

JPRS-UMA-91-008

18 MARCH 1991



JPRS Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

Soviet Press Coverage of the Gulf War

19980113 361

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

Soviet Union

Soviet Press Coverage of the Gulf War

JPRS-UMA-91-008

CONTENTS

18 March 1991

Coalition's Precision Munitions vs 'Appalling' Iraqi Training [A. Kostyushin, O. Shagov; <i>NOVOYE VREMYA</i> No 4, Jan 91]	1
Early Air War: Following Douhet's Prescription [M. Ponomarev; <i>KRASNAYA ZVEZDA</i> , 25 Jan 91]	2
Possible Consequences of Protracted, Widening War [ZA RUBEZHOM No 5, 25-31 Jan 91]	3
'Many' Iraqi Air Defense Radars Held in Reserve [A. Balebanov; <i>SELSKAYA ZHIZN</i> , 29 Jan 91]	4
Patriot Missile System Detailed [<i>KRASNAYA ZVEZDA</i> , 31 Jan 91]	5
IZVESTIYA: Iraqi Morale Falling, Surrenders, Desertions Increasing [D. Velikiy, B. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 4 Feb 91]	5
'400 AH-64 Apaches Nullify Iraqi Tank Superiority' [D. Belskiy; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 6 Feb 91] ..	6
Western Firms' Role in Developing Iraqi Chemical Capability [V. Katin; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 6 Feb 91]	7
IZVESTIYA Coverage of Cheney News Conference [D. Velikiy and B. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 12 Feb 91]	8
Arab Reaction to Gorbachev Remarks [M. Kozhevnikov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 12 Feb 91]	9
Tally of War Losses to 10 February [IZVESTIYA, 12 Feb 91]	10
France's Dumas on One-day Visit to Moscow [A. Balebanov; <i>SELSKAYA ZHIZN</i> , 13 Feb 91]	10
Potential of New Bomb Technology [D. Velikiy, B. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 13 Feb 91]	11
Bush: No 'Immediate Commencement' of Ground Campaign [IZVESTIYA, 13 Feb 91]	12
Baghdad Thought to Call for Wave of Terrorism [I. Belyayev; <i>LITERATURNAYA GAZETA</i> No 6, 13 Feb 91]	13
German Report of Russian Transmission in Iraq [Ye. Savishchev; <i>KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 14 Feb 91]	13
Speculation on Ground Offensive Operations [A. Blinov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 14 Feb 91]	14
Pro-Iraqi Soviets Try to Volunteer to Fight [N. Belan; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 14 Feb 91]	15
Iraqi Defenses include Chemical Mines [V. Belyakov; <i>PRAVDA</i> , 15 Feb 91]	16
Potential Radiation Threat from Bombed Nuclear Facility Assessed [Ye. Ryazantsev; <i>RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA</i> , 16 Feb 91]	17
CPSU CC Commission Urges Gulf War Protest [<i>PRAVDA</i> , 16 Feb 91]	18
Effect of Coalition 'Quadrant' Bombing [B. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 16 Feb 91]	19
Kulikov Sees Threat to USSR From Gulf War [V.G. Kulikov; <i>RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA</i> , 19 Feb 91]	19
Vietnamese, Gulf Wars Compared [A. Kabannikov; <i>KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 19 Feb 91]	21
Intense Air War Signals Coming Ground Campaign [B. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 19 Feb 91]	22
Iraqi Fortifications Obsolete 'by NATO Standards' [V. Nazarenko; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 19 Feb 91]	23
Presidents of Kazakhstan, Kirghizia on Gulf War [<i>KRASNAYA ZVEZDA</i> , 20 Feb 91]	24
IZVESTIYA on Start of Ground Offensive [A. Blinov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 25 Feb 91]	25
Initial Results of Ground Operation [B. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 25 Feb 91]	25
Primakov Details Third Mission to Baghdad [Ye. Primakov; <i>LITERATURNAYA GAZETA</i> No 8, 27 Feb 91]	26
Saddam's Aircraft Sighted Near Baghdad [V. Sisnev; <i>TRUD</i> , 28 Feb 91]	28
Ground Campaign in Kuwait Summarized [D. Belskiy; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 28 Feb 91]	29
IZVESTIYA Notes 'Disorderly' Iraqi Retreat [B. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 28 Feb 91]	30

Coalition's Precision Munitions vs 'Appalling' Iraqi Training

91UM0352A Moscow *NOVOYE VREMYA* in Russian
No 4, Jan 91 pp 24-25

[Interview with Professor Aleksandr Kostyushin, doctor of military sciences, and Oleg Shagov, adviser at the Administration for Arms Limitation and Disarmament of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by unattributed *NOVOYE VREMYA* correspondent; place and date not given: "Smart Weapons in the Arabian Sands"]

[Text] What does the conflict in the Persian Gulf present from the military point of view? What lessons and conclusions can be drawn for the future? This is the subject of conversation between our *NOVOYE VREMYA* correspondent and Professor Aleksandr Kostyushin, doctor of military sciences, and Oleg Shagov, adviser at the Administration for Arms Limitation and Disarmament of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

[*NOVOYE VREMYA*] Might we say that, during the course of combat operations, we are seeing a clash between Western and Soviet weaponry? After all, Moscow has armed the Husayn regime to excess. Judging from the reports, our weaponry has been put to shame.

[Kostyushin] To the first part of your question I will respond—yes. As far as the second part is concerned, we cannot make so unequivocal a statement, because it turns out Soviet weapons are once again ineffective because of the appallingly low level of training of the personnel who service and maintain them. We can say that the air defense system delivered to Iraq by the Soviet Union was suppressed precisely because of the low level of training of Iraqi military personnel.

The anti-Husayn forces are armed with the very latest in military technology, which for the first time is undergoing testing not on the proving grounds but under actual combat conditions, the conditions for which they were specifically created. This is, of course, determining the course of the war to a great degree. But I repeat—personnel training is playing a colossal role. If you compare this with our experience, clearly we have work to be done in this area.

[*NOVOYE VREMYA*] What weapons specifically are undergoing trial by combat for the first time?

[Kostyushin] The American M1-Abrams tank, F-117 Stealth aircraft, the British Tornado aircraft, and several types of artillery. If we see application of the fuel-air explosive bomb—a horrible weapon, and all the more so in open desert terrain—losses on the Iraqi side will be quite significant, for both personnel and light equipment. Such bombs were employed in Vietnam, but only in the jungles for creating helicopter landing pads, not against the Army.

The feature most characteristic of the current war is the fact that never before have such high-accuracy "smart" weapons been employed in such volume. Again, such

weapons were tried out in Vietnam, but years have gone by since that time and the weapons have been perfected. Today they are being employed in their newest modifications.

[*NOVOYE VREMYA*] Reports of their exquisite accuracy—30 centimeters deviation from target—are astonishing.

[Kostyushin] Yes, the Americans have announced that they have such systems. These projectiles guide themselves to target, tracking its illumination—heat, light, or radio illumination.

[Shagov] Among the new weapons systems, I would list the Patriot air defense missile, E-8 intelligence aircraft, and the Tomahawk cruise missile. These too are participating for the first time in actual combat operations. And they have shown great combat attributes.

[*NOVOYE VREMYA*] Iraq has inflicted strikes against Israel using the Soviet Scud missile, but the results have not been great.

[Shagov] These missiles are generally a thing of the past. They may be used in a dual mode—with conventional or nuclear warheads. Iraq created its own modification of these missiles, thereby increasing the range. Their accuracy remains low, however. Iraqi missiles armed with conventional warheads, therefore, have a low combat effectiveness. I think the most important thing to Husayn was the very fact of inflicting strikes against Israel, in order to attempt to provoke them and draw them into the war. And this could lead to a split in the anti-Iraq coalition.

[*NOVOYE VREMYA*] The war is still in full swing, but can we today draw any conclusions for the future? Might it turn out that our own military-industrial complex bangs its fist on the table and says: Enough of disarmament? Or demands new appropriations, citing the qualitative lag in certain areas?

[Shagov] The assets of our military-industrial complex are quite sufficient. Therefore, the question is one of how to manage them assiduously and thriftily. Yet, of course they will demand this. It seems to me that after the war, with them and with us, two points of view will come into conflict. Some will say the crisis has shown that war must be averted through political means. Others will insist on the need for comprehensive development of the new generation of armaments that have gone through the fire of the Arabian sands.

Something else I would like to focus attention on—equipment is becoming so complex that it requires servicing and maintenance specialists who possess the very highest skills. Therefore we have nowhere to hide from the creation of a professional army. This, too, is one of the lessons of the present crisis. And there is one more—quite a somber one. It is entirely apparent that greater and greater reliance will come to be placed on the development and creation of newer high-accuracy systems of nonnuclear "smart" weapons. Clearly the development and perfection of cruise missiles will continue.

But it is precisely these that have become one of the stumbling blocks in our negotiations with the Americans on strategic offensive weapons. The United States can hardly be expected now to agree to close off this channel of the arms race. For even in their nonnuclear configuration, cruise missiles are capable of fulfilling strategic missions. Thus, regretfully I predict we will see complications in future negotiations on disarmament problems.

[Kostyushin] And without a doubt, we will also have to draw some very serious conclusions with respect to arms exports. We need to see a sharp reduction in these and, in any event, it is intolerable to ship armaments to dictatorial regimes of the Husayn variety.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] How do you see events developing from this point?

[Kostyushin] Evidently, we can expect to see the same intense level of operations by tactical and carrier-based aircraft, primarily against mobile targets, command posts of lower and lower echelons, and continued attempts to physically destroy Iraq's military-political leadership, to include using forces within the country. It is entirely likely that we will see a shift en masse of Kurdish soldiers and officers to the side of the coalition forces. Thus the military potential of Iraq will undergo continuous degradation. The main factor will be the liberation of Kuwait. As soon as coalition forces reach the borders of Iraq, we can expect a gesture to the effect of—well, we have liberated the occupied territory but will go no farther; we will not fight the Iraqi people. In the measure of time this may take about a month. However, each day the war is dragged out will be advantageous to the Iraqi regime because of intensified disagreements in the Arab world and the possibility of Arab capitals consolidating on a basis of anti-Americanism. This is forcing the coalition command to intensify its conduct of combat operations and introduce new forces into the battle.

[Shagov] The Americans must under no circumstances drag out the war, for all kinds of considerations—political, and climatic. Bush must not lose the confidence of the people. He must avoid mass casualties of American soldiers.

Early Air War: Following Douhet's Prescription

91UM0313A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
25 Jan 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel M. Ponomarev: "The Picture Begins To Clear"]

[Text] It has long been observed that nowhere do people lie as much as in hunting and at war. Nor have the events in the Persian Gulf been any exception in this respect. Moreover, deception, disinformation, and falsification had been made the basis of the "psychological warfare" which both sides had unleashed against one another even before the start of combat operations and which they are still actively continuing. "Psychological operations,"

THE NEW YORK TIMES emphasizes, "have been sanctioned by three secret directives, which were signed by President Bush."

This enabled the French TF-1 television company to conclude: "There is under way a real 'war of news releases,' which play down one's own losses and exaggerate the losses of the enemy." There is nothing unusual in this under the conditions of wartime. But such a "war," of course, complicates a sober assessment of what is going on and prevents a sufficiently confident forecast of the development of events in the future. Nor for this reason should my observations be taken as the truth in the last instance. But the picture is beginning to clear, and certain trends are emerging increasingly distinctly.

From the very outset the United States and its allies put the emphasis on inflicting a devastating assault against Iraq from the air. Operations developed in accordance with the prescription offered 70-80 years ago by the Italian General G. Douhet. He believed that, having gained domination in the air, it was possible achieving total victory with attacks on the enemy's government and economic centers. True, this doctrine was not borne out during World War II and also in the course of military operations in Korea and Vietnam. But even today it appears very attractive to many prominent military figures of the West. It is believed that the modern level of development of technology makes it possible with air strikes if not to conclusively crush the enemy, then, at least, to inflict on him a decisive defeat.

It was in accordance with this script that military operations in the Persian Gulf originally developed. Allied aircraft have already carried out more than 10,000 combat sorties. Most important centers and military targets of Iraq have been subjected to missile and bombing attacks. However, despite the numerous high-flown reports of the multinational force command, decisive success in the course of the aerial Blitzkrieg has not been achieved. The first reports on this score have had to be disavowed. Nonetheless, combat operations are unfolding with a preponderance in favor of the anti-Iraq coalition. Various reasons are being cited here. We may distinguish among them, in my view, the following.

First, the Pentagon and the command of the multinational force succeeded to a certain extent in achieving operational-tactical surprise. It does not seem that Iraq was expecting military operations to be initiated as early as the night of 17 January.

Second, the American Armed Forces are saturated with the latest types of weapons and combat equipment. This applies primarily to electronic warfare, which has been employed on such an extensive scale for the first time in the history of warfare and which has seriously hampered the operations of Iraq's air defense, aircraft, and command and communications system. The extensive use—also for the first time in history—of precision, "smart" weapons created on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology—laser, electronic, and so

forth, pertains here. The use of such weapons has made it possible to achieve exceptional accuracy of target destruction.

Third, mention has to be made of certain blunders of the Iraqi command. It was initially unable, evidently, to organize due countermeasures to the attackers. The experience of the eight-year war against Iran, in the course of which Baghdad had clear military-technical superiority, did it a poor turn and engendered smugness and complacency.

However, as far as it is possible to judge, Iraq's regular military forces ultimately proved capable of countering the latest weapons and methods of armed struggle. In addition, Iraq has declared with a certain amount of justification that it has won the "first round" and that "Bush's game, based on the achievement of a swift victory with the aid of the latest technology, has failed."

What is at the basis of such statements? Contrary to the first communiques of American military figures and the news media, Iraq's air defense system has not been smashed. It is now being said that Iraq deliberately did not use its full might in the course of the first attacks in order not to reveal it to the enemy ahead of time. Baghdad has also succeeded in preserving the bulk of its combat aircraft, dispersed and concealed in shelters ahead of time. The initial reports concerning the destruction of Iraqi missiles capable of striking at a range of the order of 600 km have not been confirmed—the American air assaults were carried out to a considerable extent against skillfully prepared mockups and other decoys. The reports on the alleged total elimination of nuclear centers and chemical and biological weapons centers were also exaggerated, to put it mildly.

Nonetheless, Baghdad's statement about winning the "first round" also pertains to the sphere of clear exaggeration. Yes, Washington is already talking increasingly now about the fact that the war is assuming a protracted nature and will last not days but a minimum of several weeks and perhaps months and that it will be necessary to commit large-scale ground forces to the fighting. But this does not, for all that, change the overall picture. Allied superiority in the air and at sea—even given approximate equivalence on land—speaks for itself. It is no accident that Iraq has been unable to wrest the strategic initiative from the allies, carry out active operations against their air force, and transfer combat operations to the ground fronts.

Baghdad's assertiveness is being manifested only in the launching of Scud missile strikes against Saudi Arabia and also Israel. However, these attacks are having no purely military effect. To some extent because the missiles have been modified for an increase in range, but made considerably heavier here and may now carry a relatively small charge of conventional explosive. And, most importantly, the Americans have had a very considerable means of combating them. We are talking about the Patriot missiles, which can destroy aerial targets, including enemy missiles, at a range of up to 100

km or altitudes of 30 down to 1.5 km. Estimated kill probability is, it is reported, 0.9. These estimates have been borne out by practice also to some extent.

Reports are coming out of the Persian Gulf zone increasingly to the effect that, together with the continuing intensive air raids against targets in Iraq and Kuwait, the ground forces are beginning to display greater activity. Washington has approved a plan for a flanking attack by these forces, bypassing the grouping of Iraqi forces concentrated in Kuwait and southern Iraq. The special combat group "Ripper" composed of subunits of Marines, whose job it will be to be the first to attack the so-called "Saddam line"—a system of fortifications along the Saudi-Kuwait border—is being formed also. But this will be the next stage of the military operations.

As far as we can tell, such a development of events can hardly be avoided. S. Husayn is flat-out refusing to comply with the demand of the world community for a withdrawal of forces from Kuwait. And the United States is beginning to talk ever more loudly about the fact that the mission of its armed forces should not be confined to the liberation of Kuwait. The war should be prosecuted, allegedly, until Iraq has been completely smashed and its military potential wiped out.

Washington and the other capitals also understand that a high price will have to be paid for the achievement of this goal. A more sober mood has come to replace the first days' euphoria. There is no longer any talk of a swift and bloodless victory.

Possible Consequences of Protracted, Widening War

*91UF0473A Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian
No 5, 25-31 Jan 91 p 1*

[Dmitriy Volskiy "70 Lines" column: "First Lessons of the War"]

[Text] Only a short time has elapsed since war erupted in the Persian Gulf, but the first conclusions may already be drawn. First, however, we should look back a little, at the recent past.

Before my eyes are reinforcing bars bent by explosions and ferroconcrete structures, covered with the unrelenting sand, scattered many kilometers. This is all that was left of an Iraqi oil-distillation complex situated in the vicinity of the Gulf. Not after the present bombing, it is true, but after the recent war with Iran. It was hardly over before not far off, like a desert mirage, there emerged a unique structure of glass and alloys—a new airport for the commercial city of al-Basrah. Is it still intact today? Iraq had only just begun to recover from one war before it immediately found itself involved in another, even more devastating. And this is not simply the whim of fate.

The whole world knew full well that it was Saddam Husayn, obsessed with a desire to establish his domination over the oil-bearing zone of the Gulf, who unleashed the war with Iran. The world knew, but remained silent.

And the United States even prompted Baghdad to attack Khomeyni Iran, which it hated. We, on the other hand, counting the Baghdad regime as a "natural ally in the anti-imperialist struggle," persistently supplied it with weapons. Together with China and the West European countries, incidentally. Thus it was all this connivance, to put it no more strongly, on the part of the most influential states that untied Saddam Husayn's hands for the new aggression which brought about the present war.

The aggressor is now incurring just punishment. But one feels here not satisfaction but, rather, distress and alarm. And not only from a natural sympathy with the Iraqi people but also from fear in the face of the consequences of a protracted war. It is clear that it could spill over beyond the framework of the aims outlined by the well-known Security Council Resolution 678. There are circles that would like not to confine themselves to the liberation of Kuwait but to take advantage of the situation to wipe out Iraq's entire military and economic potential and, perhaps, dismember the country, maybe.

For his part, Saddam Husayn, having proclaimed Allah's "great battle" against Satan, does not conceal the fact that he sees as the sole way out of the trap into which he has driven his country the globalization of the conflict. Missile attacks on Israel, an appeal to Iran to enter the war, the first terrorist acts—these bear this out. As also the Muslim demonstrations in support of Saddam Husayn.

This is why it is so necessary now to shorten the time frame of the war and localize it to the liberation of Kuwait. There are opportunities for this. After all, combat operations have yet to assume irreversible inertia, which affords an opportunity for a new "pause for peace." At the same time, however, reports are coming from Baghdad concerning intensified discord at the top and ferment in the masses, which would help realize such a "pause." The diplomatic efforts of various countries would come in useful here.

It is very important in this connection that, in spite of the pressure of the conservatives, Moscow's policy in the Gulf region has not changed following the resignation of E. Shevardnadze. We support the Security Council resolution, as before, and are interacting politically with the United States and the West European and Arab states that have dispatched troops as part of the "multinational force." But continuation of our contacts with Baghdad and also with its supporters, primarily in the PLO—contacts that the Western powers do not have—is useful also.

We, on the other hand, have a vital need for the speediest termination of the war in the Gulf. It is not for nothing that it has been necessary to declare a state of high combat readiness in the southern military districts. And the measures to safeguard environmental security are appropriate also. For who knows what lethal clouds, toxic rain and other monsters as yet unknown, bacteriological, say, could move north in the event of an escalation of the war.

But the main real danger lies elsewhere even—in the fact that the violence virus has a tendency to spread rapidly, and there is favorable soil in our country for this. Reliable barriers to it cannot be erected unless compliance with the wishes of the world community is achieved. It is its wishes and interests common to all mankind, not dubious strategic calculations and ideological cliches, by which we should be guided at this time. Which, of course, applies not just to the Soviet Union alone.

'Many' Iraqi Air Defense Radars Held in Reserve

91UM0377B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
29 Jan 91 p 3

[Article by Andrey Balebanov: "The Knot of Military Conflict Tightens"]

[Text] Expectations that a U.S. victory over Iraq would be quick, easy, and relatively painless have turned out to be unjustified. Moreover, despite the fact that virtually no opposition has been offered to the air attacks against Iraq, the threat of a protracted and bloody ground war seems to be coming increasingly real. Military experts are suggesting that a considerable part of Iraq's military might has still not been used, and that S. Husayn's strategy is to drag out combat actions for as long as possible.

Among the flood of reports coming in from the theater of military operations in these last hours, only the main reports have been selected. The Pentagon has given permission in certain circumstances to use nonlethal war gases. Aircraft of the United States and its allies have in these last days continued to bomb Iraqi positions, and in turn, Iraq has again and again launched missile attacks against Saudi Arabia. Baghdad has openly threatened to use weapons of mass destruction against the multinational forces and Israel. And Israel has announced that it intends to retaliate against Iraq at a time of its own choosing. In addition, S. Husayn has stated that Iraq has some kind of new weapon that it will soon be using.

We will not spend our time guessing at what the Iraqi president had in mind, but it is already possible to talk about another weapon that Iraq does have—oil. Representatives of the United States have accused Iraq of ecological terrorism. According to those representatives, Baghdad has been pumping oil into the sea through the pipelines. As a result, an enormous oil slick has appeared on the surface of the Persian Gulf near Kuwait. It has reached the shores of Saudi Arabia, and over the weekend American television was showing terrible pictures of dead nature. Observers share the opinion that this action by Iraq is designed to hamper a possible landing by the allies from the sea onto the shores of Kuwait. However, Baghdad is blaming the United States for what has happened, and is claiming that the appearance of the oil slick is the result of American shooting at two Iraqi tankers.

These mutual recriminations are only part of the powerful propaganda war that is accompanying the combat

actions. The two sides have their own versions of military operations. Iraq is citing quite unbelievable figures for destroyed allied aircraft, but it has also become clear that the American estimates, particularly during the early days, were exaggerated. For example, there were many statements about how effectively targets in the Iraqi air defenses had been interdicted and destroyed. It has now become known that during the first days the Iraqis simply did not switch on many radars in order to save missile installations for the future.

Be that as it may, one thing is already clear, namely, that the war will be protracted and cruel. In the words of American representatives, the allies must prepare themselves for losses, and for possible successes by Iraqi troops. Incidentally, American military people are reckoning to minimize their losses by continuing the air raids, which are designed to destroy as many Iraqi fortified points as possible. However, according to reports in the English *OBSERVER*, some experts believe that the massive strikes from the air against Iraq should be reduced. They suggest that the United States has already expended almost half of its cruise missiles, and that the fatigue of the crews must be considered, and also the need for preventive maintenance and repairs.

In short, the knot of the military conflict is tightening even more in the Persian Gulf.

Patriot Missile System Detailed

91UM0341A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Jan 91 First Edition p 5

[USSR Armed Forces General Staff response to reader's letter, published under the rubric "From Reliable Sources": "The Patriot Versus the al-Husayn"]

[Text] I keep reading that one more or even several Iraqi missiles have been shot down by the American Patriot SAM missile systems. What kind of a missile system is this, and what are its capabilities?

[Signed] S. Serov, Moscow.

The Patriot surface-to-air missile [SAM] system is designed to destroy supersonic air targets at a range of up to 70 km and an altitude of up to 24 km. One system is able to fire at up to nine targets simultaneously, and it has a kill probability of 0.9 (when used against ballistic missiles—0.25).

The Persian Gulf War is the first time the Patriot SAM has been used under combat conditions. As is reported, it has shown itself very effective at repulsing strikes by Iraq's al-Husayn ballistic missiles (created on the basis of the Soviet missiles known by the name Scud) on the territory of Saudi Arabia and Israel. Nonetheless, a significant portion of the Iraqi missiles have reached their targets, which proves that this SAM is not an "absolutely reliable" air defense weapon as is sometimes depicted in the press.

The Patriot was developed by the firm Raytheon and adopted by the U.S. Armed Forces in 1982. It makes use

of a series of new technical decisions, in particular a phased-array radar unit with high-speed computer equipment. The system includes a multifunctional radar unit, a command and control point, surface-to-air guided missiles in transport-launch containers, launchers for up to eight containers (four missiles in each), a power supply, communications equipment and auxiliary maintenance equipment.

The MIM-104 surface-to-air guided missile (length—5.2 m, diameter—0.41 m, weight about 1,000 kg) was developed by the firm Martin-Marietta. This is a one-stage solid-fuel missile with a semiactive homing head and a fragmentation warhead weighing about 80 kg. Control and guidance to the target is carried out by combined means using radar: At the middle portion of the flight trajectory radio command is used, and at the end the so-called "through missile tracking" method, whereby the station uses data received by the sensors of the missile itself.

In addition to the U.S. forces, the armed forces of other NATO countries and Japan are also equipped with the Patriot.

IZVESTIYA: Iraqi Morale Falling, Surrenders, Desertions Increasing

91UM0340A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1, 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA special correspondents D. Velikiy and B. Ivanov: "Persian Gulf: Allied Supremacy in the Air and at Sea"]

[Text] Riyadh—**The forces of the anti-Iraq coalition have achieved total superiority in operations on the sea and in the air. This was stated by a joint allied command spokesman.**

The events of recent days have demonstrated the utter incapacity of Iraq's naval forces to put up serious resistance to the naval forces of the United States and its allies, General Robert Johnston, chief of staff of the American military contingent, told journalists. According to him, right from the start of combat operations Iraq's warships have not once in fact attempted to engage in actions of an offensive nature, confining themselves to mining Kuwait's coastal waters and an episodic foray into the central areas of the Gulf. As of the present the Iraqi Navy has practically ceased to exist as the result of strikes by the coalition forces—ships and on-board aviation. All 55 missile-firing warships constituting the backbone of Iraq's Navy have been destroyed. In addition, a further 30 ships have been considerably damaged, as a consequence of which they can no longer be used for active military operations in the future.

As far as the air situation is concerned, in the past several days Iraqi aircraft have not appeared in the theater at all. The reason is a whole number of factors. First, two weeks after the start of the war it is increasingly difficult for the Iraqis to "patch up" the airfields periodically destroyed by coalition aviation. Second, in the course of the

massive bombing attacks many aircraft in underground shelters have sustained such serious damage that eliminating it in the current situation is simply impossible. And, finally, to all appearances, the Iraqis are beginning to experience serious fuel difficulties, which is forcing them to cut back sharply on the flights of their aircraft, which are infrequent as it is. In addition, according to reports being received here, morale even among Iraqi pilots—the acknowledged elite of Iraq's Armed Forces—is falling precipitously. The heavy losses sustained by the Iraqis in the air fighting—all aerial engagements between Iraqi and allied aircraft have so far ended in the defeat of the Iraqis—are having a very dispiriting effect on the psychological state of the flight personnel of Baghdad's aviation.

The mass surrender of Iraqis in the course of the fighting at Ras al-Khafji, which IZVESTIYA has already reported, also testifies to the fall in morale in the Iraqi Army and to the fact that the soldiers are in fact fighting merely on pain of punishment. In the course of the fighting, which lasted, with interludes, almost 24 hours, 30 Iraqi soldiers were killed, 37 wounded and... 429 taken prisoner. According to the POW's, officers included, they knew full well that their offensive was an adventure which was doomed to fail and would never have ventured to move against the coalition forces had it not been for the corresponding threats from the command "to deal summarily with those who refused to go on the attack."

Yet further confirmation of the trouble in the Iraqi Armed Forces is the following military episode of recent days. A small Iraqi warship attempted to slip unseen into Iranian territorial waters, but was intercepted by allied naval forces.

As a result of this operation 35 Iraqi sailors were taken prisoner and frankly welcomed this turn of events. As Kuwaiti Army Major Ibrahim, who interrogated them, reported, the prisoners communicated the sensational news that the order to enter Iranian waters had been received from the Iraqi naval command. A courier had come from headquarters with the corresponding instructions "from the very top," and the sailors, not tarrying, left the port of Umm Qasr, after which they were intercepted. Explaining the order they had received, they confirm that the Iraqi command is convinced of the impossibility of preserving its Navy any other way. Also well known in headquarters is the mood of the Iraqi sailors, who, given a convenient opportunity, would surrender, despite the propaganda being conducted among them concerning "the Americans' inhuman attitude toward POW's." In order to prevent sailors from deserting, concentrated cordons have been set up in the port: Special services catch deserters and send them back to their ships. "I do not know what we are fighting for," a 27-year-old Iraqi ship's captain said, expressing the general mood of the crew.

Meanwhile, aside from the reports on the obvious successes of allied bomber and fighter aviation in the destruction of military targets in Iraq and Kuwait,

reports are coming in also on the fact that civilians are becoming casualties of the bombing.

"The Baghdad Road is a hellish road," say Jordanian drivers who have been in Iraq in the past several days. Jordan is continuing to obtain oil from Iraq, and right until recently its tankers were filling up not far from Baghdad. However, this practice is now being cut back appreciably on account of the fact that certain Jordanian vehicles and their drivers have become casualties of the bombing. REUTER correspondent Bernd Debusmann, who had been in Baghdad, says that on the road leading to the Jordanian border he saw several bombed and burned-out oil tankers and their dead drivers. Several trucks and passenger vehicles had been burned out on the bomb- and missile-cratered highway.

The Jordanian Foreign Ministry accused the coalition command of the deliberate destruction of oil tankers from Jordan and also trucks and passenger vehicles. In turn, command spokesmen maintain that allied aviation attacks are aimed exclusively against strategic facilities and military targets; part of their mission is to reduce to a minimum the number of casualties among the civilian population.

'400 AH-64 Apaches Nullify Iraqi Tank Superiority'

91UM0353A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 6 Feb 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by Colonel D. Belskiy under the rubric "Business and Death Go Hand in Hand": "Opinion of a Commentator"]

[Text] A blitzkrieg in the war against Iraq has not taken place. That, of course, would be the ideal plan for punishing the aggressor. But the question arises: Could it have happened at all?

The war in the Persian Gulf has already offered several surprises. Iraq has become the first Arab country to show that it can carry out missile strikes against Israel. After all, the Israelis were convinced that they were invincible as they threatened the Arab countries. And how should we view that fact that Israel, armed with the modern "Patriot" system, nonetheless let through the ballistic missile strikes of Iraq?

At first glance, Iraq's relative military passivity seemed unexpected. However what did its insufficiently aggressive reaction to the actions of the anti-Iraq coalition mean? Is it possible that there is some plan behind this? Perhaps this is the reason for the delay in carrying out missile strikes, at first on Israel and later on Saudi Arabia. Are not Iraq's missile volleys an adjustment of fire, a preparation for more serious actions?

For the time being one may say that combat operations have slowed down. At the same time, the idea of a new type of modern blitzkrieg remains the basis of the plan of action of the coalition forces carrying out the "Desert

Storm" operation. General Norman Schwarzkopf, commanding general of forces, believes that it is the first trial of the post-Vietnam American military doctrine of "Air-Land Battle."

The geography of the war has been extended to both sea and land. A landmark occurred, for example, with the destruction of strategically important objectives using "Tomahawk" cruise missiles from missile-armed submarines based in the Mediterranean and Red Seas. Prior to this, cruise missiles were only used from the direction of the Persian Gulf. Now their trajectory lies across the airspace of Turkey, Egypt, Israel, and perhaps Syria. The coalition forces, by all appearances, are preparing for a major ground attack. In all probability, a gigantic operation is coming up that will include strikes against Kuwait from all sides. One component of it should be the execution of a "general plan to use the armored forces of the multinational coalition."

Perhaps the most important thing in the present situation is the choice of the time and precise direction of the strikes and the methods of delivering them. The decision of President Bush to permit the American Air Force to enter the territory of Iraq gives them the opportunity to outflank Iraqi subunits in Kuwait. This would mean that combat operations may be conducted significantly north of the Iraqi city of Basrah.

In southern Iraq and Kuwait the Iraqi combat force numbers 545,000 men, 4,200 tanks, 2,800 armored vehicles, and about 3,100 artillery weapons. To the north of Kuwait are concentrated crack tank divisions of the Iraqi Republican Guard numbering 15,000 men.

The job of destroying such a combat force is quite difficult. The forces of the two sides are considered equal. However, the attackers, as specialists believe based on the traditional laws of military art, should achieve a superiority in men and equipment of at least a factor of three. Especially considering the fact that all along the Saudi-Kuwaiti border antitank ditches have been dug out and mine fields have been laid. This strip has been named "the Saddam line." One part of it is an earthen rampart 90 km in length and 25 meters high. On its far side is a ditch. It has been filled with oil which, in the event of an attempt to surmount it, will be set on fire. The approaches are mined. It is presumed that overcoming it will be a very difficult task. Nonetheless, a special "Ripper" group has been formed for this job from subunits of the Marines.

What kind of assault will be selected for operations by the coalition forces? According to Marine Corps General (Retired) George Crist, "it will be a powerful tank assault... perhaps, followed up by landing forces... We will operate so quickly that the Iraqis will not have time to figure out what is happening." But how will the operation really unfold?

Only one thing is clear at present—Baghdad still has a powerful military machine despite the fact that the assault of the coalition forces was fairly severe. As it now appears, Iraq was virtually able to pull its forces through

those mighty air and missile strikes. It still holds ballistic missiles as well, and the Iraqi Air Force conducted a secret maneuver ahead of time and transferred a significant portion of its combat aircraft to the northern regions of the country, hiding them in special concrete hangars able to protect the aircraft through the most severe bombardments. And finally, the creation by the Iraqis of a system of fake targets deserves attention. They cannot be identified even by American reconnaissance satellites. And the strikes fell on them to a significant degree. It turned out that of 49 objectives that were bombed on the first day of the war, 30 were fake.

At the present moment it is possible to state that the actions of the Iraqi Air Force will depend on the ability of the pilots to fly without navigational systems, which were put out of action to a significant degree as a result of the first strikes. Another circumstance fettering the Iraqi Air Force is the substantial destruction of runways and the continuing bombardment of airfields and hangars.

It must be said nonetheless that the first strikes on Iraqi combat forces by American and English helicopters have demonstrated their effectiveness. According to the calculations of specialists, only 400 of the newest AH-64 Apache combat helicopters were able to nullify the superiority of Iraqi forces in tanks. Undoubtedly the Iraqi military leadership is soberly evaluating the qualitative component of the coalition combat force.

At the same time the war is taking on an increasingly destructive character. The Iraqis have begun to implement their longstanding plan of turning the Kuwaiti oil fields into a "sea of fire." To begin with, oil wells in Wafrah and Ash Shu'aybah and installations in the oil port of Mina' Abdallah were set afire. Then a huge quantity of oil was released into the sea from the terminals at Sea Island. Iraqi forces managed to temporarily seize Ras al-Khafji. They also attacked two other population centers on the Kuwaiti-Saudi border. Should not these be interpreted as a probing action or diversionary attacks? Undoubtedly the attacks were undertaken to demonstrate the capability of the Iraqi military for aggressive operations.

Western Firms' Role in Developing Iraqi Chemical Capability

*91UM0353B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 6 Feb 91 First Edition p 5*

[Article by V. Katin, IAN special correspondent for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, under the rubric "Business and Death Go Hand in Hand": "Bombs for the President"]

[Text] Luxembourg—While preparations were underway for military operations against Iraq, the Western press emphasized in every possible way that Saddam Husayn's military is equipped for the most part with Soviet-manufactured weapons... Now that the weapons themselves are being put to use, the story has begun to reflect reality to a greater extent. It turns out that more than

1,000 companies from all over the world delivered weapons, ammunition, and the newest equipment to the Iraqi regime. But that is only one side of the problem, the tip of the iceberg so to say, inasmuch as the world weapons market is a legal phenomenon.

The most important aspect was hidden elsewhere. It has become known for certain that Western firms supplied the Iraqi dictator with a huge quantity of the most up-to-date weapons of mass destruction, including chemical, bacteriological, and binary weapons. There is even a precise number for such suppliers: There were 207 Western concerns, enterprises, and laboratories involved in the production and sale to Baghdad of types of weapons that are prohibited by international conventions. Several West German firms were caught literally red-handed: They were sending their products to Iraq even after the introduction of the embargo! For example, the procuracy of Hamburg instituted proceedings against a company of that city, Rotexchemie Internationale, which is accused of deliveries to the Iraqis last autumn of potassium cyanide for production of deadly gases.

In all, as it comes out, 59 major FRG firms took part in the creation of a giant military chemical plant in Samarra'. The chief suppliers were the Karl Kalb company and the Swiss consortium "Konsen Grup" [as transliterated]. Now that witnesses or, more accurately, West German and Austrian specialists working in Iraq during 1983-1987 have begun to speak up, the terrifying details have become known. Production of the terrible gas "Cyclone B," which the Nazis used to kill people in concentration camps, was set up in Samarra'. That gas, according to a Red Cross commission, was used by the Iraqis in the war against Iran, resulting in 5,000 deaths.

Such information would probably have remained a secret for much longer. But when Saddam Husayn publicly threatened the use of "a special weapon," implying a chemical weapon, the Western world became concerned and began a search for the firms and specialists who took part in that ill-advised project. The problem was to find out as much as possible about the chemical and bacteriological potential of Iraq in order to find an antidote. As a result, some of the information reached the press and became known to the public. On this subject the French FIGARO writes heatedly, "For two decades Iraq has been a genuine El Dorado for Western producers of all types of weapons, having received the nod from their governments..." Business and death, as we see, go hand in hand.

IZVESTIYA Coverage of Cheney News Conference

91UM0354A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Feb 91 Union Edition p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondents D. Velikiy and B. Ivanov: "The Offensive Could Begin Any Day Now"]

[Text] Riyadh—A news conference crowned the two-day visit of U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney and Powell,

chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, to Saudi Arabia, in the course of which they were received by Saudi monarch Fahd and Jabir al-Sabah, amir of Kuwait, and they also held consultations of many hours' duration with N. Schwarzkopf, commander of American forces and the multinational force, and representatives of the command of the military contingents of the other countries participating in the anti-Iraq coalition, ascertaining in detail various aspects of the situation that has taken shape at the front.

As soon as the head of the American military department mounted the platform, he was literally showered with questions: The journalists wanted to know when the start might be expected of large-scale military operations with the participation of the coalition's ground forces, on the need for and inevitability of which there has been so much talk here of late. However, the reporters did not obtain answers to their questions—Cheney skillfully and painstakingly avoiding giving any specific timeframe, emphasizing that the final decision on this matter would be made directly by the U.S. President following obligatory consultations with the anti-Iraq coalition allies. Our job, he said, is to present the White House with the appropriate recommendations.

Nonetheless, some of the Pentagon head's words in the course of the news conference were highly notable if only because they reflect not his personal position but the viewpoint of the primarily American coalition command as regards the situation which has taken shape at the front. In brief, they amount to the following.

In the period of military operations allied forces, primarily aviation and naval forces, have inflicted really serious damage on the Iraqi Army, which occupies fourth place in the world in terms of numbers of personnel and power of combat equipment. Of course, now, following almost four weeks of nonstop shelling and bombing, it no longer possesses its former potential but is, nonetheless, still quite strong and capable of doing a good deal. The Iraqis are still perfectly capable of springing surprises. They could, say, employ chemical warheads on the Scud missiles and could attempt a ground offensive or mount some other operation. However—and this is what is most important—whatever Baghdad does, it is not in a position to alter or even somehow influence the dynamics of the development of events pointing to the inevitable victory of the multinational force. Theoretically Iraq could still slow down the progress of the military campaign, but is simply powerless to turn it back.

As far as the start of ground operations is concerned, even if such a decision is made, this would by no means signify that the "air war," which has proven extraordinarily effective, would end. Regardless of the entry of ground forces into the war, the air attacks would in all probability continue.

The question of the timing of the start of large-scale ground fighting officially remains open as yet. The following fact is noticed in this connection.

Information that the American military command is advocating a continuation only of air operations for at least another month in order, as before, to pulverize the Iraqi military machine with minimum losses, without becoming involved in a ground engagement, has begun to filter through into journalist circles in recent days. Earlier the same thought had been glimpsed repeatedly in public statements of certain high-ranking Pentagon officials.

However, such statements have encountered much skepticism here. Local diplomatic circles are noting a certain similarity between the actions of the American command on the eve of the start of military operations three weeks ago and the present steps it is taking now on the threshold of possible ground operations. There suddenly came to be heard at that time, as if on command, in both Washington and among the military in Saudi Arabia, voices saying that the United States would be ready for battle no earlier than the end of January and that the approach of 15 January—the limit set by the UN resolution for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait—did not mean that war might begin the following day. The war in fact began on 17 January and came as a surprise to Baghdad, a large contribution to this having been, specialists believe, such “lulling” statements on the part of the Americans. Now, it would seem, the situation is being repeated. Only now the Americans are trying to confuse the Iraqi leadership as to the day and hour that the “battle for Kuwait” will begin.

And, further, several hours after the U.S. defense secretary's news conference, we managed to speak with a military source with connections in coalition command circles. According to him, the latter are convinced that in order to finally smash the Iraqi Army an extraordinarily serious effort and the concentrated use of all available forces and assets will be required and that this goal, however successful the air campaign, cannot, it would seem, be achieved without large-scale ground operations, preparations for which have indeed been in full swing the whole of the past week.

“So we have now entered a phase where a ground offensive could begin practically any day.”

“What, then, about the talk about the need for an extra month of air bombardment?” “This is a good reason for you journalists to argue about this. In addition, you will see that in the next few days there will be, most likely, many surprise statements both across the Atlantic and here also, which have just one purpose—to confuse the Iraqis as much as possible as regards our true intentions.”

Arab Reaction to Gorbachev Remarks

91UM0354B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Kozhevnikov: “Al-Basrah in Ruins”]

[Text] Damascus—The statement of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev in connection with the events in the Persian Gulf has been received with great interest in the Arab world. Its timeliness is obvious. The war in the Gulf is assuming a highly dangerous nature, and many countries of the Arab East are observing with alarm how not only the military but also the economic potential of Iraq is being methodically destroyed. The assurances of American and other Western spokesmen that allied aviation is not bombing residential neighborhoods are being received with skepticism.

The Soviet Union's concern over the expanding scale of the war and the real danger of other states becoming involved in it is consonant with the now prevailing mood among the Arabs. Commenting on the course of the military operations, many of my Syrian partners have expressed anger at the multinational force's manifest exceeding of the UN Security Council mandate. Yes, they said, Saddam Husayn is an aggressor, and he should be forced to leave Kuwait, but by no means at the price of the total destruction of Iraq—one of the most developed Arab states. The Palestinians are even more radical in their opinions, believing that the United States and its allies have taken advantage of the situation to change the balance of forces in the region in their favor and to the benefit of Israel.

Meanwhile militant cries and threats against the participants in the anti-Iraq coalition are, as before, coming from Baghdad. A correspondent of Radio Monte Carlo quoted an article in the government newspaper AL-JUMHURIYAH which maintains that Iraq is fully prepared for a ground engagement with the multinational force. The newspaper expressed confidence that the troops of the Iraqi Army and its high martial spirit are a sure guarantee of victory.

According to reports from Jordan, Sa'dun Hammadi, deputy prime minister of Iraq, who was paying a brief visit, called on the Arab countries to immediately sever diplomatic, economic, and all other relations with the states participating “in the aggression against the Iraqi people.” Speaking at a news conference in Amman, he categorically rejected the report which had appeared that Iraqi servicemen were fleeing from the battlefield and crossing over to the side of the enemy. Not long before this statement was made, AP transmitted information on the voluntary surrender of several Iraqi soldiers and officers who had shown up carrying a white flag at an American position not far from the Saudi-Kuwaiti border.

S. Hammadi declined to respond to a question concerning Iraq's military losses, but acknowledged that many peaceful inhabitants had died as the result of air raids against Iraqi localities.

Radio Monte Carlo reported, citing refugees from Iraq, that the city of al-Basrah and its suburbs had in recent days been subjected to massive bombing practically round the clock. Witnesses describe the great devastation, the disruption of the power and water supply to the

city, and the acute shortage of food and basic necessities. A recent visitor to al-Basrah was Ramsey Clark, the well-known American lawyer and peace movement activist and former U.S. attorney general. As AP reported, he confirmed that thousands of Iraqis were casualties of the bombing attacks.

Tally of War Losses to 10 February

91UM0360A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Feb 91 Union Edition p 5

[Unattributed article: "The Losses of Both Sides Multiply"]

[Text] According to AFP, the French information agency, losses as of 2100 GMT 10 February of the multinational forces (MNS) and Iraq since the beginning of combat operations [deystviye] in the Persian Gulf have comprised:

Combat losses (according to data of the MNS).

Allies: 30 airplanes (21 American, six British, one Italian, one Kuwaiti, and one Saudi), of which 25 airplanes were lost in the course of carrying out combat missions, and four American helicopters.

—missing in action: 26 Americans, nine Saudis, six British, one Italian, and one Kuwaiti (excluding prisoners whose capture has been confirmed by the MNS).
—killed: 12 Americans in the course of combat oppositions and 18 Saudis in the village of Ras al-Khafji.

Iraq: 134 airplanes (99 destroyed on the ground and 35 shot down in air battles), four helicopters, and 54 naval craft. According to a Pentagon representative in Riyadh, more than 750 tanks (out of 4,000), more than 650 artillery weapons (out of approximately 3,200), and more than 600 armored personnel carriers (out of approximately 4,000) have been destroyed. According to reports of the Saudis, the allies have captured 11 tanks and 70 armored personnel carriers;

—killed: According to data of the Saudis, 30 Iraqis in Ras al-Khafji.

The allies refuse to give general estimates of Iraq's troop losses.

Losses among the civilian population (according to data of the MNS).

Saudi Arabia: One killed, 71 wounded.

Israel: Two killed under debris, 298 wounded.

According to reports from Jordanian sources, 14 people have been killed and 26 wounded in the course of allied fire upon transport columns on the Amman-Baghdad highway.

Prisoners.

—according to allied data, 1032 Iraqis have been captured or surrendered since the beginning of combat operations. In addition, 418 Iraqi soldiers surrendered to the allies before the beginning of combat operations;

—13 servicemen of the allies (Baghdad has named 10). The United States has acknowledged the capture of eight, the United Kingdom—of two, and Kuwait—of one. In addition, according to reports from Baghdad one more Briton and one Kuwaiti have also been captured. According to Baghdad reports, one prisoner who had not disclosed his nationality died during an air strike by the allies on the Iraqi capital, and several others were wounded.

Iraq has also announced new prisoners captured in Ras al-Khafji comprising Americans (including several female soldiers), Saudis, and representatives of other countries.

Combat Losses (according to Iraqi data).

Allies: 371 aircraft and missiles shot down.

—killed (according to unconfirmed data): 40 servicemen of the MNS and 38 wounded in the course of fire on the northwestern sector of Saudi Arabia.

Iraq: 91 servicemen killed.

Losses among the civilian population (according to Iraqi data).

Iraq: According to radio Baghdad on Sunday, "There are hundreds of killed and wounded." According to the official representative of Iraq, in the course of the bombings of Baghdad on 21-30 January 108 civilians were killed and 249 people were wounded; in the course of air strikes on Nasiriyah (400 km south of Baghdad) 200 people were killed and about 100 are missing in action.

France's Dumas on One-day Visit to Moscow

91UF0471A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
13 Feb 91 p 5

[Article by Andrey Balebanov under the rubric "Commentator's Opinion": "Peacemaking Is Urgently Required"]

[Text] Rejecting one diplomatic initiative after another proposed by a number of countries and directed towards ending the war in the Persian Gulf, Iraq is essentially making ever more shaky any hopes for ending combat operations before they assume all-encompassing proportions. In his last radio broadcast to the Iraqi people, President Saddam Husayn praised the steadfastness of his troops and declared that his country has no intention of declining the role determined for it by Allah. In spite of what would seem to be a dead end brought about by Baghdad's policies, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev believes it is necessary to set in motion all key factors for reaching a political settlement of the conflict based on the United Nations Security Council resolutions. With this aim in mind the Soviet leader has sent his special representative, Ye.M. Primakov, to Baghdad to meet with Saddam Husayn.

The scope of the war in the Gulf is becoming such that the world community would not have imagined it. And although data on casualties, both on the Iraqi side and

that of the multi-national forces, is hidden and hushed up, it is quite clear that there are casualties, many in fact, including among the peaceful population. Tremendous material damage has already been caused by combat activities, and the spilling of a gigantic quantity of oil into the Persian Gulf may turn into a true ecological disaster. Under these conditions, it would seem that any diplomatic initiative directed towards a swiftest possible cessation of the war must be welcomed in every way. This was a specific area of discussion at a press conference which took place in the Kremlin with A.S. Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs.

As these lines were being written, Roland Dumas, France's minister of foreign affairs, arrived unexpectedly in Moscow on a one-day visit. His arrival goes beyond the framework of a usual visit of the head of the French foreign policy department, not just because he decided to leave Paris at the height of the war in the Persian Gulf, in which his country is directly involved. R. Dumas is the first minister from an anti-Iraq coalition state to visit the Soviet capital since the outbreak of combat operations. It would be logical to assume in this regard that the French minister will be speaking not only on behalf of his own country, but for the entire Western bloc. It is expected that a Soviet-French declaration on the Persian Gulf will be adopted with respect to the results of the Moscow talks.

Meanwhile, the latest reports from the front show that the American command is planning to unleash a ground offensive not sooner than in one to two weeks time. It cannot be ruled out that these plans are simply a camouflage, military cunning designed to assure the element of surprise. And although the Iraqi Army has suffered great casualties, its combat fighting ability has not yet been crushed, a fact which alarms the American military leaders. In the opinion of U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney, the enemy is still too strong to be rushing ahead with a ground attack. The United States is apparently relying on the premise that the more time goes by, the more the Iraqi Army will suffer and the fewer casualties will be endured by the allies. On the other hand, however, American diplomats are seriously beginning to be worried about an explosion of anti-American sentiment in the Arab world.

In order for peace to reign throughout the Middle East, the conflagration of war in the Persian Gulf must be quashed as soon as possible. Today, as events in this part of the globe become ever more dramatic in their nature, a diplomatic offensive by various countries can and must stifle the cannon volleys. Otherwise, the consequences of war may become such that they are irreparable for all mankind.

Potential of New Bomb Technology

*91UM0357A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondents D. Velikiy and B. Ivanov: "Bombs of A New Generation Against the Iraqis"]

[Text] Riyadh—Representatives of the command of the U.S. military contingent admitted that American troops intend to use new types of weapons against Iraqi soldiers in the course of the forthcoming large-scale ground fighting.

At issue are new types of aviation bombs primarily designed to destroy enemy personnel, which have not yet been used in combat. The representatives of the command confirmed that transport aircraft which among other things deliver these aviation bombs arrive in Saudi Arabia from across the ocean almost daily in the course of an airlift operation. They even organized the trip of a small group of reporters, mostly American, to an Air Force base in the eastern area of the country in order to show correspondents that this is no secret. Upon returning, the correspondents told their colleagues what they saw there.

As they say, stocks of modern ordnance designed for air strikes against the positions of Iraqi troops both in the Kuwaiti Theater of Operations and in the territory of Iraq proper are increasing rapidly. This is primarily the case with two varieties of a new generation of aviation bombs—so-called fuel-air explosives and cluster bombs. The fuel-air bombs spray into the air large amounts of a flammable liquid, which is ignited by an explosion. As a result, everything on the ground under this devilish cloud burns instantaneously. Moreover, a high-pressure area is formed in the fire zone which sort of extracts oxygen from underground shelters, dooming the soldiers who are there to death by asphyxiation.

Cluster bombs of a new type explode in the air, spreading around a tremendous number of bomblets and mines over considerable areas. They cover the ground like a dense blanket, becoming "traps" for infantry and combat materiel. In the opinion of Air Force officers, these bombs may obviously be used in the course of fighting at the next stage of hostilities.

Meanwhile, as conferences are being held at the White House at which U.S. Secretary of Defense R. Cheney and Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff C. Powell are briefing the American President about the state of affairs at the front, coalition troops are continuing hostilities for the most part using the Air Force, as has been the case so far. The planes of coalition air forces have flown a total of more than 61,000 sorties since the beginning of the war. Communication lines between Iraq and Kuwait, Iraqi troop positions, and primarily the Republican Guard, as well as airfields, communication centers, and command centers have remained the main targets for missile attacks and bombing raids.

As has become known here, the command of the coalition forces has decided to declare a higher state of troop readiness in order to repulse a probable Iraqi chemical attack. In the opinion of observers, this step has been prompted by the recent bellicose statements by Baghdad on its "readiness to use all types of weapons" in its arsenal.

Additional chemical defense units have been dispatched to the regions of forward deployment of the coalition troops in the last day. They are equipped with mobile field laboratories which may detect within seconds the presence of chemical contamination, determine promptly which one of the 420 possible agents has been used, and immediately generate a printout of appropriate recommendations for defensive measures.

As far as the morale of the Iraqi Army is concerned, it continues to decline, according to defectors. Around-the-clock bombing has been a powerful demoralizing influence on the psyche of Iraqi soldiers, prompting many of them to seek salvation across the front line. Increasing numbers of servicemen from units stationed in Kuwait have succeeded in crossing minefields in front of their lines of defense to surrender. The number of Iraqi prisoners of war has reached 1,000.

This number could be much higher because, as the prisoners themselves say, very many members of the Iraqi Army would have followed their example; however, there are many obstacles. Thus, those deciding to defect first of all have to evade the vigilant eye of military counterintelligence agents who have infiltrated all units and subunits of the Iraqi Army and deal mercilessly with anyone suspected of intending to put down their weapon. As a rule, deserters do not know their true location because it is intentionally concealed from them. The already mentioned minefields pose a substantial danger, as do checkpoints and patrols of Republican Guards to apprehend fugitives. Nonetheless, a considerable influx of prisoners is expected in the immediate future, after a ground offensive begins. Considerable stocks of foodstuffs, tons of rice and beans, have been accumulated for them at the coalition troop positions.

The issue of distributing gas masks to Iraqi deserters for protection against a possible chemical attack has also arisen. It turns out that quite a few Iraqi soldiers do not have them. It has been reported that prisoners of war will be kept in special plastic handcuffs which the guards will be able to cut swiftly if a gas attack signal is given.

Bush: No 'Immediate Commencement' of Ground Campaign

*91UM0355A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Feb 91 Union Edition p 5*

[Article by the IZVESTIYA Press Service: "The White House Prior to Making a Decision"]

[Text] The situation in the zone of the Persian Gulf and the possible development of events in that area were at the center of the attention of participants in a meeting between U.S. President G. Bush and journalists on Monday. After a detailed discussion of the situation with Secretary of Defense R. Cheney and General C. Powell, who have returned from the zone of the conflict, President Bush told correspondents at the White House that the air operations of the coalition forces against the troops of Iraq have been exceptionally effective and that he is not planning the immediate commencement of

potentially bloody ground operations with the goal of ending the occupation of Kuwait.

As REUTERS reported, Bush declared, "We intend to spend as much time as we need in order to determine a date to begin the next stage (of combat operations)." The President refused to give any indication of possible deadlines for the beginning of ground operations, stressing that it might put allied troops in danger.

President Bush energetically rejected the possibility that any outside pressure could push him to decide on an earlier commencement of military operations on the ground. "I have always been convinced of the correctness of our actions. I am even more convinced of their correctness today..." said Bush, as quoted by REUTERS. "And we intend to continue movement along this path."

At the same time, in a conversation with reporters R. Cheney proposed that the commencement of ground operations against the occupying 500,000 strong Iraqi army is inevitable but will not take place in the immediate future. On Sunday the secretary declared: "I am struck by the scale of military preparations of Iraq," which is being viewed as proof of his intentions to continue air attacks on the positions of Iraqi forces for several more weeks.

In a briefing at the Pentagon, Lieutenant General Thomas Kelly, chief of the Operations Section of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces, reported that in the course of the 26th day of "Desert Storm" operations alone, which was one of the longest for the air forces of the coalition since the beginning of the war, the multinational coalition forces carried out more than 2,900 sorties over Iraqi mobile missile launchers, troop locations, and strategic objectives of the enemy. "We have many targets (for air attack), and we have many aircraft," stressed the general. "The wisest thing right now would be to continue what we are already doing and to continue wearing down the enemy."

Analyzing possible variants of further development of the military situation in the Persian Gulf zone, political observers emphasize that one of the decisive factors in determining the nature of the war's future is the form of Israel's involvement in the conflict. In conjunction with this, all news agencies are paying particular attention to the visit of Moshe Arens, Israeli minister of defense, to the United States. Arens has conducted negotiations with President George Bush, Vice President Dan Quayle, Secretary of State James Baker, and Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney.

After a conversation at the White House with the head of the American administration, Arens told reporters that he had informed the president of the situation in Israel "existing as a result of the continuing war in the Persian Gulf region," "of victims from among the civilian population," and of the damage created by Iraq's missile attacks.

In turn, Marlin Fitzwater, the official representative of the White House, told journalists that Arens arrived in

Washington "to discuss the general situation in the Persian Gulf," as well as bilateral economic ties, "including economic aid from the United States to Israel."

Baghdad Thought to Call for Wave of Terrorism

*91UF0470A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 6, 13 Feb 91 p 1*

[Article by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer Igor Belyayev: "Persian Gulf: The 28th Day of War"]

[Text] The war in the Persian Gulf region is clearly dragging out. For the first time in history, in front of our very eyes an ecological war has begun, the destructive effects of which are just now being calculated by experts.

The Iraqi dictator has yet one more "secret" weapon he intends to use. The initial signs of use of this weapon have already come into view. I am referring to terrorism on a global scale.

Something took place last week which should put us on alert. The call "To Arms!" was broadcast by powerful Baghdad Radio, now called "Battle Radio" (its programs are heard even on the east coast of the United States). American and West European experts have interpreted this, not without justification, as an order to Iraqi terrorist agents in the Middle East and other parts of the world. Certain code call signs have been used in this regard—"kutayba," "madar," "aymen," and "muntaser." The order was signed by a mysterious "maamun" from a certain "Central Command." The first decoding of the order, coming as no surprise to American and West European analysts, shows that we are talking about bringing Saddam Husayn's terrorist groups abroad to a state of readiness.

I am convinced that resorting to terrorist acts is one of the Iraqi dictator's very last chances to stay afloat. He will do so in the event of a decisive crisis in the course of the Persian Gulf War in favor of the anti-Iraq coalition. It is possible that in the very near future we may witness gunfire and explosions in all world capitals, including Moscow. This is not my fantasy. Prior to writing about it, I spoke with my Arab colleagues. They share my opinion. Coming from their mouths, such an evaluation sounds like a friendly warning, and not intimidation. It would seem, therefore, that we must be prepared now for an event of this nature. We know that a great many of our fellow countrymen have perished abroad during the past five or six years at the hands of various terrorist groups. More than 60, as I recall! Let us not forget about this, and let us not allow ourselves to be caught unawares.

This does not fit in with our concepts of the rules for waging modern war, of course. However, we must take into account the fact that we are dealing with an aggressor who has flouted all the norms of international law.

Today we have occasion to read and hear a great many varied assessments on the position and role of the Soviet

Union, actively promoting an immediate cessation of the war in the Persian Gulf as well as the unconditional liberation of Kuwait through political means. How is our position explained? Primarily through a striving to ensure the achievement of a noble aim without regional or global shocks. For in front of our very eyes every "balance of interests" which today exists in the Near and Middle East might be completely destroyed. This is far from unimportant to us—we want to move towards the settlement of regional conflicts, not towards their exacerbation.

When 29 states are warring side by side (there are 28 in the anti-Iraq coalition), the consequences are unforeseen. But again this obligates us to facilitate the quickest possible end to the war. Especially since a 30th participant may indeed appear.

I am referring to Israel. Israel has been subject to missile bombardment and sustained casualties, although having declared earlier, prior to the outbreak of the war, that it would not be a participant. In following exclusively the logic of expanding the conflict at any price, Saddam Husayn has decided otherwise. The Soviet Union has expressed sympathy with the people of Israel who have suffered as a result of missile attack. And now they are talking about a responsive strike in Tel Aviv. What kind of strike will this be? If it takes place. The Israeli intention to dispatch a group of commandos to Iraq to seize Saddam Husayn merits some attention...

A great deal of conjecture has also been raised by the flight of Iraqi military aircraft to Iran. It is asserted, in particular, that these might also be used against Israel, although Iranian leaders have declared their intention to retain them until the end of the war.

We see that the war in the Persian Gulf region is replete with surprises. It has indeed become such a dramatic event that the USSR president was prompted to send his special representative, academician Ye. Primakov, to Baghdad. The aim of this mission, Primakov told me prior to his flight, is to convince Saddam Husayn to withdraw from Kuwait and stop this war which is engendering ever newer dangers.

German Report of Russian Transmission in Iraq

*91UM0356A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 14 Feb 91 p 3*

[Report by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent Ye. Savishchev: "Russian-Arabic Communication"]

[Text] Bonn—West German radio disseminated a scandalous sensation at lightning speed: "Orders were intercepted in the Persian Gulf that came over the air in the Russian language. Despite all of Moscow's protestations, it cannot be ruled out that Russian military advisers are in Iraq and are helping the Baghdad dictator."

The West German DIE WELT repeated it the following day, referring to the French newspaper LIBERATION,

which picked up this sensation from well-informed sources in its intelligence services.

Journalists from LIBERATION assumed that the Russian orders came on the air in connection with the movement of military cargo from the USSR to Iraq through the territory of Iran. Official Iranian authorities immediately rejected this statement.

The West German DIE WELT put forth its own version: It cannot be ruled out that the conversations in Russian were conducted by instructors from North Korea who are training young Iranian pilots in Soviet MiG-17's. Inasmuch as this is Soviet equipment, the simplest orders are also given in Russian. DIE WELT does not rule out the fact that, despite the statement of the Soviet side about the absence of Soviet military specialists in Iraq, about 150 persons accepted Husayn's offer and, tempted by a "regal remuneration"—\$50,000 per month—are performing advisory functions there.

In an attempt to introduce relative clarity into the official position of the West German side, I put this very question to the press service of the FRG Ministry of Defense. I was told over the telephone that they find it difficult to comment on DIE WELT's version because they have no data on this score.

Speculation on Ground Offensive Operations

91UM0368A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Feb 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Blinov: "Was the Ground Attack Postponed?"]

[Text] Washington—There have been White House meetings devoted to further combat operations by the anti-Iraq coalition. President G. Bush received French Defense Minister P. Joxe and British Secretary of State for Defense T. King. The two ministers also had meetings with Pentagon chief R. Cheney.

On the eve of these meetings the American President held a conference with R. Cheney and General C. Powell, who had returned from an inspection trip to Saudi Arabia. They discussed plans for changing over to a new phase of the war—the ground attack. As a result of these discussions, G. Bush made an announcement to the effect that the aerial bombings of Iraqi troops and installations now being conducted will remain the main form of military operations against Iraq "for a little while longer." "We will take as much time as is needed to figure out when the next stage should begin," said G. Bush.

So did they make a decision about the timing of the ground attacks? Responding to this question, British Secretary of State for Defense T. King emphasized the importance of further bombing in order to weaken the Iraqi Army's ability to resist. His French colleague, P. Joxe, responded that because of its purely military nature, such a decision "could not be made public before it began to be implemented." P. Joxe also announced

that the French military contingent in the Persian Gulf would participate fully in the operations against Iraq.

Israeli Defense Minister M. Arens, who was spending some time in the United States, visited the White House as well. According to announcements in the press, the Israeli minister applied to the American Administration for additional aid because of the damage caused to the Israeli economy by the missile attacks.

The American television company CBS reported also that the United States had promised to give Israeli aviation the electronic code for identifying military aircraft. Such coding devices, the television station reported, are necessary for flights into the zone of aviation operations of the anti-Iraq coalition—they make it possible to identify aircraft.

The WASHINGTON POST reports that Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff C. Powell and the American Armed Forces commander in the Persian Gulf zone, General N. Schwarzkopf, have already laid out a detailed plan for the offensive against the Iraqi Army.

The offensive, the newspaper writes, will begin in the pre-dawn hours, which will make it possible for the anti-Iraq coalition to utilize the advantages of its night combat equipment. Ground forces, Marines, Navy ships, and combat aviation will be put into action.

The main strike will come from the west, from the region of the border between Iraq and Saudi Arabia, through the desert regions of the southern part of Iraq. It will bypass the main Iraqi fortified positions located along the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border. Some of the participating forces will block the Republican Guard in southern Iraq and others will direct their attack to the south—against the rear of the Iraqi Army in Kuwait.

At the same time about 20,000 marines could land on the Kuwaiti coast. After establishing their positions on the shore they would be able to counterattack troops advancing from the west.

The operations will be supported by attacks on the weakened parts of the Iraqi positions located along the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border. The forces occupying them will have to fight on two fronts at the same time.

The command of the anti-Iraq coalition forces intends to make extensive use of tactics for "air-ground combat" operations, which were first developed for war in Europe. They envision striking enemy troop locations to their entire depth using aircraft and special forces paratrooper units.

It is assumed that this plan for military actions will make it possible to successfully block Iraq's main forces and cut off the remaining forces into isolated groups, which will then be routed with aircraft and artillery. The command of the anti-Iraq coalition thinks that this will make it possible to avoid direct conflicts between infantry units, which would involve significant losses.

Pro-Iraqi Soviets Try to Volunteer to Fight

91UF0481A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 14 Feb 91 p 5

[Article by N. Belan: "What, Have You Lost Your Mind?"—Talking It Over with Those Who Want To Go to Iraq as Volunteers"]

[Text] It was a typical Moscow morning. On the way to the Iraqi Embassy, I had several brief interviews with passersby. I asked what they thought of their fellow countrymen who would like to go to Iraq as volunteers to fight on the side of Saddam Husayn? And would they themselves like to become volunteers? Here are several typical answers:

"Wasn't Afghanistan enough for us? These fellows, very likely, have lost their minds."

"To get away from this life I would go not only to Iraq, but even to the ends of the world... Especially if the pay is in hard currency."

"Volunteers? But are there any really?.."

There are. I first became acquainted with them from their letters and statements. Ghalib al-Timimi, an adviser in the Embassy of the Republic of Iraq, laid out before me folders bulging with letters, by whose stamps, perhaps, you could study the geography of virtually our whole country.

"Dear Mr. President... I want to take part in the war on the side of your people. Viktor Grigoryevich Krylov. Moscow."

"I come from the Dagestan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. I am 43 years old and physically healthy. In these difficult times for Iraq, I, as a Muslim, want to stand in the ranks of your regular army voluntarily, in order to defend Iraqi brothers..." (I will not cite the names of those who did not give permission for their publication—N.B.).

"I am sending you a second application (the first was sent on 8/01/91) with a request to accept me as a volunteer in the Air Force. I have a specialty as an aviation mechanic with a high level of skill. I understand now, more than I did before the war, that the fate and future of the entire world is being decided by this war in the Middle East. Either worldwide Zionism will get an opportunity to attain world supremacy, or this will be the beginning of its end...5/02/91. Moscow Oblast."

"I am a reserve officer. I want to say in this letter that I not only sympathize with Iraq, but I am completely on your side. Moreover, I ask that you register me as a volunteer for a just war against American imperialism. I, of course, do not justify the seizure of Kuwait, such a policy is fraught with consequences, and it will lead to an unprecedented destabilization of the projected reconciliation of countries and peoples. But in the situation that has developed, it is impossible to take the side of the United States, which boasts about its democracy. What kind of talk is this about democracy, justice, and order,

when they themselves organize conflicts? Remember Panama, Grenada... The Americans are troubled by a possible Arab centralization... Arab countries are the cheap and principal donors for the American bourgeois who are bloated with wealth. Deprive them of this 'blood' (oil), and they will lose their friskiness on the spot. Kuwait is just a pretext... N. Gribakin, Poltava. 25/02/91."

And here are the reasons of a volunteer from Tashkent, a member of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League]: "I am against America's interference in the internal affairs of a Muslim state."

"The ideals of war are foreign to me, no matter what they are," writes a 48-year-old reserve lieutenant colonel from Vinnitsa Oblast. "In any war, innocent peaceful people will die, especially children. I am ready as a volunteer to give as much help as possible to your people."

There are also collective letters. From Checheno-Ingushetia, the "organizational committee in the defense of Iraq" sent a list of volunteers—610 persons, and from the city of Grozny—377 persons...

"We have thousands of applications like this," explained Ghalib al-Timimi. "These are people of various nationalities, ages, and professions, and Muslims and Christians. They write, and there are those who call us up, simply to express solidarity with the people of Iraq, without requests to be sent as volunteers. For example, Ivan Ivanovich Avdokienko, a participant in the Great Patriotic War from Bryansk, who permitted me to use his name. They are also sending money. Here is a letter, and it contains one ruble, but this ruble is dearer to us than someone else's millions..."

"What do you do with these letters?" I ask.

"We send some of them to Iraq. Naturally, we try to answer each one of them, but more and more letters are coming in; therefore, we ask those whom we did not succeed in answering not to be offended, and we thank them."

"And the applications of the volunteers?"

"This, of course, is moral support, and we appreciate it."

The conversation at the embassy was a long one. But I must admit that in addition to familiarity with the letters and the conversation with the adviser, I wanted to meet and talk with the people who wrote here: "Sign me up as a volunteer..." This opportunity soon presented itself.

...He is still young, solidly built, and he is studying in the eleventh class at one of Moscow's schools. He is called Konstantin Zhukov.

"I consider the war against Iraq to be aggressive, one whose objective is to break the freedom-loving people of the country," explains Konstantin. "Our people and the Iraqi people are bound by firm ties of good neighborliness and fraternity, and, therefore, I want to go as a volunteer. I think that an honorable person cannot abandon the people of Iraq who are in trouble. It is not

a war that is going on there, but women, old men, and children are being barbarously annihilated there..." "Do your parents know about your decision?"

"Not yet."

"Kostya, but people get killed in war... Do you understand this?"

"Yes. But it is important to know that I do not give my life in a street brawl, but for a right cause. Of course, the 'prospect' that they will kill me does not appeal to me, but someone has to oppose evil. Or do those ideals of internationalism, on which we were brought up, no longer mean anything? But what about purely human values, conscience?"

"How long ago did you reach this decision?"

"I thought about it for about two weeks, and weighed it... Understand, this is serious. Perhaps I have not thought everything out to its conclusion, but this decision comes straight from the heart."

New meetings—with Anatoliy Nikolayevich Makarov, an electrician with the Spetsavtomatika building administration; Ravil Abdulberovich Khusaynov, a driver from the Emitron plant, and Andrey Bonch-Bruevich, a student. All three are Muscovites.

[Khusaynov] I feel bad when I hear the Americans are bombing Iraq. I want to defend peaceful people, schools, and hospitals, and the residential sections of cities and villages.

[Makarov] I believe that an injustice is taking place there. The war could have been avoided: If Israel would withdraw its troops from the occupied territories, Iraq would leave Kuwait. Saddam Husayn proposed this solution, but it was turned down. And, incidentally, the mass media is suppressing everything possible in order to be able to say: Iraq is the aggressor. There is such an idea as a just cause. God stands behind it. Indeed, America has more tanks and aircraft, and its soldiers are better armed. But for America, the cause is not just, and God will punish its people. Even if the United States wins, they will lose this war all the same. In an ethical and moral sense.

[Bonch-Bruevich] This is a very bloody and brutal crime of international imperialism headed by the United States of America. Who gave them the right to bomb a peaceful population and to destroy Iraq? At one time—we will recall the history—the Americans were thrown out of Iraq, and now they found a pretext for revenge and to regain their positions."

"Andrey," I say to Bonch-Bruevich, "I got in touch with your mother by phone. She does not approve of your decision."

"My conscience tells me how to behave. And, I think, they will understand me in the end."

"I have a son, and he is 18 years old," says A. Makarov, "and he and my entire family are behind me."

"Everyone at home also approves my decision," R. Khusaynov continues the conversation. "And my fellow workers support me."

I was able to talk with a lot of people recently. There were also those who were irreconcilable with respect to Saddam Husayn; however, in evaluating the military actions of the coalition, they said: The UN did not sanction the bombardment of peaceful people, the murdering, and the suffering of the people of Iraq.

There are also different attitudes toward volunteers. For example, a teacher in the Moscow Higher Technical School imeni N.E. Bauman (he asked that his name not be indicated), declared:

"I would go as a volunteer to Iraq, because this war is an open aggression of the United States and its allies. But here the question is more complex. What can volunteers change? The problem must be resolved by political methods, at a government and UN level. The world community must give its authoritative word: Stop military actions and put both sides at the negotiating table. I am confident that mankind has this opportunity today. This, if you wish, is also a chance to stop a third world war."

Volunteers can be treated in different ways. They can be criticized severely, or they can be praised to the skies. Only we should not pretend that they and this manifestation—the beginning polarization in the attitude toward the war against Iraq—does not exist in our society. Politics is people. And as we are learning to live under conditions of differences of opinion and to depart from the stagnant unanimous "I approve, sir," then we will have to reconcile ourselves not only with a pluralism of opinions regarding this war, but also to consider it on the basis of who is building the foreign policy of our state.

I would prefer, of course, that the matter of the volunteers' applications not go any farther. Having avoided being drawn into the war on one side, we must not end up on the other side of the front. But it is for this reason that we have lent an ear to these people and, not being hasty with evaluations, we will try to understand them: They have no reason to behave toward the people of Iraq in a hostile way.

Iraqi Defenses include Chemical Mines

*91UM0378A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 91
Second Edition p 4*

[Article by PRAVDA special correspondent V. Belyakov, Riyadh: "Relying on Infantry? A Scenario for the Ground Operation"]

[Text] Riyadh—The life of a journalist in the Saudi capital does not sparkle with diversity. Every day there are the briefings of command representatives of the multinational forces in the Hyatt Regency Hotel—as similar to one another as twins. In recent days so many aircraft sorties have been flown, you get a casualty assessment—

ours and theirs, sometimes data on naval activity and line-crossers from the Iraqi Army.

The Military operations are static. For four weeks coalition air assets have been pounding Iraqi facilities and positions with an average intensity of one bombing per minute. It would seem the enemy should long since have been crushed, as was the prediction of Western military experts at the very outset of the war. But nothing of the kind is taking place.

American analysts have varying appraisals of the effect of the bombing. According to the weekly magazine NEWSWEEK, the loss of the combat capability of the elite Iraqi Republican Guard units is estimated to be 25 percent; of other units—just five percent.

Western officers in Riyadh are stating with ever increasing conviction that the war will not be won by air power alone and that a ground operation is inevitable. Its initial scenario looks rather simple. One grouping of coalition forces enters Kuwait from the south. Another envelops it from the north through Iraqi territory. A marine amphibious landing simultaneously takes place on the Kuwaiti shore. This leaves the half-million-strong Iraqi Army in Kuwait in a pocket.

This scenario can be accomplished, however, only with great personnel losses. The Iraqi forces are well protected. Approaches to their positions are mined, and in the opinion of certain American officers some of the mines contain toxic gases. In addition to the minefields, the Iraqis have placed barbed wire obstacles and have dug anti-tank ditches, filling them with oil which can be set ablaze. They have erected sand ramparts. Their tactics, tested during the recent eight-year war with Iran, have been termed "aggressive defense." The U.S. Army has a complex system for calculating the effectiveness of the armed forces of other states. In the mid-1980's, Iraqi armor units were evaluated according to this system as being more effective than Israeli, British, or even Soviet units.

The coalition is also expecting the use of tactical chemical weapons by Iraq. Iraqi artillery includes the South African 155 mm howitzer, considered today the best in the world. At a range of 40 kilometers these howitzers are distinguished by a high degree of accuracy. They can also carry a chemical charge. Tactical missiles may also be used for this purpose.

At present American public opinion is almost united in supporting the war. But it is well known from previous experience that Americans' opinion of the war will begin to change just as soon as the flow of body bags with corpses of soldiers begins to stream back to the homeland. The cost of the presumed victory may be too high.

At the same time, dragging out the war also has its negative aspects. The longer it continues, the greater is the likelihood the anti-Iraq coalition will weaken—at least politically.

Potential Radiation Threat from Bombed Nuclear Facility Assessed

*91UF0500A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 16 Feb 91 p 3*

[Interview with Ye. Ryazantsev, director of the Department of Research Reactors and Reactor Technologies of the Nuclear Energy Institute imeni Kurchatov, by Vladimir Lagovskiy; place and date not given: "A 'Chernobyl' in the Vicinity of Baghdad? Soviet Specialists Rule This Scenario Out"]

[Text] **Alarming news was found in the very first reports on the bombing of Iraq: A nuclear center in the vicinity of Baghdad was destroyed. What kind of threat do the consequences pose? Will an ecological tragedy resembling Chernobyl occur?**

Ye. Ryazantsev, director of the Department of Research Reactors and Reactor Technologies of the Nuclear Energy Institute imeni Kurchatov said: We should not worry about this. The equipment at the nuclear center is well known. Even if you wanted to, you would not be able to cause what took place at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station. The design and physical peculiarities rule this out.

Therefore, as of the time of the bomb strike, there were three pool-type reactors at the nuclear center: an IRT-5000 with a capacity of five megawatts built on a Soviet design, started up and tuned up by specialists from the Institute of Nuclear Physics imeni Kurchatov, an OSIRIS with a capacity of 35 megawatts, and TAMIZ-2 with a capacity of 500 kilowatts. They were built on a French design.

The nuclear center is situated 25 kilometers southeast of Baghdad. Iran is nearby, and the USSR is slightly further away.

What did the bomb attack destroy? Alas, there are no specific data on the nature of the destruction; at least, the specialists of the Nuclear Energy Institute imeni Kurchatov do not have any. This is why it is premature to assert anything at present.

Three scenarios of events are possible. In the first scenario, the reactors were shut down and fuel was removed. In this case, radioactive contamination is ruled out. In the second scenario, reactors were shut down but fuel was not unloaded. An explosion may scatter it over the compound of this facility. This is not as frightening as it appears at first sight: Contamination would be of local extent, and merely a small segment of volatile fission fragments would end up in the atmosphere.

The third scenario is the most dangerous. At the time of the strike, the reactors could have been in operation at nominal capacity. A direct hit, which is possible given today's technology, would have smashed the vessels. Within several minutes all the water would have drained from the pool. Nuclear fuel, a mixture of uranium-235 and aluminum, would have become hot and oozed to the bottom of the pool. A radioactive "cake" would have

been formed. As it cooled, it would have emitted almost all fission fragments present into the atmosphere. The fragments consist mainly of iodine-131. When they are inhaled into an organism through the air, they affect the thyroid gland.

Specialists calculated the scope of radioactive contamination based on the design of the reactors, the weight of fuel, and the approximate height of the emergency discharge. Within three kilometers of the reactor, the dose of thyroid gland exposure could reach 60 rem, and within 10 kilometers, four rem. Baghdad is threatened with 0.3 rem. This is not much. For example: Exposure due to the natural background is only 1.5 times less. In other words, the danger is minimal even if the outcome is the worst. According to USSR norms, only children need to be evacuated from the three kilometer zone. Eight or 10 kilometers away, protective measures are not necessary at all.

Briefly about politics. Why was there any need at all to take risks and bomb the nuclear center?

Ye. Ryazantsev said: "It was reported in passing that the strike was aimed at preventing the production of nuclear weapons in Iraq."

[Lagovskiy] Was this a realistic threat?

[Ryazantsev] I do not think so. The nuclear center had only so-called research reactors. They were built for work on the physics of solids and for manufacturing isotopes and medical preparations. In principle it is possible to manufacture plutonium for nuclear bombs in these facilities, if uranium-238 is somehow located inside.

[Lagovskiy] How long has the Soviet reactor been in operation in Iraq?

[Ryazantsev] About 15 years. However, this does not amount to anything yet. The center was inspected on an annual basis by an IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] commission. These procedures were established within the framework of the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. It is incredibly difficult to conceal perfidious designs from the commission. It checks literally everything, from reactors to fuel stocks. Iraq has never been cited by the IAEA. Therefore, by targeting the nuclear center, the United States also hit the prestige of the international organization.

[Lagovskiy] Apparently, inspections are not to be expected in wartime. Could it be that the United States resolved to get some insurance for the future?

[Ryazantsev] I will repeat that materials for the bomb cannot be generated rapidly.

[Lagovskiy] Nonetheless, persistent rumors circulate to the effect that Iraq has nuclear weapons. Could they be manufactured outside the nuclear center?

[Ryazantsev] Any answer to this question will be hypothetical only. In theory, we may conceive of some underground plant, as well as Husayn's specialists

endeavoring to manufacture a bomb with uranium rather than plutonium. The USSR, as well as other countries, delivered uranium enriched up to 80 percent to Iraq. If it were remelted it would suffice for one or two bombs. However, once again the issue arises of how to circumvent the IAEA, which controls deliveries and consumption of nuclear fuel. Still, if we assume that a secret plant exists, why bomb the nuclear center?

CPSU CC Commission Urges Gulf War Protest

*91UF0501A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 91
Second Edition p 5*

[CPSU Central Committee Commission on Science, Education, and Culture: "Appeal To Reason and Humanism"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Commission on Science, Education, and Culture appeals to scholars, instructor-researchers, and prominent figures in our native culture, calling upon them to raise their voices in protest against escalation of the war in the Persian Gulf.

Missile and air strikes of unprecedented force and the most sophisticated level of military technology have rocked the entire world. The threat of possible use of chemical and nuclear weapons in this war evokes serious anxiety and presents a danger of catastrophic consequences to the entire world community.

Attempts are again being made to turn the achievements of science and technology against mankind, to use them in a political game.

Already we see the death and suffering of many people constituting the result of combat activity. Women and children, old people, innocent civilians are perishing in the war. The most grave ecological disasters have come crashing down on the region. We see the destruction of civilian facilities, historical and cultural monuments.

In the name of humanism, weighty responsibility, justice, equality, and the freedom and happiness of all peoples, prominent figures in the science and culture of our land must use their authority and prestige to call upon political leaders and the governments of countries to resolve the conflict through peaceful, civilized, and political actions, and not allow peoples and states to be drawn into processes that will have the most tragic global consequences.

V.L. Barsukov, academician; V.M. Batenin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; V.I. Belov, writer; L.I. Vysotskiy, department chairman, Saratov Polytechnic Institute; N.N. Gubenko, USSR minister of culture; V.V. Davydov, vice president of the USSR Pedagogical Sciences Academy; V.M. Yezhov, party committee secretary, Irkutsk Scientific Center; A.K. Kadyrbekova, first secretary of the Sovetskiy Rayon Committee, Kazakhstan Communist Party; V.V. Kalashnikov, department chairman, Leningrad Institute of Electrical Engineering; N.I. Kalinina, department director, Volgograd Scientific Research Institute for Hygiene, Toxicology, and Occupational Disease

Pathology; F.N. Kaputskiy, rector, Belorussia State University; N.V. Karlov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; I.D. Kovalchenko, academician; V.N. Kudryavtsev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Yu.S. Kukushkin, academician; N.P. Laverov, USSR deputy prime minister, chairman of the State Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers for Science and Technology, academician; G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; V.M. Matrosov, academician; I.I. Melnikov, party committee secretary, Moscow State University, member of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat; K.I. Mikulskiy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; S.Kh. Negmatullayev, president of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences; O.M. Nefedov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; A.I. Onishchenko, first secretary of the Lugansk Oblast Committee, Ukrainian Communist Party; Yu.A. Osipyanyan, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; N.N. Paltyshev, people's teacher of the USSR; B.Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; Yu.P. Platonov, first secretary of the governing body of the USSR Architects Union; V.V. Ryabov, Humanities Department director, CPSU Central Committee; T.T. Salakhov, first secretary of the governing body of the USSR Artists Union; U.M. Sultangazin, president of the Kazakhstan Academy of Sciences; A.I. Tatarin, director of the Economics Institute, Urals Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences; I.T. Frolov, academician, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Science, Education, and Culture; G.A. Shvetsov, chairman of the Council of Party Organization Secretaries, Novosibirsk Scientific Center; G.A. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Effect of Coalition 'Quadrant' Bombing

91UM0375A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Feb 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondent B. Ivanov: "The Persian Gulf: Negotiations Proceed as Explosions Rumble" subtitled "Iraqi Defenses Crack"]

[Text] Riyadh—Massive missile and bomb strikes by coalition air forces have caused the command of the Iraqi Army to lose to a considerable degree its ability to coordinate the actions of individual units and subunits. This is the conclusion military experts have drawn on the basis of studying data collected by the intelligence of coalition air forces in recent days.

By all signs, the Iraqi central command is currently unable to fully control the situation at the front, reported a knowledgeable military source with connections in the circles of the coalition command. As a result of purposeful air strikes against headquarters, command centers, communication facilities, and supply lines, significant formations of Iraqi troops, primarily in the territory of Southern Iraq and Kuwait, are now beyond the reach of operations orders issued in Baghdad.

The pilots of coalition air forces who overfly the positions of Iraqi troops in Kuwait on a regular basis state that Iraqi antiaircraft barrage fire has become so lethargic and ineffective lately that at present coalition aircraft fly combat sorties in small groups or even singly. It has also become the rule that units deployed nearby no longer assist one another by means of antiaircraft fire, as used to be the case, but are concerned solely about their own safety.

These modifications in the behavior of Iraqi troops are largely the result of a new tactic which the air forces of the coalition have been using for the past two weeks. Its essence is as follows. The territory of Kuwait and Southern Iraq has been broken up by the allies into so-called "strike quadrants" with an area of several square kilometers. Iraqi positions, tanks, artillery batteries, missile launchers, and headquarters are now being struck successively, one quadrant after another. The air force shifts the focus of bombing to the neighboring quadrant, and so on, only after all targets available within one quadrant have been hit. In the opinion of the coalition air forces command, this tactic has turned out to be extraordinarily successful because a bomb strike that instantaneously carpets a fairly large area does not give the Iraqis the time or opportunity to evacuate their combat materiel from under fire and preserve it. In addition, the steel blizzard that hits Iraqi soldiers from the sky makes a tremendous psychological impact: it breaks their will to resist and prompts them to decide that it is necessary to save their own lives first of all.

There is a reason why the numbers of surrendering Iraqis who show up every morning at forward unit positions of the coalition forces have increased in recent days. As a rule, they go over in small groups waving white rags and leaflets calling for the resistance to stop, which the coalition troops drop over Iraqi positions. It is notable that in the initial days of hostilities primarily young men recently drafted into the military service surrendered, whereas now there are many veterans of the Iran-Iraq war among the prisoners, i.e., precisely those soldiers on whom Baghdad is now counting.

Recently a group of foreign reporters managed to meet with several defectors. The prisoners say that the main reason an increasing number of Iraqis are surrendering is their disappointment with the ideals proclaimed by the Iraqi leadership. A growing number of Iraqis are coming to understand that the defense of their motherland has nothing to do with seizing Kuwaiti territory.

"Fight, fight, fight, but for the sake of what? Not for the good of the country, and not to defend our own homes, but because of the whim of just one man named Saddam." The prisoners believe that this truth is now understood by many soldiers who so far remain on the other side of the front line.

Kulikov Sees Threat to USSR From Gulf War

91UM0375B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 19 Feb 91 p 3

[Interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov by Petr Afanasyev and Nikolay Panyukov; place and date not given: "So, the Two Modes of Thinking Have Met..."]

[Text] As it is, political weather is the most unstable kind of weather in nature. Quite recently, the hand of general human sentiments on a political barometer measuring the most complex situation in the Persian Gulf tended unequivocally toward condemning only Saddam Husayn and his aggressive policy. It would appear that the situation is now beginning to change abruptly! Husayn, who recently would not even consider withdrawing from occupied territories, has stated his willingness to do so, although attaching patently unrealizable conditions to his willingness. The party opposing Husayn, which does not want to consider any of his conditions, would not even think about discontinuing hostilities. There are prospects for new casualties and for broadening the scope of this tragedy.

People all over the globe are becoming seriously concerned: in view of this, what do the Americans and their allies need in the Persian Gulf zone now? Could they not seize even a minute opportunity to establish peace for the sake of avoiding new casualties? Or does the truth that even the worst peace is better than any war already appear obsolete to some people?

This is what Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, a prominent military commander, said in an interview to RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA on this subject:

[Kulikov] I am convinced that this war should not have been unleashed at all, for the sake of keeping the peace and preventing the casualties that have already been inflicted and will yet inexorably be inflicted. Peaceful forms of influence should have been continued, a dialogue should have been carried on, which, incidentally, our diplomats and President M.S. Gorbachev advocated and advocate. Such a victory would indeed have been something new and desirable. The language of "gunboats" and lethal B-52 bombers is old hat. However, it has nothing in common with the "new thinking for the entire world" which the Americans applauded warmly but did little to actually support. We may say that on this score Bush has lost to Gorbachev utterly. It turns out that Bush remains a supporter of "the old thinking."

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Viktor Georgiyevich, which specific side in this war do you support?

[Kulikov] I have already tried to express this thought. I cannot support either side because I am against this war in general. Indeed, this war was precipitated by Iraq's refusal to comply with the clear-cut and legitimate demands of the international community to relinquish Kuwait... Quite harsh measures were used against the aggressor for this reason. However, I have to state regretfully that as time went on the nature of hostilities began to transcend the framework of the mandate given by the UN Security Council. No military goals can explain the methodical destruction from the air of non-military facilities, including power supply systems and food warehouses. No goals can justify the deaths of children, old people, and women. We cannot infuse the slogan "If the enemy does not surrender, he is destroyed" with new and inhuman substance.

This war has already inflicted enormous losses on the economy of Iraq and entailed considerable loss of life. This is why supporting one of the sides unequivocally is out of the question. The deaths of people, whether they are Iraqis or members of the multinational military forces, is a woe for all humanity. This is why I am convinced that it is necessary to take advantage of all opportunities, even if most insignificant at first sight, in order to prevent a global catastrophe. After all, 30 states of the world are already involved in this conflict. Attempts to draw more countries into the war and expand its geography and scale are increasingly perceptible.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] However, it is insane, it is suicidal. After all, in essence there are no borders or limits for modern weapons. What do you think about this?

[Kulikov] We are seeing for ourselves that the consequences of war under modern conditions, when virtually all means of destruction available are used, may be altogether unpredictable. After all, the use of weapons of mass destruction by the combatants may become a fact any day. This would be a catastrophe. The very positioning of such weapons in the combat zone poses a serious threat because they are a priority target for missile and bombing attacks.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] There has already been unfortunate experience in this matter...

[Kulikov] Unfortunately, yes. The bombing of chemical enterprises, biological centers, and nuclear power facilities virtually amounts to the unannounced use of the weapons of mass destruction. The threat of such weapons transcends the framework of the theater of military operations which, naturally, cannot but concern the world community.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Our country all the more.

[Kulikov] Naturally. The region of this conflict lies in immediate proximity to the borders of the Soviet Union. Probable pollution of the territory of our country is not ruled out. We who have lived and are still living through the Chernobyl catastrophe may appreciate this danger fully. This is why the position of the USSR has been and remains clear-cut and unambiguous: We are in favor of immediately stopping this war and solving the problem by political means. Negotiations between M.S. Gorbachev and an Iraqi representative are one more vivid proof of this.

I believe that those abroad who fervently supported the new thinking verbally should have their say. It cannot be otherwise. The policy of new thinking, the triumph of which has been repeatedly proclaimed by the world community at various levels, should, after all, also develop new means for resolving international conflicts. The massacre that was brought about in the Persian Gulf zone shows quite graphically how dubious such approaches become when the world community attempts to create a new order using an old instrument, by which I mean war.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] As you see it, what should be done to this end?

[Kulikov] Nothing special. A transition should be made from words to deeds. The new thinking should be new. Let us not be crafty and evasive. We are disarming, you disarm too. We are leaving Europe, why are you procrastinating? The issue is correctly now being raised of preventing future situations in which individual countries in various regions of the world, especially those with a complex political environment, are given the opportunity to augment their military might to levels that exceed reasonable sufficiency for the defense of the integrity of their borders and the maintenance of their state sovereignty.

In conjunction with this, attempts by individual states to secretly deliver weapons and technologies to interested countries with a view to securing considerable economic and political dividends are particularly dangerous. For example, Iraq has managed to create the threat of the use of weapons of mass destruction using Western technology as well as direct aid from a number of companies. If these deliveries had been public and open in keeping with the new thinking, how could this have left the world community indifferent? I believe that measures would have been devised to put an end to such actions.

LIVE ON THE AIR: Voice of America

Secretary of Defense Cheney viewed favorably the position taken by the Soviet Union with regard to the conflict in the Persian Gulf. He called this position responsible and positive. At the same time, he made it clearly understood what outcome of the forthcoming negotiations in Moscow between Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz and the Soviet leadership would be considered acceptable:

"If they succeed in persuading Saddam Husayn to comply with the UN resolutions and withdraw his troops from Kuwait, stressing that this is the only acceptable solution, they of course will have accomplished a lot. However, we do not believe that there is any opportunity for a pause, for a cease-fire, for anything except unconditionally complying with the UN resolutions."

Vietnamese, Gulf Wars Compared

91UM0377A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 19 Feb 91 p 5

[A. Kabannikov report on interview with Vietnamese Army General Tran Cong Man in Hanoi; date not given: "We Have Jungle, They Have Desert. But This Is Not the Only Reason That a Vietnamese General Thinks That the Iraqi Army Is Doomed to Defeat"]

[Text] Hanoi—The biography of General Tran Cong Man is the envy of other military people. He has been through four wars—against the Japanese, the French, the Americans, and the Chinese. He has commanded a company and a regiment, and has been a headquarters chief in a military formation. In recent years he has been

editing an all-Vietnam army newspaper. He is now the deputy general secretary of the Association of Journalists of Vietnam.

I asked the general what in his opinion the first weeks of combat in the Persian Gulf region have shown, and whether the Americans really learned anything from the Vietnam experience.

[Tran Cong Man] They obviously have. In that war against the Americans, the sympathy of the entire world was on our side. Now that it has started this major war, the United States has gained the support of the United Nations and the world community, obviously mindful of the sad lessons of the past. At that time they were unable to blockade Vietnam for an entire decade. We got help from the USSR, China, and other countries. The aggressors were unable to cut the links between the north and south of the country. But Iraq has been under a blockade even since before the start of the war.

[Kabannikov] Did the first stage of the war—the air war—remind you of the bombardment of cities and villages in Vietnam?

[Tran Cong Man] Yes and no. In their war against us the Americans slowly built up their attacks, and they paused between them. This was their mistake, and the bombing did not have a great effect. The massive and sustained bombing of Iraq is the obvious result of the Vietnam experience. But of course, both there and here the bombers bring death to innocent people. No matter how bombing equipment may have been improved, losses among the populations of Iraqi cities are, I think, enormous.

[Kabannikov] Has the Iraqi army learned anything from the tactics of the Vietnamese?

[Tran Cong Man] They are hiding their equipment from the bombers, as we did. At one time we were able to reduce the effectiveness of the heaviest bombing strike to less than 25 percent. The Iraqis' cover is much better and I therefore think that their losses are even less.

[Kabannikov] Land operations may start any day. Do you assume that the Iraqis will choose the tactic of a prolonged partisan war?

[Tran Cong Man] I think that this will not happen. And not only because we have jungle while they have desert. You must understand that our war was essentially a people's war, and the Vietnamese were defending their own land. Iraq is in a different situation, and its soldiers and its population have quite a different attitude. An uncoordinated terrorist struggle—that is all that they are capable of doing in this situation, apart from the regular actions of an army. I think that the ground war will not be protracted.

[Kabannikov] If you were to imagine for a moment that you were the chief of the allied forces...

[Tran Cong Man] First of all I would bring up more people and the ground attack would start with all available forces from several sides, and I would include the

Marines and airborne forces. And however events unfolded, I would not cross the Iraqi border.

[Kabannikov] And what if you were commanding another army—the Iraqi army?

[Tran Cong Man] Perhaps I would personally give the order to withdraw from Kuwait.

Intense Air War Signals Coming Ground Campaign

91UM0386A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Feb 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondent B. Ivanov: "Blitzkrieg' Planned for the Liberation of Kuwait"]

[Text] Riyadh—**The coalition forces are accelerating the conclusion of preparations for the beginning of a wide-scale ground attack. Military experts are coming to this conclusion as they analyze the actions of the multinational forces over the last several days.**

The intensive missile and bomb strikes, methodically and systematically delivered by allied aircraft on Iraqi positions over the course of the last five weeks are slowly but steadily leading to the fulfillment of the main task of the air forces of the coalition's command element: destruction of half of the combat equipment of the Iraqi military. According to a well-informed military source, as a result of an intensification of air strikes the Iraqis are currently undergoing enormous losses. At the present time they can only count on 55-65 percent of their tanks, artillery, and armored personnel carriers. The rest are either destroyed or damaged and taken out of action or buried in the earth, requiring some time to bring them to combat readiness.

The intensification of the air war over the past few days is viewed by many specialists as proof of so-called "pre-attack bomb and artillery preparations," which were to begin four or five days prior to the introduction of ground troops into the battle. In the course of such preparations the Iraqi troops, as was planned and as is now apparently happening in reality, are being subjected to air strikes hitherto unprecedented in terms of power and scale. The strikes are being delivered by B-52 heavy bombers, which drop their 900 kg bombs on Iraqi defensive positions from a great height, F-15E fighter-bombers equipped with modern missile guidance systems capable of destroying targets in the dark, and F-16 aircraft and A-10 ground-attack aircraft, cited for their efficiency on the field of combat as "tank killers." The focus of the present bombings is defined very clearly: Iraqi military positions inside Kuwait and Iraqi Republican Guard locations and concentrations of Iraqi units in regions of Iraq adjacent to Kuwait. This choice of targets is one more indicator that allied aviation is currently engaged in the single-minded "working over" of terrain in anticipation of upcoming ground combat operations.

One of the key aspects which may influence the plans of the coalition command element most seriously remains the question of the condition, fighting spirit and defensive capability of the Republican Guard—elite units of the Iraqi Armed Forces. Eight divisions of the Republican Guard are situated north of Kuwait along the border with Iraq. In comparison with other units they are better equipped, better supplied with food and better protected: almost all the personnel are able to hide from air strikes in underground concrete bunkers.

What has happened to them over the month of continual round-the-clock bombings? Up until very recently representatives of the allied command were compelled to admit that they did not know the degree of the effect of the missile and bomb strikes on military readiness and the psychological state of the soldiers of these subunits. Any suppositions on this score have been raised solely on the basis of indirect signs received in the course of the study and processing of information from air reconnaissance.

But in the past few days an event took place which has been long awaited by the allied forces and which, in the opinion of many observers, amounts to a milestone in the current military campaign. For the first time in more than four weeks of combat operations soldiers of the Republican Guard have appeared among the Iraqi deserters. According to U.S. servicemen, for the most part they look about the same as the other Iraqi prisoners: "They look tired and exhausted, and they too are apparently suffering from undernourishment."

Undoubtedly such information should be very reassuring to the coalition command element, which does not conceal the fact that the main thrust in the course of the upcoming ground "Kuwait campaign" will be directed specifically against the Republican Guard. Because, as a military source stressed, deprived of the Guard which makes up the backbone of Iraqi resistance, Baghdad will be faced with an unavoidable choice: either capitulate or continue resistance, dooming his people to enormous casualties. Judging by everything, the allied command is also counting on a similarly aggressive scenario for the development of events, inasmuch as it plans something like a "blitzkrieg" for the liberation of Kuwait.

That is the picture of possible operations. In theory. But in practice? "In reality many things may be different," advised the military sources. "Much, for example depends on the weather. We are hoping not to be surprised by sandstorms or rain."

As local residents affirm, sandstorms do not begin before March. As for rain, it can be expected quite soon—perhaps at the end of this week.

This also affects the question of a deadline for the possible attack.

* * *

Brigadier General Neal reported in Riyadh on Sunday that the ground forces of the United States and the other

states belonging to the multinational forces conducted a probing action at seven areas on the border between Saudi Arabia and Iraq and Kuwait. Tanks, artillery, and ground-attack helicopters took part in the operations. The actions of the ground troops of the multinational forces in the land theater continue to be characterized "by aggressive patrolling and reconnaissance" under conditions of "readiness to conduct any combat operations."

Iraqi Fortifications Obsolete 'by NATO Standards'

91UM0386B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Feb 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel V. Nazarenko, candidate of military sciences, under the rubric "Opinion of a Military Specialist": "The Ground Campaign"]

[Text] *U.S. President G. Bush, answering questions from reporters on Sunday in Kennebunkport (Maine), expressed confidence that Kuwait will be liberated from Iraqi occupation "very, very soon," but he refused to give a date for the beginning of the ground attack. Most likely it will begin in the very near future. Let us turn to the evidence testifying to an immediate preparation of the allied forces for the beginning of an assault.*

U.S. Secretary of Defense R. Cheney and C. Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, visited the Persian Gulf region recently. They conducted their own type of "field reconnaissance," evaluated the results of the air war, coordinated questions of interaction between allied forces in the course of upcoming combat operations, and prepared a report for the U.S. President on the basis of which, in all probability, a final decision on beginning a wide-scale assault has already been adopted. The President, apparently, has established a small "window"—the period during which N. Schwarzkopf, commanding general of the multinational forces, will himself determine the exact date for launching the attack.

Thirty amphibious warfare ships carrying thousands of Marines have already entered the Persian Gulf. Having ended a series of maneuvers on the Saudi coast, they will have to land in southern Iraq or on the coast of Kuwait with lightening speed and, as specialists predict, enter into one of the most severe combat encounters of this war with units of Saddam Husayn's Republican Guard.

The battleship Missouri has been conducting a methodical shelling of reinforced concrete shelters constructed by the Iraqis on Kuwaiti territory. This 270 meter giant, with a displacement of 50,000 tons, carries nine 405-mm guns (the shell weighs 1,225 kg and the range is up to 40 km), and eight Tomahawk quadruple-mount cruise missile launchers. The battleship Missouri has been joined by the Wisconsin, a ship of the same class. Their salvos, according to representatives of the command element of the multinational forces, are producing a "strong impression" on the Iraqis: they are abandoning their coastal positions and pulling back northward tens of kilometers.

The main portion of the missile and bomb strikes are currently falling on the enemy's Kuwait combat force, primarily on the positions of the Republican Guard—the backbone of the Iraqi forces. Simultaneously, strikes are being delivered on military and industrial facilities in Iraq. Enjoying air supremacy, the air forces of the coalition are conducting intensive bombardment of communications facilities, command points and headquarters, weapons and ammunition warehouses, airfields, and missile launchers on Iraqi territory.

Al-Basrah lies in ruins, one-third (about 40) of the bridges in Iraq are destroyed, and the main highway—the Al-Kuwait-Al-Basrah road—connecting Iraqi forces in Kuwait with the main forces in Iraq is practically impassable. This means that the combat forces in Kuwait are cut off from reinforcements and, most importantly, from stores of weapons and food.

Iraqi forces are exhausted from the constant bombings and their morale and determination to fight are falling. It is no accident that more than 1,000 Iraqi soldiers and officers have surrendered. If one takes into account the effectiveness of the air operations of the multinational forces, in the course of the coming week one may expect a decline in the combat potential of the enemy forces in Kuwait literally by half, which is exactly that same acceptable figure which will ensure the success of the assault.

One of the signs of the coming ground assault of the coalition forces is the redeployment and concentration of their tank, mechanized, and ground-assault helicopter units near the border with Kuwait. Furthermore, the tactics of the multinational air forces are undergoing noticeable changes: Now their efforts for the most part are directed at exhausting and bleeding the Iraqi forces in the forward positions through continual bombings. In addition, the aircraft of the American Air Force are increasingly being armed with previously unused weapons—precision air-to-ground guided missiles for destroying tanks, artillery weapons, and other armored targets. Finally, sandstorms are expected at the beginning of March, which may significantly complicate not only air but also ground operations. All this and much else indicates that only days remain before the beginning of the assault by the forces of the anti-Iraq coalition. Conversation to the effect that the coalition forces still need no less than three to four weeks for air bombardment of Iraqi positions is most likely deliberate disinformation directed at leading the Iraqi command astray regarding the start of the "Battle for Kuwait" on the ground.

Before the coalition's ground forces are brought into the conflict, direct air and artillery preparations will be conducted for two to three days, in the course of which Iraqi forces will be subjected to powerful and wide-scale fire. B-52 heavy bombers will drop their 900 kg bombs on Iraqi defensive positions. They will be relieved primarily at night, by fighter-bombers. With the dawn, the Iraqi troops, "pinned to the ground," will be visited by aircraft with "smart" (superaccurate) bombs for

destroying underground command and control centers, concrete bunkers, batteries of artillery, and other targets. A-10 ground-attack aircraft will operate with the goal of destroying tanks and armored vehicles.

Use by the U.S. Air Force of "fuel-air weapons," second only to tactical nuclear weapons in terms of destructive force, is not ruled out. These come in the form of aircraft bombs and missile warheads. As it falls, the casing of this type of cluster bomb opens up and the charges that "fall out" of it descend to the ground under parachutes. At a height of ten meters a special device triggers each charge and a cloud of gas is "released." Then this cloud explodes, destroying everything within a radius of 100 meters. This weapon is most useful for destroying mine fields, fortifications, and personnel. The artillery of the multinational forces will continually "process" the forward positions of the Iraqis.

In short, in the course of air and artillery preparations the forces of the coalition will try to "level" the battlefield so that the infantry will be able to overcome the forward lines of defense of the Iraqi forces with minimal losses.

The wide-scale assault by the multinational forces will be of a combined nature and will develop in accordance with the American doctrine of "AirLand battle." In particular, there are plans to conduct the classical maneuver of "double envelopment" of the enemy, known as "Hannibal's pincers," with subsequent encirclement and destruction of the enemy forces. This means that during air and ground offensive operations, the following will be used: maneuver of forces and fires, vertical (air attacks) and horizontal (amphibious landings) envelopment, flanking movements, and frontal assaults of ground (tank and mechanized) forces.

In several areas of the frontal penetration of the Iraqi defenses the coalition forces will create an overwhelming superiority of no less than six to one. With the support of the air forces they will try to cut off the Iraqi defense, come out into the rear area of their forward combat forces, and destroy them in detail. Of course it will not be so easy to overcome the strip of "deadly" obstacles constructed by the Iraqis over six months. The strip is 800-3,000 meters wide and stretches all 175 km of the Saudi-Kuwaiti border as well as 80 km on the territory of Iraq. To overcome it the allied troops will run into dirt embankments four meters high, tank ditches three to five meters wide filled in some places with oil that may be set on fire, wide barbed wire entanglements, and mine fields.

However the allied forces have at their disposal a whole array of special equipment for destroying this system of defense. For example, light tanks of the attack echelon, fashioned as a kind of bulldozer, are able to lay down "fascines"—bundles of plastic pipes which are used for crossing ditches. British Chieftain tanks can lay bridges across ditches. Mine fields can be surmounted using elongated "snake" explosive charges which look like a 230 meter long pipe. In addition, there are so-called

mine-clearing vehicles—excavators which render the remaining mines harmless—and "concrete-breaking" tanks. Nor are barbed wire entanglements an obstacle. Passage through them for the infantry will be provided using "Bangalore torpedoes"—tubes filled with an explosive. According to the commanders of the allied forces, the Iraqi fortified strip is not very difficult or modern by NATO standards.

A successful landing by U.S. Marines is believed to be a key element ensuring the positive outcome of the assault. It is expected that this will be the largest amphibious operation since the allied troops landed in Normandy in 1944. The command element of the multinational forces have several different places at their disposal for the landing of the Marines. If they succeed in catching the Iraqis by surprise, immediately driving a wedge into the enemy's defenses, and quickly moving north, the outcome of the entire offensive operation may turn out to be predetermined. Encirclement of the Iraqi combat forces in Kuwait will present Saddam Husayn with a dilemma: Either surrender or continue to fight, dooming his forces to enormous losses.

Presidents of Kazakhstan, Kirghizia on Gulf War

*91P50105A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
20 Feb 91 First Edition p 1*

[Article containing statements on the Persian Gulf War by President of the Kazakhstan SSR N.A. Nazarbayev and President of the Republic of Kirghizia A.A. Akayev at a press conference in Alma-Ata on the signing of an agreement between Kazakhstan and Kirghizia; "What Is Said, What Is Written..."]

[Text] President of the Kazakhstan SSR N.A. Nazarbayev:

This war must cease. While categorically repudiating a strong state's seizure of a weaker one, we also see that the UN mandate is being exceeded. This war should not turn into mass murder. All this must not be a pretense for America to demonstrate its concentrated force to us all...."

President of the Republic of Kirghizia A.A. Akayev:

"Saddam Husayn is an aggressor and he must leave Kuwait. But it is apparent that in this war America is pursuing objectives much greater than the liberation of Kuwait. These are geopolitical objectives. We are part of the Islamic world, Islamic culture. We cannot be indifferent to what is happening in the Persian Gulf region. The attitude in the republic to this war is also ambiguous. Iraq is indeed not only one of the powerful states of the Near East, but also one of the thousand-year-old cultural centers for Muslims.

I think that in the new Union Treaty the participation of all the sovereign republics in the development of the foreign policy direction of our union state should be clearly established. In particular, this applies to events in the Persian Gulf region. The Soviet government worked out a specific position, but in fact did not consult with a

single republic on it—neither with the Central Asian Republics and Kazakhstan, nor with those situated in direct proximity to the area of combat actions....This situation must change with the adoption of the new Union Treaty....“

IZVESTIYA on Start of Ground Offensive

*91UM0405A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 Feb 91 Union Edition pp 1,4*

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Blinov: “The Ground Offensive Has Begun”]

[Text] Washington—The troops of the anti-Iraq coalition have begun an massed offensive on the Armed Forces of Iraq; preparations for the attack have been underway over recent days.

U.S. President G. Bush made the official declaration on the beginning of the offensive in a two-minute statement at 2200 on Saturday. He appeared before the television cameras 20 minutes after he arrived by helicopter from the Camp David retreat, where he had supposedly gone to rest. In reality, as the American press confirms, the departure of the head of the administration from the city was used to misinform the Iraqi leadership about Washington’s true intentions. At 1200 Washington time the deadline ran out for the ultimatum presented by Washington to Baghdad in the name of the anti-Iraq coalition. It envisaged an extremely short period of time for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait—seven days—and a number of other demands which were not accepted by the Iraqi leadership.

For its part, the United States and the other participants of the anti-Iraq coalition did not accept the plan that was drawn up in the course of consultations in Moscow with Tariq ‘Aziz, Iraqi minister of foreign affairs. The plan, which was in fact accepted by Iraq, stipulated, in particular, a more realistic deadline for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces—21 days. However, in Washington it was judged to be “insufficient.” Iraq was presented an ultimatum demanding that it accept the conditions formulated in the White House and coordinated with the other participants in the coalition.

“Saddam Husayn was offered a last chance to leave Kuwait without conditions and delay and to carry out the demands of the resolutions of the UN Security Council,” said G. Bush. “Unfortunately, by the deadline established at noon the Iraqi Government had not agreed to fulfill our demands for an unconditional withdrawal of troops from Kuwait as formulated in the resolutions of the Security Council and embodied in the coalition.” Moreover, according to the American President, the Iraqi forces in Kuwait were redoubling their efforts to carry out destruction within Kuwait.

In conjunction with this, reported G. Bush, “I gave the order for General Schwarzkopf, together with the forces of the coalition, to conduct a wide-scale offensive using all forces, including ground troops, in order to drive the Iraqi military from Kuwait.” This decision was made,

according to G. Bush, as the result of broad consultations with all the members of the anti-Iraq coalition.

“The liberation of Kuwait has entered the final phase. I am fully confident of the ability of the coalition to quickly and decisively carry out the task,” declared G. Bush.

Thirty minutes after the speech by the American President, R. Cheney, U.S. secretary of defense, held a news conference. The head of the Pentagon generally limited himself to confirming the fact of the beginning of the offensive by forces of the anti-Iraq coalition without even naming its precise time. The main portion of his speech was dedicated to the statement that, pending a special announcement, the Pentagon would be halting briefings for journalists on the course of military operations and would in general “screen” the flow of information. This step is being taken in order to ensure the secrecy of operations being conducted and to deny the enemy information which he could use in operations to repulse the offensive of the anti-Iraq coalition.

Under conditions of the existing prohibition on reporting specific military operations, the American mass media are limited to fragmentary reports from their correspondents from the theater of operations. In particular, it is reported that ground operations against the positions of Iraqi forces on the border between Kuwait and Saudi Arabia began in a number of places soon after the deadline of the ultimatum presented to Iraq ran out.

As a White House correspondent with the ABC television corporation reported, citing a conversation with sources close to the American President, the beginning of the offensive virtually coincided with the date and hour proposed a week ago by American General N. Schwarzkopf, commanding general of the anti-Iraq coalition. As the correspondent noted, diplomatic efforts to seek ways for a political resolution to the conflict undertaken in recent days had virtually no influence on the timetable for conducting the military operations against Kuwait and on the choice of deadlines for the beginning of their final stage and a wide-scale ground offensive.

Initial Results of Ground Operation

*91UM0405B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondent B. Ivanov, under the rubric “The Persian Gulf”: “The Order Arrived Before Dawn”]

[Text] Riyadh—On the night of 23-24 February the commanders of the forward units of the coalition forces occupying attack positions facing the forward lines of the Iraqi defense received the order they had long been waiting for. They were broadcast a short coded instruction over military radio communications: “Begin.” Precisely at 0400 columns of tanks and armored vehicles with infantry rushed across passages made the evening before through artificial obstacles and mine fields onto

territory occupied by the Iraqi forces. The ground battle for the liberation of Kuwait had begun.

From the very first minutes of the ground operation the command element of the multinational forces in Saudi Arabia, acting in accordance with instructions received from the Pentagon, officially introduced a so-called "information quarantine" and refused to communicate to journalists any information on the development of the situation at the front. The reason for such a step, in the words of a representative of the allied command, was to contribute as much as possible to the successful conduct of the planned maneuvers of the coalition subunits and to deny Baghdad the opportunity to guess the plans of the allies and thus reduce their probable effectiveness by analyzing data offered by the press. It is expected that the aforementioned "quarantine" may last several days or at least until the forces of the allies achieve a decisive edge over the Iraqis.

Meanwhile, the following picture may be pieced together from the information reaching the circle of journalists. The attack of the coalition units is developing in four main directions. The front-line combat forces, consisting primarily of U.S. subunits, are assaulting two areas on the Saudi-Kuwaiti border, driving a wedge into the defensive formation of the Iraqi combat force in Kuwait. In the meantime British and French forces and units of other coalition participants are penetrating the Saudi-Iraqi border west of Kuwait, trying, it is assumed, to cut communications and supply lines between the main Iraqi forces in Iraq and the Iraqi occupation forces on the territory of Kuwait. And, finally, the fourth assault consists of the landing of American Marines on the Kuwaiti coast with the simultaneous support of an air assault aimed against the rear services of the forward military units in Kuwait. In other words the allies, as was expected, have adopted the tactic of "double envelopment" of the enemy in order to subsequently surround and destroy the Iraqi forces.

According to sources, for the time being the offensive of the allies is going successfully and in complete accordance with the plan. The Iraqi forces are showing only insignificant opposition, preferring to surrender. For example, in the first hours of the operation the attack ships of the coalition navies seized the Kuwaiti island of Faylakah, situated at the entrance to Kuwait Bay, practically without a single shot fired. Despite the fact that over past months substantial defensive fortifications have been built on the island, about 1,000 Iraqis there did not put up any opposition and preferred to lay down their weapons.

Subunits of British and French forces that have crossed the Iraqi border and already travelled more than 20 km into Iraqi territory are also not meeting any serious and organized opposition. The Iraqi soldiers are acting very passively and are not making any attempts to regroup, occupy positions more advantageous for defense, or use their combat equipment, which continues to sit idle in the shelters.

Those are the results of the first hours of the wide-scale offensive that the coalition forces have begun.

Primakov Details Third Mission to Baghdad

*91UF0517A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 8, 27 Feb 91 p 4*

[Interview with Academician Ye. Primakov by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA observer I. Belyayev; place and date not given: "The Tanks Did Not Wait"]

[Text]

[Belyayev] Why did the idea of a third mission to Baghdad come about?

[Primakov] The trip was determined by M.S. Gorbachev's statement made on 9 February. This statement was of extraordinarily great, pivotal, significance, I would say. It confirmed the scrupulous position of the Soviet Union consisting of the need to secure the unconditional and full withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. At the same time concern was for the first time expressed in serious terms in connection with the nature of the military operations had assumed. The air strikes were being inflicted not only on Iraq's military but also industrial targets. The large-scale ground operation which was taking shape was threatening to grow into bloody carnage. The number of casualties among peaceful inhabitants was growing. The entire danger of actions on the Iraqi side had been manifested: The release of a vast quantity of oil into the waters of the Persian Gulf had engendered ecological danger and evoked the concern of all mankind.

Iraq's provocative missile attacks on peaceful Israeli and Saudi targets threatened to pull other countries of the region into the military operations. The Iraqi leadership had confirmed its readiness to use weapons of mass destruction in the war. Calls for the use of various types of such weapons were being heard from the other side also.

A closed circle had been formed where actions evoked counteractions, the latter, in turn, counteractions once again and so forth. It could only be "broken" in two ways: either the crushing military defeat of Iraq or one further attempt to bring matters toward a political settlement.

The statement of the President of the USSR posed as scrupulously as could be the question of the fact that the situation was being driven to a most dangerous impasse as a result of the position of Baghdad, which was rejecting the demands for its withdrawal from Kuwait. Attention was called also to the fact that a trend toward the anti-Iraq coalition going beyond the framework of the mandate which had been given by the UN Security Council was being manifested. I would recall that it proclaimed in Resolution 678 the possibility of the use of military measures also together with other means against Iraq if it refused to withdraw its forces from Kuwait. However, it was in fact the case that "all other actions"

had receded into the background and that practically no attention had been paid to them.

It was under these conditions that it was decided to once again send a representative of the President of the USSR to Baghdad to attempt, under wartime conditions this time, to turn Saddam Husayn toward a political settlement providing (I wish to say this once again) for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces without a continuation of the war, which was becoming more and more dangerous.

[Belyayev] But why was precisely the 24th day of the war chosen?

[Primakov] There is no significance here. It is simply that it was the 24th day of the war when I received the President of the USSR's assignment. The overall picture, about which I spoke in response to the first question, had become perfectly clear by this time.

[Belyayev] The itinerary via Tehran was accidental?

[Primakov] It is most convenient to get to Baghdad via Iran. The Iranian authorities displayed full interest in the success of our mission. En route to the Iraqi capital and back, everything was done to facilitate our assignments as much as possible.

But there was also another aspect, which was of considerable significance in the choice of route. Iran's position in the search for a way out of the Kuwait crisis—very active, what is more—largely coincided with our approaches, and the discussion at Tehran Airport with the Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister was of undoubted interest.

[Belyayev] Baghdad has been considerably demolished?

[Primakov] Great destruction, but "point-of-resistance" destruction. Television shots do not provide a full picture of the city and show merely the bombed areas. But what is characteristic is that the aircraft of the United States and other participants in the multinational force have destroyed with missiles and bombs not only military or quasi-military targets but entirely different ones also: big "prestige" buildings of the ministries of justice and public works and the Palace of Congresses, which was bombed at the time of our visit to Baghdad—it was located 150 meters from the al-Rashid Hotel, where we were staying.

The Americans often speak of the precision of the strikes. But there cannot be "surgical" incisions separating targets from the homes situated alongside. I do not think that residential areas were a special target of the aviation of the multinational force. But at the same time it is clear that if bridges or buildings in heavily populated areas are hit, this could lead and is leading to casualties among the peaceful population.

[Belyayev] What impression does Saddam Husayn make? What about him had changed since the previous visit?

[Primakov] We met in an ordinary house, not a bunker. We had thought that this was a "crossing point" and that

we would be kept there a while and then taken to Saddam. But, no. Saddam Husayn and the entire leadership came to us. He had clearly grown thinner since our last meeting three months ago. But comported himself, as before, with assurance and composure.

[Belyayev] How did the conversation begin?

[Primakov] I would not want to go into detail inasmuch as the mission to Baghdad was continued both in the form of a statement of the Iraqi leadership of 15 February and then of the visit to Moscow of Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz. But I can say one thing with certainty: in this conversation—the third—in Baghdad with S. Husayn I continued the former line. Its essence was showing him that the alternative to a decision to withdraw his forces from Kuwait could only be a war with the severest consequences for both Iraq and the whole region.

I told Husayn, and he agreed, that the way to a solution of the Palestinian problem, about which the Iraqi leaders are saying a great deal, by no means lies via the destruction of Iraq or a severe weakening of it. Even from this viewpoint a tough decision on the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait was essential.

[Belyayev] What, for all that, seemed promising there, in Baghdad?

[Primakov] The fact that Saddam Husayn under those conditions was really "open" for the first time to a study of the question of the unconditional withdrawal of his forces from Kuwait.

[Belyayev] Did the information reach Moscow before the actual departure from Baghdad?

[Primakov] Sending telegrams from Baghdad now is difficult: there is no power, a small generator operates for communications, but there is no gasoline; consequently, lengthy telegrams are ruled out. Communications to Moscow included only the main results of the conversation with S. Husayn. The summary said that certain promising points had emerged.

[Belyayev] Why was the statement with the Iraqi leadership put out two days after your departure from Baghdad encumbered with so many conditions of the withdrawal of forces from Kuwait?

[Primakov] The main sense of this statement was that Saddam Husayn publicly announced for the first time a readiness to withdraw the forces and contribute to the fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolution 660—it proclaimed the need for the **unconditional** withdrawal of Iraqi forces. But it is perfectly clear that Iraq simply could not in its first steps have presented a cardinal change in its position without an appropriate propaganda framework.

This was what happened in the 15 February statement.

[Belyayev] Did hopes persist following Tariq Aziz's negotiations in Moscow?

[Primakov] Hopes persisted and became more objective even.

Tariq Aziz, as our readers know, flew to Moscow one more time. He arrived in the evening of 22 February and was immediately received by President M.S. Gorbachev. As instructed by Mikhail Sergeyevich, Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and I continued the negotiations with T. Aziz early in the morning. Under our influence the Iraqis' position was continually evolving. Ultimately we got Tariq Aziz and subsequently the entire Iraqi leadership (this was confirmed by Saddam Husayn in the evening of the 23d) to accept the six points, which, it seemed, afforded a way out of the crisis. I would like to cite these points.

1. Iraq agrees to implement Resolution 660, that is, immediately and unconditionally withdraw all its forces from Kuwait to the positions they occupied on 1 August 1990.
2. The withdrawal of forces will begin the day after a cease-fire and a termination of all military operations on land, at sea and in the air.
3. The withdrawal of forces will be completed within 21 days, including the withdrawal of forces from Kuwait City within the first four days.
4. Immediately following the completion of the withdrawal of forces from Kuwait, the reasons in accordance with which the other resolutions of the Security Council were adopted will be inoperative, and, by virtue of this, the said resolutions will cease to have effect.
5. All POW's will be released and repatriated within three days following a cease-fire and an end to military operations.
6. The cease-fire and withdrawal of forces to be confirmed, monitored, and inspected by observers and/or the peacekeeping forces themselves, as determined by the UN Security Council.

M.S. Gorbachev notified by phone the results that were achieved—which attest to a qualitative shift in the Iraqi position—a whole number of leaders of the United States, Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Japan, Egypt, Syria, and Iran. Telegrams were sent to the leaders of the members of the Security Council. But the United States delivered an ultimatum, which differed in practice from these six points in two respects: First, it did not proclaim a cease-fire (if only several hours prior to the start of a withdrawal of forces!) and, second, contracted the time-frame of the withdrawal of these forces to the utmost. The Soviet Union offered to discuss these differences at an urgently convened meeting of the UN Security Council. It was in practice a question of postponing ground operations for one or two days. The Americans and their allies refused.

[Belyayev] Was Bush's decision to begin the ground operations a surprise?

[Primakov] I will be honest: I was hoping up to the final moment that this would not happen and that the politicians would be allowed if only a further couple of days, no more, to work.

Saddam's Aircraft Sighted Near Baghdad

91UM0427A Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Feb 91 p 5

[Article by TRUD special correspondent V. Sisnev: "Is Husayn's Plane at the Ready?"]

[Text] Washington, 27 February—Two jet aircraft which are usually used by the Iraqi president have been sighted by American intelligence at a military airfield in the immediate vicinity of Baghdad. The previous day they were not there. This is arousing speculation that Saddam Husayn may be providing himself the means to flee the country, possibly to the neighboring friendly countries of Jordan or Libya. His current location, from which he has broadcast a report to the Iraqis concerning his call for a "withdrawal of forces from Kuwait," has not been established.

These same sources report that over the last week eight division commanders have been shot by order of Husayn, including a general who headed one of the divisions of the elite "Republican Guard." In all, since the 2 August invasion of Kuwait at least 100 senior officers have been put to death. It has also been established that prayers directed against the regime are increasingly being heard in Iraqi mosques. The conclusion is being drawn that Husayn no longer feels secure and that he is perhaps preparing to leave his remaining circle to their own fate.

At present psychologists and military consultants are calculating Husayn's options, and the allied forces, which are predominantly made up of U.S. soldiers as everyone knows, are undertaking very real maneuvers in order to deprive the Iraqi leader of any possible hope of remaining in that capacity.

The main assault forces of Schwarzkopf, bypassing the Iraqi fortifications in Kuwait just as the fearsome Maginot Line was bypassed at one time, hit the rear area of those members of the "Republican Guard" who were stationed as a second echelon between the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border and the Euphrates River. Their task was to eliminate the "Republican Guard" as a combat force or, in any case, not to allow it to remain at the disposal of Husayn with all its equipment.

If we look at the political side of what has happened, Les Aspin, chairman of a committee of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives, expressed himself candidly on this count. He was the first of the highest circles of power to propose directly that the allies use the Iraqi territory they have seized as a lever for influencing the postwar structure of Iraq. Fitzwater, the White House press representative, hastened to disavow this statement as a "personal point of view." But a "highly placed Pentagon employee" who remained anonymous told a correspondent of THE WASHINGTON POST literally the same

thing: Control of southeastern Iraq would be a "hard reality" permitting the allies to influence events at the end of the war.

It seems that things are tending that way. In the first place, the mass media have begun to carry discussions to the effect that the UN resolution gives the coalition the right to use "all necessary means" to free Kuwait from any restrictions at all and that no prohibitions in the sense of the conduct of military actions on Iraqi soil are established. In the second place, Fitzwater quite clearly said at the Monday briefing that even if the "Republican Guard" is able to retreat into the depths of Iraq, American forces will pursue it there and continue to destroy the combat equipment and personnel of the enemy...

Ground Campaign in Kuwait Summarized

91UM0427B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 28 Feb 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by Colonel D. Belskiy under the rubric "Opinion of a Political Commentator": "Liberation or Aggression"]

[Text] Operation "Desert Storm" is already being considered the largest combat operation since the time of World War II. Indeed, ground, air, and naval forces comprising more than 700,000 men, 1,000 tanks, more than 2,000 combat aircraft, and over 100 ships took part in it.

The coalition nature of the operation, of course, has required a high degree of interaction in combat operations [boyevoye deystviye], operations which have also taken into account the political nature of the participation of each of the coalition members. It is enough to say that contingents of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Saudi Arabia, Syria, the United Emirates, Oman, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Qatar took part in the offensive operation alone.

It should be stressed that initially the Iraqis made every effort to drag the multinational forces into a "great land campaign" before the air forces of the allies could finally destroy the Iraqi military infrastructure. This, however, did not fit into the calculations of the coalition, especially the United States, for both military and political reasons, and the coalition managed to adhere to its strategy.

What has been a deciding factor in the results of the five days of ground operations of the coalition forces? In the operations of the Iraqi forces one cannot help but notice that, deprived of maneuverability by the air bombardment, they took up a "static" defense. In addition, by all indications, although it was disposed in great depth and was quite fierce, the defense was created with the aim of repulsing a massed and primarily frontal attack by the coalition forces.

The command element of the allied forces refused to attack head-on and instead split the enemy force by penetration. It should also be noted that at the beginning of the ground operation the Iraqi combat force in Kuwait

was practically cut off from its main forces. According to some evaluations, at least 90 percent of communications and transportation and supply lines tying it to Iraq was destroyed as a result of the bombardment. Logistic support of ammunition and food was significantly disrupted.

The methodical destruction of the military machine of Iraq created the necessary conditions for the beginning of the ground operation. The forces of the allies destroyed 40 percent of the Iraqi armed forces located in the zone of offensive operations (1,685 tanks, 925 armored personnel carriers, and 1,485 artillery pieces).

In the meantime one must also note the element of tactical surprise. As a result of the bombardment and artillery shellings, the Iraqi forces were no longer able to fully conduct reconnaissance. In addition, the allied forces were conducting fairly energetic measures to disseminate false information.

An important element in the choice of a time for the beginning of ground combat operations was the change in the morale of the Iraqi soldiers.

All of this convinced the coalition command element that, as a result of a wide-scale attack by ground forces, the Iraqi military would be defeated very quickly and with far fewer losses on the part of the allies than had been previously supposed.

An analysis of the operations at the initial stage shows that they developed along one of the proposed scenarios. Its most important feature was an operation to encircle and seal off the 545,000-man combat force dug in over the entire territory of Kuwait and in the southern regions Iraq. During the night hours preceding the attack the formidable shelling continued. The number of combat sorties in the course of the beginning of the offensive increased to a record level for all of operation "Desert Storm"—3,000. It was difficult for the Iraqis to simply lead their forces out of their fortifications without risking further losses.

Tank assaults were conducted in support of this plan: there was one assault in the direction of Basra—it pursued the goal of encircling and isolating the Iraqi combat force in Kuwait itself, and another cut off the Iraqi elite units, which had preserved the greatest combat readiness, from it. Even though these elite units had endured powerful assaults, consideration was given to the fact that their system of defensive structures and fortifications had been created using the latest engineering technology. In addition, the Guard was considered to be personally devoted to Saddam Husayn. And they turned out to be the most serious opposition to the coalition forces in the Euphrates River valley.

The final stage in the assault against the Republican Guard should be the capture of Basra. Communications tying the main forces of the Iraqi military intersect there, which determines the strategic significance of that city. However, taking into consideration the fact that the

bombardment has already disrupted them to a significant degree, one imagines that the completion of an outer noose of encirclement will be important.

On the fast pace of the offensive operations of the allied forces. Over a period of six or seven hours they crossed the entire territory of Kuwait from west to east and entered the area of the capital, Kuwait City. Simultaneously British and French forces, having surmounted the combat positions of the Iraqi forces, seized territory to the north of Kuwait at the end of three days of operations. In this fashion opportunities for the Iraqi forces to retreat were sealed off.

A major assault force that was airdropped on the second day of operations 80 km from the Iraqi border—that is the tactical depth of the Iraqi defense—with massed fire support of helicopters, affected the general course of the operations. To all appearances this event will go down in the annals of airborne operations inasmuch as it included an unprecedented number of helicopters which carried out massed attacks on the positions of the enemy and delivered needed combat equipment, gear, and ammunition.

Another event was an amphibious landing operation. It included 300 amphibious ships of the naval forces of the allies that were concentrated in the Persian Gulf. These ships delivered a Marine amphibious landing.

One of the quickest events of the ground operation was the liberation of the Kuwaiti capital—an amphibious assault by Marine subunits near the city, a landing in the capital itself by special-purpose airborne assault troops, and the capture by U.S. Marine subunits of Faylakah Island (located 40 km further north), which was an obstacle to approaches to the capital. Characteristically, from the very beginning of operation “Desert Storm” the assault troops were working out combat operations under urban conditions.

Military experts presume that operations to eliminate the Iraqi combat force in Kuwait will last several days more. In the end the success of the offensive operation of the allies will depend on how well they can deny the use of mobile strategic reserves by the Iraqi command element. An opinion exists that the Iraqi military will agree to surrender as a result. In the meantime a cease-fire in the Persian Gulf war is not foreseen.

IZVESTIYA Notes ‘Disorderly’ Iraqi Retreat

*91UM0428A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Feb 91 Union Edition pp 1, 4*

[Article by B. Ivanov: “Iraqi Troops Retreat in Disorder”]

[Text] Riyadh—Despite the fact that the firing has not yet died down in the central parts of Kuwait, the Kuwaiti national flag is flying above many houses and administrative buildings in the suburbs. Almost seven months after the start of the Iraqi occupation and only three days after the start of the offensive by the coalition forces, Al-Kuwayt has again become the capital of a sovereign

state. It is expected that in the hours immediately ahead the city will be completely cleared of Iraqi troops.

On 26 February, making maximum use of their own superiority over the Iraqis in terms of mobility and fire power, the multinational forces succeeded in even further developing the success already achieved in the Kuwaiti theater. Iraqi military groupings, thoroughly battered during the five-week air war, were unable to withstand the massive and rapid onslaught of coalition units and “collapsed.” As a result, Iraqi units were forced to initiate a retreat toward the Iraqi border, which in some cases was a disorderly flight from the battlefield.

Maintaining constant pressure on retreating Iraqi units, allied troops used an unexpected flanking movement to cut them into small groups, which were then surrounded and destroyed if they refused to surrender. However, there were few such refusals. According to official figures from the coalition command, more than 40,000 Iraqis were taken prisoner. And here it should be borne in mind that this figure is very approximate, and the true number of prisoners may be much higher. According to Brigadier General Richard Neal, deputy chief of staff for U.S. Forces headquarters, the influx of prisoners is so great that the military police units dealing with them have simply been unable to make an accurate count of Iraqi prisoners.

By the end of the third day of the ground war, 21 Iraqi divisions has sustained such enormous losses that according to the allied command they were no longer full-fledged military units and were combat incapable and, most important of all, had no desire to fight. The remnants of these units spread around the desert are trying to leave Kuwaiti territory somehow and return to Iraq. This is, however, not so simple. Despite a statement from Saddam Husayn to the effect that he is withdrawing his troops from Kuwait, the allies are doing everything possible to prevent the withdrawal of Iraqi units “intact and with their combat equipment.”

“The statement by the Iraqi president on troop withdrawal is dictated by the fact that he has finally admitted that it will not take much more for him to lose his Army, which is his main support helping him to stay in power. So he is trying to prevent this from happening. However, we will not allow him to do this...” This was the opinion expressed to me by an American military source, and virtually all the members of the anti-Iraq coalition share that opinion. The Western generals are making no secret of the fact that together with the liberation of Kuwait, the main goal of the present campaign has been to smash the Iraqi war machine and deprive Baghdad of military-economic potential, thus weakening the present political leadership in Iraq as much as possible; if the regime of Saddam Husayn cannot be overthrown directly, then it should be pushed to brink of collapse.

Military experts are suggesting that it is exactly in the context of fulfilling this mission that the rapid thrust of American, French, and British troops into the southeast part of Iraq, where formations of the Republican Guards

are deployed, should be seen. Allied units numbering up to 100,000 men took only hours to cover hundreds of kilometers and reach the banks of the Euphrates, totally blocking all routes of possible retreat for the Republican Guards. Engagements between the allies and the Republican Guards which started even earlier showed that the combat spirit of these elite units is somewhat higher than other units of the Iraqi Army. To judge from everything, the main intention of the guards in the prevailing situation is to break through into Iraq as quickly as possible and to do it with minimum losses. This is precisely why they are avoiding major engagements and are trying to find some kind of breach in the combat formation of the allies. Notwithstanding, according to the experts, the fate of the guards has already been largely sealed beforehand. Even if they succeed in breaking through the allies' blocking force, which possibility is almost excluded, they will still be unable to move because all the bridges and crossings across the Euphrates were destroyed earlier by the coalition forces. In this event, the guards will become a perfect target for the coalition air forces.

As was to be expected, units of the multinational forces that reached the Kuwaiti capital launched an operation on the evening of 26 February to liberate the city. At the same

time, armored and motorized columns of allied units moved into the suburbs of the capital from several sides and engaged. In some regions, particularly those close to the capital's airport, Iraqi troops offered quite serious resistance. From the first minutes of the battle, however, the Iraqi soldiers found themselves between a rock and a hard place: Units of the Kuwaiti resistance, now emerging from underground, attacked unexpectedly from the rear.

It is now known that the Kuwaitis, who had prepared enormous stocks of food, water, medicines, and other essential items on Saudi territory, have started their redeployment into Kuwait. It is assumed that food stocks will be sufficient for all the country's inhabitants for three months. At the same time the Kuwaiti Government has taken a first step toward re-assuming full powers in the country. This was how observers regarded the order from the Amir of Kuwait, Jabir al-Sabah, to impose martial law in the country for three months and to appoint the prime minister, Crown Prince Shaykh Sa'ad al-'Abdallah, military governor for that period.

As far as the further development of events at the front are concerned, in the opinion of the coalition command, in a day or two the "battle of Kuwait" may be over.

22161

61

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103

5285 PORT ROYAL RD

SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication, policy, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication should cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.