in Lisbon. This will be a new opportunity.

CSO: 5200/2680

SPACE ARMS

CZECHOSLOVAK PAPER HITS KOHL'S SUPPORT OF SDI

Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 30 May 85 p 6

[Article by Juraj Bydzovsky: "America's Plans for 'Star Wars' and Western Europe"]

[Text] At Constance on Lake Constance a meeting took place between French President Francois Mitterrand and Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the FRG. In the course of the meeting they discussed a number of differences and at the end nothing had changed.

The subject of the discussions was America's plans to militarize space, Reagan's well-known "star wars", its aspects and each state's attitude toward them. As is well known, France refuses to participate in this arms program, though with certain reservations. The government of Chancellor Kohl, as usual, will once again bet on America's cards although at the cost of some internal dissension, especially between the chancellor and vice chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs Hans Dietrich Genscher. So the two representatives parted and the state of affairs between them remained the same, just as at the recent top-level meeting of western nations in Bonn--it is a state of mutual disagreement in an area that has special significance as concerns relations between the two states, internal relations in NATO, relations in Europe and in the world in general.

The problem of the present federal government, as written in the Hamburg weekly STERN, is that, contrary to the preceding governments and especially the government of the so-called social-liberal coalition which tried to protect the FRG's interests against American pressure, the Kohl cabinet has pledged itself to maintain "loyalty bordering on subordination."

"And it appears that Reagan's government expects humility," continues STERN. It goes on to say, "So we can prophesize quite without risk. The Federal Republic will take part in America's program of space militarization and will spend a lot of money for this purpose. And it is highly doubtful that it will also get a fair share of the results of the research."

Doubtful? It is better to ask who actually doubts such results. Even such a clearly pro-American paper as DIE WELT recently stated that Bonn was greatly upset at the statement of American General James A. Abrahamson (entrusted with the direction of the "star wars" project) that West European participation in

this project (so loudly urged by President Reagan) is conceivable but only as concerns that part which is not secret.

That too, however, is deceiving the public. After all, Washington spokesman have already clearly let it be known that secrecy in this case is to be only a one-way street. Or more exactly put, they demand all West European technology and results of research without any restrictions and refuse in advance to provide the West European states with anything that, in their estimation, is classified "secret." They high-handedly assigned their allies the role of servants, porters and bus-boys. That is clearly everyone, even the government of Chancellor Kohl who in spite of all continues to play the American game.

The arrogance with which the present United States government applies its pressure on Western Europe in connection with the program for the militarization of space exceeds in a marked way the degree of earlier American arrogance in this sphere of activity. The daily INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE stated that numerous conversations with West European military experts and government figures and also government documents and official pronouncements demonstrate the deep and widespread anxiety which the American plan is arousing. It also mentioned that the United States has done nothing to allay these fears.

Instead, Secretary of Defense Weinberger gave the allies a 60-day ultimatum in April to decide whether they would participate in America's plans, or more exactly stated, that they invest in them at the expense of their own security.

The American spokesman justify their arrogance by so-called "penetration of information" from West European sources. Even the above-mentioned INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE took pause at the action of William Casey, director of America's spy agency CIA, who recently declared at a conference of leading British experts on computer technology: "We know so much about all of you that we could put most of you in handcuffs!" This was said by the chief of American espionage to a gathering of British citizens...

France's LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE wrote with unconcealed indignation about the special follow-up to Weinberger's ultimatum, that is, the letter which Reagan's powerful friend Richard Burt of the United States State Department sent quite officially to the allies unceremoniously pressed into the role of obedient subordinates. In this letter Richard Burt simply decreed to the recipients that they neither had the right to consult with the other countries nor to take a joint stand toward the American "star wars" program. Each of the countries addressed, as dictated by Washington, was to reply individually and exclusively for itself alone. In other words, it was not to throw itself in with the rest of the servants but with a nice bow and as befits a proper valet, with his hands on the seams of his pants, reply "Yes, sir."

Every normal West European stateman would see in this arrogant demarche sufficient cause to try to reach a common position with his neighbors, even though he is aware that this would not please Washington at all," wrote LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE. Nothing else remains but to state that this French periodical does not consider Helmut Kohl a normal West European statesman.

An article in this same French journal, however, goes further in the determined unmasking of America's plans and their West European supporters. It openly scoffs at the American argument that claims Reagan's so-called "strategic defense initiative" means "protection of the world against nuclear weapons."

Among other things it ridicules the idea which is prepared to sacrifice to this chimera for all too many years any real possibility of resolving the most pressing problems in the present world. It states quite clearly that all the claims of Reagan's gang to the effect that it will protect the civilian population from nuclear death are nothing but a bare-faced fraud.

By now it is clear to all those in the know that the United States does not really plan to create the promised "shield" for the civilian population but only for its nuclear launching pads. So it ensures for itself the first strike capability with impunity and it ensures for itself the possibility of destroying the world in the name of an illusory idea that they will remain here after a nuclear war and will rule over that post-war wasteland. Or it assures for itself the possibility of blackmailing the whole world by permanently using the threat of universal destruction except for the United States. What more can be said--the idea is as unrealistic as it is enormously dangerous.

But let us return to the French periodical. It states that the so-called "strategic defense initiative" of the United States "which was publicized without prior consultation with the Western allies upset the foundations of peace in Europe." And several lines farther: "With this 'strategic defense initiative' not only is the security of the FRG, Belgium, Great Britain, France and other U.S. allies at stake but the security of all Western Europe as a whole is at stake, regardless of the geographical position or level of armaments of each individual country."

And it continues: "In view of this fateful alliance, it is necessary for the West European allies to take a joint position in spite of the fact that Washington is exerting great pressure at each ally's capital." Then it says that agreement with the American plans means getting into a situation which is entirely incompatible with the basic requirements of the national security of the West European states. In this connection it cites the American daily THE NEW YORK TIMES which, among other things, wrote that this Reagan program, "regardless of what name it is called, remains 'star wars', the most exaggerated and least thought-out action of the nuclear age."

Chancellor Helmut Kohl has agreed to this action. He became its advocate at Lake Constance. A sensible party never takes this kind of advocacy.

8491
CSO: 5200/3059

SPACE ARMS

VIETNAM OPPOSES MILITARIZATION OF OUTER SPACE

OW251749 Hanoi VNA in English 1540 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Hanoi VNA June 25 -- Addressing the meeting of the U.N. committee on the peaceful uses of outer space in New York on June 20, ambassador Le Kim Chung, acting head of the Vietnamese permanent mission to the United Nations, highly praised many countries' achievements in space control. At the same time, he expressed grave concern over the increasing threat of militarization of outer space.

He exposed the militarist circles' attempt to regain military superiority and said that these schemes are seriously threatening international cooperation in using outer space for peaceful purposes threatening world peace and security and human life.

Ambassador Le Kim Chung reiterated Vietnam's full support for all efforts and initiatives aimed at preventing the taking of the arms race into space and the militarization of space. He reaffirmed Vietnam's support for the Soviet Union's initiatives and proposals in this field including the proposal on signing a treaty whereby the countries pledge not to use force in outer space and not to carry out attacks on the earth from space.

He expressed support for Czechoslovakia's proposal on holding in Prague a seminar to discuss ways and means to use outer space for peaceful purposes.

He expressed Vietnam's interest in the application of space-control achievements to the development of the economy, science and technology and informed the audience of the results obtained by Vietnam in cooperation with other socialist countries under the intersputnik and intercosmos programs, with Laos, Cuba and some Southeast Asian countries, as well as with a number of international organizations and U.N. offices in this field.

He expressed the hope that Vietnam would receive more than U.S. assistance on this score in the coming period.

CSO: 5200/4338

SALT/START ISSUES

MOSCOW EXPLAINS WHY U.S. 'CIRCLES' OPPOSE SALT II

LD192141 Moscow International Service in Italian 1900 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Six years ago in Vienna 18 June 1979, the Soviet Union and the U.S. signed the treaty on the limitation of offensive strategic weapons, known as SALT II. Today, we bring you a commentary by the TASS observer, Vladimir Chernyshev, expert on military problems.

It is worth recalling, Vladimir Chernyshev writes, the opinion on the SALT II treaty voiced in 1979 by then U.S. President Jimmy Carter. I think, Jimmy Carter said, that this treaty will give us, and the Soviet Union likewise, many advantages. In my view this document can be considered as a rightful minimum treaty which is acceptable, balanced, stable and verifiable. It is the most specific and detailed treaty which any country has ever signed. This is what Jimmy Carter said. Despite this positive assessment of the treaty by the then head of the White House, the U.S. did not ratify this document.

Over all these years, there has been a struggle between supporters and adversaries of SALT II in the White House, a struggle which has taken a particularly sharp turn in the past weeks. Who, then, does not like this exceptionally important and mutually useful document? It is not to the liking of those in the U.S. who are dreaming of achieving superiority over the USSR through a sharp increase in the U.S. nuclear potential--in other words, the U.S. military-industrial complex and its puppets in the U.S. administration.

Why is the SALT II treaty not to the liking of these circles? First of all, because it is based on the principle of equality and equal security. In the joint declaration on the principles and the main guidelines of the talks which would have resulted on the limitation of strategic arms which are an integral part of the SALT II treaty, the sides stated that in the course of the talks, they would work towards achieving the established targets on the basis of the principle of parity and equal security. However, this is precisely what those who are dreaming of military superiority do not want.

U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger once said: If the process from the Cold War to detente is a sign of progress, we cannot allow ourselves progress of that sort. We shall take all necessary steps to increase America's war-making potential and to achieve military superiority over the USSR. Still today, Weinberger is in the first ranks of those who are (?challenging) [word indistinct] the renunciation of the SALT II treaty. The scheme (?worked

out) by the White House is very clear: to have a free hand in an uncontrolled arms race.

Why did these heated discussions on SALT II come about in the White House precisely today? The fact is that the White House has decided to start on a large scale works for the creation of offensive space weapons, and the creation of the so-called space shield for the U.S. In other words, the advocates of military adventure are hoping finally to achieve their dream of military adventure are hoping finally to achieve their dream of military superiority thorugh the militarization of outer space. The initial premise is that the space shield could guarantee the U.S. anti-missile defense and the possibility of striking first. Once the decision to create the shield is taken, it is necessary to set an even more intense pace [words indistinct] for a first-strike blow, and this must be hampered by nothing, by no previous agreement. It is also worth noting that the launching of the Trident submarine "Alaska" is scheduled for next September. It will be equipped with 24 MIRVED missiles. The SALT II treaty envisages that the number of missiles of this type must not exceed 1,200. Thus, with the commissioning of this submarine the U.S. is overstepping the agreed limit.

Therefore, the treaty and the limits set by it represent an obstacle to those who always want to extend the U.S. military potential further. This why the American leadership recently developed modifications aimed at putting an end to the restrictions imposed by the SALT II treaty, keeping in mind that beforehand the U.S. allowed itself gross violations of the provisions of the treaty. The U.S. generally rejected an important part of the treaty--the protocol whereby long-range cruise missiles must be limited or even banned. Consequently, a new type of strategic arms which already today total thousands of units was born.

On 10 June President Reagan made a statement on the policy of the U.S. with regard to the agreements in force in the field of the limitation of strategic arms. The White House did not decide, did not venture to renounce openly the SALT II treaty, owing to the fact that in the world at large, including the U.S., strong concern in this respect was felt. A resolution adopted by the Senate urged the U.S. administration to refrain from scrapping the provisions and the codicils in force on offensive strategic forces.

American [word indistinct] political and public figures and representatives from allied countries, including the foreign ministers from some NATO countries, warned that the decision on the renunciation of the treaty would signify a further arms race and endanger the atmosphere at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons underway in Geneva.

As shown by the President's statement, the U.S. administration does not want to (?give up?) its plans to proceed toward the cancellation of a treaty which is aimed at containing the nuclear arms race. But, in order to disguise the true meaning of these plans, the White House has chosen to extricate itself gradually from the SALT II treaty by rejecting, one after the other, the restrictions provided by it, and methodically eliminating its vitally important provisions. The head of the White House has said that with the launching of

the submarine "Alaska" the U.S. intends to dismantle the "Poseidon" submarine; but he added immediately that this isolated measure does not mean that the U.S. will be [word indistinct] also in the future.

The principle meaning of Ronald Reagan's statements is that Washington intends to say without any [word indistinct]. [Sentence indistinct.] They will be the obstacle in the way of implementing the U.S. military programs. To justify to international public opinion the violations of the commitments taken by the U.S. President Reagan presents them as measures taken in answer to alleged violations of the SALT II treaty by the USSR. However, Washington has not been able to present any evidence to confirm the accusations against the USSR. Thus, official Washington has shown again its faithfulness to the line bent on scrapping all the positive elements gathered by both sides in the field of the limitation of strategic arms. However, the U.S. must not delude itself that it can decide arbitrarily which commitments to observe or not; expecting that the other side will be forced to adapt itself to the U.S. line is a dangerous mistake.

CSO: 5200/1293

SALT/START ISSUES

FURTHER CRITICISM OF REAGAN POLICY ON SALT II

"Fierce Attack' on SALT II

LD180541 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1840 GMT 17 Jun 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper has published an article that reveals the attitude the Reagan administration towards the SALT II treaty. The White House, the paper notes, has not given up the idea of having nothing to do with this treaty in order to give itself carte blanche for further cranking up the arms race. THE WASHINGTON POST cites data according to which many influential figures in the U.S. leadership oppose U.S. observance of the treaty obligations. An especially fierce attack against the SALT II treaty is being waged by Secretary of Defense Weinberger, his deputy, Ikle, and assistant, Perle. They are supported by CIA Director Casey and other highly placed figures in the Reagan administration. However, the White House, THE WASHINGTON POST notes, has had to camouflage its intentions, since it is forced to take into account the mood of the U.S. population, the NATO allies, and the world in general. The paper cites in particular the resolution by the Senate that calls on the U.S. administration to observe the SALT II treaty conditions. The U.S. allies in Western Europe are also alarmed at Washington's position. It appears that during the recent session of the NATO Council in Portugal, Secretary of State Shultz sent three telegrams about this to President Reagan.

'Seeking Pretext' To Abandon Treaty

LD180656 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] The foreign mass media are publishing material related to the sixth anniversary today of the signing by the Soviet Union and the United States of the treaty limiting offensive strategic armaments. Many commentaries analyze the significance of the SALT II treaty. In the view of the world public, the conclusion of this document marked a great step forward along the road to a general improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, and thus in the whole international climate. The implementation of the treaty would open opportunities for the drafting of subsequent measures to not only limit but reduce strategic armaments.

However, Washington soon refused to ratify the treaty, and now the U.S. administration is seeking a pretext to break it off, so as to free its hands and embark upon a new stage in the arms buildup.

As for the country: The Soviet Union, true to its obligations, is unswervingly carrying out the SALT II agreement.

'Undercutting' SALT II

LD181336 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] New York, June 18, TASS--The Reagan administration's policy vis-a-vis the SALT II treaty is actually that of undercutting both this and other important agreements, charged Matthew Murray, a leading expert in arms limitation from the School of International and Social Problems at Columbia University.

Commenting on the U.S. President's statement on SALT II, he said in the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR that until the United States and the Soviet Union signed another treaty that could replace SALT II, the U.S. President should seek to maintain and preserve that document rather than try to undercut its provisions. In the absense of limitations imposed by that treaty, Murrey said, the arms race would inevitably pick up speed, which would complicate the task of achieving deep cuts in arms still further.

CHICAGO TRIBUNE columnist Steven Chapman said that the U.S. President's SALT II decision gave no grounds for optimism. Ronald Reagan had demonstrated once again his disbelief in arms control and that he was itching to denounce the treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems which stood in the way of his "star wars" program.

'Bound To Destroy Treaty'

LD181504 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Excerpt] Six years ago, on 18 June 1979, the Soviet Union and the United States signed an agreement on limiting strategic offensive arms. The treaty is known under the name of SALT II. Here is our comment:

During the signing of the treaty the sides declared that it registered the mutually acceptable balance of Soviet and American interests. The treaty rests on the principle of equality and equal security and contributes essentially to the prevention of nuclear war, thus meeting the interests of not only the Soviet and the American peoples but also peace aspirations of humanity.

The Soviet Union strictly observes and invariably stands by all the provisions of this important and carefully worked out document. As for the United States, many in the world have noticed of late reservations that one of the latest statements by President Reagan contains. From these reservations it follows that the Washington administration has embarked on the policy that is bound to destroy the treaty curbing the nuclear arms race.

'Purposeful Course of Undermining'

LD211538 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 21 Jun 85

[Text] The Reagan administration is pursuing a purposeful course of undermining the accords with the USSR on strategic arms limitation. Without any doubt, Reagan would gladly destroy SALT II, writes THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR observer Harsch. The only thing that is now holding the administration back from doing away with the limitations set by the treaty is the mood of the American public and of the NATO partners of the United States. Washington's attitude toward SALT II, says the political observer of NOVOSTI press agency, Edgar Cheporov, is dictated by the desire to obtain military superiority over the USSR. That is why the United States has not ratified this highly important agreement.

The director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Edelman, claims that if Washington ratified SALT II, it would create a dangerous precedent for future talks, since the criteria laid down by SALT II would be applied. What are these criteria? The main criterion is recognition of the parity of the strategic potentials by Washington and the undertaking not to disturb that parity. It is precisely against the observance of the balance of military forces that the cutting-edge of present American military strategy is aimed. American officials declare that before the end of this year, the United States may decide to violate the provisions of SALT II. Well, at least it's logical. The President has already given the green light for new arms programs. It is intended to build up spending on the production of the Midgetman missile, the "star wars" program, the refitting of the Poseidon submarine, and the building of MX missiles.

It follows from a statement by the President's National Security Adviser McFarlane that the United States will be ready to violate the limits set by SALT II for the number of nuclear missiles by refusing to dismantle their old carriers and by commissioning new ones. This will happen next summer, when another -- the eighth -- Ohio class nuclear submarine will come into service with ICBM's on board. Nor is there any doubt that SALT II will also be assailed by the eight Trident submarines that are also due to put to sea in 1986. It is clear that such plans, the implementation of which is already begun, contradict the very meaning of the process of curbing the arms race which the United States as well as the USSR pledges themselves to participate in when they signed SALT II. Responsibility for the consequences of attempts to (?annul) the vitally important provisions of SALT II will rest entirely with Washington.

House Poseidon Decision

LD221231 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 22 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 22 TASS -- The U.S. House of Representatives has endorsed an amendment under which the U.S. Administration has no right to decommission and dismantle the nuclear submarine "Poseidon" but should consider various "options" of its further use. The amendment, sponsored by Republican Congressman Duncan Hunter who is notorious for his reactionary views, suggests, in particular, installing cruise missiles on the submarine.

The demarche by the House of Representatives to a considerable extent leaves the White House free to act to depart from the SALT-2 treaty. As is known, it is being asserted in Washington that the dismantling of the submarine Poseidon will enable the USA to

remain within the limits provided for by the agreement after the running trials of the seventh nuclear-powered submarine of Ohio type with D-5 missiles on board will begin. However, such one-off measure absolutely does not change the U.S. overall course towards breaking the existing accords, the SALT-2 treaty, in particular.

Earlier the U.S. Senate, which passed a resolution, which has no binding force, urging Reagan to abide by the SALT-2 provisions -- for tactical considerations rejected a similar amendment, sponsored by Jesse Helms, which banned the dismantling of Poseidon submarine. This matter will be finally decided upon in the House-Senate conference committee.

CSO: 5200/1293

SALT/START ISSUES

IZVESTIYA: PENTAGON SEES B-1 AS 'TRUMP CARD'

PM011323 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 4

[B. Ivanov article under the rubric "International Notes"; "Pentagon's Trump Card'"--first graf is TASS report]

[Text] The official ceremony of the presentation of the first B-1 strategic bomber to the U.S. Air Force has taken place in an atmosphere of militarist frenzy at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska.

The B-1 bomber is not just another aircraft taken on by the U.S. Air Force. It is a new stage in the strategic force's modernization aimed at further intensifying the U.S. nuclear triad.

The development of the aircraft was begun in the early seventies by Rockwell International, one of the Pentagon's leading contractors.

In 1977, when experimental models of the bomber had already been created, President Carter "suspended" work on the program, emphasizing instead the accelerated production of cruise missiles. At that time this White House decision was made out by U.S. propaganda to be evidence of the United States' "peace-loving" policy. There was a simple explanation: The White House was giving preference to cruise missiles which could be created and deployed far more rapidly than the B-1.

When the Republicans came to power and the White House announced a large-scale program for modernizing the armed forces, the speediest completion of the B-1 program was publicly proclaimed a "priority" task "of national importance."

Work is now in full swing at the Rockwell International plants. It is planned that in 1986 the first consignment of 20 bombers will leave the conveyor belt. In all the Pentagon intends to create a fleet of 100 of these aircraft, which, according to preliminary calculations, will cost U.S. taxpayers over $28 billion.

Washington strategists link their far-reaching aggressive plans, above all to create a first-strike nuclear potential, with the new bombers. It is not for nothing that General Allen, former chief of staff of the Air Force, has frankly called the B-1 "the Pentagon's trump card" with whose aid the United States is to take a new leap forward in the strategic arms field.

SALT/START ISSUES

U.S. ACCELERATING PRODUCTION OF 'FIRST-STRIKE' B-1, D-5, MX

LD092340 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 9 Jul 85

[From "News and Views" program]

[Text] At a ceremony at Dyess airbase in Texas, the first B-1B bomber has been handed over to the Strategic Air Command, Dmitriy Zakharov comments.

Spokesmen for the Rockwell International company say this is one of the best systems the American strategic air force has ever been armed with. A B-1 can fly at low altitudes which allows it to approach targets unnoticed. This guarantees the suddenness factor which is necessary for delivering the first strike. The B-1 bomber is to become part of the triad, the complex of United States strategic armaments. This complex is being modernized at a high speed of late. Last month alone saw the decision to produce D-5 missiles for Trident submarines in addition to the introduction of B-1 bombers. The manufacture of MX missiles has begun. Though these components of the triad differ they have one common feature. Like the bomber all of them are first strike weapons.

But what about the assurances of American diplomats in Geneva about the desire to cut down armaments? Apparently the talks are meant as a distraction to calm down public opinion. This happened before when the United States decided to station new missiles in Western Europe and used the Soviet-American dialogue in Geneva for dragging out time.

This makes one think that the arms build-up is the goal and Washington's political maneuvering is a means of reaching it. What makes it develop ever new arms systems? According to the plans of the White House they should guarantee it military superiority that will allow the United States to impose its order on the rest of the world. This policy is very dangerous. (?Great) production capacities and millions of people are involved in its implementation. Thousands of millions of dollars are invested in it. The growth in the number of military programs leads to the transition of the country to military [word indistinct]. The United States is being transformed into a giant conveyor belt for the production of weapons. The process is picking up speed and influencing political developments that impose the course of militarization on the United States regardless of the feelings of the Americans.

Because of inertia the process threatens to become a dominating force in shaping the present generation and the generations to come in the United States. Washington's military plans will inevitably undermine and destroy existing agreements and make it impossible to conclude new ones.

SALT/START ISSUES

MOSCOW STRESSES TIE BETWEEN SALT II COMPLIANCE, SDI

LD071431 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 6 Jun 85

[Text] Wednesday night the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly adopted a resolution urging President Reagan to continue to adhere to the Soviet-American SALT II treaty, signed in 1979 but never ratified by Washington. Here are some details:

The resolution was adopted amid strong rumors that the White House was undecided on the issue of compliance. The treaty expires at the end of this year and Washington is said to be working out an updated policy towards SALT II. Another reason for the indecision is the fact that with the sea trials of the seventh Trident submarine "Alaska" due to being this fall, the United States (?would exceed) the treaty's provision limiting each side to 1,200 missiles carrying multiple warheads. So if Washington wants to adhere to the treaty, it will have to scrap either one of its Poseidon submarines or 14 Minuteman land-based ICBM's.

The Senate resolution shows that the legislators still have faith in SALT II as being a lid on the race in strategic offensive weapons. With the treaty the situation appears to be much better than without it. However SALT II is only one of the accords signed between the Soviet Union and the United States in the 1970's. Another and very important one is the 1972 ABM treaty. In fact it stands in the way of an unrestricted military buildup in all spheres, strategic nuclear weapons included. The grand paradox is that while the Senate has called on the White House to respect SALT II, it supports the administration's efforts to undermine it by endorsing the star wars program.

Is there any connection between SALT II and the ABM treaty? There most certainly is. If the latter is violated and space weapons are built, tested and ultimately deployed--and this is what the president's strategic defense initiative is all about--then the other side will be compelled to take countersteps. As top Soviet military leaders have warned, for this country there will be no other choice but to increase its offensive strategic force supplementing it with defensive weapons.

The star wars program will destroy the very foundation of arms control. If the ABM treaty is revised or canceled under whatever pretext, this will signal the end of the arms control talks and the beginning of an uncontrolled arms race for many decades to come. So what will be left of the Senate's desire

to comply with SALT II? There can be no such thing as a selective approach to arms control like: let's comply with one treaty because it is more or less acceptable to us and let's vary another treaty because it is a hindrance. This is dishonest and irresponsible, and the sooner this is realized the better.

CSO: 5200/1293

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

TASS REPORTS MIDGETMAN CONTRACT--Against the background of our country's peace-loving policy the actions of the Washington Administration continue to arouse alarm among millions of people. Recently, for example, this official statement came out of the Pentagon: The buildup of armaments can never be considered complete. The Pentagon chief, Weinberger, was even more specific: According to him, just listen to this, the United States must acquire the potential to inflict a devastating nuclear strike against the Soviet Union, threatening the existence of society itself. When it comes to military plans, programs and conceptions, and the buildup of a nuclear potential and the arms race, the words of American figures, to one's profound regret, are not at variance with their deeds. Some days ago, the U.S. military department officially stated the conclusion of two contracts with the Martin-Marietta corporation amounting to $450 million. This money will go toward the erection of prototypes of the Midget man mobile-based intercontinental missiles and for flight testing of them. [Text] [Moscow Television Service in Russian 1155 GMT 6 Jul 85]

CSO: 5200/1054

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

TURKEY DEPLOYS U.S. MISSILES--The United States will deploy in its bases in Turkey Lance II missiles with nuclear and neutron warheads having a range of 250 km, as well as Howitzers with a nuclear capability. The Honest John missiles with nuclear war heads will be removed from U.S. bases in eastern Anatolia and will be replaced with U.S. Lance II missiles in accordance with an agreement reached at the U.S.-Turkish Joint Defense Group meetings held last week in Ankara. In a report on the subject, the Istanbul CUMHURIYET says that U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, who headed the Pentagon delegation which participated in the Ankara talks, toured U.S. bases in eastern Anatolia where the new missiles will be deployed before the talks began. The report adds that an agreement was reached during the talks held by the Joint Defense Group for the deployment of the new U.S. missiles on Turkish soil. [Text] [(Clandestine) Our Radio in Turkish to Turkey 0500 GMT 29 Jun 85]

CSO: 5200/2675

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOVIET GEN TATARNIKOV: NATO VERIFICATION PROPOSALS UNACCEPTABLE

PM022019 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 85 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the Stockholm Conference"]

[Text] Stockholm, 28 Jun -- Major General V.M. Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation, today addressed a plenary session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. He noted that the proposals of the United States and the other NATO countries put forward in the guise of verification measures will lead to the legalization of espionage and to interference in other states' internal affairs. By insisting on completely unnecessary inspections they are placing a delayed-action mine under the talks. This deliberately unacceptable proposal is clearly designed to achieve unilateral advantages and is dictated by Washington's old custom of wanting to see what its neighbors are doing.

NATO's entire package of measures is imbued not with concern to strengthen confidence and security in Europe but a desire to monitor the Warsaw Pact countries' military activity. It goes without saying that the Soviet Union cannot accept such an approach to verification questions.

The basic form of verification of the accords on confidence-building measures and security in Europe must be the use of national technical facilities in keeping with the generally accepted norms of international law. Forms of verification such as requests for information [napravleniye zaprosov] and bilateral and multilateral consultations could also be used. This is a realistic and reasonable approach, ensuring the effective implementation of confidence-building measures in Europe and in the adjacent seas [oceans] and air space.

CSO: 5200/1307

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

USSR: NATO OPPOSES 'AMBITIOUS' PROPOSALS

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 2 Jul 85 pp 2-3

[APN item by political commentator Vladimir Katin under the rubric "News and Views"]

[Text] What is going on at the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, which opened in Stockholm 18 months ago?, Vladimir Katin, Political Commentator for Novosti Press Agency, writes.

The general picture is this. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Europe have put forward a number of constructive proposals, such as a treaty that would pledge its signers not to use nuclear or conventional weapons against one another and not to use force against third countries. However, the United States and its allies would like merely to reaffirm the principle of non-use of force as it is formulated in the UN Charter and other international documents. Is this sufficient reason for calling a special meeting of 35 nations?

The aim of the ambitious Soviet proposals is to halt the arms race in all fields, bring about a reduction in armaments and prevent an arms race in space. Alongside these global initiatives, the socialist countries submitted to the conference some other proposals aimed at building trust in Europe. A few days ago they proposed that the participating countries notify one another about major troop movements and transfers.

The current tense situation in the world and the growing risk of nuclear war make it extremely important for states to assume clearly-formulated obligations about troop movements. It is no secret that NATO countries often use major troop transfers as a means of pressure, blackmail and intimidation. Such actions cause suspicion and mistrust in relations between states. Mention also should be made of the transfers to Western Europe of a steadily growing number of troops of the U.S. strategic reserve.

The adoption of the Warsaw Pact countries' proposal would strengthen trust in relations between all European countries and consolidate European security.

CSO: 5200/1307

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOVIET DELEGATE SPEAKS ON EXCHANGING MILITARY DATA

LD011533 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 1 Jul 85

[Text] Stockholm July 1 TASS -- Addressing the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, I. Rozanov, a member of the Soviet delegation, criticized the stand of the United States and some other NATO countries on the issue of exchange of military information.

He stressed that Western proposals on that score contradicted the spirit and the letter of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and were aimed at winning unilateral advantages for the North Atlantic bloc. Trying to get from the socialist states data on the structure and deployment of their armed forces, the United States at the same time is not going to disclose information about its military capabilities.

The Soviet Union, the Soviet representative said, consistently proceeds from the premise that the exchange of information itself cannot build up confidence and security. The amount of information to be made available should strictly conform to the character of specific agreed confidence measures and be an organic part thereof. The sooner NATO countries in Stockholm renounce the course toward attaining unilateral advantages, the sooner it will be possible to achieve important practical results which the people of Europe expect from the conference.

CSO: 5200/1307

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

TASS REPORTS ADVANCE NOTIFICATION PROPOSAL BY HUNGARY

LD211234 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1109 GMT 21 Jun 85

[Text] Stockholm, 21 Jun (TASS) -- Correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Aleksandr Stepanenko report:

At today's session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe, the socialist countries came forward with a fresh proposal aimed at strengthening confidence and security on the European Continent.

Ambassador K. Szigeti, the head of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic, submitted a working document "Advance Notification of Large-Scale Movements and Transfers of Troops." This proposes that notification should be given of large-scale movements and transfers of land forces numbering more than 20,000 in the region encompassed by the confidence-building measures as well as into and out of it. Notification also extends to aviation from the level of more than 100 aircraft being transferred from other continents or other regions to Europe, the adjacent oceanic region, and air space. The document contains the proposition that notifications should be made within 30 days. These will contain information about the general goals of such movements or transfers, the states participating in them, the numbers and types of troops, schedules, and the starting and finishing points of the movements.

Ambassador-at-Large Oleg Brinevskiy, the head of the Soviet delegation, stressed in his address that large-scale troops movements, such as those currently being undertaken by NATO countries, represent a threat to the security of states and are a serious source of suspicion and distrust in interstate relations. They are not infrequently used as a means of power pressure, blackmail, and intimidation.

In the current exacerbated international situation, the transfers of U.S. strategic reserve troops to Europe, which are increasing every year, take on a particularly sinister character. During the course of the "Reforger-85" exercises alone, over 20,000 men, dozens of war planes, and thousands of tons of military cargo and equipment were transferred from the United States to the European Continent. Last year troops numbering a total of about 60,000 men were transferred from Britain to the FRG during the "Lion Heart-84" exercises. Even the Western press commented that Europe had not seen such major troop transfers since the Normandy landing operation in June 1944.

The socialist countries' proposal relating to advance notification of major movements and transfers of troops, the Soviet representative noted, will lead to a reduction of unpredictability, possible errors and misunderstanding of the aims of such actions, and consequently to a reduction of military danger on the European Continent.

CSO: 5200/1307

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

USSR: COMMENTS ON END OF SUMMER SESSION

Grinevskiy Cited

LD051319 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 5 Jul 85

[Text] Stockholm July 5 TASS -- The Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe completed its scheduled session here today.

Summing up the results of the just-ended round of the talks, ambassador-at-large Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation at the conference, said that the proposal of socialist countries on the non-use of military force was making its way forward, despite stubborn resistance of the U.S. and some of its allies. That proposal has become the core of the poltical debate. Many neutral and nonaligned states come out in favor of imparting the international obligation on the non-use of force with the necessary weight and authority, and giving it a concrete content as regards the present-day dangerous situation in Europe.

The working documents tabled by socialist countries on the issue of notification of major exercises of ground, naval and air forces, as well as major troop movements and re-deployments charted a new direction for the development of the Helsinki confidence measures. They clearly orientate the conference toward efficiently enhancing European security.

Against the backdrop of these broad initiatives NATO proposals on notification of operations of ground forces only and on making available intelligence data on the structure and stationing of military formations of the socialist countries look like an overt attempt to win unilateral military advantages for the United States.

One of the major issues at the conference is the issue raised by socialist countries concerning the limitation of the scale of military exercises in Europe which, as is seen from the example of some NATO exercises, closely resemble in character the deployment of combat troops for the beginning of combat operations. Nonaligned countries enthusiastically back such limitations. And again the whole matter turns on the negative position of the United States and its allies.

The replacement of confidence measures with shameless attempts at espionage, the reluctance of the U.S.A. to resolve urgent problems of confidence-building in Europe prevent the conference from embarking on practical talks and hinder it from entering a business-like rhythm. The next session of the conference is to open on September 10.

Bloc's 'Moral Success'

LD052258 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Jul 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Good evening, comrades. Today in the capital of Sweden the routine session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe completed its work. The linchpin of the political discussion held over the past weeks was the proposal put forward by the socialist countries for the abstention from using military force. In spite of the determined resistance of the U.S. delegation and some of its allies, many representatives of neutral and nonaligned countries supported this proposal. As a result one can speak of the moral success of the socialist countries, whose position stimulates growing support throughout the world. At the same time it needs to be noted that the U.S.'s determined reluctance to address current problems, mainly connected with the strengthening of confidence in Europe, continues to prevent the conference from approaching practical negotiations. In any event, in the course of the round of negotiations which finished today it did not prove possible to do this. The next session of the Stockholm Conference has been set for 10 September.

NATO Countries Main Obstacle

LD052229 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jul 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast -- Valentin Gubernatorov video report]

[Text] The sixth session of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe ended in Stockholm today.

[Begin video recording] The sixth session summed up the results of the 18 months' of work of this international forum. Now, not only the positions of the sides and the way toward progress have become clearer, but also the difficulties hampering them. The session demonstrated that the main obstacle in the way of confidence and security in Europe is the position of the NATO countries. They fail to meet the socialist states halfway on any issue, even the smallest.

At the same time, the current session demonstrated a good and working attitude among the representatives of the neutral and nonaligned countries. Many of these advocated that the international obligations on not using military force and maintaining peaceful relations should be filled with specific substance in the conditions of the dangerous situation in the world. These countries also supported the proposal to limit the scale of major military exercises on the European Continent. Only the United States and its NATO allies have so far given no reasonable [vrazumitelnyy] reply to these peace initiatives by the socialist states.

The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community advocate substantive negotiations and the drawing up of mutually acceptable accords that would unite major measures of a political nature with specific confidence measures in the military shpere. The attainment of such accords at the conference would be another stage in strengthening and developing the process of relaxing tension, the foundations of which were laid 10 years ago in the Final Act of the Helsinki conference. [end recording]

CSO: 5200/1307

PRAGUE ON LACK OF PROGRESS AT STOCKHOLM TALKS

LD062216 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 6 Jul 85

[Text] Jirina Dupalova comments on the end of the sixth round of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe

Almost 1 and 1/2 years have passed since the opening of the Stockholm conference; the sixth round of talks ended yesterday. We therefore have a sufficiently long period to allow us to carry out some evaluation.

Although there were some positive results, particularly in the sense of clarifying the positions of the two sides, a constructive tackling of the basic objective of the conference -- strengthening trust and security, and disarmament in Europe -- has so far not been attempted. At the same time, specific negotiations about the elaboration of mutually supplementing confidence-building measures in the political as well as the military spheres are the key to the success.

The Warsaw Pact countries' proposals are based on the need to adopt a comprehensive attitude to this issue. The principles of equality and equal security are respected by these proposals. Therefore they meet with a positive response from the neutral and nonaligned states, which are interested in Stockholm being a truly effective continuation of the development begun by the Helsinki Security and Cooperation Conference.

The NATO countries, on the other hand, do not pay attention to the political sphere and aim only at measures of a military and technological character. The purpose of their tactics is to gain one-sided advantages and to legalize espionage and interference in the internal affairs of other states.

This attitude was apparent during the sixth round of talks. A number of examples could serve as evidence of this. Let us examine the socialist countries' proposal, which concerns agreement on the nonuse of military force and the preservation of peaceful relations. Although President Reagan promised that the NATO countries were willing to discuss this proposal, the Stockholm talks did not produce any result in this respect. On the contrary, the NATO countries continued their obstructions. This upset the neutral and nonaligned countries which support the proposal.

At the same time, renouncing the use of military force is a fundamental prerequisite for strengthening international confidence. It represents a basis upon which it is later possible to construct further measures aimed at securing military relaxation. The socialist countries made several such proposals in this respect. These proposals concern advance information about large-scale maneuvers of marines, ground forces, and the marines and air forces together, as well as the limitation of military maneuvers.

The urgency of solving these matters is obvious. It is indisputable that such large-scale maneuvers endanger security because they create situations during which the danger of error or the accidental start of war is increased.

The NATO countries again rejected these proposals. Therefore it is not surprising that at the end of the sixth round of talks, the results achieved in the sphere of specific measures for strengthening confidence and security remain at zero. The United States and some of its allies are playing for time and at the same time unleashing a new round of the arms race, continuing the deployment of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in order to gain military supremacy. These efforts are absurd because the Warsaw Pact states will never allow this to happen.

The Stockholm conference is one of those international forums whose tasks are to break the vicious circle of confrontation-arms race-confrontation. It is therefore high time to make a real turn from proclamations to specific deeds. It is necessary for this categorical imperative of our time to be taken into account at long last in the NATO countries and mainly Washington, because it is only the good will of all the participants that can prevent the Stockholm conference from becoming trapped in a blind alley.

CSO: 5500/3064

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND DAILIES REPORT OPPOSITION'S ANZUS SUGGESTION

McLay's Way To 'Defuse Breach'

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 20 May 85 p 2

[Text]

NZPA Dunedin

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr McLay, has suggested a way for New Zealand and the United States to defuse the Anzus breach.

In a speech to the Otago University extension school in Dunedin, he said each side could back away a little without compromising basic policy.

Mr McLay suggested a "time out" of six months with the Government's nuclear ships ban "on hold."

The United States should have no significant problem if over that period there was no request for a ship visit.

Negotiation

"This would certainly not compromise its non-disclosure policy," he said.

"Such action on both sides might just create a climate that enabled the negotiation of a compromise of the type that New Zealand Foreign Affairs officials and American diplomats thought they were close to in January this year."

During the "time out" New Zealand could offer to host a meeting of medium-level officials to lay the groundwork for practical future military and political co-operation between Anzus countries.

"It must be conceded it would certainly not be easy for either side to take even one step back from an apparently firm stance," Mr McLay said.

Inflexibility

"But if that does not happen, and both countries maintain their present inflexible positions, there can be little prospect of reconciliation.

Later, Mr McLay said that a National Government, in two years' time, would not regard ship visits as the first item on the agenda.

He listed: paying attention to ensuring the appropriate domestic climate; rebuilding confidence in the relationship; re-establishing broken communication; and ensuring trust.

Australia

"One would have to look to Australia as the third treaty partner to help in re-establishing that relationship," he said.

These matters were vital because Anzus no longer existed as it had and the massive Soviet military build-up in the region could not be ignored.

"Nor can we overlook the vulnerability and the delicate economies of the small states in the South Pacific, nor the quickening of interest in the Antarctic."

Lange: McLay's Call 'Staggering'

Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 22 May 85 p 3

[Text]

The Prime Minister, Mr Lange, does not accept that the Association of South-east Asian nations (Asean) will be upset by his decision to bypass its meeting for foreign ministers in July.

The United States Secretary of State, Mr Shultz, is expected to attend, and it was earlier suggested Mr Lange and Mr Shultz might hold a separate meeting to discuss the anti-nuclear/Anzus issue.

However, Mr Lange said today, there was no evidence that Mr Shultz was going to the Asean meeting with the purpose of discussing Anzus.

Fact

In fact, Mr Shultz is going on to talk Anzus in Australia at a meeting to which New Zealand had not been invited, said Mr Lange.

"So I don't see any realistic possibility whatever of having an Anzus round with Mr Shultz at Asean when he's going to Australia to talk Anzus without New Zealand."

Mr Lange said it would be good if Mr Shultz could come on to New Zealand after Australia — "he would be very welcome here."

The Prime Minister said a moment's thought from the people like the Opposition Leader, Mr McLay, who would be screaming for him (Mr Lange) to make yet another overseas trip, was that as soon as he left, they would be screaming for him to come home.

Disagreed

To the suggestion that Mr Lange would be expected to attend as Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the Asean countries might be upset, Mr Lange disagreed. He had already been around the Asean countries.

Asked why he wasn't going to the meeting, Mr Lange said: "because it's an Asean meeting."

New Zealand is not a member of Asean, but was invited on an observer basis.

He confirmed that the deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr O'Flynn, or another appropriate minister involved in overseas representation, would certainly attend.

Meanwhile Mr McLay said Mr Lange was turning down an excellent opportunity to do something to heal the rift between New Zealand and the United States, and it was "pitiful" that Mr O'Flynn was reportedly being sent instead.

Mr McLay said that Anzus partners had not held any tripartite talks since January when the crisis over the treaty developed. New Zealand should lose no opportunity to initiate senior ministerial contact with the US and Australia, either separately or together.

'Insulted'

He said the Australians were "insulted" by Mr Lange's stopover in Australia of only three hours at the end of his African trip. He had got that message "very loud and clear" when he was in Canberra recently.

In further comment today, on the Anzus row between the Government and the Opposition, Mr Lange responded to Mr McLay's call at the Dunedin foreign policy conference for a moratorium on the impasse with the United States.

'Staggered'

Mr Lange said it was staggering Mr McLay should call for such a moratorium, because that was exactly what was happening.

"It's like asking people to speak prose. We are speaking prose." He said he couldn't think of a better word to describe the situation at the moment, adding, "the moratorium" would be indefinite.

Editorial Supports McLay

Christchurch THE PRESS in English 22 May 85 p 18

[Editorial: "A Way Back to A.N.Z.U.S.?"]

[Text]

Among the most alarming aspects of the Government's anti-nuclear policy has been the rigidity with which it was applied, without regard for consequences. At the time of the General Election, nearly a year ago, the Leader of the Labour Party, Mr Lange, gave assurances that the A.N.Z.U.S. Treaty would continue in force under a Labour Government, in spite of Labour's proposal to ban nuclear-powered ships and nuclear-armed ships and aircraft from New Zealand. Seemingly, then, a degree of compromise would be possible. Instead, the policy has been applied in such a manner that A.N.Z.U.S. is moribund.

Mr Lange, as Prime Minister, maintains that the treaty is still effective. Leaders in both the other member States, Australia and the United States, have described it as "inoperative." For practical purposes, A.N.Z.U.S. has been dead for three months, killed by the Government's preoccupation with keeping all nuclear-powered vessels, and all vessels that might conceivably have nuclear weapons, out of New Zealand ports. The country remains without a coherent defence policy.

Mr Lange might argue that the firmness of the American response to New Zealand's ban must take at least equal blame for the demise of A.N.Z.U.S. Yet what else could the Labour Cabinet have expected? Amid world-wide concerns, the United States could not be expected to take lightly an action by an ally that eroded the foundations of a treaty based on mutual assistance. When the United States is again attempting to negotiate a difficult arms limitation treaty with the Soviet Union, it could not overlook an action by New Zealand that seemed to reduce—if only a little—the strength and cohesion of the Western world. The prospects for lasting nuclear peace in the world have been reduced by New Zealand's ban and it is the United States that must carry the greatest share of the burdens and the risks.

The United States could not give an unequivocal warning of what the outcome of a rigidly-applied Labour Party ban on possible nuclear visitors would be. To have done so would have been an unacceptable intrusion into the New Zealand election and New Zealand's domestic politics. The Americans were left in the position of being able only to react to events. It should be no surprise that they reacted uncompromisingly when faced with a refusal to compromise. New Zealand would have been equally put out if either of its A.N.Z.U.S. partners forbade visits by New Zealand ships to their ports, for whatever reason.

The rigid attitudes in Washington and Wellington mean that suggestions made at the week-end by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr McLay, have special importance. Mr McLay has proposed a cooling-off period of, perhaps, six months in which neither New Zealand nor the United States would attempt to embarrass the other further. He suggested that the time be used to seek ways in which practical co-operation on defence and other matters could be improved between the members of what was once the A.N.Z.U.S. alliance. Mr McLay made the important point that, while New Zealand and the United States hold strongly opposed positions, little progress can be made; the longer the rigidity persists, the harder it will be to move either side.

The matter does not concern New Zealand alone, nor New Zealand's relations with the United States in isolation. Australia has been caught awkwardly between two of its closest friends. That position might be used to improve communications and trust between New Zealand and the United States; but the Australians cannot act unless the other parties show a readiness to negotiate. The small Pacific Island States to the north of New Zealand have been left without the protection from outside interference that New Zealand's membership of A.N.Z.U.S. once conferred on them. In the last few months, Tonga, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, and Western Samoa have all had visits from American warships. The Soviet Union is showing increasing interest in the region. Where New Zealand's membership of A.N.Z.U.S. once provided a buffer between the islands and the Great Powers, now those

Powers cannot reasonably be expected to stay away. Where one goes, the other will follow.

After the damage done in the Whitlam years in Australia, relations on defence matters and intelligence between the United States and Australia took the best part a of decade to restore. To restore American trust in New Zealand is going to be a slow process. The longer it is left, the harder it will be. In the meantime, the rivalries of nuclear powers are intruding into the very region that the Labour Government's policy was intended to keep apart from the conflicts of the wider world. Bringing sense back to New Zealand's defence policies is too important to be left until after the next General Election, especially as it is an election that Labour might not lose.

Mr Lange cannot be expected to accept readily suggestions on an important policy from his principal political opponent. Nevertheless, the need to rescue something out of the A.N.Z.U.S. fiasco is too important for the question to fall victim political of bickerings. Mr McLay has suggested the beginnings of a way out. It should not be beyond Mr Lange's ingenuity to take up the suggestion of a cooling-off period, coupled with exploratory talks with the Americans, and to seem to make these things his own. To go on as he is, pretending that all is well with New Zealand's defence and with its place in the world, is stubbornly to ignore the facts. It is damaging seriously the interests of the country he has been elected to govern.

CSO: 5200/4337

WELLINGTON RESPONSE CAUTIOUS TO WHITE HOUSE LETTER

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 23 May 85 p 5

[Text]

NZPA Washington

The first sign of a thaw in the port calls row with the United States came yesterday with news that the White House has agreed to review the United States decision to suspend joint military exercises with New Zealand forces.

However, the Prime Minister, Mr Lange, has cast doubt on the significance of the American report, saying he did not have enough information to assess whether there would be a positive review, and that he did not see it as a first step to re-establishing full defence links.

"I do not think there is a substantial review under way."

New Zealand had not indicated that its position in the Anzus row had changed at all, he added.

Nothing New

A member of Mr Lange's staff suggested to journalists that the Oglesby letter was not as strong as it looked, and that it merely suggested a review of the recommendation from the members of Congress that Mr Reagan not cancel joint exercises with New Zealand.

And in Washington an official of the New Zealand Embassy, Mr John Wood, speaking in the absence of the ambassador, Sir Wallace Rowling, said the embassy was aware of the substance of the White House letter.

"In one sense it does not add anything new, because we have been told all along that the measures would be kept under constant review," Mr Wood said.

"On the other hand, we will be inquiring of the State department if it does add anything to our present state of knowledge."

That assurance came from a White House aide, Mr M. B. Oglesby, writing on behalf of President Reagan.

His letter, to 11 members of Congress who had urged President Reagan to treat New Zealand "not as a recalcitrant ally to be coerced, but as a long-standing partner whose continued support we value," said their recommendation not to cancel the joint exercises would be reviewed.

"You should be hearing further regarding this matter," his reply said.

It added, too, that the congressional letter had been referred to the presidential advisers "most familiar with this issue."

Intelligence

Suspension of joint exercises was one of the sanctions the United States imposed after the New Zealand Government refused port access to a nuclear-capable destroyer, the USS Buchanan.

The United States also cut down on intelligence sharing, said New Zealand would no longer get help in battling trade bills in Congress, and said it considered New Zealand a non-participating member of the Anzus alliance.

CSO: 5200/4337

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND PAPER ON U.S.-PRC SHIP VISIT FAILURE

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 20 May 85 p 6

[Editorial: "Still a Chinese Puzzle"]

[Text]

The abandonment of a visit which three United States warships were to have paid to Shanghai this month reflects serious misunderstandings — or worse — between Washington and Peking. The Americans place great stock in such visits, as Wellington well knows.

Not since the 1949 communist revolution have United States Navy vessels visited China. Calls planned this month had been years in delicate preparation. Cancellation might seem of less account had so much not already been invested in their symbolism and had the Chinese not regarded them as part of a process for securing practical help with naval technology.

Superficially, Labour policymakers in New Zealand might well applaud. For China has apparently been resisting visits by either nuclear-armed or nuclear-propelled vessels; consequent controversy has generated intense diplomatic embarrassment and a familiar standoff.

Last month, before retreating into inscrutability, the Chinese Communist Party general secretary spoke of an agreement that a nuclear-armed vessel would not be involved in the visit. That assertion has never been retracted. Subsequent Chinese official statements emphasised that only conventionally powered naval vessels would call.

The United States has consistently insisted that its policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons in ships has not varied. There the matter rests — and will perforce do so for some time. A certain opacity prevails and the cancellation now confirmed does not mutually save face but shares its loss.

Exquisite though the situation may seem, there is scant solace for New Zealand in all of this. Although its proximate difficulties have been with the United States, on an almost identical basic issue, New Zealand wants to preserve good rela-

tions with both parties. Questioning the veracity of either would hardly have helped. Accordingly, local politicians have shown a distinct dearth of curiosity, at least in public, over how and why the Sino-American misunderstanding arose, or even who said what to whom at the outset.

That China is itself a nuclear superpower invalidates precise local parallels; it also makes Peking's predilection in the matter the more mysterious. In its own crusade for a nuclear-free near Pacific, local Labour must be more concerned at events since it precipitated the atrophy of Anzus. They have included American nuclear ship visits to Tonga and Western Samoa and French moves to create a nuclear-vessel base near Noumea, not to mention higher domestic defence spending.

CSO: 5200/4337

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND EXPECTS PACIFIC FORUM OKAY ON NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 20 May 85 p 25

[Article by Karen Brown]

[Text]

DUNEDIN, Today. — The proposed South Pacific nuclear-free zone is likely to further isolate France diplomatically, says the chairman of Parliament's Foreign Affairs Select Committee.

Ms Helen Clark told those attending the annual Foreign Policy School at the weekend that there was every reason to believe that South Pacific Forum leaders due to meet in August would accept the wording of the proposed treaty establishing the zone.

It was expected, she said, that the South Pacific Treaty would have attached to it a number of protocols which the nuclear-weapons states' would be invited to endorse.

The United States, the United Kingdom and France all had territories in the area, which was likely to be covered by the proposed zone, the final details of which were expected to be considered by forum leaders at the August 2 meeting in Rarotonga.

The nuclear-weapons states' were likely to be invited to respect the zone and to undertake neither to subvert it nor use or threaten to use nuclear-weapons against its site parties.

The treaty would reinforce the efforts state parties, which are to include New Zealand, were making to end French nuclear testing in the Pacific, Ms Clark said, noting also that the key target of Australia in promoting the zone was French testing.

"France is likely to become even more diplomatically isolated as a result, particularly if it is the only nuclear-weapons state which shows an unwillingness to adopt the protocols of the treaty."

The Mt Albert MP added that the present proposals before the forum fell far short of excluding all undesirable matters nuclear from the region, however.

There would be no agreement at this time about the role of nuclear support facilities in the region, nuclear power generation, and the export of the strategic mineral uranium from Australia. In addition, transit on the high seas by any vessel was protected by international law and it was highly unlikely that at this time any nuclear-weapons state would be prepared to waive its right.

These were sensitive issues that could not be tackled now, Ms Clark said.

CSO: 5200/4337

END