

0570070

JPRS-TAC-85-057

25 November 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



19980728 090

DISCONTINUED

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

9
44
A63

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

25 November 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG's BILD Carries Passages of Gorbachev Letter (Hamburg BILD, 2, 4 Nov 85).....	1
Gorbachev Warns Kohl	1
Further Report	2
FRG's Kohl 'Demands' Genscher Halt Negative SDI Comments (Bonn DIE WELT, 6 Nov 85).....	4
France's Quiles on Space Arms, Nuclear Research (Hong Kong AFP, 9 Nov 85; Paris AFP, 12 Nov 85).....	5
Views 'Destablizing' Weapons	5
Outlines Research Efforts	5

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Soviet Comment on Reagan's New Arms Proposals at Press Conference (Moscow TASS, 1 Nov 85; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 3 Nov 85).....	7
'Old Commodity, New Wrapping'	7
IZVESTIYA Report	9
Public Interviewed on Upcoming Summit. Arms Proposals (Moscow Television Service, 2 Nov 85).....	10
TASS Hits Weinberger Speech to Foreign Policy Association (Moscow TASS International Service, 5 Nov 85).....	13
USSR's Karpov Explains Soviet Stand to Canadian Press (Moscow TASS, 25 Oct 85).....	14
USSR: U.S. Cites 'Rigged' Missile Data at NATO Meeting (Moscow TASS, 26 Oct 85).....	15

Continued Soviet Attacks on NATO Nuclear Planning Meeting (Various sources, various dates).....	16
U.S. Attempting 'To Distort'	16
Comments on Results	17
'Differences of Opinion'	18
USSR: USA Institute Officials Voice Pessimism (Moscow in English to North America, 11 Nov 85).....	20
FRG's Genscher Says U.S. Serious About Geneva Summit (Hamburg DPA, 3 Nov 85).....	24
FRG's Genscher, Netherlands' van den Broek Meet (Hamburg DPA, 4 Nov 85).....	25
Reagan Speech at UN Called 'Unworthy' of U.S. by Czech Press (Prague RUDE PRAVO, 26 Oct 85).....	26
Czechs Denounce Reagan Arms Proposals as 'Variant' of Old (Prague Domestic Service, 2 Nov 85; Prague Interna- tional Service, 2 Nov 85).....	28
U.S. Military Budget	28
U.S. Still Seeks Superiority, by Jindrich Makota	29
U.S. 'Falsifying' Weapons Counts	30
Importance of Warsaw Pact Statement Noted by CSSR (Prague Domestic Service, 24 Oct 85; Bratislava Domestic Service, 24 Oct 85).....	31
Immediate Solution Demanded	31
Additional Commentary	32
CSSR Presidium, Government Approve Pact Talks Report (Bratislava Domestic Service, 30 Oct 85).....	33
Turkish Communists Call for Results in Geneva Summit (Voice of the Turkish Communist Party, 5 Nov 85).....	34
 GENERAL	
PRAVDA Editorial Article on European Disarmament (Moscow PRAVDA, 13 Nov 85).....	36

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG'S BILD CARRIES PASSAGES OF GORBACHEV LETTER

Gorbachev Warns Kohl

DW041000 Hamburg BILD in German 2 Nov 85 pp 1, 3

[Text] Kremlin boss Gorbachev, in a 9-page letter to Chancellor Kohl (CDU), has sharply warned against participation in the U.S. SDI program. Moscow's Ambassador to Bonn Semenov presented the letter at the Chancellor's Office Monday. It was an original letter from the Moscow party chief and had been flown to Bonn by courier. A second envelope contained a working translation from Russian into German by the Soviet Embassy in Bonn. The letter was stamped "secret" and was made available in numbered copies to only a few members of the government.

The letter, a copy of which BILD has in its possession, states verbatim: "The question is basically whether the FRG Government will permit its country's material and scientific potential to be used to implement the most dangerous military plans in space.

"It would seem to me that the signs of goodwill on our part should have elicited corresponding steps on the FRG's part. However, that has not happened.

"With the approval of your government, the stepped-up deployment of U.S. Pershing missiles on FRG territory is continuing. Judge for yourself whether we can regard such action as a contribution to the solution of urgent issues..."

Gorbachev continued: "The world has reached a point where the arms buildup and the arms race, in particular in the sphere of nuclear weapons, may get totally out of control."

Gorbachev concludes: "I would like to hope that you, Mr Chancellor will accord due attention to the thoughts I have advanced, and that you will exploit all options at your disposal."

Very truly yours,
M. Gorbachev.

Further Report

DW041041 Hamburg BILD in German 4 Nov 85 pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "Did Gorbachev Send His Letter to BILD?"]

[Text] BILD's (2 November) publication of parts of the secret Gorbachev letter to Chancellor Kohl created excitement in Bonn and Moscow. Government spokesman Ost said on television that the letter probably came to BILD from Soviet sources. As always, the chief editorial board of BILD-ZEITUNG refuses to name the source -- be it in the Soviet Embassy in Bonn, in the chancellery, in Moscow, in the Foreign Office, or elsewhere.

State Secretary Ost bases his theory on the fact that BILD printed only those passages of Gorbachev's letter that are critical to Bonn. So that the public may make an objective assessment, today BILD prints all the important passages of Gorbachev's letter.

The Communist Party chief praises German-Soviet cooperation after the Moscow treaty; he offers further treaties, for instance on scientific-technical cooperation; he wants to take steps to safeguard peace.

Gorbachev to Kohl: The Letter

"Most esteemed Mr Chancellor: I have attentively studied your letter which was handed to me on 11 September by the FRG ambassador. In the letter you indicate interest in continuing the political dialogue that we began in March this year on a broad range of current international problems.

"We have always advocated an active exchange of opinion with the FRG Government and with the governments of other West European countries. In other words a businesslike and constructive dialogue that would contribute to the search for points of contact on basic problems of peace and security..."

Gorbachev goes on to say: "With our proposal (banning space weapons, reducing the number of missiles by 50 percent -- editor) we have been striving to safeguard the best possible conditions to overcome the deadlocked process of negotiations on nuclear and space armament and to achieve agreements. Thus a real breakthrough would be achieved in the development of international relations from which peace, security, and cooperation would benefit. I think that we can expect, with justification, that the West will cover its part of the journey in response to our proposals. One would hope that the FRG Government would also make appropriate corrections in its attitude in view of new Soviet initiatives..."

The Communist Party chief then deals with intermediate-range missiles: "As you know, the Soviet Union has introduced a moratorium on deployment of its missiles of that class in Europe. Recently, we exempted from the duty system those SS-20 missiles that were additionally deployed in June 1984 as a reaction to the deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe. Simultaneously, the dismantling of the SS-4 missiles will be continued; we have already dismantled all SS-5 missiles. As a whole, the number of intermediate-range delivery systems in the European zone of the USSR is considerably lower than that of 10 or 15 years..."

Gorbachev deals with the U.S. SDI space weapons program: "As to space problems... the wish is rather clearly expressed in your letter to depict such a program as quite legitimate and integrated into the framework of the ABM treaty..."

"Objectively, the situation in the field of disarmament is such that militarization of space would not only make the reduction of nuclear arsenals impossible, it would also create a dangerous arms race in every direction with really unimaginable consequences... I would like to hope that the FRG Government would act here in awareness of the responsibility it has assumed before its own and other peoples..."

Broad coverage is given to the European issue: "I have repeatedly stated in public, and I want to stress it again today, that the Soviet Union wants to participate actively in making Europe a continent of peace and mutually advantageous cooperation among all countries and peoples."

"As far as bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG are concerned, I would like to note that we judge political objectives and intentions... primarily on the basis of their practical deeds. And if FRG policy is received in the Soviet Union, and in a number of other countries in a manner different from what Bonn desires, it is not our fault. The Soviet Union holds to its fundamental course. It is prepared to continue developing mutually advantageous cooperation with the FRG in the most diversified fields on the solid basis of the Moscow treaty."

"We could examine yet some other practical issues broached in your letter, among them the question about the conclusion of work on the scientific-technical cooperation agreement."

"But not for a moment must the problems of security be put aside. They are indeed of determining significance for the East-West relationship as a whole and for the relations between the USSR and the FRG, as you yourself have acknowledged. The Soviet Union will duly appreciate all efforts of the FRG Government to safeguard peace and security in Europe and to discontinue the arms race."

"It would open broad new prospects to develop cooperation between our countries. The positive experiences we have had since the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty clearly testify to the fact that the Soviet Union and the FRG indeed can act as partners in solving the cardinal problems of the present..."

"Very truly yours,"

/9274

CSO: 5200/2540

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG'S KOHL 'DEMANDS' GENSCHER HALT NEGATIVE SDI COMMENTS

DW060947 Bonn DIE WELT in German 6 Nov 85 p 1

[Article by "MS": "Kohl Challenges Genscher -- SDI Planning Unchanged"]

[Excerpt] Bonn -- Chancellor Helmut Kohl demanded in a talk with Foreign Minister Genscher (FDP) that indiscretions by the Foreign Ministry and negative remarks by the minister in the discussion on German participation in the U.S. SDI research program be stopped. An insider said that a telephone talk between Kohl and Genscher on Monday was, in part, such that "the walls began to shake."

The federal chancellor reminded the foreign minister of cabinet discipline and internal government agreements and stated that he who believes that he is unable to support that course then he should give the matter some consideration. According to Kohl, the Federal Government will decide on SDI after the Geneva summit meeting in late November.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2540

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRANCE'S QUILES ON SPACE ARMS, NUCLEAR RESEARCH

Views 'Destabilizing' Weapons

HK090550 Hong Kong AFP in English 0536 GMT 9 Nov 85

[Text] Paris, Nov 9 (AFP) -- The French Parliament early today approved a 158.3 billion francs (20 billion dollars) defense budget for 1986. Apart from one centrist, only the governing Socialist Party -- which has a majority in the chamber of deputies -- voted for the text.

The defense funds, accounting for 13.9 per cent of the total national budget, represented a 5.4 per cent increase over current military spending. A last-minute amendment to the budget included some 21 million francs (2.6 million dollars) to issue credit cards enabling conscripts to make free telephone calls during their basic training period.

In debate before the vote, Defense Minister Paul Quiles said France must move toward conquering space since "space has become an added dimension in strategic relations." He said the "uncontrolled extension of destabilizing weapons systems in space" had become a "major political problem" for France, which should give priority to this subject along with nuclear technology, overseas intervention capability, and modernization of conventional forces.

For the opposition, neo-Gaullist RPR defense spokesman Francois Fillon said that, to make its nuclear deterrent effective, France should have satellite-killer weapons as well as observation satellites.

Outlines Research Efforts

AU121146 Paris AFP in English 1140 GMT 12 Nov 85

[Text] Paris, Nov 12 (AFP) -- Defence Minister Paul Quiles revealed today he has ordered research into how French nuclear defences could be adapted in view of the proposed U.S. "star wars" space defences, which he strongly criticised.

France, he said, would extend research into nuclear penetration techniques, including a near-invisible "miniaturised" submarine-launched warhead, and study possible ways of "exhausting" an adversary's defence and "blowing up" radar.

Mr Quiles, in the defence minister's annual address to the National Defence Higher Studies Institute at the military academy, also said he wanted a second nuclear-power aircraft carrier, and two more nuclear attack submarines, making nine in all.

Mr Quiles, whose government urges Western European civilian high technology cooperation in the "Eureka" project, said the U.S. "star wars" Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) for a space-based missile defence shield seemed to owe more to ideology than strategic concept. The quality and determination of its researchers could not be underestimated, he said, "but the achievement of a foolproof defensive shield is today hardly credible."

In addition, in any rapid response it could only be effective by way of "a completely automatic functioning and a launch without human intervention."

"This is a logic which has never been accepted either by political officials or public opinions," Mr Quiles said.

Mr Quiles said France was concerned that the U.S.-proposed space shield, ineffective against medium- or short-range ballistic missiles threatening Western Europe, would mean "unequal security zones" within the NATO alliance. The transitional period for development of the shield would also constitute a "particularly critical phase" for world security, as a very short war could intervene since it was thought the world had escaped the nuclear threat.

The SDI, Mr Quiles added, also risked causing a strengthening of Soviet defensive programmes.

"The more the superpowers stress strategic defensive programmes, the more the penetration capacity of our missiles will become the fundamental criterion for the credibility of our dissuasion force."

This was why he had decided to extend a programme launched last year of aid to penetration techniques. He had asked the Atomic Energy Commissariat (CEA) for "highly ambitious" aims for 1994, when France's new-generation nuclear missile-launching submarine was due to enter service, for the "miniaturisation" of nuclear warheads. The CEA believed it possible to achieve a warhead near-invisible to radar defences by then, Mr Quiles said.

"We will study the possibility of using missiles to exhaust adverse defences, (and) pursue studies on the blinding of radars by nuclear explosions," Mr Quiles said.

France would also "reserve the possibility" of developing, in view of the conclusions of SDI studies in 1990, a "new system of weapons," he added. A decision on its components had been postponed until after 1990.

Mr Quiles said the French Navy was of primary importance as it had a capacity to project power while able to deploy at low cost, giving it an "inestimable value." The aircraft carrier was thus indispensable to action abroad, and it was imperative to order a second nuclear vessel in 1989. The first was due on the stocks next year.

With a major programme for nuclear attack submarines already launched, in which a seventh submarine was envisaged for the 1986 budget, France had to order two more in the coming years, Mr Quiles added.

/7358

CSO: 5200/2541

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET COMMENT ON REAGAN'S NEW ARMS PROPOSALS AT PRESS CONFERENCE

'Old Commodity, New Wrapping'

LD011402 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 1 Nov 85

["Old Commodity in a New Wrapping?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, November 1 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev and Vladimir Chernyshev write:

At a press conference in the White House, President Ronald Reagan of the United States has come forward with a statement on new U.S. proposals at the talks on nuclear and space arms. According to the President, the purpose of the proposals is to contribute to achieving real cuts in nuclear arms, to strengthening stability and to solving problems with due regard for the legitimate interests of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The President did not concretize the essence of the U.S. proposals, referring to the confidentiality of the talks. However, spokesmen of his administration immediately revealed a number of concrete details of the proposals, hurrying to publicize their ostensibly "constructive character". Judging by the commentaries of the U.S. press and television, the "leak" of information on the U.S. proposals was of an organized and purposeful character.

THE NEW YORK TIMES points out that Reagan in point of fact is putting forward a variation of his old proposals on reducing offensive strategic arms, without substantially changing his stand as to carrying on with the U.S. space-based anti-missile defence system which has been dubbed the "star wars" program.

According to explanations by Washington officials, the United States suggests cutting down the number of warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM's) to the level of 4,500 for each side. The number of warheads on ICBM's should not exceed 3,000.

Noteworthy is the assertion by U.S. official spokesmen that in the field of nuclear arms reductions the USA ostensibly goes farther than is suggested by the Soviet Union. They point out that the USSR suggests that 6,000 warheads be left on nuclear weapons delivery vehicles whereas the USA suggests a lesser amount -- 4,500. In so doing the U.S. spokesmen pass it over in silence that the Soviet proposals at the talks on strategic nuclear arms cover a wide range of such systems including, in particular, all the three elements of the strategic "triad" (ICBM's, SLBM's and heavy bombers) of each of the sides.

The U.S. proposal covers only two elements of the "triad" -- the ICBM's and SLBM's, i.e. 4,500 warheads will remain only on part of nuclear systems. Taking into account all the other nuclear systems, the aggregate number of warheads will be much larger after cutbacks effected according to the U.S. scheme.

A question arises: Why is the third element of the triad -- the strategic bombers -- excluded from the estimates of overall nuclear potentials subject to reduction? Each of U.S. heavy bombers, of which there are 509 in the USA, is capable of carrying 20-28 long-range cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. Apart from the bombers, there also exist other nuclear weapons delivery vehicles which are capable of reaching the territory of other side such as medium-range and forward-based weapons.

Why does not the USA include all those systems in the strategic balance?

As regards those systems, Washington has not gone beyond quite vague promises to tackle the questions of limiting them separately.

Further, the President in his statement asserts that the U.S. proposals equally take into account the interests of the USA and the USSR. However, as follows from explanations by spokesmen for his administration, Ronald Reagan suggests establishing a compulsory sublevel for a number of warheads only on one element of the "triad" -- the ICBM's, i.e. for those systems which constitute the basis of the strategic potential of the USSR. No though restrictions are set for the systems in which the USA is strong -- the SLBM's and heavy bombers. How can one maintain that the interests of each of the sides are taken into account? There are grounds to draw a conclusion that Washington's old aim of gaining one-sided advantages at the negotiating table has not undergone any changes.

It is appropriate to recall that, according to the Soviet proposals, the stationing of more than 60 percent of the overall established number of nuclear warheads is not allowed on any of the elements of the "triad" after reductions are effected.

The head of the White House, publicizing the U.S. proposals, stated that they cover all the three fields which are under discussion at the talks in Geneva, i.e. space weapons, strategic arms and medium-range nuclear systems. However, as follows from his further pronouncements, Washington does not at all intend to abandon its "star wars" program but presupposes to continue to limit itself to explaining those deadly "benefits" which mankind would get as a result of the militarization of outer space.

Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger, interpreting the U.S. proposals, has asserted that the USA is ostensibly prepared to give up any types of arms in the interests of reaching agreements which would be verifiable and would ensure parity. However, he immediately hurried to add that the United States does not intend to give up the Strategic Defence Initiative or to hold talks on it.

Without solving the question of preventing militarization of outer space, it is simply senseless to speak of any limitations on and reductions in nuclear arms.

The U.S. CBS television network reports that the U.S. proposals do not envisage a freeze on work on new weapon systems. Thus, unlike the Soviet Union, the United States virtually comes out against taking effective measures with a view to curbing the nuclear arms race.

Summing up the essence of the U.S. proposals, most Western observers agree that they are based on the USA's same old principles which have failed to lead to progress at the talks in Geneva up to now and which have brought them to a deadlock. It is pointed out, in particular, that Ronald Reagan's proposals are in point of fact the USA's old proposals which have been slightly modified and presented in a new wrapping.

IZVESTIYA Report

PMO21948 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In A Different Wrapping"]

[Text] Washington, 2 Nov -- U.S. President R. Reagan has made a statement at a White House press conference on the new U.S. proposals at the talks on nuclear and space weapons. Although he did not specify their nature, referring to the confidentiality of the talks, administration spokesmen immediately revealed a number of details of these proposals.

As THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, in them Reagan "has not changed his position regarding the continuation of the U.S. program of space-based ABM defense, which has become known as the 'star wars' program." "He made it plain that the new U.S. proposals do not envisage the United States ending its research within the framework of his program," the paper notes, stressing that the White House boss maintains a "resolute commitment" to its implementation.

This was also confirmed by M. Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, who said in an interview for the ABC television company that the implementation of the "star wars" program "will be continued."

The CBS television company notes the U.S. proposals do not envisage freezing the work of new weapons systems. "Some U.S. Administration officials," the company points out, "admit the U.S. proposals are essentially the old U.S. plan in a new wrapping."

/12858
CSO: 5200/1127

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PUBLIC INTERVIEWED ON UPCOMING SUMMIT, ARMS PROPOSALS

LD022151 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1520 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Video report from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] What do Soviet people think about the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva? Our correspondent put three questions to people he spoke to from different professional and age backgrounds: What do you expect from the Geneva meeting? What is your attitude to the new Soviet peace initiatives? What do you think about the observance of human rights in our country and abroad?

[Unidentified correspondent] This morning we walked across the middle of Moscow with a television camera, from the Mayakovskaya Square to the 50 years of October Square. Some of those questioned gave their full names, others gave just their age and profession.

[Male passerby] Evidently one cannot think 100 percent that the kind of agreement that we and similar citizens in the West are expecting is going to be reached. But nevertheless, I am optimistic. I think that Comrade Gorbachev will do everything possible, and we hope that Reagan will have to reply not just to him but to the whole world public.

[Correspondent] How do you assess the major new Soviet peace initiatives in the field of disarmament?

[Male passerby] In the most positive way possible. I do, and it is not just me: I do not think I am alone in this, and I feel that the major new initiatives are an enormous step along the path toward progress in disarmament, in ending the trend started by the United States in space. I assess them in the most positive way possible.

[Correspondent] What do you think, will progress be made at these talks?

[Male passerby] Well, I would like that, at least, because it is in the interests of our countries.

[Correspondent to woman at his side] And you?

[Female Passerby] I agree with my husband. Naturally I share the hopes of the whole people that progress will be achieved.

[Male Passerby] Before they talk about human rights they should put things right in their own country, because in my view they have far more problems than we do on this issue.

[Second Male Passerby] There has never been a freer country, nor will there ever be. We say everything we think. We say this to those in charge and to those under them.

[Correspondent] And how do you assess the major new initiative of the Soviet Union on reducing the arms race?

[Second Male Passerby] Behind this question lies the fact that we do not need armaments. We need prosperity, and we are doing everything possible to enable the people to perceive that Soviet power is the power of the Soviet, the power of the people.

[Correspondent] You are someone, I think, who has lived in this world for quite some time, no doubt you remember the war?

[Taxi-driver] Yes. How much was suffered by our people! And now the only thing is to live, and to live well. We went to war as the capitalists would like, and always have wanted; this is what they want. They themselves will not go to war, they will set people against each other. They want to do so, so that they can get rich at the expense of the working people.

[Correspondent] We are talking here about how people assess the forthcoming meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan?

[Taxi-driver] They are waiting for it. They are definitely waiting for it, and they are hoping for positive results.

The whole people is waiting for this. It seems to me that they must move away from the dead-end.

[Female Passerby] I think that they will reach an agreement, because this is a problem that disturbs everyone. I think they will find some point on which both can come together and agree.

[Correspondent] Is it possible for such great changes to take place in world politics?

[Female Passerby] If a common language is found, then of course it will happen.

[Correspondent] Are you hoping that a common language will be found:

[Female Passerby] Yes.

[Correspondent] For you, as a military man, it is no doubt clear just how dangerous the arms race can be.

[Man in uniform] Of course, in general we are expecting a great deal from this meeting, and by all appearances, even Reagan will now be compelled, under the pressure of public opinion. It is hardly likely there will be great progress, of course, judging by the whole situation, but there will be some progress. That is certain, because our Comrade Gorbachev is now respected by the whole world, not just ourselves. Therefore there will be progress, I have no doubt.

[Male passerby] We were the first to make a statement that the Soviet Union is the first to stop testing nuclear weapons in all spheres. It seems to me that flexibility is being shown by our party.

[Correspondent] What do you think, will this not weaken our security?

[Second man in uniform] Our equipment is at the proper level to ensure that our country can always give whatever rebuff to any aggressor. You just have to take history: Take Napoleons ("of any kind). The Russian people will always stick up for itself. [Quotation marks as received.]

/8918

CSO: 5200/1130

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS HITS WEINBERGER SPEECH TO FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

LD051304 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 5 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, 5 Nov (TASS) -- Certain reactionary circles in the U.S. Administration are increasing in their attempts to poison the atmosphere on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit and to wreck the opportunity for reaching specific accords in the field of arms limitation and the prevention of nuclear war. Only in this way can one appraise the militarist homilies made by Pentagon chief C. Weinberger to members of the Foreign Policy Association in New York.

In his speech he again voiced propaganda -- unprecedented for peacetime -- for the administration's program of building up U.S. strategic and nonnuclear arsenals, which he called "America's energetic efforts to maintain a strategic nuclear deterrent potential." As on previous occasions, this U.S. policy was justified by means of the notorious "Soviet military threat," backed up by blatantly fabricated, spurious data.

Weinberger made an attempt to provide a "theoretical basis for the U.S. Administration's effort to revive the so-called theory of "linkage" of arms limitation talks with other questions having no relation to this priority task. "We are not severing arms control from other important bilateral and international problems which also exert an influence on U.S.-Soviet relations," the Pentagon chief affirmed. Here he spoke in a blatantly mocking tone of those in the United States who give main priority to precisely the task of holding talks on nuclear arms limitation. "We do not share that opinion," Weinberger declared. He added that the main threat to peace and the United States "comes not from nuclear weapons, but the existence of hostile political ideology." In other words, the Pentagon chief was developing those "theses" already contained in President Reagan's speech at the 40th UN jubilee session, which caused indignation throughout the world.

As was shown by Weinberger's subsequent statements, such "linkages" are used only to camouflage Washington's blatant striving to sweep into the corner the solution of the major issues of modern times -- limitation of the arms race on earth, banning it from space, and the prevention of nuclear war. Noticeable here is the extremely crude anti-Soviet tone of the speech by Weinberger, who is dreaming of building relations with the USSR only from a position of strength.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1127

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S KARPOV EXPLAINS SOVIET STAND TO CANADIAN PRESS

LD251246 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 25 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, October 25 TASS -- Viktor Karpov, the leader of the USSR delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms, received a group of Canadian journalists on Thursday. During the conversation he explained the meaning of the recent Soviet proposals aimed at radically reducing strategic arms on earth and at preventing an arms race in outer space. Viktor Karpov emphasized that the proposals had been fully supported at the just-concluded meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states in Sofia. The Soviet initiatives had also roused a broad response and had met with approval in various countries of the world.

The Soviet side is convinced that security issues connected with nuclear and space arms should figure importantly during the forthcoming meeting in Geneva between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the President Ronald Reagan of the United States. However, Washington is prepared to approach in an unprejudiced and objective way to the set of the far-reaching proposals on nuclear and space arms, the proposals which the Soviet side has put forward at the talks.

In answer to questions, the leader of the USSR delegation specially pointed out that the "star wars" plans are not so much of defensive character as of offensive one. The implementation of those plans would destabilize the situation and would considerably increase the danger of an outbreak of a nuclear conflict with disastrous consequences to mankind, and vice versa, a ban on space weapons would open the way to deep cuts and ultimately to full elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere.

Ambassador Aleksey Obukhov and Ambassador Yuriy Kuzetsov, members of the Soviet delegation, also took part in the conversation.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1127

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: U.S. CITES 'RIGGED' MISSILE DATA AT NATO MEETING

LD261051 Moscow TASS in English 1031 GMT 26 Oct 85

[Text] Brussels, October 26 TASS -- A regular meeting of NATO special consultative group on nuclear arms control was held here. Purportedly, it was devoted mainly to reviewing the course of the third round of the Soviet-U.S. talks in nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

The meeting was held behind closed doors. Director of the bureau of politico-military affairs of the U.S. Department of State Allen Holmes said at a press conference, however, that the Soviet Union's new initiatives in the sphere of nuclear missile weapons had been, specifically, discussed. Going by Holmes' pronouncements, these Soviet proposals were not analyzed in a detailed and constructive way at the meeting, and their assessment had a biased nature dictated from across the ocean.

Clearly with the aim of exerting further pressure on the Netherlands which should decide before November 1st whether or not it should give its consent to the deployment of 49 U.S. cruise missiles on its territory, the U.S. delegation at the meeting juggled again with rigged data on the number of Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles. Moreover, openly interfering in the Netherlands internal affairs, Holmes expressed at the press conference utter confidence of all allies in NATO that the Dutch Government will give a green light to the deployment of U.S. missiles.

Allen Holmes refused to divulge the exact number of U.S. "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles that have already been deployed on the territories of West European countries in accordance with the decision of the NATO council. However, 118 such missiles were deployed there by the end of 1984 and 16 more cruise missiles were stationed on the Belgian territory in March of this year.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1127

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CONTINUED SOVIET ATTACKS ON NATO NUCLEAR PLANNING MEETING

U.S. Attempting 'To Distort'

LD282152 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 28 Oct 85

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] A 2-day session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group opens in Brussels on Tuesday [29 October]. As a dispatch from the DPA agency reports, on the agenda are the issues of modernizing strategic nuclear weapons at the disposal of the North Atlantic bloc and also -- I quote from the DPA dispatch -- U.S. and Soviet research in the field of creating [sozdaniye] space defenses against missiles. The very way the issue is formulated -- with such a slant to it -- is clearly provocative. In fact, the USSR has again and again authoritatively stated that it is not engaged in developing space strike weapons. However, those who set the tone in NATO repeat their own words. Why and what for? I'll ask my colleague Viktor Levin to answer these questions.

Indeed, there is no way one can disregard the attempts by NATO circles to distort the truth -- these attempts are obvious. It is already known in Brussels that U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger intends to devote a great deal of attention at the Nuclear Planning Group meeting to the matter of how -- as the Pentagon asserts -- the USSR is engaged in developing [razrabotka] space weapons. At the same time, an important official in the U.S. State Department -- Holmes, director of the Bureau for Military-Political Affairs [title as heard] also in Brussels on the eve of the Nuclear Planning Group meeting -- assured journalists at a news conference that the USSR allegedly has, despite the moratorium announced by them at the beginning of April on the deployment [razvertivaniye] of SS-20 missiles, almost until mid-September continued work on developing [sozdaniye] fixed installations to launch such missiles.

This is frank attempt by the United States to distort the Soviet stance and twist the truth. And, this is being done to justify and substantiate the continuing U.S. course toward the creation [sozdaniye] of its own space strike weapons and the deployment in Western Europe of new U.S. nuclear missiles. But, the question arises as to whether the Washington politicians are really seriously counting on the facts being unknown to the West Europeans.

Speaking in Paris, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev set out the fresh and far-reaching Soviet peace initiatives. Our country proposed to the United States that they reach agreement on completely banning space strike weapons and reduce by 50 percent their own nuclear missiles within range of each other on both sides. A week ago, at a news conference in Moscow Comrade Akhromeyev, marshal of the Soviet Union, when replying to

one of the questions from Western journalists unambiguously said we are not working to create [sozdaniye] space strike weapons and are not developing [razrabativayem] antimissile defense systems for the country.

The problems of medium-range nuclear weapons were extremely clearly set out. Comrade Gorbachev also said in Paris that we are not only observing the unilaterally introduced moratorium on the deployment of new SS-20 missiles, we have also taken missiles deployed in response to the installation of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe off the combat roster. Now the USSR has 243 SS-20 missile units on combat duty in the European zone. Here too, is perfect clarity, however, the U.S. side stubbornly continues to disseminate fables.

This stance can only be explained by the United States not displaying the slightest desire to renounce its own militaristic plans and at the same time trying to evade a constructive response to the Soviet initiative.

Indeed, it has reached the stage where the West Europeans tried to urge the United States to respond to the essence to the Soviet proposals at President Reagan's meeting with the leaders of five major capitalist states -- I recall that France refused to take part in it -- but, as is clear from Reagan's latest radio address, the U.S. side has once again refused to heed these calls. So, in order to give their negative stance the appearance of being well-founded, high-ranking representatives of the U.S. administration are resorting to distorting the truth. But this kind of stance not only fails as a response, it evokes new questions, which are extremely unpleasant for Washington, even among the U.S. partners in NATO.

Comments on Results

LD312141 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 31 Oct 85
(News Analyst Yuriy Solton commentary)

[Text] A 2-day meeting of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group with the participation of the defense ministers, has ended in Brussels. Here is what Radio Moscow news analyst Yuriy Solton writes:

Key attention was given to problems connected with the coming Soviet-U.S. summit. Washington held another conference with its allies, who seem to be clearly worried about the U.S. stand. In the eyes of the public that stand does not look at all attractive. The United States still gives no answer to the concrete Soviet proposals which provide for banning space strike weapons on both sides, reducing by half corresponding nuclear arms and concluding separately an agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. Nor does Washington advance any proposals of its own. Besides, there doesn't seem to be any desire to abandon the "star wars" program, which hampers agreement in the field of limiting and reducing nuclear arms.

It was to make the allies reconcile themselves with such an approach and ensure their unconditional support that U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger arrived in Brussels. He kept talking about an alleged Soviet military threat and tried to discredit Soviet peace initiatives. What is more, he questioned the very idea of an agreement with the Soviet Union, and for that purpose resorted to crude falsifications. For instance, he claimed that the Soviet Union allegedly violated the SALT II treaty, the ratification of which the United States itself had torpedoed.

Crude pressure has produced results. In the final communique the participants in the session support the course of further deploying U.S. first-strike missiles in a number of West European countries and modernizing other types of nuclear arms in Western Europe. Nevertheless, many observers believe that Weinberger did not get everything he wanted. The NATO ministers expressed the hope that the Soviet initiatives indicate the readiness of the Soviet Union to come to terms on verifiable, just agreements on arms control. The ministers refrained from directly supporting the work done by the United States under the "star wars" program. Greece expressed its own special opinion. Denmark reserved its stand as regards medium-range nuclear arms. Besides, the session was not attended by France and Iceland. As for Spain, it was represented by an observer.

The NATO meeting in Brussels has shown once again that the United States does not want to abandon its militaristic course in the field of nuclear arms and preparations for "star wars;" it drags its allies on the dangerous road of military preparations, depriving them of the possibility of taking any independent steps to slow down the military race.

'Differences of Opinion'

PM051630 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Nov 85 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "Commentator's Column": "Still in the Same Position...."]

[Text] Brussels -- The war ministers from a number of NATO countries have been in session in Brussels for 2 days. A session of the bloc's Nuclear Planning Group has been held here. It has taken place at a time when the bloc's Washington bosses are trying with all their might to mobilize their allies' support for U.S. policies before the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting Geneva.

What U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger tried to get primarily from the partners in this connection was a joint statement from the same old unseemly position of inveterate opponents to any easing of the arms race. If we are to judge by the formulations in the session's joint communique, the Pentagon's representative did succeed in this to a certain extent -- the participants proclaimed their intention to continue the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, as well as the implementation of a whole series of other militarist programs. Clearly succumbing to U.S. pressure, the war ministers proclaimed "the alliance's total support for the solidarity with" the U.S. President who will soon be on his way to Geneva. To further please Washington, the communique also expresses solidarity with the U.S. line at the Geneva talks on space and nuclear arms, which are currently in progress.

At the same time, the session also demonstrated the growing concern of some of the bloc allies with the Washington administration's unremitting militarism. It is noteworthy in this connection that, at the present war ministers' conference, Greece and Denmark refused to support fully some sections of the joint communique. In addition to this, France and Iceland are altogether absent from the group's work. There is a growing fear in West Europe that Washington's attempts to push through the "star wars" program at all costs and its unwillingness to embark on even partial steps toward curbing the nuclear arms race will result in even further exacerbation of international tension. The broadest public circles and influential political forces in Western countries, including NATO members, are advocating that the currently existing favorable opportunities generated by the USSR's peace-loving initiatives be utilized to improve the situation in the world and limit militarist preparations.

It becomes clear from the communique and from the press conference given here jointly by NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington, C. Weinberger, and British Defense Secretary M. Heseltine that the most bellicose North Atlanticists have basically succeeded in pushing the bloc toward the continuation and even expansion of joint efforts in the nuclear sphere and toward support for Washington's dangerous plans for the militarization of space. But there is no doubt that the Nuclear Planning Group session demonstrated the existence of certain differences of opinion within NATO and showed that, although some U.S. allies still proceed from almost vassal-like positions, this dependence is beginning to weaken under pressure from indisputable political realities and primarily the need to diminish the threat of war and avert the Damoclean sword of nuclear catastrophe from mankind.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1127

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: USA INSTITUTE OFFICIALS VOICE PESSIMISM

LD111329 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 11 Nov 85

[Weekly "Top Priority" program with moderator Vladimir Posner and a United States of America and Canada Institute deputy director, Dr Radomir Bogdanov, and institute member Dr Sergey Plekhanov; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Posner] Well, with the Geneva summit now just days away, actually, I think that should be our topic, quite obviously, and I would like to ask both of you gentlemen if you could give me a short assessment, if you wish, of the Soviet approach to and view of the summit. Who would like to start?

[Bogdanov] Let me.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Let me say just a few words about how Moscow sees that event. First of all, you know, in my position of a student of American scene and of the Soviet-American relations, I have been very much in touch with Soviet people and I should say that there is a very great, immense interest to Geneva. I am getting a number of telephone calls, people come into my office, those who know me they call me at my home asking how is Geneva, what they should expect. So what does it mean? It means that there is, as I told you already, there is a great interest in Moscow, in the Soviet Union as a whole, to that (?meeting).

[Posner] You mean people are concerned.

[Bogdanov] People are concerned and very much concerned. Why? Because it's not a secret, it's a fact that people were and are very much concerned because of a great danger. There is a feeling of a danger. Nuclear danger which is lying upon our heads is very much felt here and the state of the Soviet-American relations, and I should say that they've been worsening all the time. And what is the strange, the real strange fact that closer we are to Geneva the worse those relations becoming, you know. So, there is a big hope that Geneva will bring some improvement in the Soviet-American relations. At the same time, there is a certain level, I would say not a certain, just a big level of pessimism about Geneva because people look at the American position, people listen to the speeches, to the statements coming from the American side. People read some interviews and there is a question if America is so much inclined to be caring only about their own interests what we should expect from Geneva. So, you have a mixture of hope at one side and the pessimism on the other side.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov, you were talking about popular concern, the man on the street, your acquaintances and the general feeling in the Soviet Union. We are no less interested in the attitude of the Soviet Government. First of all, is there a difference in this attitude and, second, with what kind of a view is the Soviet Government approaching Geneva? Dr Plekhanov, perhaps you could comment on that.

[Plekhanov] Well, in the first place, I don't think that there is any difference between attitudes to the summit on the part of the Soviet public and the Soviet Government. I think they see eye to eye on that. The Soviet Government is just as concerned about the deterioration of Soviet-American relations, the increase in tensions, the heightened danger of a nuclear war, the accelerated arms race, and all those things. We don't regard them as healthy development. And, in connection with that, the Soviet Government has been putting forward all kinds of initiatives designed to be acceptable to the United States.

The hallmark of our initiatives is that they are acceptable and that's why they have attracted so much attention in the West, because this is serious bargaining, this is serious business, and I think that the Soviet Government is approaching the summit as an opportunity to produce serious changes in Soviet-American relations, to stop the process of deterioration, and if possible to turn them in the direction of improvement.

[Posner] Well, it is true that the Soviet Government has indeed proposed a whole series of initiatives over the past relatively short period of time. Now, in the United States, there are some who say that if this is really all public relations, that the aim of all of this is indeed to persuade public opinion -- not so much in the Soviet Union, but in the United States -- that the Soviet Union really does, is intent upon reaching agreement, but that in reality that is not true. Now, what is, how would you treat this whole public relations assessment of what the Soviet proposals are?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, it sounds very strange, how, now in the modern, present environment, how you can separate your policy from the public relations. They are going together. They are going together and any policy nowadays is a public policy. You have to build up your policy on the popular support. You should make your policy known to your own public opinion and to the other side's public opinion. What's wrong with that? I cannot understand. When American side makes hue and cry around anything they suggest it's not a public relations business, it's American policy. When we do something of the sort they say it's public relations. I don't think it's a fair approach. What they say about us, it's exactly public relations, but what does it mean? It means they got scared, they have got worried about the impact of our proposals on people's mind. So, I am really surprised when they say all that.

Now, now, you know, you should judge any proposals on their merits, not on their, you know, how they are perceived by you. What are our proposals' merits? Number one, they are meeting American worries and desires halfway. That's very important -- halfway. Number two, they are very practical. They are very practical and we believe if they are taken seriously by the other side it's a very good ground and very productive ground for a compromise, if you like, to find out a compromise. And number three, you know, as far as I know and I am convinced that Geneva it's a kind of historical change in the Soviet-American relations. On you have it or you miss it. There is no other way out. We are very serious about Geneva. We are taking very seriously the Geneva meeting. We don't want it to be a confrontation show or a propaganda or public relations show. We want to be it first businesslike, businesslike in the sense that two sides are taking into consideration their worries and interests and on that ground trying to find out a common approach to the solution of the problems. And I believe it's very simple.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov, you have just used the word describing the Soviet proposals as meeting American desires halfway. And you, Dr Plekhanov, have said that these proposals take into consideration American needs. Dr Bogdanov, how would you look at this issue of meeting the Americans halfway? I understand this whole problem of the heavy missiles and the cuts that we have proposed -- limiting the number of warheads to 6,000 per country and having no more than 60 percent of those warheads on any one of the three parts of the treaty. Would you to furnish any more details that you think are very important?

[Bogdanov] You know, if you take a pen and you make a proper calculation you will see that as it concerns our so-called heavy missiles, it comes down, it comes down in warheads to 3,600, something like...

[Posner, interrupting] Maximum.

[Bogdanov] Maximum, yes. And what is the American figure now, if you take the latest American proposal?

[Posner] Three thousand. I believe.

[Bogdanov] Three thousand, three thousand, something like that. So there is a difference in 600 warheads. Isn't it a halfway? I believe it's more than halfway. So, there is a ground for real compromise. But, we forget one thing which is very important. There is only, there is one major condition for these cuts which is not met by the American side so far. I mean the deployment of, in the cosmos, striking, striking...

[Posner, interrupting] Space strike weapons. Not only deployment, the development of [word indistinct] research, [words indistinct] everything [words indistinct].

[Bogdanov] [Words indistinct] research, testing, development, because you, you, it's just a wishful thinking even 50 or you may say 80 percent without that condition: that they don't test, they don't research, they don't test, they don't develop. You know, so far if you study American proposals you will not see a bit of concession to the Soviet Union on that. So, it means that they know that without meeting that condition no cuts are possible. So I have a suspicion, I am sorry to say, Vladimir, I have suspicion that it's a deliberate attempt to make a propaganda show how nice they are to us but they know for sure that without meeting that condition (?bargain), no deal is possible. So, you have a question how far the other side is sincere in suggesting in all that great proposals, great cuts and things like that. That's my point.

[Posner] That's a very strong statement. I'd like, I wonder if Dr Plekhanov shares the view that perhaps indeed what the American side is pursuing is indeed a grandstand play, as they say in America, and that is offering on the one hand cuts, but refusing to budge on SDI, and therefore, knowing that nothing will happen. Do you think that that could indeed be a hidden motive somewhere?

[Plekhanov] Well, there have been some very disquieting developments in the U.S. Government in the last few weeks. In early October, the Reagan administration had a review of the ABM Treaty as it (?impacts) the work on SDI, and they came to a conclusion, which is a striking conclusion, I would say, that the...

[Posner, interrupting] ABM Treaty.

[Plekhanov] Amazing, amazing, amazing, amazing, conclusion that the ASM Treaty of 1972 permits everything short of deployment, which is... [Plekhanov changes thought] No legal

expert who knows anything about ABM in the United States, not to mention the Soviet Union, has supported that kind of interpretation. Now, if that interpretation really reflects the desire of the U.S. Government and we have no grounds to think that it doesn't because recently President Reagan has reiterated that this is how they read the ABM Treaty, although he said that there are other interpretations as well. If that is how they see the ABM Treaty then we have, I think, a very big problem.

[Posner] Yes.

[Plekhanov] And that is reflected in their attitude to the talks on SDI. So far they have not really been willing to speak about demilitarization -- nonmilitarization of space.

[Posner] A few days ago on the prime time evening news program "Vremya," which as we all know is shown all over the Soviet Union, they featured a very interesting poll done of people in the streets who were asked what they thought would happen at Geneva, what would be the results, and some of you mentioned were quite pessimistic. Others were not.

I would say that the ratio was two out of three were hopeful. Now these are just average people who are not experts, who may not know the details, who certainly don't know things like the number of warheads and all of that. Now you, gentlemen, are indeed experts. Soviet-American relations are your field. At the same time you are ordinary people and I would like to ask you both in conclusion what do you really think can be the outcome of Geneva. Dr. Plekhanov?

[Pekhanov] Well, I wish you hadn't asked that question because that ... [laughs]

[Posner] All right, you can simply say, no comment. What about you, Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Yes, but I would be quite frank with you. I am rather pessimistic and I base my pessimism on the knowledge of the American policy, on the knowledge of the nature of this administration. And if I am wrong, Vladimir, I promise to you -- and I wish I were wrong -- and if I am wrong I promise to you to state it publicly that I was wrong.

[Posner] Well, thank you very much.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1132

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S GENSCHER SAYS U.S. SERIOUS ABOUT GENEVA SUMMIT

LD031227 Hamburg DPA in German 1140 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] Bonn, 3 Nov (DPA) -- In a first statement on the latest U.S. proposals on arms limitation, Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) has expressed the conviction that both the United States and the USSR are interested in achieving something constructive at the Geneva talks. The U.S. proposals were the expression of a serious desire to negotiate, and the Federal Government found many of its own suggestions again in them, he stated on Sunday at the FDP function in the Black Forest.

An agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on the halving of inter-continental strategic missiles would be, in Genscher's view, a "great step towards disarmament and a great sign of hope." Genscher called on the Soviets to declare themselves in agreement with the complete elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles. "We wish no longer to live under this threat," he stressed. The Soviet Union ought to take American readiness for reduction seriously.

According to Genscher, there have to be cooperative solutions relating to space weapons. Security, in view of technological developments, can no longer be guaranteed unilaterally, but only cooperatively. Of course, the Geneva talks should not be loaded with impossible expectations, but with the aim of preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2540

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S GENSCHER, NETHERLANDS' VAN DEN BROEK MEET

LDO42104 Hamburg DPA in German 2046 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Bonn, 4 Nov (DPA) -- Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and his Netherlands counterpart Hans van den Broek together expressed hope in Bonn this evening that the forthcoming U.S.-USSR summit meeting in Geneva will bring concrete results. In a talk lasting several hours, the two politicians, according to a Foreign Ministry spokesman, "exceedingly" welcomed the fact that Washington made counter-proposals to the Soviet disarmament proposals.

As well as questions of disarmament, both ministers discussed problems of European policy, East-West relations and bilateral topics. Van den Broek told Genscher again about details of the final decision made by The Hague to station 48 U.S. cruise missiles in the Netherlands in accordance with the NATO two-track decision.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2540

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

REAGAN SPEECH AT UN CALLED 'UNWORTHY' OF U.S. BY CZECH PRESS

AU281404 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 26 Oct 85 p 8

[Zdenek Porybny commentary in the "We Comment" column: "Reagan Disappointed the United Nations; From Our Washington correspondent"]

[Text] President Reagan's Thursday [24 October] statement at the UN rostrum was received with disappointment by the absolute majority of the countries of the world community. Whereas the representatives of countries with most different social systems and foreign-political orientations, including closest U.S. allies, spoke mostly in support of specific steps for averting the threat of a nuclear war and of halting feverish armament as the main problems facing mankind, the American President delivered a verbal exercise, the purpose of which was the complete opposite. As a high American government official conceded to journalists, Reagan's speech was a "planned attempt to change the general opinion in the world that the Geneva summit meeting is to be primarily oriented toward arms limitation."

President Reagan failed to reply to the Soviet proposals to halt the feverish arms race, not to allow the militarization of space, and to reduce the strategic arsenals of the two countries by 50 percent. Instead, he oriented himself toward defending the U.S. "star wars" program and toward gross attacks against the right of the people in developing countries to choose the progressive path of development. In this, he threw into the same bag both the legitimate governments of Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia, Cambodia, and Nicaragua, and the bandits and mercenaries kept with American dollars. He in fact demanded Soviet agreement with the U.S. interference in the internal affairs of the above countries as a condition of progress in negotiations on arms reductions.

This is nothing new. Other American presidents, who refused to become reconciled to the objective social processes in the world, also unsuccessfully attempted to push through a similar policy of "linkage." The only thing which the present American President can achieve by such an approach is that he will block the road toward an agreement on the truly cardinal issue of today -- to halt feverish armament on earth and to avert the militarization of space. In fact, it is not to be excluded that this is exactly what it is all about.

Reagan's endeavor to shift arms limitations to a secondary place in Soviet-American relations has encountered immediate criticism even among the closest U.S. allies. As THE WASHINGTON POST wrote a few hours after Reagan's speech, "The Western representatives reminded him that arms limitation negotiations remain the first and foremost concern of the two countries prior to their approaching summit meeting". Reagan's meeting with the

representatives of Britain, the FRG, Italy, Japan, and Canada, which was to have provided the American President with the hallmark of allied support prior to his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, in the end backfired, as the allies insisted that the United States "not weaken arms limitations as the primary concern of the meeting," as British Prime Minister M. Thatcher expressed it. Italian Prime Minister Craxi added: There are Soviet proposals, which contain certain positive elements. Now it is essential to have counterproposals for reducing the strength of nuclear arms. FRG Chancellor Kohl, as well as Japan's Prime Minister Nakasone, also demanded from Reagan an active U.S. approach to negotiations on arms limitations with the USSR.

The American President's statement in the United States showed that, 3 weeks before the Soviet-American summit meeting, the United States is still not prepared to give a constructive reply to the Soviet peace and disarmament appeal.

At a time when, as Mikhail Gorbachev states in his letter on the 40th UN anniversary, it is essential for states and nations to exert a joint effort to save mankind from the threat of a nuclear war, the American President's speech to the world community was neither worthy of the significant moment, nor was it worthy of the significance of his country in the world.

/9274

CSO: 5200/3006

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CZECHS DENOUNCE REAGAN ARMS PROPOSALS AS 'VARIANT' OF OLD

U.S. Military Budget

LD032143 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Jiri Cebrovsky commentary]

[Text] Everyone has been waiting, with appropriate curiosity, for the response of the U.S. Government to the new Soviet peace proposals, presented several weeks ago by the highest Soviet representative, Mikhail Gorbachev. This time Washington could not get away with the usual phrase, namely that it is the usual Moscow ploy; it had to declare that it is studying the proposals carefully. The significance and value of the Soviet disarmament proposals simply cannot be denied, let alone ignored. Reagan himself, and his staff, have in the past few days appeared like tired runners exposed to the sights of millions of viewers.

The fear of oxygen starvation was handled by the U.S. President on several levels: The U.S. military budget for the coming fiscal year was announced. It is an astronomic sum of over \$300 billion. Even the [word indistinct] government bowed under the White House whip and consented to the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles on its territory and, at the same time, Ronald Reagan announced that the time for study is over and that he is proposing responses to the Soviet disarmament proposals. All this occurred in 1 week, at the end of October and the beginning of November.

According to the U.S. President, his proposals represent a contribution by the United States to achieving a real reduction in nuclear weapons, to strengthening stability and tackling problems, while taking into account the justified interests of the United States and the USSR. This formula may raise hope, but also pessimism. What has leaked to the public, through indiscretions of the press and from some U.S. politicians, makes it possible to think that Reagan has proposed a variant of his old proposals on reducing the stock of offensive strategic weapons. This, in fact, follows the old aim: seeking to enhance the arms potential of the United States with the idea of gaining military superiority over the USSR using the roundtable in Geneva for this purpose.

It also emerges from Reagan's response that there is no change in the principles of the approach to the U.S. program of antimissile defence with [word indistinct] in space. This was confirmed by Defense Secretary Weinberger, who resolutely declared that the United States has no intention of giving up the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative or to conduct talks about. The daily NEW YORK TIMES has written, I quote: The United States is able to permit the USSR to take part in any U.S. space defense technology -- end of quote. This sound like a generous proposal for some, but is it really so magnanimous? One can hardly think that Ronald Reagan was motivated here by unselfish aims.

The contrary is true. The USSR's aim is not to take part in the militarization of space in any form. Its aim is to do away with the possibility of space becoming engulfed by new weapons. The United States proposal, is, therefore, an attempt to involve the USSR in the space arms race and is masked by a notion of some sort of mutual cooperation. The U.S. aim is to legalize what has entered the vocabulary of the modern times as the so-called "star wars." And if the United States refuses to talk at all about the militarization of space, one has to remember a basic fact: There is simply no point of talking about any limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons without tackling the question of how to avert the militarization of space.

If we are looking for substance in the response of the U.S. President to the Soviet peace initiatives, one cannot but suspect that, for the most part, it is a rhetorical exercise whose aim is to influence the public prior to the Geneva summit and to present the U.S. attitudes as the only way out of the maze of the arms race. It is an attempt to push through the old principles of U.S. policy in new conditions, only to give them a new wrapping. However, one cannot fail to notice that these attitudes did not generate progress during earlier talks and one can hardly hope that it will be different in the coming days or months.

U.S. Still Seeks Superiority

LD931128 Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 0830 GMT 3 Nov 85

["Commentary on the International Events of the Past Week" by editor Jindrich Malota]

[Excerpt] The Soviet peace policy has been meeting quite logically with great response and support among an ever-growing section of the international public.

This fact has at last forced the United States Government this week to react more seriously to the extensive peace proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev during his visit to France and to the important peace initiatives that came out of the Sofia meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact countries. At a press conference held in the White House last Friday [1 November] Ronald Reagan, the American president, announced that the United States had put forward new proposals at the Soviet-American talks on space and nuclear weapons in Geneva. In contrast to Mikhail Gorbachev, the American President did not specify in any detail the essence of these proposals; therefore, political observers so far have had to fall back on analyzing statements made by various other representatives of the United States Administration. Everything so far indicates that the White House is still being guided primarily by the effort to acquire military superiority over the Soviet Union. The proposals mentioned do not touch on the questions of the militarization of space, despite the fact that this in itself constitutes one of the principal problems in ensuring international security, and despite the fact that the Soviet Union has put forward important proposals on this very issue.

The United States, on the contrary, stated emphatically through the mouths of various representatives that it does not intend to retreat from its so-called 'star wars' program.

Another feature of the U.S. proposals is the continuing effort to force on the Soviet Union a reduction in the number of weapons in that area where the Soviet Union has concentrated most of its weapons, which means in land-based strategic nuclear missiles. Meanwhile, in those areas where the United States enjoys superiority, especially in submarine-based missiles and in the number of strategic nuclear bombers, the existing correlation of weapons is to be maintained. It is not difficult to understand that these U.S. proposals, which the bourgeois media have begun to praise loudly, are designed above

all to calm down world public opinion that is criticizing the existing American attitude to this vitally important issue of today. What is therefore involved are not proposals, but rather a new attempt to enforce U.S. superiority.

This has been indirectly confirmed by the American course taken at the meeting of the Nuclear Planning Group of NATO, which met in Brussels in the middle of last week, and the increased pressure by the White House on the Netherlands Government, which gave its consent on Friday evening -- against the will of the overwhelming majority of the people of its country and in variance with its previous statements on the conditions which it would consider -- to the deployment of 48 American first-strike nuclear missiles on its territory. Thus, less than 3 weeks before the American-Soviet summit in Geneva, question marks hang over the sincerity of the United States Government's endeavor to achieve an honorable agreement beneficial to both sides as well the whole world.

U.S. 'Falsifying' Weapons Counts

LD021643 Prague International Service in Czech and Slovak 0800 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies stated at a press conference in London that an approximate balance exists at the moment between the Soviet Union and the United States in strategic arms. This balance was agreed during the preparation of the SALT II agreement in 1979 and is valid today. The number of the Soviet Union's strategic forces has recently become the object of unashamed manipulation by certain circles in Washington.

If we look, for example, at the Pentagon brochure, Soviet Military Power in 1985, the falsifiers claim that they are not taking into consideration the more than threefold supremacy of the United States in the field of strategic bombers, and they speak about the vast supremacy of the Soviet Union.

Similar methods of counting the strategic balance for the public at large are also used by the Pentagon in the area of intercontinental ballistic missiles, ballistic missiles fired from submarines, and a number of nuclear battle charges.

The present government is distorting the true ratio of the forces of the Soviet Union and of the United States in this way, in order to justify an unprecedented increase in American military forces. By publishing false information, Washington wants to distract the public's attention from the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, which recently proposed a reduction by 50 percent of the numbers of nuclear weapons belonging to the Soviet Union and the United States. In defiance of logic, U.S. representatives are trying to convince the public that such a reduction would strengthen the supremacy of the Soviet Union for all time. Mutual parity is, however, a significant guarantee to secure peace and international security.

/9274

CSO: 5200/3006

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

IMPORTANCE OF WARSAW PACT STATEMENT NOTED BY CSSR

Immediate Solution Demanded

LD242039 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 24 Oct 85

[Text] Jiri Halousek considers the significance of the statement of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact states which was published yesterday on Sofia at the close of the meeting:

The document which was signed by the leading representatives of all seven participating countries contains a deep analysis of the main international problems faced by the whole of humanity, which demand an immediate solution. The number one issue of the present is the preservation of world peace, and that is why the largest part of the meeting in Sofia concerned the problems of disarmament. This can be seen from the very title of the statement: "For the Removal of the Nuclear Threat and For a Positive Change in the Situation in Europe and the World."

Because the previous session took place in January 1983 in Prague, it was necessary to evaluate the past period and to set out new tasks corresponding to the present state of the international situation. In recent years, alas, international tension has continued to grow and the world has come closer to the brink at which events can go out of control. The causes of this development can be found in the policy of imperialism, of the United States in particular, which openly follows the goal of achieving military supremacy so that it can dictate its will to other nations and states. This was particularly clearly seen in the deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and in the present attempts to extend the arms race into space.

Socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union, have put forward a whole range of peace proposals in the face of this trend, which, as the statement emphasizes, remain valid. Just like the Prague declaration of January 1983, the present one from Sofia contains further important initiatives which extend the present peace proposals of the socialist countries even further. In particular, it is concerned with the Soviet Union and the United States pledging not to develop and produce new types of conventional weapons of great destructive force; that on 1 January 1986 they freeze the number of their armed forces; and that both sides should not increase their military budget starting in the next financial year.

As the statement says and as can be seen from the entire past policy of the Warsaw Pact, its states energetically oppose the arms race and they decidedly stand behind a Europe completely rid of nuclear arms. Even a number of bourgeois media were forced to write, after the Sofia session had ended and the statement was published, that this defensive alliance of socialist countries has consistently followed the line entered upon at its foundation. So the voice of peace has again been heard from Sofia. It is all the more

important because in less than a month there will be a summit meeting between the Soviet Union and United States in Geneva, to which the nations of the whole world rightly give all their attention.

The proposals contained in the statement of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact states create an important prerequisite not only for a successful course of that meeting, but also for the overall improvement in present international relations.

Additional Commentary

LD242107 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1730 GMT 24 Oct 85

[Text] Here is our editor Dusan Kerny with a commentary and review of the response to the Sofia statement of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states.

Three things stand out in connections with the Sofia statement. First, there is the actual package of proposals and initiatives for international relations.

Second, there is the reaction of Western leading political circles, and primarily that of the United States -- the opportunity for this arose during today's meeting of officials of the advanced Western capitalist countries, except for France, in New York, and President Reagan's speech today at the United Nations. Third, there is the impact the statement will have on political thinking and on world public opinion less than a month before the November meeting of the Soviet and American leaders in Geneva, which will be their first personal meeting and the first meeting between the present U.S. President and Soviet leaders in his 5 years in office. In this respect he differs fundamentally from every other postwar U.S. President.

The content of the statement shows, in an exceptionally concise way, the resolute efforts of the Warsaw Pact states to bring about a radical and positive turnabout in the overall present international situation. It presents opportunities for the people and it describes what all of us feel: that the world has come close to a point beyond which events could get out of hand. That is why it is necessary to bring about a change and do away with the policy of force and confrontation. How can this be done? Well, this is shown clearly in all aspects of the statement. It notes that there is not a single weapon which the Warsaw Pact is not willing to limit, reduce, take out of its arsenal, and destroy once and for all on the basis of mutual security.

As far as Europe is concerned, the Soviet Union has already taken concrete steps here, steps which demonstrate its good will. It has halted, for example, the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, and it has withdrawn from standby alert [st'ahol z bojovej pohotovosti] its SS-20 missiles which were additionally deployed in the European part of the USSR as a response to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. Our goal and the goal of the Warsaw Pact is to rid Europe completely of nuclear weapons. That is why a substantial step is being undertaken, through the Sofia statement, toward this end. We are proposing, for example, a reduction in medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe as soon as possible by means of a separate agreement -- an agreement which is not directly linked to the issue of space and strategic weapons. These steps could be undertaken even before any agreement was reached on strategic and space weapons.

/9274
CSO: 5200/3006

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CSSR PRESIDIUUM, GOVERNMENT APPROVE PACT TALKS REPORT

LD302302 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1730 GMT 30 Oct 85

[Text] The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the Federal Government discussed the report on the results of the session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact countries which was held in Sofia on 22-23 October, and voiced agreement with the policy of our delegation, headed by Comrade Gustav Husak. They highly praised the documents adopted, the declaration and the communique which contains a profound analysis of the current situation in Europe and in the world, and which sets out further joint progress of the Warsaw Pact countries in the struggle for peace and to avert the danger of war, to halt the arms race on earth and to prevent it in space, as well as for a transition toward disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament. They stressed that the CSSR, in close cooperation with the fraternal countries, will contribute as much as possible toward normalization of the international situation.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the Federal Government fully support the constructive policy of the USSR and its new far-reaching peace initiatives at the USSR-U.S. talks in Geneva. They are of the opinion that the coming USSR-U.S. summit meeting must contribute toward relaxing the current dangerous tension in the world, achieving mutually acceptable decisions to halt the arms race, and to make realistic progress toward disarmament. They noted with satisfaction that the Sofia session confirmed yet again the unity and cohesion of the Warsaw Pact members, as well as the determination to do all to avert the danger of nuclear catastrophe and to safeguard peace.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the Federal Government entrusted the party and state organs and institutions with turning the conclusions, adopted at the session, into concrete plans, and to ensure their consistent implementation.

/9274

CSO: 5200/3006

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TURKISH COMMUNISTS CALL FOR RESULTS IN GENEVA SUMMIT

TA061242 (Clandestine) Voice of the Turkish Communist Party in Turkish
0500 GMT 5 Nov 85

[Turkish Communist Party Central Committee statement dated 4 November 1985]

[Text] Do not deploy weapons in the sky. Purge the earth of weapons. A meeting will be held between CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan in Geneva on 19 and 20 November. Top-ranking officials of the two greatest states in the world will be coming together for the first time in a long time. The issues on the agenda of the Gorbachev-Reagan meeting are the most basic issues concerning the entire humanity. These issues are the prevention of the arming of space and the reduction of nuclear weapons in the world on the basis of the principles of equality and equal security. The danger of a worldwide nuclear threat can in no way be reduced unless specific steps are taken regarding these issues. Therefore, all the peoples of the world expect Gorbachev and Reagan to reach specific results in their summit. The improvement of international relations, detente, and disarmament are the greatest desires of all the peoples of the world today.

During recent months, the Soviet Union submitted a series of new proposals to the U.S. Administration aimed at halting the arms race. It also unilaterally declared that it will not be the first side to resort to nuclear arms, reduced the number of nuclear weapons in several fields, halted nuclear experiments, and declared that it will not deploy antisatellite weapons in space.

Now it is the turn of the United States. If the U.S. Administration gives up its efforts to arm space and if it agrees to the reduction of nuclear weapons on the basis of equality and equal security, then a historic opportunity facing humanity will have been taken. The road will have been opened toward the elimination of a nuclear war threat.

The U.S. Administration has to date issued numerous statements favoring peace and disarmament. However, the steps it has taken have never been in line with its statements. Now, on the eve of the summit meeting, Reagan's approach seems to be one of trying to undermine the solution of the problem. He is trying to include the domestic affairs of a series of countries on the agenda of the summit under the guise of regional problems. In this way, he will prevent the achievement of a specific result regarding the basic disarmament issues. This should not be allowed.

The people of Turkey are greatly harmed by the strain in international relations and by the escalation of the arms race. Hundreds of billions annually go toward the arms race. Due to the increasing number of U.S. and NATO military bases in our lands, our country is one of the first countries which would be eliminated in a nuclear war. If the relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact are normalized, our people, like all the peoples of the world, will greatly benefit.

The Turkish Communist Party calls on all the forces that feel responsible for the future of our country and our people and for world and regional peace to take a specific stand now. Let us not surrender to the oppression and threats of the Evren-Ozal dictatorship. Let us join our people's voice to that of the world peace forces which want the Reagan administration to reply positively to the Soviet Union's peaceful proposals. There must not be a deployment of arms in space. The earth must be purged of weapons.

/6091

CSO: 5200/2543

GENERAL

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON EUROPEAN DISARMAMENT

PM121817 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "Europe Is Our Common Home"]

[Text] The world today has approached a dangerous boundary. Through the fault of reactionary imperialist forces, international tension has increased. The arms race spiral is soaring rapidly. The threat of the militarization of space is generating particular alarm. A situation is taking shape in which events may get out of control. "That is why," M.S. Gorbachev has noted, "we believe it is so important right now, immediately, before it is too late, to halt the 'infernal train' of the arms race, to begin arms reduction, to normalize the international situation, and to develop peaceful cooperation among the peoples."

This is a universal task. All states, great and small, irrespective of their potential, geographical position, or allegiance to social systems, are called on to take part in its solution. But the European countries' responsibility is particularly great. Europe is the cradle of one of the most brilliant human civilizations and...the main field of two most bloody world wars. Now this continent has been faced with a choice: either an instability fraught with the danger of a nuclear explosion or the lowering of the level of military confrontation under conditions of a progressing detente.

I.

In the interests of mankind, for the good of present and future generations, the Soviet Union has elaborated and is upholding a broad, constructive program of measures aimed at ending the arms race, at disarmament, and at safeguarding peace and the peoples' security.

With a view to the cardinal consolidation of strategic stability and enhanced trust between the world's major powers, the USSR has proposed to the United States that they agree on a radical, 50 percent, reduction in the nuclear armaments which can reach each other's territory, on the condition that there is a mutual total ban on space strike armaments. The implementation of this proposal would sharply reduce the level of global nuclear confrontation and would have a positive effect on the situation throughout the world.

A new situation is being created thanks to the Soviet initiatives with respect to military security in Europe too. The prospect is opening up here for a decisive reduction in medium-range nuclear means. To facilitate an accord the Soviet side deems it possible to conclude the relevant agreements outside any direct connection with

the problem of space and strategic armaments. It seems that this path may prove the more practical one.

At the same time, it is proposed to embark on a direct exchange of opinions with France and Britain. The point is that the Western side, alongside the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, not to mention forward-based U.S. nuclear weapons, also possesses the French and British nuclear potentials. The magnitude [moshchnost] of the latter is growing rapidly and they must be considered within the European balance of force. Hence the logic of the Soviet invitation to France and Britain to initiate a direct conversation on this subject and to try by means of joint efforts to find an acceptable solution to the problem.

The Soviet Union has already taken exceptionally important steps on the European salient. It has unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles. Moreover, the numbers of SS-20 missiles in the European zone have been reduced to the level of June last year.

That is, the number of SS-20 missiles deployed in response to the deployment of the U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe has been removed from operational readiness [boyevoye dezhurstvo]. Taking into account the powerful SS-5 missiles which have now been completely taken out of service [snyatyye s vooruzheniya], and the continuing dismantling of the SS-4 missiles, in the European zone as a whole the USSR now has considerably fewer medium-range missile delivery vehicles than 10 or even 15 years ago. That is a substantial self-limitation on the Soviet Union's part. Europe has the right to expect a responsive move from the United States -- the halting of the further deployment of its medium-range missiles on the continent.

But the U.S. side is responding by moving in the opposite direction, it is moving farther and farther away from the all-European goal of freeing the continent of weapons of mass destruction and lowering the overall level of military confrontation -- and it is continuing to move along the path of building up its nuclear armaments in West Europe. For instance, in the FRG the United States has deployed 90 Pershing-2 missiles -- or, according to DER SPIEGEL, all 108 missiles already. The explosive concentration of the latest means of human annihilation is growing. Gigantic new arms programs and the most dangerous strategic concepts are being elaborated and implemented, although Europe is simply too small and too fragile for power politics. But for Washington, Europe is someone else's home, a "battlefield" on the strategists' maps.

The deceitful story about the Soviet Union's "sevenfold superiority" is being used as propaganda cover for this anti-European course. Only Baron Muenchhausen could say what this garbled version is based on. Until very recently the method of falsification was basically as follows: On the Western side they would omit the French and British medium-range missiles as if they did not exist; on the Eastern side, they would include in the European balance all Soviet missiles no matter where they were stationed. But if you take NATO's figure of 441, actually a considerable exaggeration, for the total number of SS-20 missiles on USSR territory and compare it with the 218 U.S. missiles in Western Europe alone, not even such a distortion will in any way produce a "sevenfold superiority."

The real picture in Europe is nothing like Washington's fabrications. The NATO countries have 387 medium-range missiles there. The USSR has 373 missiles in the European zone, 243 of them being SS-20's. Counting aircraft, NATO possesses more than the Warsaw Pact in terms of both medium-range delivery vehicles (1,015:850) and nuclear charges on them (approximately 3,000:2,000). Taking into account the differences in

the structure of the sides' nuclear armaments, there can be said to be an approximate equilibrium in this sphere.

Our unilateral actions of goodwill and our proposals on reducing the military, above all nuclear, confrontation in Europe are seen by all the Warsaw Pact states as important steps on the path to completely ridding Europe of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. At the present time it is extremely important for all West European countries, and above all the members of NATO, to vigorously facilitate this. Countries deploying or planning to deploy medium-range nuclear weapons on their territory bear a great responsibility for the destiny of European and world peace.

The implementation of initiatives aimed at creating nuclear-free zones in various parts of the European Continent -- in particular in northern Europe and the Balkans -- as well as a corridor free of nuclear weapons along the line dividing the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries in central Europe, could play a considerable part in lowering the level of military confrontation. These initiatives meet with full support in the socialist countries.

In the statement they adopted at the Sofia Political Consultative Committee conference, the Warsaw Pact states again reminded the NATO countries of the highly urgent nature of their proposals to hold direct talks on concluding a treaty between them on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations which would also be open to all European and other interested countries. The proposal on holding direct talks to reach an accord on not increasing and reducing military expenditure also holds good. The USSR is also ready for an accord with the United States not to increase military budgets, beginning with the next fiscal year.

The initiative on ridding Europe of chemical weapons and the efforts by the GDR and CSSR Governments on creating a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe also assume special urgency in connection with the developing production of binary toxic agents in the United States. The Soviet Union, in supporting these initiatives, is proposing that the experience of reaching the accord on nuclear weapons nonproliferation be used in relation to chemical weapons as well. Our country is prepared to participate in such an international agreement. This would fall within the general framework of efforts for a complete ban on chemical weapons. Europe, which experienced the horrors of gas attacks in World War I, must be the initiator in the work of halting attempts to revive this weapon of mass destruction.

The question of lowering the level of confrontation in Europe in terms of conventional armed forces and armaments is also of considerable significance. Especially as these armaments are approaching the effectiveness of weapons of mass destruction. We want the speediest achievement of an accord at the talks in Vienna on the mutual reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact Armed Forces and armaments. The starting point could be a mutual reduction of Soviet and U.S. Armed Forces in central Europe.

Future accords concretizing and giving maximum effect to the principle of nonuse of force are beginning gradually to take shape in Stockholm. The USSR also advocates the adoption of definite confidence-building measures in the military sphere, including the exchange of annual plans of military activity.

Nor is there a taboo on the possibility of establishing contacts between the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic alliance as organizations. In the conditions of the existence of two military blocs one might establish the kind of "modus vivendi" which would blunt the edge of the present confrontation.

The European public, like all the world public, is following with growing alarm the extremely dangerous and illusory attempts to seek a solution to security problems through new space arms. International security cannot be ensured by military force. Its use would only lead mankind to catastrophe. Europe, by virtue of its geographical compactness and its oversaturation with arms, is more vulnerable than any other continent in the face of an armed conflict, especially a nuclear conflict. Here, as throughout the world, security can be achieved only along the path of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems, the relaxation of tension, disarmament, the strengthening of trust, and the development of international cooperation.

Europe is our common home; ensuring security here has invariably been the priority cause of the Soviet state. Suffice it to recall the efforts undertaken by the USSR in the thirties to create a system of collective security in the path of fascist Germany's aggression. And if at that time the Western powers had supported these efforts, the course of history could have been different. Anticommunism, inducing blindness, made it impossible at that time to break the vicious circle in which peace was only the interval between wars.

And if you look back at the postwar period, it is indisputable that the rebirth of militarist tendencies in Western Europe was stimulated to a significant extent by forces outside the continent, mainly U.S. imperialist circles. The dangerous revival of revanchist forces in the FRG always takes place in precisely this atmosphere of the arms race. Encouraging revanchism runs counter to the interests of ensuring peace, detente, and cooperation on the continent; it is impermissible.

But the potential of peaceability and the wisdom born of experience gave Europe the strength to become the motherland of the policy of international detente and the Helsinki Final Act. This document enshrines for the first time in the continent's entire history, many aspects of all-European peaceful cooperation. Each European country contributed a share of its own national experience to the Helsinki process. This is the common property of Europe's peoples; it must be protected and augmented by joint efforts. The Soviet Union plays the most active part in this.

Our country convincingly demonstrated its readiness to make a start today, without procrastination, on the transition to more stable, more secure relations between states in the course of the recent Soviet-French summit meeting. With a whole series of initiatives, and first and foremost the steps taken unilaterally, the USSR demonstrated in practice the clarity of its peaceful intentions and the predictability of its political behavior. It has gone its half of the way toward a reasonable compromise and awaits an equivalent response.

In the seventies our countries were present at the birth of detente and this increased the opportunities in the international arena for both the Soviet Union and France. The summit meeting showed that to this day both countries are in favor of restraining the arms race in a number of its most dangerous avenues. The USSR and France are in favor of making space an arena not of military confrontation, but of peaceful cooperation. The concrete expression of this is the 40 or more joint experiments and the new proposals for continuing the peaceful study of space.

The two countries' position on this question is of particular value in view of the fact that the U.S. military-industrial complex counts on involving Western Europe's scientific research potential in the implementation of its crazy "star wars" program. The results of this would be not only the growth of the threat of war on a scale which

is difficult to even predict at present, but also the exhaustion of the intellectual basis for future progress in Western Europe and the final decline of its independence.

The socialist countries are convinced that in present conditions it is necessary to devote international scientific and technical cooperation exclusively to peaceful purposes and make it global. This will be the surest guarantee that the new achievements of human genius do not cause strife between nations and that they will be used collectively by them in the universal interest.

The political climate in Europe depends to a considerable degree on the development of the entire range of economic and scientific and technical ties between West and East. In turn, the effective utilization of the international division of labor considerably facilitates and accelerates industrial, technical, and scientific progress. The Soviet Union, by concluding agreements with a number of West European countries stretching right into the next millennium, has emphasized its general orientation toward peaceful, stable cooperation on the basis of mutual advantage, equality, and genuine good-neighborliness.

It is necessary to seek out new forms of collaboration and cooperation. For instance, it would be useful to establish more businesslike relations between the EEC and CEMA.

The CEMA countries' constructive initiative in this direction has apparently had a favorable reception. It is important that it produce real results. To the extent, moreover, that the EEC countries are a "political unit," the CEMA countries are prepared to seek common ground with them -- in various forms, including parliamentary ties -- on specific international problems, too.

The problem of maintaining and improving the environment is more acute in Europe than anywhere else in the world. It transcends national limits. It cannot be resolved without the combined efforts of all European countries.

Much can be done in the humanitarian sphere. The benefits of mutually enriching exchanges of cultural values are generally recognized. The development of these exchanges deserves the closest attention. It is also necessary to expand the level of knowledge of each other's lives and to develop feelings of mutual sympathy and respect. It is important for the young generation in the European countries to have the correct conception of each other: They will have to build a peaceful Europe.

The Soviet Union attaches the most serious importance to ensuring human rights. This question must only be stripped of all hypocrisy and speculation. Problems such as the position of migrant workers, mixed marriages, and the reunification of families are being posed quite acutely in modern Europe. We favor a positive and humane approach to this type of problem, provided, of course, there is complete respect for the sovereignty of all states.

The Soviet Union's orientation toward international detente and peaceful cooperation in Europe is not dependent on any transient considerations dictated by prevailing situations. It does not contain a grain of the intentions ascribed to us of wanting to drive a wedge between Western Europe and the United States. We stand for cooperation among all states -- including the United States and Canada -- which signed the Helsinki Final Act.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program currently under discussion by the party and the people says that the CPSU attaches great importance to the further development of peaceful good-neighborliness and cooperation among the European states.

Europe is called upon to promote the implementation of these tasks of an all-European and universal nature. It is Europe that could play a notable role in overcoming the present phase of confrontation and in asserting the principles and policy of detente.