


008087

JPRS-TAC-85-042

21 October 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



ERIC QUALITY INSURED

19980728 084

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10
92
A05

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

21 October 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR's Chervov Interviewed on Offensive Aspects of SDI (Vasil Asparukhov, Nikolay Chervov; Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT, 4 Oct 85)	1
Moscow Queries Shultz on Matching Signs of Good Faith (Moscow in English to North America, 24 Sep 85)	8
TASS Criticizes U.S. Brochure on Soviet SDI Program (Moscow TASS, 5 Oct 85)	10
Contents Labeled 'Fabrication'	10
Chernyshev Disputes Findings	11
Soviet September-October Comments on SDI (Moscow, various sources, various dates)	13
Criticism in U.S. Cited	13
Shultz, Perle Comments Hit	14
'Massive Propaganda Campaign'	14
Ground-Based Laser Tests	15
Rapid Progress Seen, by Yevgeniy Kachanov	15
Moscow Comments on U.S. Shuttle Atlantis Military Mission (Moscow, various sources, various dates)	16
Geneva Talks Impact	16
Crew Entirely Military	17
Military Communications, SDI Role	17
Moscow on Easy Verifiability of U.S. Space-Arms Tests (Moscow in English to North America, 1 Oct 85)	18
Soviet Weekly on Strategic, Technical Aspects of SDI (Yuriy Gudkov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 38, Sep 85)	20

USSR: Early October Reports on European, Japanese SDI Responses (Moscow, various sources, various dates)	26
FRG's Rau Confirms SPD Opposition, by Viktor Levin	26
Willi Brandt Cited	27
FRG SPD's Vogel Cited	27
Netherlands Rejection, by Igor Melnikov	27
Austrian Opposition	28
Pentagon Pressures Tokyo	28
Japan To Supply Equipment, by Yevgeniy Kachanov	29
Japan Dietmen Interviewed	30
TASS Notes Bonn Meeting on Eureka Project (Moscow TASS, 26 Sep 85)	32
USSR's Zamyatin on USSR-French Ties, SDI, Eureka (Leonid Zamyatin Interview; Paris LE MATIN, 3 Oct 85) ...	33
French Neutron Warhead Considered for 1992 Missile (Paris AFP, 26 Sep 85)	35
Dutch Paper Urges 'Reserved' Response on SDI (Theo Klein; DE VOLKSKRANT, 21 Sep 85)	36
U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
PRC Commentary on USSR Disarmament Proposals (Ma Weimin; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 7 Oct 85)	39
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
French LE MONDE on Gorbachev Arms Proposal (Michel Tatu; Paris LE MONDE, 5 Oct 85)	42
De Vries Questions Constitutionality of Cruise Missiles (Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT, 14 Sep 85)	45
NUCLEAR TESTING	
Moscow Rejects U.S. Claims on Nuclear Tests Verification (Moscow in English to North America, 31 Aug 85)	49
Moscow Paper Views World Response to Moratorium (Yuriy Romantsov; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 31 Aug 85)	51
GENERAL	
Gorbachev Addresses French Parliamentarians on Arms Proposals (Various sources, various dates)	54

Gorbachev Speech	54
TASS Overview	62
Zamyatin News Conference, by Georgiy Zubkov	64
Details on Arms Proposals	65
Mitterrand Rejects Arms Proposal	66
Gorbachev on Status of SS-20's	66
USSR Reports on Gorbachev-Mitterrand Press Conference in Paris (Moscow, various sources, various dates)	67
PRAVDA Account	67
Moscow TV Coverage.	76
USSR's Arbatov Addresses San Francisco Meeting (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 11 Sep 85)	87
Moscow TV: FRG TV Reports U.S. To Deploy Neutron Arms (Vladimir Kondratyev; Moscow Television Service, 4 Sep 85)	88

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S CHERVOV INTERVIEWED ON OFFENSIVE ASPECTS OF SDI

AU072301 Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT in Bulgarian 4 Oct 85 p 9

["Conversation at the OTECHESTVEN FRONT correspondent's office in Moscow" between Vasil Asparukhov, "our correspondent in Moscow," and Colonel Nikolay Chervov, "USSR military expert," and Colonel Vasiliy Morozov, "NOVOSTI observer of military-political issues" under the heading: "The Truth and the Lie About the U.S. 'Star Wars'" -- date not given]

[Text] [Asparukhov] Throughout the world and in the United States people are now speaking about "star wars" in connection with the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" announced by President Reagan. Thus, for instance, from the pages of newspapers, on radio and television, the U.S. advocates of the programs preparing for "star wars" are trying to convince mankind that space weapons have some "noble mission" that is aimed at virtually saving the world from the horrors of nuclear war. Where is the truth and where does the lie start?

Nikolay Chervov: First of all one must point out that even in the United States there is a big camp of critics and opponents of the Washington's "star wars" program. They think, completely logically, that the new category of weapons called space weapons represents a terrible danger which hangs over mankind.

Among those who reject the SDI one can also find that part of the U.S. ruling class has more and more often in recent years opposed the traditional U.S. expansionism and adventurism with peaceful coexistence -- the only possible situation in the 20th century. Among those opposing the programs one also finds a large group of U.S. figures, who in principle share the thesis of a "strong America" and its "leading role in the world," but understand the great danger "star wars" programs represent for peace on the planet. Among them one also finds the authors of the monograph "The Lie of the 'Star Wars,'" published by the Group of Concerned Scientists at the end of 1984 in the United States.

This view is shared by the proponents of detente and disarmament, the participants in the antiwar and antimissile movement, and all honest people who support the freezing of nuclear arsenals. This pointed issue is also being faced now by a significant group of U.S. military-political experts who really understand the true state of affairs and really evaluate the combat qualities of the existing and potential military equipment and weapons.

[Asparukhov] What is the Soviet opinion of the U.S. "star wars" programs?

Nikolay Chervov: When the U.S. adherents of militarization of space speak about defense, they are in fact preparing for an attack. Intensely advertising the space shield, they are in fact preparing a space sword. Loudly promising to liquidate nuclear weapons, the "star wars" strategists are in fact advocating that they be increased and perfected. Talking about striving toward stability in the world, they in fact move to destroy the military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, or as they are accustomed to say -- between East and West. They are striving by all means to achieve military advantages for Washington. Their claims that the creation of space weapons can liquidate nuclear weapons in fact opens the sluice gates for a more intense race both in the areas of space and nuclear weapons.

[Asparukhov] Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, said in one of his recent interviews, published in THE WASHINGTON POST: "'SDI' does not represent a stage in the arms race. It is not in fact a weapon. It is a harmless defensive means for protecting people.... It is humane."

Nikolay Chervov: What can I say about this improbable claim. Only this -- it is improbable disinformation.

Whatever Washington decides to call its "star wars" program, it will not reduce the danger for mankind. This is fully understandable because a completely new class of weapons is involved -- space strike weapons -- as well as the construction of an anti-missile space "shield" over the United States. Under these conditions the claims of official Washington that the attacking space weapon is "defensive" and thus "humane" is nothing but a deception based on an assumed lack of information on the part of the people.

[Asparukhov] Why do you think the U.S. "star wars" program is called a "defensive" program?

Nikolay Chervov: Only for the purpose of camouflage. One does not have to be a great specialist to understand that this is an attacking strategy aimed at striking ground, air, space, and sea targets -- in other words, a means of beginning an aggression. In fact this is only another attempt by the Pentagon to turn its sword into a longer and sharper one.

If this program is implemented, the Washington leaders would be tempted to risk the use of nuclear and attacking space weapons against the USSR, hiding behind the space anti-missile "shield" and counting on being invulnerable. They think that this "shield" will "kill" the Soviet missiles that survive the U.S. first nuclear strike at the moment of their launch.

This is not aimed at "defending people" as official Washington is cynically trying to present the purpose of "star wars." The stress is being put on the possibility of disarming the other side, depriving it of the possibility of inflicting a responding strike, and being ready yourself to totally use strategic and space weapons against the military targets and cities of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The reasoning about the humanity of "star wars" is a pure lie. The truth is that the mythical defense [mitichna zashita] of the people through Washington's space plans leads to a greater increase of the danger of nuclear war. These plans will become a danger for the security of all peoples, including the U.S. people and their NATO allies.

Playing with the people's understandable fear of nuclear weapons, Washington intensely pushes the thesis that the space antimissile defense will almost free the world from

nuclear weapons. Some sort of concept has even been formulated of a gradual transition from nuclear attacking to nonnuclear defensive means. However, no arguments can hide the absurdity of this thesis. The SDI adherents claim that today we must continue to develop nuclear weapons and militarize space through the creation of space antimissile systems. And after all this is created, "possibly after many decades," we can reduce and even liquidate nuclear weapons.

This means that in order to liquidate nuclear weapons we must first increase nuclear arsenals many times. According to this perverse logic, the road toward nuclear disarmament leads only through increasing offensive weapons and militarizing space, something which will take many decades. According to them, there is no other road. All this is being done only in order to deceive the people and divert their attention from the necessary of adopting urgent and active measures for reducing nuclear arsenals.

Thus Washington turns the task of fully liquidating nuclear weapons upside down, striving to clear the road for further U.S. military preparations, including the increase of nuclear weapons. This is what the United States is doing in practice: It is developing [razrabotvat] at an accelerated pace new strategic offensive means, such as two types of heavy bombers, two types of medium-range ballistic missiles, and cruise missiles with a broad range of action; and creating ever newer systems of nuclear weapons.

Speaking recently in Congress, Caspar Weinberger openly stated that by creating [suzdavayki] its space antimissile, the United States will increase its "powerful strategic triad" for inflicting a crucial first strike against the USSR. Thus, what they have in mind is not to save the world from nuclear weapons, but a new program of forcing growth of the United States' nuclear potential.

The U.S. space antimissile system and the arms race programs in all directions lead to an undermining of international security. This conclusion was drawn with extreme clarity by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in his talks with the chief editor of PRAVDA. He stated: "As the appearance of nuclear weapons did not remove conventional kinds of weapons, so the creation of space weapons can only develop into one thing -- the arms race will become ever more intense and will encompass new spheres."

Today we have every reason to maintain that the "star wars" program is an obstacle to the Geneva talks. Furthermore, this is a dangerous step, which not only does not reveal the road toward an agreement, but on the contrary -- blocks the road.

The only road leading toward radically solving all problems at the Geneva talks is stopping the militarization of space and decisively reducing strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons in the same context. As the USSR appeal "To the Peoples, Parliaments, and Governments of All Countries," published on the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, reads: "reaching an agreement on the issue of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons is unthinkable under the conditions of militarizing space."

Harsh reality shows that with the militarization of space all nuclear weapons, strategic and medium-range alike, will develop and be perfected; the mountains of weapons will grow higher. An uncontrolled arms race in all directions will begin, something which can lead toward a very dangerous situation and a sharp decrease in strategic stability.

The USSR appealed to all peoples, parliaments, and governments to listen to the voice of wisdom; stop, by means of active joint measures, progress toward the nuclear

preceptice; block the road leading toward a new war; and achieve a total ban on nuclear weapons. For its part, the USSR undertakes no steps which would lead to militarizing space. It implements no actions which would contradict its obligations ensuing from the 1972 Treaty on Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems. All allegations to the contrary are coarse lies which do not correspond to reality.

Space is now free of weapons and must remain so forever. The main thing is not to deploy in space offensive space weapons of any kind. The USSR is for space without weapons.

[Asparukhov] What does the "star wars" program represent from a military-technological point of view? What components does it include?

Morozov: The essence of the "star wars" program camouflaged under the name "SDI" is the mass creation [suzdavane] and deployment [razgrushtane] in space of new types of weapons, which have a great striking ability. As far as the components of this program are concerned, this issue was already answered very precisely by Richard DeLauer, U.S. Undersecretary of defense, who in his speech to the U.S. Congress in March 1984 outlined all the directions and components of "SDI".

According to the statement of this high-ranking Pentagon representative, the "star wars" program includes the creation [sozdamiye] of weapons that can destroy intercontinental ballistic missiles at all stages of their flight -- the initial stage, when the jet engines are activated; the intermediate stage, when the main components of the missile separates into individual warheads; the third stage, when the free flight of the warheads is taking place in space; and the fourth, when the warheads reenter the atmosphere near their targets.

As we can see "SDI" set the task of creating an antimissile defense which comes close to being comprehensive in scope. According to its authors plans, it is precisely the multistage character of the system that increases its effectiveness.

To be able to implement this program, the United States needs new kinds of weapons and new means of observing, aiming, monitoring, and guiding the battle. What do we have in mind? These are first of all weapons based on guided beams, chemical lasers (infrared beams), excimer [eksimerni] lasers (ultraviolet beams), and x-ray lasers with a nuclear basis (nuclear explosions will serve as their generators). Some of these weapons will be deployed on earth, others -- in space, and a third group will be transported by special missiles to the area of interception. In many cases the deployment of large-scale optical equipment in space and on earth will be needed for reflecting and focusing the guided beams.

The new type of self-guiding intercepting missiles, including those based in space -- in other words, satellites with launching installations and "electromagnetic guns" -- belong to another category.

I must point out that the creation [suzdavane] of space weapons is being programmed in Washington with great scope. Thus, the specialists have already computed that 300 to 500 permanent orbital combat stations will be needed for deploying chemical lasers in low space orbits. No less than 250 flights of space shuttles will be needed to supply them with fuel. The total amount needed for creating such a system has been computed at a minimum of \$500 billion.

[Asparukhov] Can you point out some concrete facts which could prove that the "star wars" program is already being placed today (and not in the distant future as its creators are claiming) on a practical footing?

Morozov: There are enough such facts. We have information that three radio-tracking [radiolokatsioni] stations for monitoring space objects of the "spacetrack" system are already operational. They have been deployed on the territory of the United States in New Mexico, the Hawaiian islands, and in South Korea. The construction of a fourth such station on Diego Garcia Island, where one of the largest U.S. naval bases is located, is nearing completion. According to the Portuguese and U.S. press, the construction of the last, fifth such station in the southern Portuguese province of Algarvi, is underway. It will become operational at the end of 1986. This closes the circle of earth centers for monitoring the situation in space. They will be able to constantly control space and maintain communications with all objects in space, including spy satellites and other military satellites. In the final account, the "spacetrack" system of monitoring stations will become one of the important units in the practical implementation of President Reagan's "SDI" initiative.

As another important direction of practically implementing the "star wars" program, we can consider the creation of a major scientific pool in the United States, which includes many leading institutes and universities. Among them are the California Institute of Technology, Stanford University, Carnegie-Melon University, the Lincoln Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and so forth.

According to THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE and THE NEW YORK TIMES, one of the main directions of these institutes' work is to create within the next 3 years an ultra-miniature and ultrafast computer, which would have a decisive importance in implementing "SDI." We have information that in the near future seven to eight additional such scientific pools will be created and their combined budget for just the current year is \$28 million.

I pointed out just two examples. They show how the idea of acquiring unilateral military advantages on the part of the United States, through the implementation of "SDI" is being put into effect. I could cite many other examples which eloquently speak of the corruption of the U.S. Administration's attempts to describe SDI as a program with defensive goals, which does not threaten or even contradict the 1973 U.S.-USSR ABM Treaty.

[Asparukhov] Many uninformed people are asking themselves the natural question: Why are the Washington politicians and strategists who determine U.S. state and military policy so intensely and insistently implementing Reagan's "SDI"?

Morozov: Of course, there are many reasons for this. First of all, I would like to point out that the most reactionary U.S. circles, longing for America's hegemony and leadership, cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that the United States lost the position it held when it alone had the nuclear bomb. Today, they are irritated by the fact that the United States -- the leader of the aggressive NATO bloc -- cannot fully use the colossal military power concentrated in its hands for securing its dominating position in the world. The existing military-strategic parity is the reason for this. Therefore, the United States is toying with the obsessive idea of violating this parity in favor of the United States by any means and achieving military superiority over the USSR.

It is well-known that constant efforts in this direction were made in the United States during the first 5 years of the 1980's. It is also well-known that these

efforts did not lead to any successes, including successes in the area of activating U.S. strategic nuclear weapons. Let me recall that the first step in this direction was modernization of the U.S. strategic nuclear forces aimed at creating a "counter-force" potential. The second step, which is completely logical from a militaristic point of view, is a full-fledged antimissile defense and utilization of space weapons to support the United States' ability to inflict a first nuclear strike. In other words, in the plans of the U.S. generals, the implementation of "SDI" is a logical completion of their intention to guard themselves against nuclear retaliation and turn nuclear weapons into an active means of blackmail and world domination.

The achievement of economic advantages, something for which the interested departments and companies are hoping, is certainly not last among the reasons which compel Washington to so insistently implement "SDI." It is extremely clear that the military-industrial complex will obtain colossal profits for decades. Naturally, there are other reasons, too....

[Asparukhov] What can you say about the effectiveness of the large-scale antimissile defense which is being created in the United States now? Can it create an impenetrable "space shield" over the United States, which could guard that country from a retaliatory responsible strike?

Chervov: In my opinion this question can serve as a theme for a separate talk. However, in short, we can say with total clarity that since the other side is not going to stay idle, the creation of a "space shield" is practically impossible. Authoritative military specialists in the West and East alike have written about this.

Even many U.S. experts share the opinion that, under the present conditions when, for example, the two sides have identical scientific, technological, and production potentials, it is impossible to construct a totally impenetrable "space shield." Even when the "SDI" system is described as having an unrealistically high percentage of intercepting objects from the other side during their flight -- 95 percent -- even then, the United States will not be fully guarded from the effects of a responsive strike. With a massive responsive strike by the other side, even the remaining 5 percent of the warheads will be enough for inflicting an irreversibly effective retaliation against the United States.

Taking under consideration everything which has been said until now we must understand the fact that modern nuclear weapons have accumulated in huge quantities in the two countries' arsenals. They are not conventional weapons. They carry a new qualitative danger of annihilating people. By this we do not mean several millions, but all of mankind, everything living on the planet.

As Einstein pointed out once, communication with such a weapon imposes the radical destruction of conventional thinking. It is necessary to think in a new manner -- the defense against nuclear weapons cannot be found in some supermodern, rare technology: It can only be implemented through a political process, in other words, through the controlled process of disarmament.

Therefore, the USSR in its foreign policy is purposefully pursuing the course of nuclear disarmament; insistently proposing to the United States the conduct of negotiations on the complex of nuclear and space weapons on the basis of the only correct principle -- equality and equal security.

As Mikhail Gorbachev recently stressed in his interview for the Indian agency PRESS TRUST OF INDIA "...going to the Geneva talks, we agreed that their goal is not to begin

an arms race in space but to stop the arms race on earth and to begin a radical reduction of nuclear weapons, including their total liquidation."

There are two diagrams and two artist's impressions on the page carrying the interview. The first diagram is called "A Variant of the Large-Scale System of Antimissile Defense -- A Component Part of the Nuclear First-Strike Potential -- Which is Being Developed [Razrabotvana] in the United States." It depicts simultaneously a U.S. first strike and a USSR "responsive strike." The U.S. first strike employs a "self-aiming shell," a "satellite with self-guided small-dimensional missiles," "electromagnetic guns," "X-ray lasers," "accelerator of component elements," and "chemical lasers." The diagram shows some missiles hitting USSR territory, as well as USSR missiles hitting U.S. territory.

The second diagram is titled "The ASAT Antimissile System on the Basis of the F-15 Fighter and the Scheme of its Action." It depicts an F-15 fighter hitting a satellite with a "nuclear warhead, guided by heat."

[The first artist's impression shows two beams coming from a satellite and aimed at earth. It carries the caption: "Space War -- Fantasy or horrible reality of the near future? This question is being asked by many states today."]

[The second artist's impression depicts the space shuttle and a beam connecting it with earth. The caption reads: "In July, during the flight of the discovery shuttle, an experiment was conducted -- a laser beam sent from earth hit a special mirror installed on the shuttle."]

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW QUERIES SHULTZ ON MATCHING SIGNS OF GOOD FAITH

LD251631 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 24 Sep 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] On the same day as the U.S. Department of Defense set in motion its joint space command Secretary of State George Shultz said that signs of Soviet good faith in arms control will be more than matched on the American side.

The functions of the space command include not only the coordination of a vast network of various military satellites but also control of military flights of the space shuttle, military uses of a space station to be launched in the early 1990's and even the direction of military flights to the planets. As one Air Force official, who requested anonymity, told the UPI, you have a beginning, you have to have the ground floor, something concrete, not a dream on paper. It is the very beginning that can build up.

The militarization of outer space by the Reagan administration is described as a step towards effective arms control, as space weapons are supposed to make nuclear arms redundant. The claim doesn't square with the far-reaching objectives set for the space command. If the administration's stated goal is to get rid of nuclear arms the new command could be assigned less ambitious goals than military uses of yet nonexistent space stations or of future flights of the planets. The dictum of the White House, that "Star Wars" is not negotiable, is still reverberating. This is in defiance of the Soviet-American agreement, reached at the beginning of January this year, that space weapons would be a key area of the three-prong talks in Geneva on strategic and medium-range nuclear arms and space weapons.

George Shultz spoke at the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly. He couldn't ignore the widespread wishes of the world community to have the arms race slowed down and reversed. That's why he said signs of Soviet good faith will be more than matched on the American side. But what kind of signs did he have in mind? Was a unilateral Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions a sign of good faith? It was both a sign and a concrete step. It was more than matched on the American side after a nuclear device was detonated in Nevada less than 2 weeks after the Soviet moratorium became effective. Washington also more than matched the 2-year-old Soviet moratorium on launching antisatellite weapons by having conducted a live test of its new generation ASAT system, despite yet

another Soviet moratorium, this time on the deployment of its medium-range missile and other countermeasures.

The United States continues to station its cruise and Pershing II missiles in Western Europe. Moscow has been accused of making blatant one-sided statements, but moratoriums are not statements, they are deeds that require much more sense of responsibility than the setting up of space commands, awarding contracts to build space weapons, or testing them.

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS CRITICIZES U.S. BROCHURE ON SOVIET SDI PROGRAM

Contents Labeled 'Fabrication'

LD051132 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0312 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, 5 Oct (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Alexandr Lyutyy reports:

Official Washington has once again resorted to crude lies in an attempt to justify its dangerous plans for militarizing space. At a news conference held here, a brochure entitled "Soviet Programs in the Area of Strategic Defense," jointly prepared by the Pentagon and the State Department, was distributed with great pomp. The brochure is nothing more than a fabrication put together by administration disinformation specialists. It claims groundlessly that the Soviet Union is carrying out a broad program of offensive space weapons development [razrabotka] and that the administration's famous "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a "sensible and essential response" by the United States to similar activity.

The brochure's creators are not afraid of even the most brazen distortion of the facts, nor of slander. They go as far as to claim that Soviet military doctrine envisages the creation [sozdaniye] of a first-strike potential and that the USSR may try to resort to "nuclear blackmail." Speaking at the news conference in connection with the brochure's appearance, Paul Nitze, special presidential advisor and state secretary for arms limitation and Richard Perle, assistant defense secretary, held forth about the Soviet Union's "violation" of the 1972 ABM Treaty.

The administration is in need of all these lies to attempt to, in the eyes of the public, once more justify the arms race on earth, which is being stepped up by the United States, and Washington's stubborn efforts to extend it into space.

Thus, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and Secretary of State G. Shultz, in a jointly written preface to the brochure, insist upon continuing the modernization of the U.S. nuclear potential, and also pushing through work in the field of the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

As the UPI news agency writes, the brochure's appearance "is to all appearances linked" with the introduction of the Soviet Union's latest peaceful initiatives. Washington has obviously set itself the aim of putting the USSR's constructive steps, which are aimed at curbing the arms race, in a negative light with the help of a dirty lie.

Chernyshev Disputes Findings

LD052034 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 5 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The stronger voices of protest sound in the world against the "star wars" programme conceived and implemented by Washington, the more practical steps and initiatives come from the Soviet Union with the aim of creating a favourable atmosphere for the attainment of positive accords at the approaching Soviet-America summit, the more often one hears a stubborn "no" from the United States. All sorts of reports, "studies", booklets and other fabrications with eye-catching titles and claiming to be "scientific" pursue the aim of playing down the role and importance of the USSR's striving for peace and at the same time to whitewash the American Administration's plans that threaten mankind.

The Pentagon together with the State Department have just put out a booklet purportedly about Soviet programmes in the field of strategic defence. A glossy cover, 27 pages of text, diagrams and drawings. It looks pretty, but when you start reading this so to say "study" you feel soiled by every single page. The only element of truth in it is Washington's intent to create space strike arms at all cost and to carry out its "star wars" programme. And this obsessive striving totally deprives the authors of an elementary sense of logic and the natural fear of appearing ridiculous.

Take, for instance, the foreword to the booklet signed by Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and Secretary of State George Shultz. They write that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is the most expedient and necessary answer, a reaction to the Soviet Union's big effort in the field of ABM defences. But what about President Ronald Reagan's authorship of "star wars"? For the head of the White House constantly stresses that it was his idea, that he is the "father" of "star wars", even though he prefers to call his brainchild the "Strategic Defence Initiative". It was for good reason that this "slight" to the initiator was immediately noticed by the Western mass media.

The attempts of the United States to convince the world public that the Soviet Union is implementing a "star wars" programme contradict President Reagan's statements who lauded the "star wars" plan as a potential means of saving mankind from the threat of nuclear war, wrote the British newspaper GUARDIAN.

The Soviet Union, as it has been repeatedly stated at the highest level, is not creating space strike weapons and an ABM defence of the territory of the country and has never tried to dispute the American "claim" to inventing "star wars". On the contrary, it is consistently and firmly coming out for preventing any steps to militarise outer space and is calling on the United States to formalise this in a treaty. But to this day Washington refuses to heed the voice of reason.

The authors of the booklet go so far as to contend that the USSR perhaps is preparing an ABM system for its entire national territory, and that while the American "star wars" should result in a destruction of nuclear arms the mythical Soviet developments pose a serious threat to the West. Indeed, there is no limit to cynicism and falsehoods.

Other statements in the booklet are also surprising, to put it mildly. According to them the SDI is a reaction to the deployment by the Russians of a system allowed by the ABM Treaty. It appears that the American "researchers" are trying to prove what cannot be proved.

Indeed, how can a sane person contend that the creation in the United States of space strike arms that are prohibited by the ABM Treaty is an expedient and necessary answer to what is allowed by the treaty? And what is the worth of the contention that the SDI is a factor preventing the Russians from adopting a decision to build up their ABM potential? It follows from this that not the prohibition of the development and deployment of space strike arms, as is called for by the USSR, but the big effort on the part of the United States to implement the "star wars" programme should be regarded as a factor helping to keep the arms race in check. It is difficult to imagine a more absurd "logic".

But the main conclusion drawn by Weinberger and Shultz crosses the t's and dots the i's. They write that the United States must modernise its offensive nuclear arms and develop a reliable ABM system. This is the thought that the authors of the booklet want the reader to accept.

The other aim is to ascribe to the Soviet Union everything for which the world public is long criticising the United States Administration.

For this reason it is announced that the USSR supposedly is conducting extensive research with the aim of creating laser and particle beam arms, that the USSR has the world's only operative anti-satellite weapons system, that the USSR violates the ABM Treaty, and so on.

But the whole world knows that these are American sins. That it is the United States which is not only developing but also testing laser and particle beam weapons. That it is exactly the United States that is developing and testing in space anti-satellite arms of the second generation. That it is exactly the United States that is violating the ABM Treaty by setting itself the aim of creating a large-scale ABM system with elements of space basing, by developing mobile ABM radars, by testing "Minuteman" missiles to impart to them an anti-missile capability, by deploying "Pave Paws" radars to cover the territory of the United States, and by carrying out other programmes.

All this shows that with the direct participation of the State Department the Pentagon is working to wreck the existing international agreements that "impede" Washington's militaristic course and striving by means of other space strike arms to secure strategic military superiority over the Soviet Union, while at the same time trying to delude the world public by using outright slander against the USSR as a "substantiation" of its actions.

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER COMMENTS ON SDI

Criticism in U.S. Cited

LD302201 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 30 Sep 85

[Text] New York, 30 Sep (TASS)--Speaking at a news conference in Lewistown (Maine), former U.S. President James Carter and former U.S. Secretary of State Edmund Muskie said that the "Star Wars" program was a serious obstacle on the way to a success of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

That program will have an adverse impact on U.S. security and the process of arms control, Carter said. Until the United States shows flexibility on the issue of space weapons chances for an agreement with the USSR will be slim, Muskie noted.

Development work carried under the "Strategic Defense Initiative" may well take us perilously close to the unverifiable stage of deployment of ABM components, Senator Albert Gore said in an interview to CBS. He stressed that despite U.S. President's assurances, the deployment of an ABM system would lead to a race in both offensive and defensive arms. The senator urged the U.S. administration not only to abide by the ABM treaty, but also to make efforts to strengthen it.

About 60 anti-war organizations in the United States demanded that Washington renounce its dangerous plans for outer space militarization. At the recent conference "independent initiatives and the nuclear arms race" members of such prestigious public organizations, as the Union of Concerned Scientists, Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Center for Defense Information, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, the Council of Economic Priorities and many others, condemned the "Star Wars" program which could undermine the process of arms control.

Shultz, Perle Comments Hit

PM011110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under general headline "'Star Wars'--Threat To Life"]

[Text] Washington, 30 Sep--The United States intends to continue adhering to its line of hampering the achievement of accords to curb the arms race. This has been reaffirmed by U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle, who defended the "Star Wars" program.

In an NBC television interview the head of the U.S. Foreign Policy Department pointed out that President R. Reagan would not agree under any circumstances to a ban on "research work" forming part of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." He did not rule out that the United States would proceed to practical tests of space strike arms, which is allegedly permitted under the 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the limitation of ABM systems.

G. Shultz maintained that the administration is seeking to remove the threat of nuclear war. However, it followed from his explanations that to achieve this it is necessary above all to seek to reduce Soviet arms while continuing the "Star Wars" program.

For his part, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle told the CBS television company: "I have no doubt that the President will continue the program."

'Massive Propaganda Campaign'

PM011338 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Oct 85 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Comments by Pentagon Boss"]

[Text] Washington, 28 Sep--The U.S. administration has launched a massive propaganda campaign in an attempt to convince Americans of the "need" for the "Star Wars" program, which is aimed at achieving the total militarization of space. Addressing a meeting of Republican staffers of the Senate apparatus, U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger asserted that this program "gives mankind a better hope than any other strategic concept in the last 100 years." The Pentagon boss' comments were clearly conceived as a reply to a recently published report of the Congress Office of Technology Assessment. Its authors came to the conclusion that the creation of an ABM system with space-based elements will lead to an unrestrained race in offensive armaments.

Ground-Based Laser Tests

LD041746 Moscow TASS in English 0755 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 4 TASS -- A new test has been carried out in the United States within the framework of the programme for the creation of space strike weapons. A Pentagon spokesman has said that the beam of a ground-based laser installation tracked a rocket which was launched from the U.S. Navy test range at Hawaii islands. According to the Pentagon, it is the first time a laser beam, adjusted for atmosphere distortion, has been propagated from the ground to space. The experiment with the use of a laser installation is yet another evidence that the Pentagon has already started testing components of a large-scale anti-missile defence system with space-based elements.

Rapid Progress Seen

LD051035 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Yevgeniy Kachanov commentary]

[Excerpts] A new test has been carried out in the United States within the framework of a program for the creation of space strike weapons.

Washington has recently been urgently promoting the view, through all its official and unofficial mouthpieces, that the development of a large-scale system of antimissile defense with space-based elements -- that is, the implementation of the Reagan "star wars" plan -- is supposedly something in the distant future. For the moment, though, it is, they say, only a question of research and theoretical work of a totally inoffensive nature. Like it or not, certain not too farsighted politicians beyond the borders of the United States have also started adhering to a similar version. Meanwhile, as you see, the Pentagon is carrying out at top speed prototype testing of individual components of a space weapons system. Let the word "prototype" confuse no one. After all, what may be one today, may become a real combat element tomorrow of a system that directly violates the provisions of the 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Antimissile Defense Systems.

The term "research work" can deceive no one either, because it is clear that after it is completed, its results will not be shelved. Highly placed spokesmen of the U.S. Administration, including President Reagan himself, leave no shadow of doubt on this account.

Moreover, I repeat, in parallel with theoretical developments the Pentagon is creating the material basis for tomorrow's "star wars" at a rapid rate. A significant role in this is allocated to the space flights within the space shuttle program which the military are increasingly using. The Atlantis spaceship, which has just been launched into orbit, is carrying out a program of an exclusively military character; the whole flight is completely under Pentagon control. Thus, Washington is gradually bringing matters toward an undermining of the 1972 treaty, which not without justification, is considered a cornerstone in the process of arms limitation.

The Soviet leadership has pointed out the danger of this policy of the U.S. Administration several times. Large segments of the world public and in the United States itself are becoming increasingly more aware of its destructiveness to the cause of peace and international security.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON U.S. SHUTTLE ATLANTIS MILITARY MISSION

Geneva Talks Impact

LD191547 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 19 Sep 85

[Excerpts] As it has been announced in the United States, the first flight of a new shuttle space ship, "Atlantis," is scheduled for 3 October. It will be devoted to military purposes only. Dmitriy Zakharov has this comment?

It's not the first time that the shuttle crew will be working on a program for the military, but there are some factors that distinguish the current flight from all previous ones. For the first time, the space ship, just built, will be accomplishing a purely military task. There are other things worthy of attention. On 13 September, the United States tested the ASAT antisatellite system. A special missile launched from a F-15 fighter-bomber hit the stationary target in earth's orbit. Only 2 weeks separate those tests from the currently planned flight of the "Atlantis." Earlier, intervals between such experiments lasted much longer. Now they follow one after another. One gets the impression that a series of remonstrative actions is taking place.

If we take into account the fact that the Soviet-American summit meeting is due to convene soon and that the Soviet-American talks have resumed in Geneva, we cannot help but regard the situation as rather strange. After all, the range of questions due to be discussed at the talks includes the prevention of the militarization of outer space. That was one of the topics outlined in January in the Soviet-American statement concerning the subject and purposes of the talks in Geneva. American officials themselves declare that they wish the Geneva talks to be a success. But the thing is that Washington's approach to them is very peculiar. It believes that successful tests of military systems in outer space may play the role of trump cards. American Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger has declared that, if the United States succeeds in developing an effective system that would make Soviet weapons powerless, it will then return to the situation when it'll be the only possessor of nuclear arms.

Critics of the administration's programs are right when they maintain that the Pentagon needs space weapons to build up its first strike capabilities. As for the Soviet Union, it has always been doing all in its power to halt the arms race. It declared on many occasions that talks can be a success when the principle of equality and equal security is observed and when the sides seek no

unilateral advantages for themselves. To contribute to success at the talks, the Soviet Union set as of 6 August a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and called on the United States to do the same.

Today's attempts to secure supremacy with the help of space weapons is a project that will end up in a blind alley. In this sense the flight of the "Atlantis" can be described as flight into political nonentity [as heard].

Crew Entirely Military

LD011249 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] At the American spacecraft launching center on Cape Canaveral, the countdown has begun at 9 o'clock GMT before the launch of a reusable spacecraft on a purely military mission. The start of the "Atlantis" ship is scheduled for Thursday [3 October]. The crew consists of military officers whose task is to put in orbit secret military satellites. It is believed that the satellites will be part of the U.S. space system for tracking and guiding strategic missiles.

Military Communications, SDI Role

LD071936 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 7 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 7 TASS -- The U.S. space shuttle Atlantis with five astronauts on board touched down at Edwards Air Force Base, California, today.

The four-day mission was fully devoted to a Pentagon programme and was shrouded in secrecy. No details of the flight were released. Even the planned duration of the mission was not known till the last moment -- newsmen learnt about the landing only twenty-four hours before the actual touch-down.

Press representatives, however, came to know that the astronauts deployed two military communication satellites hardened against electromagnetic radiation caused by nuclear explosion. According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS, this will enable the national command to be in touch with troops in various parts of the United States and abroad even in the event of a nuclear war. The overall cost of the satellites, built by General Electric, one of the Pentagon's largest contractors, exceeds 150 million dollars.

Atlantis' flight is the second mission in which a space shuttle was used fully in the interests of the U.S defence department. The American press stresses in this connection that reusable spacecraft are to play an important part in the U.S. Administration's programme of militarizing outer space. THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper reports in this connection that the Pentagon intends using them for building orbiting battle stations, observation and reconnaissance platforms, and for deploying laser and particle-beam weapons in outer space. The flight by Atlantis, notes the C.N.N. television network, as well as the secret mission by Discovery earlier this year, apparently tally with the Reagan administration's "star wars" programme.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ON EASY VERIFIABILITY OF U.S. SPACE-ARMS TESTS

LD011349 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] U.S. officials said on Sunday that there was no way the administration would agree to calls for limits on the "Star Wars" program. Here are some details:

Speaking on American television, Secretary of State George Shultz and Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle voiced the view that any deal on the research limits would be ridiculous because there would be absolutely no way to verify whether or not it was being observed. When, earlier this month, one of the old Titan-I stationary missiles was destroyed by a chemical laser was it research or a practical test of a component, crude as it was, of the "Star Wars" system? The word research has been used so often that its true meaning has been virtually eroded. A few months ago work on "Star Wars" was called fundamental research that defies control and verification because nobody could impose any limits on what is in a scientist's mind. When leading arms manufacturers were given multimillion orders to produce components of space weapons, this was also called research. And tomorrow we will be told that deploying weapons in space without testing them is also research.

On 13 September, the United States tested its new ASAT weapon against an object in space. Experts said that the technology it is based on is very similar to the technology that can be used in antimissile defense weapons. More such tests are scheduled.

Another fully military mission of the fourth American shuttle "Atlantis" is scheduled for next Thursday. Also this month the U.S. Air Force activated its space command. Its primary function is to control not only the vast network of military satellites but all kinds of military uses of space including an antimissile umbrella. According to reports from Washington, experts are studying new deployment plans for the MX missile and the so far nonexistent Midgetman. The latter is said to be the mainstay of the American strategic land-based forces until the end of this century and beyond. But we are being told that "Star Wars" is going to render such weapons redundant and obsolete.

When the ASAT weapon was tested, the missile from a high-altitude F-15 fighter split the Solwind satellite into 150 pieces. At a missile warning center they not only knew the exact number of pieces, they also kept track of them, as well

as of a screwdriver that was dropped by an American astronaut on a recent shuttle mission. But they tell us they have no adequate national means of control and verification of anything that would go on in space or down on the ground.

What we have here is a pattern to cite difficulties of control and verification, be it in nuclear testing, chemical arms, or other areas when there is no desire to accept proposals that would slow down the nuclear arms race and prevent a military competition in space.

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET WEEKLY ON STRATEGIC, TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF SDI

PM251508 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 38, Sep 85 pp 3-5

[Yuriy Gudkov article: "False Promises and the Nuclear Reality"]

[Text] The report was brief, somewhat ambiguous and two months late. The papers reported "an important advance in the development of an X-ray laser space weapons."

If the information available is true, it refers to the first practical result the Livermore National Laboratory (California) has achieved in its top secret research on the focussing of X-rays. "The new device," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "channels the power of a nuclear explosion into laser rods that emit powerful bursts of radiation before the whole device is consumed in a giant fireball."

Over a period of several decades the Livermore National Laboratory headed by Edward Teller, father of the U.S. hydrogen bomb, has been, perhaps, the main supplier of ideas and designs for the latest in strategic weaponry. As far as this device is concerned, it was named Excalibur after the sword King Arthur, according to legend, drew out of a miraculous stone. The new version known as Super Excalibur has been tested in Nevada. It is regarded as a most promising weapon in the "star wars" programme. Only it was not drawn from a stone, but from a nuclear blast. This is the gist of the "secret" that has created a rather awkward problem for official Washington.

When a group of America's most eminent scientists finally got the President to receive them to tell him they disagreed with the Strategic Defence Initiative he several times repeated that the USA had started research in non-nuclear defense against a nuclear attack.

The term "non-nuclear defence" bears a meaningful message. Indeed, defence is not attack. The side in defence not only exercises a lawful right to defence and to the strengthening of its defences, but also cannot be suspected of aggressive intentions. On the other hand, "non-nuclear defense" implies that the "star wars" programme will ultimately result in the abandonment of the nuclear weapon. It follows that the programme takes account of the dangerous realities of the nuclear age.

The scientists did not agree with this argument, and duly informed newsmen after the audience. The reason for this is their competence. As experts they are well aware of the danger arising from the abandonment of the present security system based on an approximate parity of strength, and from the "weaponry of the future" as such. As for the public, the situation is totally different. As a rule, the public does not know the facts. It is offered biased interpretation of these facts or simply lies for

the "sake of national security," as is usually the case. The nuclear stuffing of Super Excalibur creates difficulties, because it gives food for thought and betrays the true purpose of the programme even to the uninitiated. After all it is not impossible to reconstruct a dinosaur from the end of its tail.

The official silence and reticence are highly significant. The point is that Washington has tried to persuade U.S. and world public opinion that the "star wars" programme means salvation, that it is a sweeping, though costly, but practicable solution to the dilemma that threatens the world with total disaster as nuclear weapon stockpiles accumulate.

Torrents of Words

Washington's campaign to promote SDI is unprecedented with respect to its forcefulness, duration and the personalities involved. If official assertions are true, "star wars" is an abstraction—a promise of a distant millennium when," as NEWSWEEK ironically remarked, "nuclear weapons will no longer exist, a piece on the global chessboard, a budget line." The exaggeration is not too great here. The promises do indeed take your breath away, if, of course, you turn your back on reality.

The term "star wars" went into circulation practically the day after the President delivered his speech on March 23, 1983. It was borrowed from the film of the same name, which imaginatively presents war in space. The President was hurt. He said he wanted the person who had coined the expression to take it back, because it misrepresented what he had in mind.

What did he have in mind?

As the President put it, he was averse to "a certain immorality" in the strategy of guaranteed mutual destruction. He gave the gist of the strategy as follows:

"If you blow our people up, we'll blow your people up." It would be appropriate to recall that it was Washington that produced the concept and elaborated it in detail. Hence the question: "Isn't it worth it to see if we can't come up with a non-nuclear weapon that won't destroy people, will prevent those weapons from reaching their targets?"

The U.S. secretary of defence paints the following picture: "If we have ours ready, then SDI may eventually provide mankind with the means to a safer basis for deterring aggression and ensuring world stability." Moreover, "the very process of achieving strategic defence could be a key step on the path to greater political cooperation and a reduction in East-West antagonism."

Paul Nitze, the President's adviser for arms limitation talks, has said that in the next ten years the aim of the United States would be radically to reduce the stockpiles of existing and planned offensive nuclear weapons and to stabilize the balance between offensive and defensive nuclear weapons, whether on the ground or in space. The ultimate goal would be to free the world of nuclear weapons.

These statements account for only a small share of the torrents of words inundating both sides of the Atlantic. Not only a new name, "Strategic Defence Initiative," but also a complete system of arguments have been worked out. And it is all based on people's dream of a secure world, better mutual understanding, and delivery from nuclear weapons. The very idea of the "shield" was prompted by the understandable

desire to cherish such a possibility. Though promises of a "golden age" have invariably produced sceptics, they have also won crowds of supporters. Public opinion polls have always shown that many Americans take for granted what official Washington says.

Of course, this is not the first instance of deliberate deception. A special jargon has even taken shape. The propaganda backup to every intention is referred to as "declarative," as distinguished from practical policy, because, unless it is camouflaged, the latter is considered to be totally unacceptable to the public. In a contribution to THE LOS ANGELES TIMES Thomas S. Powers writes that "explaining defence to the people in a democracy is a bit like explaining love or money to children in a family -- you do not want to lie exactly but the whole truth seems a little raw for innocent ears."

Thomas S. Powers happens to be a "sceptic." Not because he is distrustful by nature, but because of his professional involvement. He studies weapon systems and strategic concepts for their use. His final conclusion is: "The secret of 'star wars' is that it is intended to defend weapons, not people. The purpose is not to keep the Soviets from threatening us, but to make sure we can threaten them."

Let us bear this in mind while examining real, and not declarative, policy.

"Another Course"

In 1972 the USSR and the USA signed a treaty which stipulated that both sides abandon the idea of strategic defence. During the presidential campaign in 1980 Ronald Reagan as a nominee opposed the doctrine of mutual assured destruction which essentially recognized a reality that was new to the USA, namely the parity the two sides had achieved in their nuclear strength. He presented the case as being simply common sense. To make his point he cited the example of two people poking pistols at each other's heads. He has never tired of reiterating that there must be another course. If the United States were to proceed from the commitments it had assumed under the terms of the 1972 treaty, the only course open was to conduct arms limitation talks.

However, "another course" the President proposed was "strategic defence."

Though very few people noticed it, in its 1980 platform the Republican Party pressed for "vigorous research and development of an effective anti-ballistic missile system." In November 1980 the first X-ray laser test was conducted in the Nevada desert under the code name Dauphin. It was held in deep secrecy. Despite this, less than three months later AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY carried a detailed description and a concluding proposal: "The X-ray lasers based on the successful Dauphin test, when mounted in a laser battle station, are so small that a single payload bay on the space shuttle could carry to orbit a number sufficient to stop a Soviet nuclear-weapons attack."

Several months later a group of scientists, brass hats, business people, and executives of aerospace corporations met on the premises of the Heritage Foundation, an ultra-conservative organization. In May 1981 George A. Keyworth, a nuclear physicist, was appointed the President's science adviser.

The members of the group first visited the White House in January 1982. Another meeting took place early in the following year. It was then, on January 14, that George A. Keyworth broke the official silence by referring to the work on the X-ray laser as "one of the most important programmes that may seriously influence the nation's defence posture in the next decades."

Modernization of the Armed Forces was being vigorously advanced on the basis of programmes Congress had endorsed and long-term appropriations that were to guarantee it in the 1980's and 1990's. Meanwhile new factors made themselves felt. The protracted and exhausting battles fought in Congress over the MX missile and the painful doubts about the Midgetman system are proof positive that it is becoming increasingly difficult to explain to and defend before public opinion the endless stockpiling of nuclear missiles. The fact that there are enough weapons to destroy life on earth, if not the earth itself, many times over makes further nuclear arms race pointless. No wonder the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the MX was probably the last missile this Congress is ever going to go for. The conclusion the Joint Chiefs of Staff have drawn is that "we've got to look beyond MX." The question is where.

It was here that the other factor was brought into effect. It was proposed to develop an anti-missile weapon, or a weapon of the third generation, as it is called.

This was a conspiracy against the policy of looking for a way out through talks and not through projects developed in the secret laboratories of the military-industrial complex. It can also be seen as a conspiracy against humanity.

Those Opting For

The Livermore National Laboratory is not the only one of its kind. The Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory is equally famous. Then there is Sigma Tau, a laser development centre belonging to the Rockwell International near Los Angeles. Over a period of many years the Grumman Corporation has been working on space-based radar stations in Bethpage, New York. Since the 1960's the Martin-Marietta Aerospace Co. of Orlando, Florida, has been working on anti-missile interceptors and "intelligent" missiles. Finally, there are Boeing, TRW, IBM, Honeywell, and many other firms.

The vice-president of Rocketdyne Inc., a Los Angeles subsidiary of the Rockwell International, says the "star wars" programme did not come as a surprise to them. This is not an admission, but a mere statement of a fact that was concealed from the public till the time was ripe for it.

This is not the first time that doctrines and strategic concepts have been revised under the pressure of technological developments, and not of circumstances. The military-industrial monopolies are behind them. As far as they are concerned, these developments mean tenders for more government contracts and for more billions of dollars in profits. The military appropriations having surpassed the \$300 billion margin, the stakes are fabulously high. Through the Pentagon the munitions corporations get the lion's share of the national budget. However, their main concern is not merely to preserve this share, but to increase it with every passing year. The supply of new hardware is justification for their claims.

At present the scope of these claims is indeed boundless and is not likely to diminish for decades to come. In scope the Strategic Defence Initiative can be compared with the nuclear-missile race started 40 years ago and still going on.

Chain of Consequences

However, those who daydream about a "shield" repelling and rendering useless nuclear missiles should know that at best it will really be no more than an umbrella full of holes. Even the Americans cannot conceal this. Lieutenant-General James Abrahamson, the "star wars" programme supervisor, says that "a perfect defence is not a realistic thing." Harold Brown, ex-Secretary of Defence who happens to be a nuclear physicist, considers the chances of creating a "perfect or near-perfect defence negligibly low."

Ronald Reagan had remarked that he had never demanded that strategic defence should be one hundred per cent foolproof.

A whole chain of consequences follows from here, which reveal the essence of the intention. Above all the "discarding" of nuclear weapons is out of the question: If the Teller laser implies the use of a nuclear explosion in the new weapon system, an unreliable "shield" will mean that the "sword" -- the nuclear-missile strength -- will have to be retained and advanced. Contradicting himself, but not the intention, Caspar Weinberger says in plain language they are not going to stop modernizing the existing strategic arms.

In this context the U.S. position at the Geneva talks is significant. While refusing to discuss space weaponry, it demands that the USSR should reduce its strategic missile potential. This will, naturally, make it easier for the "shield" makers. As James Fletcher, chairman of an administration panel for the examination of the SDI's technical prospects, said "the ultimate utility...of this system will depend not only on the technology itself, but on the extent to which the Soviet Union agrees to mutual defence arrangements and offence limitations." Here the indissoluble link between defensive and offensive arms leaps to the eye. It explains the USSR's position at the talks. Mikhail Gorbachev put it in very clear terms: "Unless the arms race in space is prevented, there will be nothing at all."

Though this sort of defence will not afford adequate protection against a massive first attack, it might prove helpful in beating off a retaliatory blow dealt by an enemy already weakened by a first attack.

Even if the offensive forces are equal, these circles hope the "shield" will offer them an advantage that will enable them to threaten the other side with nuclear war or even unleash it. That is why the character of "strategic defence" is so provocative. No wonder that in an interview he gave Ronald Reagan admitted that any defence system combined with offensive arms might be regarded as a factor contributing to aggressive policies.

It follows from this that "strategic defence" is intended to pave the way for nuclear war and help find a means for unleashing it, instead of building the "shield" some people would perhaps, like to have faith in.

It is necessary to take account of yet another circumstance. All these moves fit in with the policy Washington has been pursuing over the entire postwar period. It was inaugurated in Hiroshima and Nagasaki when the United States committed itself to nuclear superiority as a means of achieving its objectives. Ever since the position of strength in its nuclear version has constituted an organic element of U.S. policy. Two plans, Halfmoon and Dropshot, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff produced provided for massive employment of the atomic weapon. Of course, they counted on impunity. When the USA's nuclear monopoly ended, these calculations proved impracticable. However, this did not cause the USA to abandon the idea of employing the nuclear weapon. A flexible response strategy and the concept of local nuclear war were devised. The assumption was that superiority in nuclear strength would enable the United States to threaten other countries with total war and thus give it a free hand in pursuing its policies.

Parity in strategic weapons brought about further changes. Hopes to secure and retain superiority by quantitative stockpiling of nuclear weapons did not materialize. In a statement signed in Vladivostock in 1974 the USA recognized the principle of equality and equal security. However, subsequent events have shown that the USA had not given up the drive for superiority. Only now it has been switched to the qualitative improvement of weaponry.

Among the weapons now available are missiles equipped with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles, Trident missiles which are supposed to make sea-based nuclear missiles as accurate as the ground-based weapons, cruise missiles, which cannot be detected by radar, and Stealth, a bomber of the new generation. Let us recall that the USA has developed the neutron weapon and deployed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in Western Europe to upset strategic parity. And, finally, take the plans to equip NATO ground forces with the latest means of detection, combat control and destruction. Such anti-missile systems as Nike-Zeus, then the Nike-X, Defender, Sentinel and Safeguard were developed in the hope of a technological breakthrough.

The "star wars" programme is the biggest and most dangerous of these undertakings. Having been launched in defiance of existing agreements, it provides for a total mobilization of scientific manpower, technological facilities, and material and financial resources. When Washington compares "strategic defence" with the Manhattan (atom bomb) and Apollo (sending a crew to the moon) projects, it wants to show that concentrated effort can produce practical results in the foreseeable future. Only instead of ushering in a "golden age" it will start another round in the arms race designed to assure U.S. military superiority and the possibility of unleashing nuclear war.

That is precisely why it is so important and urgent to realize this danger, to see through the carefully thought-out broad-based campaign of deliberate deception and to counter it. The Soviet initiatives offer practical possibilities of search for a solution. Mikhail Gorbachev has made it clear that "our proposals have been made in earnest." But Washington has responded to them with a nuclear test in Nevada and the announcement of the first anti-satellite weapon test carried out against a target in space. As THE WASHINGTON POST has pointed out, this decision has been adopted on the initiative of the White House and the Pentagon, and not the Air Force command. This response is more eloquent than the most lavish assurances. Similarly no propaganda trickery can possibly alter the basic fact, namely that Hiroshima and Nagasaki have shown that mankind is now capable of self-destruction. Therefore, the improvement of weapons, regardless of pretty promises, is a sure way to destruction. Such is the present-day reality which calls for both reason and action.

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: EARLY OCTOBER REPORTS ON EUROPEAN, JAPANESE SDI RESPONSES

FRG'S Rau Confirms SPD Opposition

LD021052 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Station commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Text] Johannes Rau, eminent figure of the SPD and minister-president of North Rhine-Westphalia, has called upon the great powers to renounce plans for the militarization of space, as DPA reports in an account of Rau's speech to a group of U.S. businessmen. Here is a Moscow Domestic Service commentary by Viktor Levin:

In essence, Rau reiterated and confirmed his party's stance. In the same speech, as is clear from the DPA dispatch, he stated directly that the SPD views the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of the United States with great concern. At the same time, during his recent meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Rau had the opportunity of personally being convinced of the fact that the Soviet Union views prevention of the militarization of space as a most important task. The Soviet leader spoke of this precisely and clearly in his speech on French television, transmitted last evening. So one can state with every reason that the appeal to the great powers which Rau initiated is a diplomatic move. It is clearly not necessary to convince the Soviet Union of the need to prevent the militarization of space. Our country is firmly in favor of that. But the position of the United States gives rise to misgivings, and Rau has pointed straight at it. But the significance of Rau's speech is not limited to reasserting the SPD's position. He is, by the way, the SPD's candidate for the post of FRG chancellor at the next Parliamentary elections, so his words carry particular weight. It is also important to note the timing of Rau's statement.

Much is now being said in the world about the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit, while from Washington voices are again and again to be heard asserting that the United States does not intend to renounce plans for the creation of strike space weapons. President Reagan himself spoke about this recently, as well as his closest aides. So it was in response to these dangerous statements that Rau's speech, which in effect contains an appeal to the United States not to embark on a path fraught with terrible danger for mankind, was made.

Willi Brandt Cited

LD012212 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Bonn, 10 Oct (TASS)--The "Strategic Defence Initiative" poses a grave danger because it can lead to the destabilization of the world situation, Willi Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, has told journalists. According to him, the Social Democratic Party of Germany supports in principle the Soviet Union's proposal on cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space. Brandt stressed the importance of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva for breaking the deadlock over the problems of disarmament.

FRG SPD's Vogel Cited

LD011655 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Bonn, 1 Oct (TASS)--The West German Social-Democrats rejected the U.S. "Star Wars" plans and stand for the termination of the arms race, said Hans Jochen Vogel, chairman of the group of the Social Democratic Party of Germany in the Bundestag, addressing a press conference here today. In view of the recent proposals of the Soviet Union, aimed at preventing the militarization of outer space and terminating it on earth, he urged the West German Government to use all of its influence to promote this goal. Bonn, he said, should declare unambiguously for a halt to the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe and to say a firm "no" to the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" of U.S. President Reagan.

Netherlands Rejection

PM080848 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[Igor Melnikov "Commentator's column": "Netherlands Government Decision"]

[Text] The Netherlands Government has refused to participate in the plans being developed by Washington for preparations on "star wars." Speaking on national television, Defense Minister J. de Ruyter stated that after a thorough study of the question the cabinet had decided not to accept the U.S. proposal to participate in the research stage of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

At the time the Netherlands Government sent a letter to parliament. It reaffirms that the Netherlands will not participate in the SDI program in any form. True, there is a suspicious factor. The authorities are not prohibiting private Dutch firms from accepting individual overseas proposals to participate in the development [razrabotka] of the aforesaid program. However, as Prime Minister R. Lubbers noted at a press conference, private companies have also failed to show any particular interest in the U.S. proposal.

Thus, the Netherlands has become the sixth NATO country -- after France, Norway, Greece, Denmark, and Canada -- to have rejected the Strategic Defense Initiative idea. These steps, which have clearly dissatisfied Washington, and particularly its military

department, have been taken after long and thorough consideration. They have been taken despite pressure through NATO channels and despite generous promises. After all, as London's THE ECONOMIST put it, the Americans did their utmost to brandish subcontracts in front of West European companies and scientists.

Common sense suggests to the West's political and business circles that to a considerable extent the probability of economic gain from participation in the "star wars" project is illusory and that the danger of involving their countries in Washington's adventurist plans is entirely real and tangible. French President F. Mitterrand recently stated at a Paris press conference that his country "had been forced in well-known circumstances to state that it would not participate in the creation of space weapons in any shape or form." Roughly the same thing is being argued by the leaders of a number of other Western countries, both inside and outside NATO, which have refused to participate in the militarist project that Washington is imposing.

The Soviet Union's recent initiatives have given a new boost to the nonadoption of "star wars" and the shift toward "star peace." The USSR proposal addressed to the U.S. Government that agreement be reached on entirely banning space strike arms for both sides and making really radical, 50 percent, reductions in the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories have elicited a widespread response. If Washington accepted honestly and without any ulterior motive, the hand being extended toward it this would make it possible to restrain the arms race and prevent it spreading to space.

Austrian Opposition

LD072006 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 7 Oct 85

[Text] Vienna, October 7 TASS -- Austria will not take part in the American "star wars" plans.

According to a statement made here by the country's Foreign Minister Leopold Gratz, "the Austrian Government opposes any form of the militarization of outer space." There is no justification for the militarization of space. It is necessary to press for an accord on its peaceful use.

Pentagon Pressures Tokyo

LD062205 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 6 Oct 85

[Text] Tokyo October 6 TASS -- "Join in until it is too late" has been the message pushed by the Pentagon in talks with a group of Japanese experts who have arrived overseas to study the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

Quoting government spokesmen, KYODO TSUSHIN News Agency reported today that high-ranking officials from the U.S. Defense Department have familiarized Tokyo's emissaries with "star wars" research.

It follows from statements made by Japanese government officials that the talks in Washington have been marked by unprecedented pressure on the Japanese delegation. Its members were told bluntly that a delay with joining the SDI will not allow Tokyo in the future to use the results of the U.S. militarist research under the "star wars" program.

Acting in line with their instructions, the Japanese experts expressed consent to provide the Pentagon with missile guidance technology although on the whole they in Japan are apprehensive of the long-term effects of the transfer of latest scientific and technological developments to their chief trade and economic rival.

This latest Japanese contribution to the U.S. effort to create a space-based missile defense, the local press believes, is setting the stage for the Nakasone government's "political decision" on joining the SDI. Judging by what Japanese statesmen are saying, Tokyo is not going to take a long time to make it, the more so as the Pentagon's contractors have long been taking advantage of Japanese technical innovations in developing various kinds of weaponry, including space missile weapons.

Japan To Supply Equipment

LD072259 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1731 GMT 7 Oct 85

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Yevgeniy Kachanov]

[Text] [Kachanov] According to a report from Tokyo, a delegation of high-ranking representatives of the National Defense Agency, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and certain other Japanese government departments, has returned from the United States. It was sent to study possibilities for the further expansion of Japanese-American cooperation in the exchange of technological developments for military purposes, as well as Japan's participation in the creation of a U.S. space-based antimissile system. The Japanese delegation held talks in Washington with American officials responsible for the implementation of president Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. As a result, an accord was reached to the effect that the Pentagon will obtain from Japan technology for the production of missiles guidance systems by the end of this year. In connection with this, the Japanese paper IOMIURI has noted that the talks in Washington paved the way for the switching over of Japan's scientific-technological potential to the fulfillment of the "star wars" program. I invited my colleague, commentator Boris Andrianov, to express his opinion on this subject.

[Andrianov] It is quite obvious that official Tokyo is giving the American military increasingly wide-ranging access to Japanese technological achievements. And it is doing this contrary to a resolution by the Japanese parliament which bans the supply of agreements to other countries. And what interests the Pentagon in this case? It is interested mainly in developments by Japanese companies which can be used for the deployment of offensive space weapons in near-earth orbit. Incidentally, some of their components, which have been made in Japan, are already undergoing tests in military laboratories across the ocean. The Japanese delegation, which has returned from Washington, is ready to present the Nakasone cabinet with its recommendations -- according to KYODO TSUSHIN -- on the problems it was engaged with across the ocean. It will only remain for the government to adopt a political decision, and, by all appearances, the matter will not be held up by this. There are already too numerous and frank statements by the representatives of official Tokyo in support of the White House's Strategic Defense Initiative.

There is one more circumstance which provides grounds for supposing that we will not have to wait long for a political decision by the Japanese government. The White House Chief has fixed a meeting of the leaders of the seven major capitalist countries for 24 October in New York. According to U.S. press reports, President Reagan intends to strive for the official approval of his allies of research work on the Strategic Defense Initiative. As is known, the French president has rejected the invitation. But the Japanese premier was the very first to agree to show up on the appointed date. In explaining this haste, NIHON KEIZAI stressed that Nakasone attaches great importance to this conference and intends to give the American administration energetic support in it. KYODO TSUSHIN points out that, before setting out for the United States, Nakasone may make an announcement of his positive attitude to Japanese participation in research for the "star wars" program.

Japanese ruling circles are attempting to justify their aspiration to link their country up to this program with references to the effect that it is only a matter of the period of research work. But surely it is clear with what purpose it is intended to conduct it? For even Pentagon spokesmen do not deny that the Strategic Defense Initiative opens new directions in the arms race. It will aggravate even further the international climate, which is already extremely tense.

For this reason Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, speaking some days ago in Paris Before French parliamentarians, stressed how important it is to halt the infernal train of the arms race now, immediately, before it is too late, and to begin a reduction in armaments, improve the international climate and develop peaceful cooperation among peoples. It is evident that these noble aims do not come into the calculations of official Tokyo, preparing to jump onto this infernal train as soon as possible which Washington is attempting to speed up by stepping up its "star wars" program.

Japan Dietmen Interviewed

OW050436 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Passages in quotation marks recorded]

[Excerpts] The Japanese Diet delegation wound up its week-long visit to the Soviet Union on 27 September. The visit was made at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. A Moscow Radio reporter interviewed Michita Sakata, the Lower house speaker and head of the Japanese delegation, before its departure from Moscow.

Included in the Japanese Diet Delegation was Tsuruo Yamaguchi, member of the lower house and Chairman of the Japanese Socialist Party parliamentary measures committee. Radio Moscow's reporter also interviewed him on the Japanese delegation's visit to the Soviet Union.

Mr Yamaguchi said: "Our Japanese Diet delegation is a supraparty delegation, and the Japanese parties somewhat differ on the Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI, issue. The government says it understands the development of an SDI system, but we of the Socialist Party are against it. There is a Japanese diet resolution, which was adopted through our efforts, on the utilization of space. We went through enormous difficulties to work out this resolution, which limits the use of space to peaceful

purposes. As long as the Diet abides by this resolution, the Japanese Government will never be allowed to participate in the SDI program. I told Mr Gromyko and Mr Tolkunov that we would stick to the resolution, which we had worked so hard to pass, to the end. Both Mr Gromyko and Mr Tolkunov nodded. We will make strenuous efforts never to allow any act which may undermine the friendship between the Soviet Union and Japan so that we can promote a genuine friendship and good-neighborly relations between the two countries."

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS NOTES BONN MEETING ON EUREKA PROJECT

LD262124 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 26 Sep 85

[Text] Bonn, 26 Sep (TASS)--The working group has met for its special session here to draw up and implement a programme of actions to pool efforts in developing high technology for the military and civilian industries ("Eureka" Project), initiated by France. The session has formulated the priority directions in scientific research under the project and examined financing matters.

As has become known here, the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain and Italy said they agreed to join the "Eureka" Project only on condition that it would not be an impediment to their involvement in the U.S. "Star Wars" programme--the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The decisions passed by the session will be submitted to the second European intergovernmental conference on the "Eureka" Project at the level of foreign ministers and scientific research due to be held in the Federal Republic of Germany in November.

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S ZAMYATIN ON USSR-FRENCH TIES, SDI, EUREKA

PM091201 Paris LE MATIN in French 3 Oct 85 p 3

[Interview with Leonid Zamyatin, CPSU Central Committee "spokesman for international questions," by Frederic Dupre--date and place not given]

[Excerpt]

LE MATIN: CPSU General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev has decided to make his first official visit to the West to our country. Does this choice have any particular significance?

Leonid Zamyatin: In politics when you want to be realistic and effective you try to avoid coincidences. It is naturally no accident that France is the first Western country to which Mr Gorbachev has paid an official visit. We have always advocated close cooperation with France because we think that our peoples' fundamental interests coincide on the basis of a general interest in peace and security. There is no clash of vital interests and there are no conflicts between our two countries. Although we are far from agreeing on all the problems of contemporary international life, although we have many important disagreements, I think we are unanimous on the essential things. The French and Soviets want relations within this European edifice which we share, based on the principle of good-neighborly relations. This presupposes security and well-being for all. We think that, at the present dangerous turning-point, two countries like the USSR and France could help set the development of the international situation back on a normal course.

Let us recall a few facts. Our countries were virtually the first to agree on the principles of political cooperation. We signed a specific document which defines the way in which the policy of detente should be understood and asserted. We took part together in preparations for the European conference. So should we not now logically expect our two countries' leaders to have something to say in overcoming areas of confrontation? I think that what they say could have an influence, as in the past.

I am convinced that the French and Soviets have every reason to hope that this meeting between leaders at the highest level will lead to better mutual understanding of the more urgent current problems: pushing back the threat of war and limiting the arms race, especially with regard to outer space.

LE MATIN: The Soviet Union has expressed anxieties about President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. The PRC has for the first time given a positive assessment

of the European Eureka program in which France is taking the initiative. Do you think there is now objective agreement for reaching a comprehensive compromise on the militarization of space?

Leonid Zamyatin: In our opinion, any attempt to carry out SDI would inevitably have harmful consequences. The arms race will be extended to space, while a new spiral in this dangerous escalation will begin on earth. This will undoubtedly make the international situation even more delicate, the existing balance of forces will be destroyed, and the previously signed agreements, especially the 1972 ABM treaty, will be damaged.

LE MATIN: During the UN General Assembly, the Soviet Union proposed to replace this disastrous prospect with the theory of "star peace", to present the international community with specific ideas on the options and fundamental principles of international cooperation in the sphere of research and the exploitation of space for peaceful purposes. But this can only become a reality if all channels leading to the militarization of outer space are hermetically sealed.

As regards the Eureka program, we hope that its aim is the exploitation of space for peaceful purposes. If that is the case, our efforts take the same direction. Indeed, faced with the "star wars" plans, the only possible alternative is to organize large-scale international cooperation for the peaceful exploitation of space. It is appropriate to stress that the situation which has been created requires diligent action.

The need for agreement on these questions is much more important than the disagreements which exist. All those interested in improving the situation should channel their efforts into the search for such an agreement.

LE MATIN: Mr Gorbachev has referred several times to the increased possibilities for cooperation between the two parts of the European continent. How does the USSR intend to promote dialogue and exchanges among countries with different social systems?

Leonid Zamyatin: Dialogue between Moscow and the European capitals has undoubtedly become livelier and more substantive recently. Its value for states in the East and the West is not in doubt, especially in the difficult period we are now going through. In our view, priority must once again be given to political cooperation. This dialogue and these joint actions are aimed reducing military confrontation and increasing stability; without that it seems difficult to imagine an offensive development in the other sectors. In its effort to reduce tension, to establish normal, calm, and productive relations -- in a word, civilized relations -- with all the Western countries, the USSR has put forward a whole series of far-reaching peace initiatives.

In our view, despite belonging to different economic and social systems and to different political and military alliances, all the European countries can perfectly well become partners in solving the crucial problems of peace and security and in developing international cooperation. The Soviet Union aspires to constructive political dialogue and cooperation. It is proving this by actively supporting various peaceful plans put forward in Western Europe.

CSO: 5200/1046

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRENCH NEUTRON WARHEAD CONSIDERED FOR 1992 MISSILE

AU261418 Paris AFP in English 1409 GMT 26 Sep 85

[Text] Paris, Sept 26 (AFP) -- The French missile Hades, which is to replace the Pluton within the country's nuclear artillery arsenal in 1992, may be fitted with a neutron warhead, the latest issue of the Defense Ministry review TODAY'S ARMIES said.

The new missile, with a range of 350 kms (210 miles) compared with 120 kms (72 miles) for the Pluton, is characterized by "its aptitude to meet the technical demands attached to the use of neutron weapons, if the decision is made, as part of a massive strike," the review added. I cited a document signed by the Army General Staff.

The French Defense Ministry announced several months ago that the development of the neutron bomb at France's nuclear testing center at the South Pacific Mururoa Atoll had been finalized. But so far no decision has been made regarding the mass production of this weapon, which kills people while causing minimal material damage.

"Although it is similar to other nuclear arms, this weapon can reduce constraints relating to its use while enhancing the effectiveness of the strike, notably on armored concentrations. It brings added credibility and flexibility," the document said.

CSO: 5200/2513

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

DUTCH PAPER URGES 'RESERVED' RESPONSE ON SDI

PM241547 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 21 Sep 85 p 6

[Theo Klein report: "Netherlands Has Little Inclination for Star Wars"]

[Text] Within a few weeks the Netherlands Government will respond to the U.S. request for participation in the research into SDI, also called "Star Wars." Preparation for the cabinet decision is not yet fully complete, but it is already clear that the Hague's response will not be overflowing with enthusiasm.

No obstacles will be placed in the way of Dutch companies able and willing to contribute to the research program, but cabinet support will be at best marginal. A positive reaction from the Dutch Government is important to the companies involved because the conditions for participation would be improved through an agreement between the two governments. In addition, a positive reaction would mean that not only industry and commerce but also the authorities would take an active interest in the research program. In other words, there would also be additional government money available for participation.

In the preparations for the cabinet decision this is a controversial point. None of the four ministers involved (defense, foreign affairs, economic affairs, and education and science) is ready to open his purse for this. They expect the "Star Wars" program to have little economic effect on the Netherlands.

In his report on the defense budget this week Defense Minister De Ruiter said that the chances of Dutch industry participation in SDI research are small. On Thursday [19 September] his colleague, Economic Affairs Minister Van Aardenne, went a step further.

During the presentation of his new technology policy survey he said that Dutch participants in "Star Wars" must negotiate directly with the Americans for orders. Once they have won such orders "the government will provide the customary cooperation and support given to other companies."

Thus, as far as Minister Van Aardenne is concerned there is no question of any special involvement of the Dutch authorities in SDI. This restrained approach is also to be found in Minister De Ruiter. In his budget report the passages on SDI are noticeably more somber than those of Foreign Minister Van den Broek.

Although the foremost question at present is whether the Dutch Government should involve itself in the research, this discussion cannot be divorced from the fundamental question of the Dutch attitude to the "Star Wars" project in itself. According to ministers, a definitive judgment on this question can only be reached when, in addition to more technical information from the project, greater clarity has emerged about the political and military-strategic repercussions.

In the discussion of the introduction of strategic defense systems such as SDI the cabinet is working with a set of guidelines involving seven principles:

The introduction of defensive systems must make a contribution to deterrence and fit into a policy aiming at preventing war;

The introduction of defensive systems must fit in with the Western policy aiming at stable relations with the Soviet Union;

The political and strategic unity of the alliance must be preserved;

Systems must not be introduced at the expense of commitments in the conventional field and must not lead to a situation in which even greater political and military weight is given to the existing conventional superiority of the Warsaw Pact;

The stipulations of the ABM treaty, which lays down strict limits for defenses against offensive strategic missiles, must be obeyed;

The introduction of defensive systems must not be allowed to lead to more offensive weapons;

The introduction or otherwise of defensive systems must take place in consultation with the Soviet Union.

The cabinet has always stressed the necessity of a united European response to the United States. This should happen within the framework of the Western European Union (WEU), of which France, Italy, West Germany and Britain are members in addition to the Benelux countries. There seems to be little chance of success for this attempt at achieving unity.

At civil servant level the member states have agreed on a number of guidelines, but these are so general that individual members could take them as the basis for decisions both for and against participation in the research. The divisions are also clearly visible. France has already decided to reject participation and itself launched the Eureka project as a European civilian counterpart to "Star Wars."

Britain and West Germany on the other hand incline toward participation in the U.S. research. With their choice of stance they have preempted a joint WEU declaration. Observers in the Hague expect that the Dutch cabinet will also decide its positions before the ministers of the seven member states produce the official WEU reaction.

The WEU has not limited itself to a decision on SDI research but has also ventured a formulation of a series of points of departure which can be used in the assessment of SDI by member states. It is generally assumed that these are little different from the seven points mentioned by the Dutch ministers in their budgets this week.

A reserved response to "Star Wars" by the cabinet would fit in well with the tone of the Second Chamber debate on "Star Wars" which was held in June, when really none of the parties appeared genuinely happy with President Reagan's initiative and invitation. Taking as its point of departure the chamber majority's negative evaluation of the U.S. plans, the cabinet could have much to gain in The Hague from a friendly-worded but very reserved response to Washington.

CSO: 5200/2507

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC COMMENTARY ON USSR DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

HK080851 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 7 Oct 85 p 6

["Commentary" by reporter Ma Weimin: "Soviet Diplomatic Initiative in Western Europe"]

[Text] Paris, 5 Oct -- Just as people have expected, the main purpose of the 4-day visit to France by Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was not merely to promote bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and France. Instead, proceeding from the current situation of East-West relations in general, the Soviet Union took nuclear disarmament as the key issue to promote its main diplomatic initiative from Paris to Western Europe on the eve of the U.S.-USSR summit meeting.

The speeches made by Gorbachev here can be summed up as follows:

-- With regard to medium-range missiles in Europe, a separate agreement can be reached which has no direct link with space or strategic arms; the Soviet Union is willing to hold "direct talks" with France and Britain on their nuclear forces.

-- The 243 SS-20 missiles currently deployed by the Soviet Union in the European region would be maintained at the same level as before the Soviet Union took countermeasures against the United States in June of last year. Along with the dismantling of the extra missiles that had been deployed thereafter, the launchers for those missiles would also be dismantled within 2 months. The countermeasures aimed at the U.S. territory would still be in effect.

-- The Soviet Union would be willing to reach an "internal understanding on the nonproliferation of chemical weapons," and is preparing to make efforts to establish a chemical weapons free zone in central Europe.

-- More constructive relations could be established between the CEMA and the EEC.

-- Certain "temporary methods for settlement" could be adopted by the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO to ease the present severely confrontational situation.

The above-mentioned suggestions and statements in conjunction with the proposals on the Soviet Union and the United States respectively reducing their strategic nuclear weapons by half and a complete ban on offensive space weapons presented to the United States a few days ago and reiterated in Paris constitute the complete diplomatic initiative of the Soviet Union, from which people can dimly perceive the basic trends of Soviet diplomacy now and in the near future.

The reaction of the political and press circles in France and Western Europe toward all this was fast, varied, and cautious. France's LE MONDE maintained that it "contains the exercising of a certain prudence in reopening the dialogue." The West German foreign minister said that it was "interesting." The Belgian foreign minister said that it was a "positive step." The reaction of the United States was: It showed a "change in the Soviet attitude," and could be regarded as the "basis of talks" between the United States and the Soviet Union. Many people have avoided commenting hastily on the real implications of the above-mentioned proposals, the actual intentions of the Soviet Union, and the influence it will have on East-West relations in the future. They would rather observe them quietly.

The key goals of this Soviet diplomatic initiative are to present the proposals concerned to the United States and express the wish to hold "direct talks" with France and Britain.

As far as the first goal is concerned, on 4 October, President Reagan reaffirmed his determination to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative, saying that he would "sincerely discuss" with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva the "most important relations between strategic offense and defense." It is obvious that people should not be too optimistic, at least at present, about the actual steps taken by the Soviet Union and the United States aimed at greatly promoting disarmament and banning space weapons. As far as the second goal is concerned, due to the fact that it directly concerns France, it caused a "sensation" in the country. The experts concerned believe that the actual purpose of the Soviet Union in holding "direct talks" with France and Britain is still to achieve a certain "balance" between the United States, France, and Britain in a bid to bind France and Britain hand and foot.

To attain this goal, an additional private talks session between Mitterrand and Gorbachev was held. Although Gorbachev stressed that "at present, there is no problem of reducing" France's nuclear force, Mitterrand definitely rejected his proposal. He expounded the reasons for doing so: France actually has no medium-range nuclear weapons and its whole nuclear force is not "powerful enough." The main problem it faces is to maintain the minimum reliability and effectiveness of its nuclear force. The British Foreign Office stated that Britain would consider the matter of reducing its nuclear force only after the two superpowers had actually reduced their nuclear arsenals.

The press here universally holds that the real purpose of the USSR's diplomatic initiative, with Gorbachev's visit to France as the arena, was still "the playing of the Western Europe card," in an attempt to sow discord in U.S.-European relations. On the USSR's reasons for selecting France as the first Western country for the Soviet leader to call on, the press suggested that this was in view of France's weight in Western European politics, and its strong aspirations for, and actions in, safeguarding its independence and taking the initiative. In particular, France is, at present, the Western European country that has the greatest differences with regard to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. Therefore, one of the basic targets of Gorbachev's current visit was to seek a "juncture" with France on this issue. Regarding this, Mitterrand expressed his position: While France will not participate in the space weapons project, "it has no direct concern in the current dispute," "which should be discussed exclusively between the USSR and the United States." Therefore, the USSR has failed to find the "juncture" it hoped for in Paris. Gorbachev also said that the USSR would maintain its SS-20's at the level of June 1984, and its direct target was the Netherlands. This is because the Netherlands will decide on the deployment of U.S. guided missiles in November, and it has said that if the USSR maintains its SS-20's at the level prior to the counter-measures (243 in all), the Netherlands would turn down the deployment. Thus it is clear that if we say the Soviet leader's Paris visit was

aimed at sowing discord in U.S.-European relations, it would not be too far from the truth.

All facts have demonstrated that on the eve of the U.S.-USSR summit, both parties are enthusiastically trying to win over Western Europe, so that each may be in a more favorable position to force its opponent to make greater concessions. However, if one pays lip service to seeking a balance of power, while actually trying to gain superiority over the other party, it will be very difficult to find a means to ease the current situation. If, in particular, the USSR and the United States, which each have the power to destroy the other party several times over, have not yet changed their countless proposals and expressions into concrete actions, and if those proposals and expressions have so far remained nothing more than lip service, and have not even been put down in black and white, it would be unfair as well as difficult for them to attempt to gain something from those countries that have only very small nuclear force. The fact that Gorbachev's proposal to hold direct talks with France and the United Kingdom has met with a quick refusal has served as an example to illustrate this point.

CSO: 5200/4001

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRENCH LE MONDE ON GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSAL

PM080331 Paris LE MONDE in French 5 Oct 85 pp 1, 4

[Article by Michel Tatu: "Dealing the Cards Again"]

[Text] The Gromyko era is truly over. The foreign correspondents, especially the many Americans, who crowded into a tiny room in Avenue Kleber on Thursday to hear the Soviet explanations on Mr Gorbachev's new proposals had the overwhelming feeling that the lengthy repetitions of the same arguments and the same propaganda are over, that the new team has imagination, and that it is even -- or seems to be -- making a clean sweep. But the comfort of Western diplomats and analysts has vanished with the Kremlin's old men: Soviet diplomacy has become less predictable and the game more uncertain. There was some good in Andrey Gromyko's set sermons....

It must be said that in the 15 years or so that East-West arms control talks have been going on, the cards have become so complex that there is a great temptation to put the cat among the pigeons and to gain the upper hand by counting on confusion in the types of negotiation on the negotiating procedures, techniques, and figures. And this is to some extent what Mr Gorbachev has just done.

With regard to negotiating procedures, the most spectacular proposal is the one to start direct negotiations with France and Britain. Mr Zamyatin, the Soviet leader's spokesman, and Mr Kvitsinskiy, the negotiator on space weapons in Geneva, had no difficulty in explaining the essence of this to the journalists: "For years," they said in substance, "the Americans told us that they were negotiating on the Atlantic alliance's behalf, and that they had to take into account the interests of their European allies. But when we wanted to discuss the French and British forces, they told us: They are independent countries, we cannot speak for them. There was a deadlock."

Hence, the idea of "getting off the beaten track" by proposing direct negotiations with Paris and London. But on what? In principle on everything, the Soviets say. But in their view the main goal is still to obtain "equivalence" between the medium-range missiles of the three NATO countries "which are targeted on the USSR," namely the United States, France, and Britain, and the SS-20 missiles and other intermediate forces which the USSR has. There would be separate agreements with each of the three, but each agreement would be part of a "broader agreement" (obviously concluded with the Americans), each national subtotal would be "a component in the nuclear balance in Europe," the whole being deemed acceptable by Washington, Moscow, Paris, and London.

The whole is therefore still complicated. But other bait is being laid for France, taking account of the conditions which the latter posed back in 1983 with a view to "joining" the superpowers' negotiations "when the time comes." Thus Paris' request for a

"reduction in the two superpowers' arsenals to levels such that the gap between potentials changes in nature" could be taken into account by the Soviet proposal of a 50-percent reduction in the same arsenals (the figure of 50 percent is the one which the Chinese put forth when they posed the same precondition, and Mr Gorbachev is thus putting out a new "signal" to Beijing). Similarly the same "limitation of defensive systems" demanded by Paris is precisely what Moscow is demanding with regard to the SDI; and finally the third condition -- the reduction of the conventional and chemical imbalances in Europe -- is also taken into account by Mr Gorbachev, who suggested in his speech on Thursday the creation of an area in Central Europe free of chemical weapons.

Indeed it is difficult to believe that Paris and London will accept this offer of direct negotiations as it stands, and they will have no difficulty in consulting the United States on this point despite the setback of the missed rendezvous in Washington on 24 October. Thus Mr Gorbachev's real innovation may be elsewhere, in the revival of negotiations on the intermediate nuclear forces (INF). Since they were broken off in 1983, these talks had been included, and in fact almost completely drowned, in the new three-part negotiations which opened in Geneva this year: The other two parties -- long-range weapons and "star wars" -- stole the limelight. The CPSU leader is now not only reopening this file, but is officially separating it from the other two: An agreement on the INF does not need to wait for an agreement on space weapons.

There is, therefore a new departure here too, but the situation is entirely to Moscow's advantage since it holds all the threads of the negotiations and also benefits from its geographical position. With France and Britain it will discuss those two countries' missiles and the SS-20 missiles. With the Americans it will continue to discuss the three sections, but in fact the American Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe move from the INF section to the "strategic" section since, as arms which are targeted on Soviet territory, they are added to America's central arsenal (and accordingly increase the number of concessions Washington will have to make in the framework of a 50 percent reduction).

Thus the real Soviet concession is still elsewhere. By revealing that the stock of SS-20 missiles targeted on Europe was reduced to a total of 243 vehicles (and 729 nuclear warheads) as of 1 October 1985, Mr Gorbachev is reversing the line imposed by the Chernenko-Gromyko-Ustinov team which made provision for -- rather superfluous -- countermeasures to the deployment of the NATO missiles.

We now learn that the new SS-20 missiles deployed in the USSR in the framework of these countermeasures have been dismantled, whereas, according to Mr Zamyatin, 81 Pershing-2 missiles and 128 cruise missiles are now deployed in Western Europe. On the other hand, Mr Gorbachev has not conceded the other measures taken directly against the United States (forward-based submarines near the U.S. coasts), or the limited deployments in the GDR and Czechoslovakia; Mr Zamyatin explained that the Soviet gesture relates to the SS-20 missiles alone, and that there are no SS-20 missiles in these two countries.

The figure of 243 SS-20 missiles deployed "in the western part of the USSR," (in other words, Mr Kvitsinskiy specified, west of 80 degrees longitude east, in western Siberia) is presented as a return to the figure of 1 June 1984 -- before the countermeasures were taken -- but it is also exactly the figure which Brezhnev mentioned back in November 1981, before announcing a "freeze" on this type of weapon in Europe on 16 March the following year. In other words, nothing has apparently changed in the past 4 years.

Indeed the construction of sites seems to have continued throughout this period, slowing down in 1983 under Andropov. Shortly after he took office in December 1982 the

latter offered to reduce this number to 162 -- the exact equivalent of the number of French and British missiles -- and even to 140 in the final negotiating effort in fall 1983. Mr Gorbachev's "sacrifice" is therefore relative, since the 103 additional SS-20 missiles with their 300 warheads he is giving himself compared with his predecessor more than compensate for the 209 new nuclear warheads which NATO has meanwhile deployed.

But some missiles do seem to have been dismantled very recently: In September American sources reported the "movement toward the east of some of the SS-20 missiles" deployed in Europe, and it is no coincidence that NATO, in its regular lists of figures, has for several months only been giving overall figures for the SS-20 arsenal, without making a distinction between Asia and Europe. The latest such list gave a total of 441 launch vehicles compared to 378 in June 1984.

Mr Gorbachev's signal to The Hague is particularly obvious since the Netherlands Government had made its decision to deploy its quota of 48 missiles dependent precisely on the reduction of the SS-20 arsenal to the June 1984 level. The Hague has replied by stressing the need to take account of the USSR's Asian arsenal. However, if the numbers given by Mr Gorbachev and NATO are correct, this Asian arsenal is now 200 missiles and 600 nuclear warheads, which is a large number.

CSO: 5200/2514

DE VRIES QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CRUISE MISSILES

Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 14 Sep 85 p 7

[Article from our correspondent: "Chamber member of the PvdA wants a new debate because of legal flaws: State Council not careful about cruise missiles"]

[Text] The Hague -- If it is up to PvdA chamber member Klaas de Vries, the politically-oriented in the Hague, will enjoy the next sequel to the debate on the question of whether siting American cruise missiles in the Netherlands is consistent with the Constitution or not. He gives the basis: a devastating commentary on the State Council's interpretation that 48 cruise missiles can be sited in the Netherlands in accordance with a new treaty with the United States. Last year the cabinet joined in this view.

Based on this interpretation the issue was tentatively put on the back burner, but with the letter from the cabinet about the upcoming treaty (on 1 November) the battle-ramparts are again manned. Anticipating the decision on the cruise missiles, the cabinet asked the State Council two years ago to give a tentative judgment on the constitutional aspects of such a decision. The question was whether siting of the weapons would be in violation of the Constitution, on which Dutch sovereignty is based.

(That is) a not unimportant problem, because should the answer be in the affirmative, a treaty with the Americans regarding control over the cruise missiles would have to be accepted provided there is a two-thirds majority in parliament. Given current political relationships, that is out of the question. Thus, that could mean a block to the introduction of the new weapons.

Guaranteed

It did not have to come to that according to the State Council. A treaty with the Americans does not infringe upon Dutch sovereignty as long as it is stipulated (in the treaty) that the nuclear weapons are to be used exclusively in connection with NATO, thus the advice. In that case, the Dutch NATO representative is guaranteed a voice in the use of the missiles, according to the Council. After all, NATO is an organization made up of sovereign states which are guaranteed a voice through current consultative procedures, the Council reasoned.

The Council members pointed to the F-15 jet-fighters based at Soesterberg. Those also are weapons which can be activated by the Americans without permission from the Dutch Government. There has never been a debate about the constitutionality of that agreement. The fact that the F-15 does not have a nuclear task does not make it fundamentally different, according to the Council. With this reasoning the Council answered some scholars of Constitutional Law and left-wing politicians who see in a treaty on control over the cruise missiles a constitutionally inadmissible transfer of sovereignty to another state.

According to them, that has never happened before. The Netherlands has as many as six nuclear responsibilities, but in all cases there is no question but that the Dutch Government has a direct say in the matter.

To withdraw

Thus in practise, it comes down to the fact that, in connection with NATO, no nuclear warhead can be launched from Dutch soil without the permission of the Dutch Government. If the American president, after consultation with his NATO partners, should decide in wartime to launch an atomic weapon from the Netherlands, the government in the Hague still has the opportunity to withdraw its weapons and airplanes from the NATO-command.

It is different with cruise missiles. That unmanned small aircraft, along with its launching installation, is American property. They [the Americans] insist upon deciding themselves whether or not the weapon will be used. This has to do with the scope of action, and the purpose of this weapon, which, in contrast to other Dutch nuclear weapons, can reach the Soviet Union directly.

In June of last year a decision was taken to site 48 cruise missiles at Woensdrecht unless the Soviet Union on 1 November of this year has less than 378 SS-20's deployed. Now that that date is approaching, the temperature in the Hague is going up. It is not that there is so much a question of tension over the counting of the Soviet missiles. It is generally accepted that the cabinet, based on American data, is coming to the conclusion that the Soviets have exceeded the limit; but there should still be a treaty with the Americans about control of the weapons, and in this the opposition sees a small chance to thwart the cabinet and the governing parties.

Too easy

De Vries has made himself thoroughly familiar with the issue as far as the Constitution is concerned, and the result is a memorandum in which he forcefully attacks the judgment of the State Council. His judgment is: the Council came too easily to the conclusion that a treaty with the United States would not be in conflict with the Constitution.

An agreement with a state (the United States) can not be brushed off according to him [de Vries] by simply referring to the co-partnership, which the Netherlands will have as a NATO member. De Vries thinks that the Council

mistakenly failed to make a distinction between an agreement with a human rights organization and a treaty with an independent state. The State Council (an advisory body to the cabinet) has lumped both issues together, for the sake of convenience.

The Council, in its advice, erroneously refers to consultation procedures in NATO, because the authority to decide on the use of cruise missiles, remains emphatically with the United States and not with NATO, according to De Vries. It should be asked, he writes, which position the Dutch Government and parliament would take should the United States decide to go on high alert with nuclear weapons, for example, during a conflict in the Middle East.

The Netherlands-based cruise missiles, in such a case, would be immediately involved. De Vries accuses the State Council of speaking out of both sides of its mouth: "Either the Dutch State can relinquish its sovereignty to the United States, or it cannot. If this can be done, then there is no reason why it should be necessary to relinquish sovereignty within the NATO framework. If this cannot be done, then the NATO framework in particular cannot give it a human rights flavor to remove the first shortcoming."

To prevent

On the comparison with the F-15, De Vries refers to the point of view which notes the government's ability, in an extreme case, to cancel the F-15 basing agreement with the United States to prevent -- unwanted -- flights by those airplanes from Dutch bases. That would also apply to the cruise missiles, according to the cabinet in its request for advice from the State Council.

De Vries emphasizes that it has to be a case of a treaty that can be terminated. And that, according to him, is exactly what the governing parties want to prevent. If the agreement with the Americans cannot be revoked in the interim, then the Dutch Government has given up having a voice on the use of cruise missiles, according to the PvdA Chamber member.

The Constitutional problems can be avoided through setting up "a dual key [mechanism]." One of the keys would be in the hands of the Dutch Government. A cruise missile can, in that case, only be launched with the permission of the Dutch Government. The Americans do not like that idea at all.

In the Netherlands too, there is little support for such a solution, because in supporting this solution, the Netherlands becomes, in fact, part owner of the nuclear weapon. That is in conflict with the non-proliferation treaty (against the spread of nuclear arms). Moreover, it would cost the Netherlands a lot of money. Italy, Great Britain, the Federal Republic and Belgium have already abandoned that possibility. Another possibility is the siting of the cruise missiles in the Netherlands on condition that in wartime they may only be launched from Belgian soil.

De Vries, a specialist in Constitutional Law, will not accept the fact that the same Chamber majority that opted for the cruise missiles, is going to

explain that position by taking refuge behind the interpretation set forth by the State Council. He proceeds from the point that the CDA and the VVD parties have members who insist that cruise missiles may only be sited if it can be done legally.

He quotes the liberal leader Oud, who once wrote that for the government and the Chamber majority the temptation is strong to play fast and loose with the Constitution in such cases. Oud: "In this manner the government and the States-General [parliament] must make a choice, either to violate what they believe to be of greatest importance to the country, or to betray their oath to uphold the Constitution."

De Vries: "In the past, the existence of any doubt was enough for governments to press for consent by a two-thirds majority."

13092

CSO: 5200/2791

NUCLEAR TESTING

MOSCOW REJECTS U.S. CLAIMS ON NUCLEAR TESTS VERIFICATION

LD011313 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 31 Aug 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Can there be proper control and verification of moratoriums on nuclear explosions? Well, to somehow justify the continued nuclear tests by the United States at a time the Soviet Union has stopped all nuclear explosions as of 6 August, Washington has declared that, allegedly, verification of underground nuclear tests is impossible. But only a few days after that statement was made by the White House the United States carried out another nuclear test in Nevada, that was reported even before the official release by the Department of Energy.

The explosion was carried out on 17 August in a mine 330m deep, 120 km from Las Vegas and its yield was under 20 kilotons. This data were obtained by the USSR, but not from American sources, this fact reaffirms that claims by the United States leaders about ineffectiveness of national means of verification are all wrong.

Actually scientific and technical capabilities that exist in the Soviet Union, in the United States, and in other countries give the necessary degree of certitude that a nuclear explosion, even of small yield, will be detected and become common knowledge. There are possibilities today to determine with great accuracy at a distance of many thousands of miles away underground explosions with a yield of only one kiloton, and in many cases even less than that. Scientists all over the world share this view. Nevertheless, for a greater certainty in that the agreements to stop nuclear tests are indeed observed, the Soviet Union proposes that the national verification means should be supplemented by a number of other measures. As experience shows, working out such mutually acceptable measures is quite a realistic thing. For example a protocol on the Soviet-American treaty to limit underground nuclear arms tests signed in 1984 hasn't been ratified so far by the United States. It provides for a whole number of procedures to make more reliable the verification means used for the purpose. This includes an exchange of data about the geographic boundaries of each testing ground, as well as a supply of information about two nuclear tests in order to calibrate explosions and an exchange of data about the geological conditions on the testing grounds.

As for the protocol on the treaty between the USSR and the United States about underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, signed in 1976 and still to be ratified in Washington, it provides for giving access to the personnel of the other side to the places of explosions and for all sorts of checks on the spot. A whole number of measures, in addition to the national verification means, was also worked out in a draft agreement about a full and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests which was almost ready for signing in 1980, when the United States broke off the talks.

In short, were the United States leaders sincere about ridding mankind of nuclear tests, verification would be no obstacle. The White House regards continued nuclear explosions in Nevada as a need to develop new nuclear and space armaments in order to get military superiority. That, and that alone, is the true reason for the refusal by the United States administration to join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions as well as for its rejection of the Soviet proposal that the talks on a full and universal ban on nuclear arms tests should be resumed immediately.

CSO: 5200/1037

NUCLEAR TESTING

MOSCOW PAPER VIEWS WORLD RESPONSE TO MORATORIUM

PM031309 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 31 Aug 85 p 3

[Political observer Yuriy Romantsov's "Review of Events": "In the Main Direction"]

[Text] Sufficient time has elapsed since the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, proclaimed unilaterally by the Soviet Union, came into force on 6 August, the anniversary of the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima, to make it possible to analyze the results of how this action has been received in the world. Summing up the opinions of eminent statesmen and politicians from different countries, specialists, and press evaluations, there is only one conclusion to be drawn: The decision to terminate nuclear explosions, announced by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his 29 July statement, has generated an enormous positive response and has been assessed as an important step toward the strengthening of strategic stability and peace on the planet.

The world public has correctly interpreted the meaning of the moratorium, perceiving it as an honest and open initiative dictated by principled political considerations and the desire to help end the nuclear arms race and encourage the United States and also the other countries possessing nuclear weapons to do the same. Not a respite in between explosions, but a complete and general termination of nuclear weapon tests--this is the Soviet Union's objective, the numerous commentaries on the Soviet initiative emphasize. Thus the U.S. military-political ruling clique, having taken a "special" and particularly negative stance on the issues, has found itself in isolation.

What fruit will be yielded by the comprehensive termination of nuclear weapon tests, the road toward which is opened by the Soviet moratorium? Primarily, it will limit in practice the opportunities for the production of new models of nuclear bombs and warheads. Secondly, the "aging" process of nuclear weapons already accumulated will be accelerated under the conditions created by the absence of tests. Finally, the regime of their nonproliferation will be reinforced.

This is precisely why many countries, as THE WASHINGTON POST notes, see in the Soviet initiative "a rare opportunity to slow down work on the creation of nuclear weapons and to contribute toward controlling the arms race." In its

own turn, the renunciation of the nuclear race will create favorable opportunities to reduce and ultimately to fully eliminate nuclear arsenals.

The peoples see the Soviet Union's moratorium on all nuclear explosions as yet another vivid confirmation of the consistency and purposefulness of our Leninist foreign policy course. Back in the fifties the Soviet Union, itself being a nuclear power, resolutely and firmly advocated the imposition of a ban on nuclear weapon tests. These efforts produced tangible results. The 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water, has become one of the most authoritative international agreements, with 113 states party to it at present. It has substantially reduced the possibilities for the development of the most powerful nuclear weapons and, in addition, has blocked a highly dangerous source of radioactive pollution of the environment.

But underground nuclear tests went on. Our country launched a resolute struggle for their termination. Two Soviet-American documents were elaborated--the 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and the 1976 Treaty on Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes--which could have been important landmarks along the path to total termination of tests. The first bans underground explosions in excess of a 150-kiloton yield, in other words makes it more difficult to test the most powerful and most destructive nuclear means. The second eliminates the possibility of using peaceful nuclear explosions for the purpose of improving nuclear weapons. But neither of these documents has hitherto come into force through the fault of the United States, which is raising far-fetched arguments against them.

The United States displayed an equally negative approach toward the tripartite talks on the question of concluding a treaty on the complete and general ban of nuclear weapon tests, which began at our initiative in 1977 between the USSR, the United States, and Britain. At the end of 1981, by which time many of the treaty's important provisions had been agreed upon and matters were progressing toward its signing, the United States broke off these talks and, since then, has not moved toward their resumption.

This time, too, Washington is raising absurd and contradictory "arguments" to justify its negative attitude toward the Soviet moratorium and its unwillingness to joint it. It is claimed, for example, that the introduction of the moratorium would supposedly perpetuate some kind of nuclear parity between the USSR and the United States at present. So, what kind of "superiority" by the USSR can they be talking about in this case?

References are made to "verification difficulties." But this argument, too, is far-fetched. Leading specialists, including Americans are unanimous: Effective verification of a termination of nuclear tests can be implemented with the help of national scientific and technical means. This is also confirmed by the fact that the technical specifications of the underground nuclear explosion carried out 17 August in Nevada are no secret at all, having been received from sources that were not in any way American and having been already published by the Soviet press. As if in response to the Soviet moratorium, the United States carried out the explosion of a nuclear charge [zaryad] with a yield of under 20 kilotons in a 330-meter deep shaft situated 120 km northwest of Las Vegas.

Vain attempts are being made to prove--by means of juggling with figures-- that the Soviet Union has supposedly carried out more nuclear tests than the United States and that it proclaimed the moratorium only after it had successfully completed an intensive series of nuclear explosions. But figures are stubborn things. They testify eloquently that this year, until the moratorium was proclaimed, the USSR had carried out practically the same number of tests as the United States. And if we were to speak of all nuclear explosions carried out until now, there have been many more of them in the United States than in the USSR.

The proposal to conduct nuclear explosions in the presence of observers, put forward by Washington following the Soviet Union's proclamation of the moratorium, does not stand up to any critical examination at all. The problem of terminating tests would not progress one iota as a result of the presence of observers.

The following conclusions suggests itself: The prospect of terminating nuclear explosions does not suit the incumbent U.S. administration. This would create a serious obstacle for it in the implementation of an extensive program to build up first-strike forces both in the sphere of offensive strategic weapons and in the sphere of medium-range nuclear means for the purpose of breaking the prevailing equilibrium and securing military superiority for itself. This stance generates the justified indignation of the international--including the American--public.

The Soviet Union is not relaxing its peace-making efforts. Having already proclaimed the moratorium on nuclear explosions, it submitted to the United Nations proposals on international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of outer space under conditions of its nonmilitarization, which have been highly assessed by the world public as an important practical step along the path of ending the deadly arms race and improving the tense international situation. And how did the United States respond? Under conditions of a mass anti-Soviet campaign conducted with the direct participation of the White House's top echelon, it announced President Reagan's decision to undertake in the immediate future tests of a new American combat system of antisatellite weapons against a real target in space. In other words, the incumbent U.S. administration responds to each constructive Soviet initiative with a destructive measure.

The latest Soviet foreign policy steps create a real opportunity for actual and practical progress toward complete and general ban of nuclear tests so that outer space may remain peaceful for ever, so that the arms race, which threatens to overwhelm human civilization beyond hope and raises doubts about its very existence, may be curbed. This is why they encounter broad understanding and response in the world. The peoples demand that the United States goes its part of the way and takes advantage of the historical opportunity to curb the arms race that has presented itself before mankind.

CSO: 5200/1037

GENERAL

GORBACHEV ADDRESSES FRENCH PARLIAMENTARIANS ON ARMS PROPOSALS

Gorbachev Speech

LD031542 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Oct 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "For the Peaceful, Free, and Prosperous Future of Europe and All Other Continents: Meeting With French Parliament"]

[Text] Paris, October 3 TASS -- Today Mikhail Gorbachev met with parliamentarians, members of the foreign affairs commissions and Franco-Soviet friendship groups of the National Assembly and the Senate at Lassay Palace. Present at the meeting on the Soviet side were: E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Foreign minister; I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; N.D. Komarov, first deputy minister of foreign trade; Y.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, A.M. Aleksandrov, V.V. Zagladin, and L. M. Zamyatin, members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Foreign Affairs Commission; A.G. Kovalev, USSR Deputy Foreign minister; and Y.M. Vorontsov, USSR ambassador to France. Mikhail Gorbachev was warmly greeted by Louis Mermaz, president of the National Assembly of France, and Alain Poher, president of the French Senate.

In his speech Louis Mermaz pointed out the long-standing traditions of friendship and cooperation existing between the two countries. Cooperation between France and the USSR has been and remains an example which must inspire countries with different socio-economic systems, he said. Our people fought side-by-side during World War II. This strengthened our friendship. In the sixties Franco-Soviet relations to a great extent, promoted the commencement of the spirit of Helsinki. Our cooperation has been and can be of great mutual benefit in future and contribute to the progress of the peoples of France and the Soviet Union, and of the whole of mankind.

We sincerely believe in the USSR's striving for peace. It is with immense interest that we are studying your proposals on a moratorium on nuclear tests and on the reduction by the United States and the Soviet Union by 50 per cent of their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory, because we have always held that the two great nuclear powers should set the example in this field. The contacts maintained by members of parliament of the two countries over many years have facilitated the strengthening of Franco-Soviet relations, Louis Mermaz stressed. Good accord between France and the USSR will facilitate to a certain extent the favourable development of events in Europe and beyond it. The French members of parliament are further prepared to maintain the direct and constructive dialogue.

Then the members of parliament were addressed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Esteemed presidents, esteemed deputies and senators, ladies and gentlemen, I am gratified by the opportunity to address members of the French Parliament. To meet with you elected representatives of the French people. I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to thank the president of the republic for the kind invitation to visit your country.

Today is the second day of our delegation's visit. Important meetings have been held and an exchange of views has been started on topical questions of bilateral relations and international affairs. Of course, it is yet early to sum up the results of the talks with President Mitterrand and other statesmen of France. But it is obvious already that both sides are showing desire to impart a new impulse to the development of relations between our countries and, with due account to the existing realities, to bring closer our positions on international problems.

When talking with the president of the republic and when addressing you today I strive, naturally, for the essence, the main thrust of the Soviet state's foreign policy to be understood better, to a fuller extent in France. Like the foreign policy of any state, it is determined first of all by internal requirements.

Permit me to dwell briefly on this question. I believe you know what a long and in many respects difficult road has been traversed by our country in the years of existence of Soviet power. From Tsarist Russia we inherited extreme economic backwardness. Three quarters of the population were illiterate. Within a very short period of time, if the yardstick of history is applied, the USSR turned into a mighty, in all respects modern power with a high level of the people's culture. We put an end to unemployment and ensured for the population such social boons as free provision of housing, medical services and education. I will name a few figures illustrating the country's economic development. In the post-war years along our national income grew more than 16 times while industrial output increased 24 times over. During the same time the real incomes of Soviet people increased six-fold.

Pride in our successes does not make us complacent. We see that at the present stage society's increased maturity sets before us much more scopeful tasks which in many ways are new ones by their content. We are fully aware also of the shortcomings that exist in our work, of the existing difficulties and problems, quite often sufficiently serious ones. The main task that we set ourselves today can be expressed in a brief formula: to accelerate society's social and economic development.

This requires that many things be raised to a higher level -- the scientific and technical base of the national economy, the methods of management and man himself, his consciousness, skills and qualification. In short, we have set off on the road to achieving a new qualitative state of society.

Our main task is to make the economy more efficient and dynamic, to make the life of people spiritually richer, more full-blooded and meaningful, to develop the socialist self-government of the people.

It is not difficult to understand that not only reliable peace but also a calm, normal international situation are paramount conditions of attaining these aims. And it is these priorities that determine our foreign policy, a policy in which, naturally, we strive to take into account in full measure the interests and requirements of other peoples, all the realities of the present epoch.

Our world, a multifaceted and contradictory world, is rapidly approaching the end of the century and the millennium. It has more than its fair share of complex problems of a

political, economic and social nature. The co-existence on our planet of two social systems, each of which is living and developing according to its laws, has long become a reality.

But one must see the other reality as well. And this reality is that the inter-connection and inter-dependence of countries and continents is becoming increasingly closer. This is an inevitable condition of the development of the world economy, of scientific and technological progress, the acceleration of the exchange of information and the movement of people and things -- on land and even in outer space. In short, the entire development of human civilization.

Alas, it is not always that the gains of civilization are a boon for people. All too often and too vigorously the achievements of science and technology are being used also for the creation of means of annihilating humans, for the development and stockpiling of ever more terrible types of weapons.

In these conditions Hamlet's famous question: "to be, or not to be" is being set already not before a single individual but before mankind. It develops into a global problem. There can be only one answer to it -- mankind, civilization must survive at all cost. But this can be ensured only if we learn to live together, to get along on this small planet by mastering the difficult art of taking account of each other's interests. This we call the policy of peaceful coexistence.

We are strong enough to give a crushing rebuff to any attempt to encroach on our people's security and peaceful work. But we hold that it is not by force of arms but only and exclusively by force of example that one must prove the correctness of one's ideology, the advantages of the system that each people has chosen of its own will. Such is our firm conviction.

I spoke yesterday to the president about our perception of the main axis of contradictions, the struggle of the two tendencies in world politics. We regard as extremely dangerous the view, no matter how it is being justified, that the tasks facing the international community can be solved by the creation and stockpiling of ever new and more destructive types of arms -- on earth and in outer space. We regard as dangerous also actions that preserve and aggravate international tension. It is incandescent as it is. It is so incandescent that now it has become extremely difficult to reach agreement not only on complex, urgent matters but also on relatively simple problems. If we do not stop the present tendencies, tomorrow we will not be able to overcome their monstrous inertia. It will become even more difficult to talk.

That is why we consider it so important already now, immediately, before it is too late to stop the "infernal train" of the arms race, to start the reduction of arms, improve the international situation and develop peaceful cooperation among peoples. This is in mutual interest, this is everybody's task. Nobody can permit himself to sit it out on the sidelines.

The Soviet Union, as you probably know, not only issues calls but also acts in this direction.

We have unilaterally suspended the further siting of medium-range missiles in Europe and called on the United States to respond in kind. We stopped all nuclear explosions and called on the United States to respond in kind. Quite naturally, we address this call to the other nuclear powers as well.

The Soviet Union proposes to start a reduction of the armed forces and armaments of both sides in Central Europe -- and to start with a reduction of Soviet and American troops. Moreover, we are prepared to reduce more troops than the Americans.

As for outer space, we are for its use exclusively for peaceful purposes and persistently call for the reaching of agreement on this because a transfer of the arms race into outer space will make the reduction of nuclear arsenals objectively impossible. As you know, we have submitted to the United Nations Organisation a proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

And now I would like to inform you of the new steps taken by the Soviet Union. They pursue the same aim: to stop the baleful process of the arms race and ward off the war danger overhanging mankind.

First. A few days ago we proposed to the government of the United States to come to terms on the total prohibition of space strike arms for both sides and to reduce really radically, by 50 per cent, the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory.

In other words, we propose a practical solution to the very same tasks that were agreed upon by both sides early this year as being the aims of the Geneva talks: not only to stop the arms race but also to drastically lower the level of armaments and at the same time avert an arms race in outer space.

There is hardly any need to say how all this would strengthen strategic stability and mutual trust.

I can inform you that our delegation in Geneva has been instructed to present concrete proposals on this question and authorised to give the partners exhaustive explanations.

I am saying all this because a multitude of versions and false rumours are already circulating in the West concerning our proposal, and it is time for some clarification.

Second. Concerning medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. With the aim of making easier agreement on their speediest mutual reduction (as we are often told, in Western Europe, too, there is great interest in this) we consider it possible to conclude a corresponding agreement separately, outside of direct connection with the problem of space and strategic arms. This road, as it appears to us, may turn out to be practical.

In this connection I consider it important to explain our position on such a question as the place of the nuclear potential of France and Britain in the European balance of forces. This potential is growing rapidly and we can no longer ignore it. It was said from the French side that the nuclear forces of France are not subject to discussion without her participation. This stands to reason. It follows from this that it is time to start between us a direct dialogue on this theme to try to find an acceptable way out through joint efforts. The Soviet Union is prepared for such a direct dialogue with France just as with Britain, of course.

Here I want to stress that we will take into account the security interests of France in the most attentive manner. And today, as it appears to us, the question of a reduction of her armaments is not on the agenda.

Third. You know that we have announced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. The number of SS-20 missiles that the Soviet Union has on standby

alert in the European zone is now 243. This means that it precisely accords with the level of June 1984 when the additional deployment of our missiles was started in response to the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe. The SS-20 missiles that were additionally deployed in the process have now been withdrawn from operational readiness and the fixed installations for housing these missiles will be dismantled within the next two months.

This is verifiable. As to our reply measures in respect of the territory of the United States itself they continue to remain in force.

I would also wish to explain the meaning with which we invest the term "European zone" in this case. This is the zone in which medium-range missiles capable of striking targets on the territory of Western Europe are deployed.

It should be added to this that we have already totally phased out the old, and very powerful, SS-5 missiles and are continuing to phase out SS-4 missiles. This means that on the whole the number of medium-range carrier missiles in the European zone of the USSR is now much smaller than ten or even fifteen years ago. In accepting this self-limitation we are guided by the broad interests of European security. I think Europe is now entitled to expect a reply step by the United States -- the termination by it of the further deployment of its medium-range missiles on the European Continent.

You see what serious steps the Soviet Union is taking. In combination with the previous actions our latest proposals, as it seems to us, are a package of constructive and realistic measures the implementation of which would bring about a genuine breakthrough in the development of international relations. A breakthrough in favour of peace, security and cooperation among peoples.

This, if you please, is our programme of improving the explosive international situation that threatens peace. We expect that in response to our proposals the West too will traverse its part of the road.

I would like to stress that the realisation of the programme proposed by us would also signify substantial advance toward an aim that is so desired by all the peoples and is so important to them -- the prohibition and total liquidation of nuclear arms, the total delivery of mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

There can be no victors in a nuclear war. It seems that all responsible politicians are in agreement on this. It is time to draw a practical conclusion from this -- to stop the nuclear arms race. And we believe that this demand will be supported by all honest, realistically thinking political forces, public figures, all people who cherish their homeland, their life, the life of their children and grandchildren.

The task of totally prohibiting chemical weapons and liquidating their stockpiles is becoming ever more urgent. At the conference on disarmament in Geneva the Soviet Union is actively taking part in the drafting of a relevant convention. We are meeting our partners in the talks half-way in a number of substantial aspects, including in respect of verification. I am sure that it is quite possible to reach agreement on reliable verification.

Incidentally, the following thought also prompts itself here. If it was possible to reach agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear arms why not apply the same method in respect of chemical weapons? This would be in the general channel of efforts to achieve their total prohibition. The Soviet Union would be prepared to take part in

the drafting of an international accord on the non-proliferation of chemical weapons. We are also prepared to do everything depending on us for the creation of a zone in the centre of Europe free from chemical weapons.

As I speak here, in Paris, in the heart, it can be said, of Western Europe, I cannot but speak about some substantial problems of European security, about how we in the Soviet Union see them.

I will start with the most general question. What, after all, is security in Europe? It is the absence of war and the danger of war. The interconnection and intertwining of the destinies of peoples, despite the difference of the social roads chosen by them, is felt in Europe with special force. Because of geographical density, over-saturation with armaments Europe, like no other continent, is vulnerable to an armed conflict, the more so a nuclear one.

This means that Europe's security cannot be ensured by military means, by military force. This is an absolutely new situation and means a departure from traditions, from a mentality and manner of action that took centuries, even millenniums to form. It is not at once that human thought adjusts itself to something that is new. This applies to all. We are feeling this. We have started the rethinking, the adjustment to full conformity with the new realities of many customary things, including in the military and, naturally, the political fields. We would want such a rethinking to take place both in Western Europe and beyond it.

So far fear of unacceptable retribution is one of the obstacles to war, to the use of military force. But everybody understands, however, that it is impossible to build a lasting peace on fear alone. But the entire question is where to search for the alternative to fear or, to use military language, deterrence?

We see what attempts are now being made to find a way out -- by using new arms in the so-called "star wars". This is an illusion. And an extremely dangerous one at that. It is naive in general to search for a solution of the problem of security in the perfection of the shield and the sword. Security in Europe, just as international security as a whole, can be achieved only on the road of peaceful coexistence, relaxation of tension, disarmament, strengthening of trust and development of international cooperation.

This is a long and difficult road, the more so that it requires the overcoming of mutual suspicions, mistrust and prejudices accumulated over decades. But there is no other road, if we want to live. And like any long road, it begins with the first steps which often are the most difficult ones to make. We understand this and want to help ensure the solution of the task -- for ourselves and for you. It is this that motivates the proposals that I have already mentioned.

This applies also to the conference in Stockholm which is discussing the important problem of mutual trust in the military field. As it appears to us, the contours of future accords are gradually beginning to take shape there. They include making more concrete and imparting maximum effectiveness to the principle of the non-use of force. They include a definite set of confidence-building measures in the military field, these so to say safety fuses to prevent an erroneous interpretation of the actions of the other side in conditions of an aggravation of the military confrontation. A number of states, first of all neutral ones, propose to reach agreement on mutual exchanges of annual plans of military activity subject to notification. We are prepared for such an accord in the hope that it will help overcome suspiciousness and impede covert preparations for war.

The ideas of setting up nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, including on our continent -- in the north of Europe and in the Balkans, are spreading ever more wider. We support these ideas, are ready to take part in the appropriate guarantees where this is required. We view as useful the idea to create a corridor free of nuclear arms along both sides of the line dividing the two military-political groupings. We also hold that states that do not possess nuclear arms and do not have them on their territory have full right to reliable guarantees of their security based on international law, guarantees that nuclear arms will not be used against them.

Many aspects of all-European cooperation are recorded in the Helsinki Final Act. We hold that it is a serious achievement and fully retains its importance. When the tenth anniversary of the Helsinki accords was marked, all the participants in the all-European process declared for its continuation. The Soviet Union is prepared to take the most vigorous part in this. Every European country has contributed a share of its national experience to the Helsinki process. This is a common asset of the peoples of Europe, and it should be protected and multiplied by joint effort.

The political climate in Europe depends in no small measures on the development of economic ties between the West and the East. Here, too, an innovative approach is necessary. The solution of the tasks of industrial, technical and scientific progress that face each country today could be made much easier by an effective utilisation of the international division of labour. We in the Soviet Union are prepared for this, including for the search of new forms of co-production and cooperation. It goes without saying that this implies principles of mutual advantage, equality and a serious approach.

The establishment of more businesslike relations between the CME and the EEC also appears to be useful to us. The countries of the Council for Mutual Assistance have displayed in this respect a constructive initiative which appears to have been met favourably. It is important for it to produce concrete results. Here, as it has already been stated, in the measure in which the EEC countries come out as a "political unit", we are prepared to find a common tongue with them on concrete international problems as well. This could be done in various forms, including also parliamentary ties, among them with those who represent the European Parliament.

Without uniting the efforts of all European countries it will not be possible really to solve also such an acute problem as preserving and improving the environment on our continent. In many of its areas, figuratively speaking, the land is beginning to burn under the feet, the rain falling from the sky is an acid one, if not fiery, while the sky itself cannot be seen because of smoke. European rivers and seas are acquiring a pitiful state. At one's time, it seems, we did not act with sufficient far-sightedness and generated such problems that now simply defy solution within national frameworks. Here truly there is a field in which we all must become aware of the continent's common destiny.

Much can be done in the broad sphere that is called the "humanitarian" one. The preservation by common effort of the cultural values of the past, cultural exchanges that mutually enrich one of the cradles of mankind's spiritual values -- Europe -- does this not deserve the closest attention? It is with interest that we are preparing for such an out of the ordinary event as the "cultural forum" opening in a few days in Budapest. Also belonging to this sphere is the expansion of information about each other's life, cultivation of feelings of mutual sympathy and respect. The mutual study of each other's languages is of much importance from this point of view. Extensive exchanges of school pupils, students and teachers is a promising thing. However, it is very important for the young generations to have correct perceptions of each other because it is for them

to build peaceful Europe. The pooling of efforts in the struggle against diseases -- old and new ones -- is a task of immense importance.

The Soviet Union attaches the most serious importance to ensuring human rights. It is only necessary to free this problem from hypocrisy and speculations, from attempts at interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Such problems are rather acute in present-day Europe as the position of migrant workers, mixed marriages, reunification of families, we are for approaching such problems in a positive and humane spirit with full respect for the sovereign rights of all states.

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, I believe that in the present situation it is especially important not to emulate medieval fanatics and not to spread ideological differences to inter-state relations. Stability in these relations, their lesser susceptibility to political situations will strengthen also stability in Europe as a whole.

We do not think, for instance, that there is a taboo for life on the possibility of establishing contacts in some form between the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic alliance as organisations. Not to speak of overcoming Europe's division into opposing groupings in a more or less foreseeable future. As is known, this is exactly what we and our allies are proposing. But, as we see it, even in conditions of the existence of the two blocs it is possible to create such a modus vivendi which would blunt the acuteness of the present confrontation.

And, of course it is more important today than ever before to develop a more intensive political dialogue between the East and the West, to use all the already established forms of this dialogue -- regular meetings at various levels, including of course the highest one, political consultations, broad contacts of the scientific and cultural communities.

We regard the development of parliamentary ties as a very important matter as well. I would like to stress this particularly as I am speaking within these walls. This includes, naturally, also the development of parliamentary ties with France. Deputies of the National Assembly and Senate of France can be assured that they are welcome guests in Moscow. I state this on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Such, in most general outline, are our views on how really it is possible to achieve, and within a comparatively short period of time at that, an improvement of the situation on our continent and to increase Europe's role in overcoming the present stretch of confrontation.

I will add yet another thing. The need of more active interaction to eliminate the seats of conflict and tension existing in various areas has never been felt more than now. The fact that the Soviet Union and France, despite their belonging to opposing military-political groupings, have much in common in the approach to a number of presently existing regional problems and situations is one of the examples of the possibilities of such interaction. For instance, the situation in the Middle East, in Central America, South Africa, and so on. Our contacts with the French leaders confirm this.

When proposing an expansion of goodneighbourhood and cooperation with Western Europe we have no intention at all to belittle the importance of a possible contribution to this by Canada which belongs to NATO and at the same time has signed the Helsinki Act. Neither does our European policy have anti-American thrust.

Since one hears numerous speculations on this theme permit me to dwell on it in greater detail. The very way the question is posed -- that by improving relations with Western

21 October 1985

Europe we want to drive a wedge, to set it at loggerheads with the United States -- is absurd. Firstly, we want to have good relations not only with Western Europe but also with the United States. Just as for that matter also with China, Japan and other countries. We are not pursuing a Metternich-like policy of "balance of forces", of setting one state against another, knocking together blocs and counter-blocs, creating "axes" and "triangles", but a policy of global detente, of strengthening world security and developing universal international cooperation. Secondly, we are realists and we understand how strong are the ties -- historical, political and economic -- linking Western Europe and the United States.

Esteemed deputies, the best minds of mankind have warned about the danger of our consciousness lagging behind the rapidly changing life. This is especially topical today. Man is already appearing in the galaxial distances. But how much remains undone on earth! Not a single nation, not a single state is capable of solving the existing problems alone. But the old baggage of disunity, confrontation and mistrust impedes unification.

I know that by far not everybody in this hall accepts our world outlook, our ideology. Being a realist I am not trying to convert anyone into our creed. Any philosophy is approached by individuals and peoples themselves, only achieving it through much suffering, only on accepting it with their minds and hearts. But despite all differences in political and philosophical views, in ideals and values we must remember one thing: We all are keepers of the fire of life handed over to us by the previous generations.

Each had its own mission and each in its own way enriched world civilisation. The giants of the renaissance and the great French Revolution, the heroes of the October Revolution in Russia, of victory and the resistance -- they all have fulfilled their duty to history.

And what about our generation? It has made great discoveries but it has also found recipes for the self-destruction of the human race. On the threshold of the third millennium we must burn the black book of nuclear "alchemy". May the 21st century become the first century in life without fear of universal death.

We will fulfill this mission if we unite our efforts. The Soviet Union is prepared to make its contribution to ensuring a peaceful, free and flourishing future of Europe and all the other continents. We will stint nothing for this. Thank you for your attention.

Mikhail Gorbachev's speech was listened to most attentively and received with applause.

In memory of this meeting the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee presented as a gift to the National Assembly a model of the "Vega" automatic interplanetary station on which French scientific apparatus was fitted.

TASS Overview

LD031415 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Text] Paris, October 3 TASS -- Addressing members of the French Parliament today Mikhail Gorbachev set forth the new steps taken by the Soviet Union to stop the baleful process of the arms race and ward off the war danger overhanging mankind.

First, a few days ago, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said, we proposed to the Government of the United States to come to terms on the total prohibition of space strike arms for both sides and to reduce really radically, by 50 per cent, the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory.

In other words, the Soviet Union proposes not only to stop the arms race but also to drastically lower the level of armaments and at the same time avert an arms race in outer space.

The Soviet delegation in Geneva has been instructed to present concrete proposals on this question and authorized to give the partners exhaustive explanations.

Second. With the aim of making easier agreement on their speediest mutual reduction (as we are often told, in Western Europe, too, there is great interest in this) we consider it possible to conclude a corresponding agreement separately, outside of direct connection with the problem of space and strategic arms.

In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev explained the USSR's position on such a question as the place of the nuclear potential of France and Britain in the European balance of forces. This potential, he said, is growing rapidly and we can no longer ignore it. It was said from the French side that the nuclear forces of France are not subject to discussion without her participation. This stands to reason. It follows from this that it is time to start between us a direct dialogue on this theme and try to find an acceptable way out through joint effort. The Soviet Union is prepared for such a direct dialogue with France just as with Britain, of course.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed that the USSR will take into account the security interests of France in the most attentive manner and that today the question of a reduction of her armaments is not on the agenda.

Third. Recalling that the Soviet Union has announced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the number of SS-20 missiles that the Soviet Union has on standby alert in the European zone is now 243. This means that it precisely accords with the level of June 1984 when the additional deployment of our missiles was started in response to the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe. The SS-20 missiles that were additionally deployed in the process have been withdrawn from standby alert and the stationary installations for housing these missiles will be dismantled within the next two months. As to our reply measures in respect of the territory of the United States itself they continue to remain in force.

Mikhail Gorbachev explained the meaning with which the Soviet Union invests the term "European zone" in this case. This is the zone in which medium-range missiles capable of striking targets on the territory of Western Europe are deployed.

Mikhail Gorbachev added to this that the Soviet Union has already totally phased out the old, and very powerful, SS-5 missiles and are continuing to phase out SS-4 missiles. This means that on the whole the number of medium-range carrier missiles in the European zone of the USSR is now much smaller than ten or even fifteen years ago. In accepting this self-limitation, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, we proceed from the broad interests of European security. I think Europe is now entitled to expect a reply step by the United States -- the termination by it of the further deployment of its medium-range missiles on the European continent.

LD032016 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Oct 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] Soviet-French talks took place today. The full delegations of both countries participated. [Video shows the delegations at either side of a long table; Gorbachev is flanked by Shevardnadze and Arkhipov]

There is tremendous interest in the Soviet leader's visit to France. This pack of microphones at a news conference is another confirmation of the attention which journalists from many countries of the world are showing to the Soviet-French talks and to Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev's speeches in Paris.

At the news conference, Comrade Zamyatin, Soviet delegation spokesman, and head of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department told journalists about the new Soviet proposals on disarmament and about the course of the summit meetings. [video shows Zamyatin at a desk addressing journalists]

[Zamyatin] The essence of the Soviet proposal which was expounded recently to President Reagan, and yesterday also to the French president, is as follows: The Soviet Union and the United States should agree to ban entirely, on both sides, space strike weapons, and to reduce radically, by 50 percent, their nuclear weapons which can reach each other's territory. We propose solving in practice those very tasks which were agreed by both sides at the start of this year as the goals of the Geneva negotiations. They would not only halt the nuclear arms race, but also sharply reduce their level and at the same time prevent an arms race in space, which is what was agreed on 6 January when we adopted the document about the aims of the Geneva talks.

Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, when setting forth these proposals to the French president yesterday during a confidential talk, stressed that the acceptance of these proposals would strengthen strategic stability and mutual trust. The new proposals which we have presented to the United States on the subject of space and strategic weapons are quite radical in character.

Gorbachev told the French president that in our opinion, France itself spoke on more than one occasion about the desirability of implementing such a step. During yesterday's talks, the hope was expressed by the Soviet Union that the French side would greet our proposal with understanding and would support it. As far as medium-range nuclear systems in Europe are concerned, in order to make it easier to achieve an accord on their mutual reduction as soon as possible -- and everyone says that this is a desirable factor -- we considered it possible to reach a corresponding agreement separately, without direct linkage to the problem of space and strategic weapons. We consider such a path to be the most practical one. Gorbachev also informed the French president that in addition to the moratorium already in operation on the stationing of our medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union made the decision that the number of SS-20 missiles on combat duty in the European part of the Soviet Union should be 243. This means that they would correspond precisely to the 1984 level when the implementation of our countermeasures was begun due to U.S. actions. I would like to stress that in our opinion -- and this was conveyed to the French President -- under the conditions of implementing our proposals, it would be considerably easier in our view to solve the question of European nuclear weapons. Here we are ready to move away from the established methods and to start talks directly with France, and afterward possibly with Britain. Gorbachev said that we never wanted to include the French

nuclear forces in the Soviet-U.S. inventory. We are in favor of a separate accord as a component part of the nuclear equilibrium in Europe that could be acceptable for France and the Soviet Union, and correspondingly for Britain and the Soviet Union. Permit me to end my statement there and express the wish that the Western side will study those proposals carefully and react positively to them in a corresponding way.

Details on Arms Proposals

AU031452 Paris AFP in English 1448 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Text] Paris, Oct 3 (AFP) -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev today made public wide-ranging Soviet arms proposals involving a 50 percent cut in the strategic weapons of both superpowers in return for a ban on space weapons, and offered to negotiate a separate agreement on Euromissiles with Britain and France.

Addressing French parliamentarians on the second day of a four-day visit to France, he also announced a three-day old unilateral cut in "extra" Soviet missiles.

The main Soviet proposals outlined almost simultaneously by Mr. Gorbachev in his speech and Kremlin spokesman Leonid Zamyatin accompanied by Soviet arms negotiator Yuliy Kvitsinskiy at a news conference were the following:

- A 50 percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. nuclear (strategic) weapons capable of striking each other's territory and a total ban on the "development, production and deployment" of U.S. and Soviet offensive space weapons. This proposal notably appears to fall short of calling for an end to laboratory research of the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative.
- Conclusion of a separate agreement with Britain and France on intermediate-range missiles.
- Verification that the agreements were being enforced. The controls would be "national" but there could be "complementary" checks "on a cooperation basis".

The Soviet Union also announced the dismantling of additional Soviet SS-20's which had been installed in Eastern Europe after June 1, 1984, when the Soviet Union responded to the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in Western Europe. Mr. Zamyatin said the total number of medium-range SS-20's in Eastern Europe on October 1 was 243, the same number as there had been in June last year.

Mr. Kvitsinskiy said the reason for unlinking the British and French arsenals from the main U.S.-Soviet talks and starting Soviet-British-French negotiations was in order to break the deadlock at the Geneva arms talks, which had arisen because "the United States said it spoke for all of Europe but also says it won't take into account their nuclear systems".

Until now the Soviet Union has insisted that Britain and France be included in the total arms count, but both Paris and London have refused.

The Soviet negotiator said Moscow was trying to find a way of counting all the components of the nuclear balance in Europe.

Mr. Zamyatin said that the proposal was not in order to set a ceiling on the French and British forces, "but in order to have a number which would be in the total."

Mr. Gorbachev outlined the plan to French President Francois Mitterrand yesterday after he arrived in Paris, but Mr. Zamyatin did not reply when asked whether the British had been informed. Mr. Mitterrand's reaction to the Gorbachev announcement was not immediately available.

The overall proposals were detailed in a letter to U.S. President Ronald Reagan a few days ago, the Soviet side said.

Mitterrand Rejects Arms Proposal

LD041329 Paris Domestic Service in French 1200 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Statement by French President Francois Mitterrand at a joint press conference on 4 October with CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev held in the Elysee -- recorded]

[Text] France does not accept that anyone should talk or decide in its place. But Mr Gorbachev's idea involves precisely a certain change of level.

Why not talk about this problem together. The problem of disarmament for us arises in all fields simultaneously, not only with intermediary forces, with strategic forces, as well as conventional weapons, as well as chemical, and antimissiles. But I will repeat what I said in the United Nations, France is not refusing -- for a start it is not refusing an exchange of views, in particular with the Soviet Union. The dialogue which has been started, or restarted, is a good method from this point of view, that is an exchange of views. However I said that I did not think it reasonable to think there could be negotiation.

Gorbachev on Status of SS-20's

AU041202 Paris AFP in English 1200 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Paris, Oct 4 (AFP) -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said today that the Soviet Union would not simply move to Soviet Asia the SS-20 intermediate-range missiles it has dismantled or may dismantle west of the Urals.

Such a fear, raised yesterday by President Ronald Reagan in reaction to Mr. Gorbachev's new disarmament proposals, was "not reasonable", Mr. Gorbachev told journalists at a press conference with President Francois Mitterrand.

In Asia, "We have enough missiles to balance those" of the United States, the Soviet leader said.

Yesterday, Mr. Reagan said in Cincinnati, Ohio, that the Soviet proposal concerning SS-20 missiles marked a "change," but noted that the weapons were mobile, and that by being "withdrawn from operational service," as Mr. Gorbachev had suggested, meant that they could simply be moved elsewhere.

"To simply drive them up into the Ural Mountains or someplace else and then to say they're not a threat to Europe makes no sense," Mr. Reagan said.

Mr. Gorbachev said yesterday in Paris that the Soviet Union had cut back the number of SS-20's in Europe to the June 1984 level and that stationary installations for extra missiles would be dismantled within two months.

GENERAL

USSR REPORTS ON GORBACHEV-MITERRAND PRESS CONFERENCE IN PARIS

PRAVDA Account

LD041943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "Joint Press Conference by M. S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand"]

[Excerpt] Paris, 5 Oct--M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and French President F. Mitterrand held a joint press conference yesterday in the Elysee Palace to mark the completion of their talks.

Opening the press conference, F. Mitterrand noted that "it was with much interest that he had taken note of the whole package of issues set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev; and carried from the talks with the Soviet leader "the feeling that both sides have made progress in familiarizing themselves with their respective views and thus getting an opportunity to contribute to progress in the resolution of the complex problems confronting the present-day world." Francois Mitterrand declared that states should orientate themselves toward detente in their international relations policy, relations which have recently too often sharpened."

Having noted that the point at issue in the course of the French-Soviet talks was first and foremost that of disarmament, of an equilibrium of forces, and, consequently, at peace and conditions of preserving peace and of how to avert the risk of war, the French head of state specially touched in this connection upon the new Soviet proposal for a 50 percent cut in all strategic weapons.

"The countries directly concerned -- the USA and the USSR -- should discuss that proposal in more specific terms," the president said. "To this end they have all possibilities: experts and the necessary data. They can compare what is comparable, to dispute what is disputable. In other words, the USSR and the USA have everything necessary to ensure progress at the talks. I hope that this aim will be served by the meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President next month.

"All, including those who do not take part in the Geneva talks, have a stake in their success, as peace is our common cause."

Francois Mitterrand pointed out that a considerable cut in arms could be achieved only if linked with the impermissibility of spreading the arms race to outer space.

"France has always wished not to create differences with its allies, among whom are its American friends." the president said. "Quite recently she was forced to declare under well-known circumstances that it would not participate in any form in the production of space weapons. These weapons differ from the existing ones. The spreading of nuclear weapons to outer space will signal not only an end to the treaty of 1972 on anti-ballistic missile defence systems, but also a new spiral of the arms race, an advancement toward other forms of armament which I cannot even specify at this moment.

"I, certainly, remember the statement made to me to this effect by the American leaders: They think of it as a defensive weapon, but I do not wish to discuss it. France has already said that it would not participate in the SDI programme, that outer space is also of interest to it, but it believes that there are other methods of exploration of space and its use by present-day mankind." The president recalled that France had invariably declined to have its nuclear weapons taken into account and stressed that France's nuclear forces are not to be discussed without her participation. In our view, he continued, the disarmament problem should be examined in all of its aspects simultaneously: not only in terms of medium-range nuclear weapons, but also in terms of strategy and also of the conventional non-nuclear weapons, but the main thing in terms of chemical weapons and anti-missiles. France does not decline an exchange of views, in particular, with the Soviet Union and the established or renewed dialogue is a good method for that. But I did not deem it sensible to think that talks could be held.

"The position of our countries is not the same. We belong to two different types of society. We belong to different alliances. To overcome this distance it is necessary to display mutual understanding and contribute toward all opportunities for broadening cooperation.

This is precisely what we have done and will continue doing since the general secretary has kindly invited us to visit Moscow next year, and I have accepted this invitation." Other problems have, certainly, been dealt with, the president continued, in particular, our wish that the Stockholm conference should end before the middle of next year with an accord between its 35 participating countries. And the wish that the Final Act of the Helsinki conference should be implemented in its various aspects to a larger degree than has been the case until now. We have touched upon some most important aspects of what could be called regional conflicts, Francois Mitterrand pointed out.

"In terms of bilateral relations our conversations covered trade, equilibrium of the trade balance, a number of projects in the field, which could be described as a peaceful exploration of outer space, exceptional successes in the field of technology. We have spoken, in particular, about what is called nuclear synthesis, a field in which our two countries have advanced technology. In short we touched upon all fields where one or the other side has to its credit some accomplishments, wealth and successes, from which mutual benefit could be derived."

In conclusion Francois Mitterrand said: I would like all my pronouncements to be received as gratitude of sorts for our discussing seriously the world's most important problems, and also for the general secretary conducting these discussions in a way which makes it possible to envision even more cordial cooperation. This would well accord with the historical traditions of our two countries throughout all times and especially after World War II, in which the Soviet Union, and we too, suffered such heavy losses. We thank once again the peoples of the Soviet Union for their sacrifices, one of the heroic results of which was the liberation of France.

Then Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev issued a statement. He said:

Mr President, it seems I can take over from you now. I would like to say again why and for what we came to France. We in the Soviet Union proceed from the premise that the present situation in the world is at such a stage of its development when responsible decisions and responsible actions are needed, first of all by countries pulling considerable international weight. I have in mind first of all the Soviet Union, the United States, France and Britain, and other countries. The realities of the world today are such that we can build a better, safer world, ensure progress and achieve an improvement of the international situation if all this becomes our common endeavour.

Despite the entire difference of our political systems, ideologies and world outlooks we all face the need to find the road to such a world that would be characterised by trust, mutual understanding and cooperation. We are for a dialogue. In any case, the Soviet leadership is of the opinion that all this is simply a demand of common sense.

For the Soviet Union, France is an important partner for discussing such questions. Firstly, this is explained by traditions, and these traditions nourish our present-day relations. I think they will nourish our relations in the future as well. When I speak of traditions I have in view not only contacts of a political nature, on the state leadership level, but of all that for decades and centuries has already united our peoples.

This is the solid foundation that has always enabled the Soviet Union and France to meet at the most difficult periods of human history and discuss the most acute, vitally important problems, to engage in a search for their solutions. It is exactly proceeding from this that we accepted President Francois Mitterrand's invitation to visit France. I want to express to you once again heartfelt gratitude for your hospitality.

Concerning what you said, I add that our countries both before the visit and during the visit -- and it is already nearing its end -- were and remain in their socio-political systems, profess their own ideology and today belong to the same military-political alliances to which they belonged yesterday and to which they will belong tomorrow. Neither I nor Mr President has ever set the task of converting each other into the other's creed in the course of the talks.

But does the fact that we belong to different systems and military-political organisations diminish the importance of the dialogue in which the Soviet Union and France, the general secretary and the president are engaged?

I think perhaps, in a certain sense this even has its advantages. And this conclusion is confirmed by what the president has said when characterising the talks and meetings held during these days -- and we had three meetings with the president face to face, not to speak of the conversations with other French politicians. It is very important that this echoes the president's thought. While each remaining in his real situation the leaders of the Soviet Union and France managed to rise above the existing differences and analyse the processes taking place in the world, compare their evaluations, exchange views on what the contribution of the Soviet Union and France could be to making the events in the world and the international situation change for the better. I think this is evidence of the existence of an immense sense of responsibility both on the part of the Soviet leadership and the leadership of France for the destiny of the world. And this, I think, is quite important for conducting the dialogue and outlining ways of joint or parallel actions to improve the situation in the world.

On the whole, we highly appreciate the conversations of the past few days with President Mitterrand and other French statesmen and politicians. Those were substantive

conversations, noted by a constructive character. They were actually taking place in an openforum and in the spirit of mutual respect and goodwill.

The president has already touched upon the problems covered in those conversations. They were centered on the more urgent problems of the present-day dangerous international situation. We have quite understandable differences on a number of concrete questions. But there also emerged a common understanding of the need to do everything possible to improve the situation, to remove the threat looming over the peoples and to contribute to a turn from confrontation to the relaxation of tension. I received the impression from our meetings that the president shares this point of view.

Mr President has said that the word "detente" featured in our talks not because we indulged in reminiscences of the past. This, I would say, is a certain lesson of the process of detente. We will not now go into reasons why that process has been weakened and subverted to some extent. All of us have realized the urgent need to return to detente if we want to think big and approach the problems of safeguarding peace with great responsibility. In this context, the realistic possibility to return to detente has been mentioned here and also in the course of our conversations.

Questions of how to put an end to the unprecedented arms race were most important in our conversations. When in Paris, we informed the president, the parliament, the public and the people of France of the proposals that we made to the leadership of the United States of America and which have already become a subject of study at the Geneva talks. These questions cause the concern not only of the leaders of France and the Soviet Union, the cause and concern of all nations, of all clear-headed political leaders, and of all those who have not become insanely obsessed with the arms race, confrontation and hostility.

I am not going to repeat now our new proposals. You are familiar with them. I only want to say that after our exchange of views, and they were very substantial, the leaders of France, and the president personally, expressed understanding of the importance of our proposals, and their constructive potential. When we made these proposals we spelled out what the Soviet leadership was stating over the past several months. The Soviet Union is prepared for radical reductions of nuclear arms under the condition of keeping space strike arms from outer space. This is the crux of the problem. The way the question is posed is in line with the January accords between the ministers of foreign affairs of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Several weeks and months ago our partners in the Geneva talks were saying -- Where are your radical proposals? Information on these matters reached us. Now we hear from the same sources: Why are you so pressing with your proposals?

This reminds me of a situation involving Hodzha Nasreddin. As the story has it, he was riding on his donkey in Bukkara and people were calling out at him saying it was the first time they saw an old donkey carrying a young one. But when Nasreddin put the donkey on his shoulders and continued on his way he again heard jets, this time they were just the opposite.

We think that the time has come for concrete actions. Why? Because we have reached a point when it is no longer enough to say, yes, we stand for a better world; yes, we will take the road to normalization of the international situation. If these words are not matched with concrete deeds, we call it political demagogy and deception of the peoples.

In addition to these measures which the Soviet Union took earlier unilaterally, we put forward new radical proposals so as to impart a constructive character to the Geneva talks. We know perhaps better than anyone -- at least not worse than the Americans -- what is in store for the world if the arms race is not stopped now. This awareness adds to our responsibility.

Given that the situation is very tense, if another round of the arms race, related to space, is initiated, I do not know if we will be able to conduct talks. How can they be approached? This should be clear to everyone. Incidentally, the press, too, should rise to an understanding of the seriousness of the situation in present-day international affairs. You journalists serve not only editors and those who finance your publications. You should serve primarily the peoples. The general demand as we in the Soviet Union understand and feel it is that it is necessary to stop, to gather one's wits, to think of where we are, and to begin to act, and to take concrete steps. It is a simple formula, a simple plan, but we think that it has a sense of responsibility for the destiny of one's people, for the destinies of the other peoples. It contains a proposal, a constructive quest. We are ready for this.

What I know about the results of the meetings of the Soviet foreign minister with U.S. President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz is encouraging, to some extent. We did not hear the typical, stereotype reply, "no, it is propaganda." I think that sober, realistic thoughts are germinating in the public opinion of the United States of America, in the political community and in the Congress. Naturally, I can hardly speak for the United States. But we hope that both in Geneva, where another round of talks has begun and where our proposals have been put on the table, and at the forthcoming meeting with President Reagan that the United States will approach the problem with a sense of serious responsibility. In this sense I share the view of Mr. Mitterrand that there are problems which directly concern the Soviet Union and the United States and that the process of the talks should be moved from the stalemate towards normalization. The Soviet Union has a serious intention to have the world situation changed.

We touched in the talks in Paris also upon problems of medium-range missiles. We would like to move this question away from a point at which it is hard to come to grips with it. This question is also being discussed in Geneva with the U.S. side. It is a fact that Pershings and cruise missiles are being deployed in Western Europe.

Developing our position, we have made new proposals on medium-range missiles. We think -- and I told Mr. Mitterrand so -- that a new situation is being created in this way. Generally speaking, we have not entered and are not going to enter the French nuclear forces in the "Soviet-U.S. roster."

We are saying that this problem should be discussed with France, and also with Britain. A possibility is being opened for beginning an exchange of opinions with France, which may lead at some point to talks. We are not setting before France the question of a reduction of her nuclear potential, or of stopping the fulfillment of her military programs. This is a matter for France. As we understand it, France will approach this question from her own positions with due account for all the processes taking place in the world. But we say: Let us start talking, let us start studying this problem in interconnection with other ones. Perhaps there could be some flexible equivalent for the corresponding nuclear systems. In any case this is the first step. We had an indepth exchange of views on this score with Francois Mitterrand. As I understand it, the president is not against continuing an exchange of views on this problem. And we too stand for this. Through our ambassador in London we addressed a similar proposal to Mrs. Margaret Thatcher.

We also explained the essence and significance of the unilateral step that has just been taken by us and as a result of which the number of the Soviet SS-20 missiles in the European zone now does not exceed the number that we had as of June last year. The additionally deployed SS-20 missiles have now been withdrawn from standby alert

while the permanent installations for housing these missiles will be dismantled in the coming two months. Those who would like to verify this can take photographs. It is being intimated that we allegedly intend to haul these missiles to Asia. These are unscrupulous intimations. When the Soviet Union makes a deal with somebody it does it seriously.

We have as many missiles in Asia as is needed to balance the corresponding potential of the United States in that region -- neither more nor less. If the United States builds up we will build up. If the situation changes for the better, our reaction will be adequate.

The president and I devoted much time to questions of European security. We have experience of joint efforts with France in that field. That experience made it possible to accumulate a substantial potential of cooperation, which can be used to carry on the European process based on the Helsinki accords and to fill it with even greater contents.

Addressing the parliament yesterday, I presented our position on the entire complex of these problems. I would not like to repeat it. The crux of the matter, I think, is that both sides, the USSR and France, remain committed to the cause of expanding and carrying on the European process, and Mr President has reiterated it now. Like France, we stand for the implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Act in all its parts and it is of my profound conviction, moreover, that the improvement of the situation in Europe would be vastly important to the whole world.

The military-political groupings come into immediate contact in Europe. Its peoples have learned major lessons from their own history. After the Helsinki conference, there also exists a legal base making it possible to advance on the road of cooperation and security. The USSR and France were co-authors of the Stockholm conference. We believe that it is time to turn it more resolutely towards drafting agreements. Incidentally, as we understand, and in the view of France too, there are possibilities to energize a search for mutually acceptable solutions.

During the talks with President Mitterrand we devoted proper attention to the study of a number of regional problems and existing seats of tension. We have mutual understanding in the evaluation of some of these problems. As to other problems, there are differences both in analysis and in approach. But we agree that it is necessary to eliminate these seats by political means under conditions of full respect for the independence and sovereignty of each country. And it is within the framework of this exchange of views that we dealt with the situation in the south of Africa, the Middle East, in central America and other problems.

We came to Paris with the desire to give a new impulse to bilateral Soviet-French relations. As I understand it, the president's position coincides with this striving of ours. The results of the discussion of these questions give reason to hope for an intensification of the political dialogue and a growth of economic and trade cooperation between the USSR and France.

We positively assess the fact that the pace of development of economic and trade ties has quickened in recent years--they have doubled. But what we have does not accord today with the scale of the possibilities of our countries. That is why we have agreed to increase the search, to impart more initiative to our relations in the sphere of trade and economic cooperation. An agreement has just been signed on these questions. Many concrete, interesting projects have appeared, among them several big ones. On our part we welcome this. We think that this, too, will facilitate an improvement of the overall situation.

As I have already stressed, we have agreed to build up political dialogue. I invited Mr President on behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to pay a visit to our country. He will be a welcome guest in the Soviet Union. When intervals between visits become shorter, perhaps there will be fewer problems. We have also exchanged opinions on the following idea. There is a project known as Tokamak.

The Soviet Union, France, the United States, Japan and other countries have contributed to the development of that project of thermonuclear synthesis. It would be interesting to consider whether this project can be carried out by joint efforts in the present-day situation to provide a possibility for leading our research on the road to obtaining a practically inexhaustible source of energy. It is a tempting idea. It would be timely since it is a peaceful idea -- and there are those who advance very different things. Our specialists have told me that there are realistic hopes for the fulfillment of this proposal of ours. On the whole, the results of the talks, in our view, are not only positive but I would say even impressive. They serve the interests of the Soviet and French peoples, and the broad interests of European and international security.

In conclusion, using the opportunity, I express gratitude to President Francois Mitterrand, to the government, politicians and public figures of France, to all the French women and men we have met during these days, for their hospitality and sentiments of affection and respect expressed by them for our country and for the entire Soviet people.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand subsequently answered questions from journalists.

Question (French Television Antenne-2): Mr. General Secretary, you said that the Soviet Union could not close its eyes to the development of the French nuclear forces. Do you wish that the level of the French nuclear forces would not be built up, or that it would be built up moderately, in other words, should the modernization of the French nuclear forces become, in your view, a subject of discussions with the Soviet Union?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I think I have made quite a definitive statement on this question. We suggest that the process of a direct exchange of opinion be initiated. All the concrete questions can be discussed in the course of that process.

Question (Soviet Television): Mr. President, do you think it possible to achieve an international agreement blocking the arms race in outer space?

Francois Mitterrand: I am no clairvoyant. The arms race has been rising to qualitatively new levels for a long time and has now reached the space level. If reason has not prevailed up to now, who can say that common sense will prevail today? I do not make forecasts. I have put forward a wish, a political stand. Yes, there is a need for a compromise that will be acceptable to both sides and beneficial to all. I do not want to go into technical details of the character of such a compromise. As for the position of France, I have already said that she does not participate in it, she is not seeking it, she wants to devote herself to the peaceful exploration of space. Naturally, as a great power with a population of 55 million, she shows an interest in everything concerning questions of war and space.

Question (Italian newspaper SECOLO XIX): Mr General Secretary, as I understand, you have announced the dismantling of all Soviet SS-20 missiles in excess of 243. I would like to know if you confirm this. As to the separate agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, do you believe it possible that the basis for this agreement can be found in what was termed in 1982 as the "agreement during the walk in the woods"?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I confirm that 243 missiles are now on standby alert in the European zone. This is exactly as there were in June 1984. The other missiles have been removed and within the next two months the permanent launching installations will be dismantled. Our reply measures related directly to the territory of the United States remain in force. As to the further process of talks on medium-range missiles, in order to invigorate it and impart a realistic direction to this process we have proposed to work out a separate accord on this type of arms.

And at the same time we proposed a direct exchange of views with France and Britain. In our opinion this makes it possible to start practical steps. We are prepared to go in this direction as far as our partners are prepared to go -- I refer to the United States, and where it concerns French and British missiles -- to France and Britain.

Francois Mitterrand: I would like to specify that not on a single question will France deny an exchange of views, the more so to such a country as the Soviet Union. But at present I do not see possibilities for talks, although I told the general secretary this morning that it is necessary to precisely determine the subject of discussion. I will add that as to the question of counting our forces, the United States has not distanced itself from the position of France on this question and France has no reason to separate its position from the U.S. one when it comes to counting forces in the world and in Europe, with due account, of course, for everything that I have already said about outer space and for the fact that France retains full freedom to express herself and think. We are an independent country which has its independent strategy and which speaks out accordingly.

Question (BBC): Mr. General Secretary, I would like to touch on the Soviet Union's relations with Mrs Thatcher. Why, in your opinion, should the British premier take a different position than France on the question of its medium-range nuclear systems? Secondly, have you resigned yourself to the Thatcher government's decision to expel Soviet diplomats?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I am replying to the first question. I think that so far Britain's position on medium-range missiles was formed under one set of conditions. Today I invite the president of France -- and I have already done this -- and Mrs Thatcher to make a new approach in connection with the radical proposals made by the Soviet Union. This indeed cardinally changes the situation. And if the situation is new, there should be new approaches as well. I agree with President Mitterrand -- we have already discussed it with him -- that it would be strange if we had begun to discuss this question yesterday and would have entered talks and reached accord already today. But I remember at the same time that Mr Mitterrand, in particular, during his last visit to Moscow, presenting his position on the French nuclear forces, said that France was committed to a search for peace and to the process of disarmament. In his view, today the Soviet Union and the United States should be the first to make their contribution, which does not at all rule out that at some point France will join this process. A new situation is emerging today and new possibilities are being opened. It was natural on my part to invite the president to exchange opinions on this situation.

Now I will answer your second question. Every embassy in the country to which it has been posted has instructions from its government to study processes, and to supply information on processes taking place in the country in question so that there should be nothing unpredictable in relations, either in bilateral relations or in international problems. This information, I think, is a natural process. It involves all countries. If anyone wants to spoil relations and to prevent their improvement as soon as the signs of an international dialogue, of a thaw appear, forces immediately come to the force which have their social order. They are always ready. It is "quick response forces"

intended to spoil the international situation. But who has involved Mrs Thatcher in these affairs, when all the representatives of the Soviet Union are en masse charged with spying, I do not know. We proceed from the assumption that the Soviet Union is interested in relations with Britain to a no bigger extent than Britain is interested in relations with the Soviet Union. I repeat, we are for the development of relations and a political dialogue, and of economic relations with Britain who is also our long standing partner. I believe this question is already exhausted.

Question (GDR Television): Comrade Gorbachev, I believe that after the World War II the Soviet Union has made more than a hundred proposals directed at strengthening peace and achieving disarmament. Are they still in force?

Mikhail Gorbachev: It would really be a good thing to return to some of the good old proposals on general and complete disarmament that were gradually driven into a corner and are now in a Cinderella position. And that, mind you, is a fundamental issue. Had attention been given in time to this proposal of ours I am sure we would not be living in the present situation in the world. Such proposals that were of a long-term nature, and did not appear like a reaction to some current process, to some current situation, all such proposals of ours remain in force.

Question (correspondent of Dutch television): Mr General Secretary, could you name the number of SS-20 missiles throughout the territory of the Soviet Union? You know that the Dutch Government must adopt a decision starting with November 1 on U.S. missiles.

Mikhail Gorbachev: Your leadership is informed of our steps and it has the possibility of considering our proposals. As to information on how many missiles and of what type - I think it would take much time for me to answer this question. The more so since this concerns Europe and the entire European zone, and goes beyond even the limits of the Urals till the 80th meridian. I think this is enough for the Netherlands.

Question (GDR radio): I also have a question for the general secretary. Here in Paris you have spoken at length about the non-militarization of outer space. Are there new concrete plans of joint space flights, such as three years ago?

Mikhail Gorbachev: Yes, we will continue cooperation with France along these directions. We have good experience in this respect. We even thought maybe about carrying out a joint flight once again. We exchanged views on this with the President.

We adhere to the idea of the peaceful uses and exploration of outer space, and big successes can be achieved here. I think you know about our proposals in the United Nations Organization in this respect. It would be possible to set up an organization, sited in Paris and launch peaceful studies of outer space.

Question (U.S. ABC TV COMPANY); Mr General Secretary, you hinted in your statement this morning that there were elements of political demagogy in the U.S. reaction to your proposal on arms cuts. Do you mean President Reagan? If this is so, does not it contravene your statements to TIME magazine that rhetoric should be softened during preparations for the Geneva meeting?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I want to reiterate everything I said in the interview to representatives of TIME magazine. I would like to note right away that the remark I made was based on the information I had received. It would be, I think, irresponsible to create the impression that all this is a propaganda shootout.

As for the position of Mr. Reagan, I was told this by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze -- sensed on the part of the President and those who participated in the conversation, I mean Mr Shultz, Mr McFarlane and others, a serious attitude to our proposals. We hope that this will be really so. We do not want to do damage to the security of the United States. This does not enter our plans. We do not want to outplay the United States of America and do not advise them to try to do so either.

Question (London GUARDIAN): Do you make questions of reducing strategic arms dependent on agreement by the United States to discontinue the development of space arms or do you not consider these issues to be interdependent? To what extent are you inclined to reach agreement with President Reagan during the meeting in Geneva?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I think that at this press conference we should not get ahead of the act and deal with the meeting in Geneva. That is a serious matter after all. Both we and, I think, the U.S. side understand this and are preparing accordingly. As to the concrete part of your question I will say that in our opinion we must reach agreement on the non-militarization of space and on a radical reduction of strategic nuclear arms on earth.

Question (BBC): Mr General Secretary, President Mitterrand has said that he is not prepared to start talks with the Soviet Union on medium-range missiles. Why?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I do not understand why you have this impression. What I was saying was that by our steps we, so to say, impart movement to this process, impart dynamism to it, begin to move it off the ground, and that possibilities are opening up of contacts both with the Americans and with French and Britain.

Moscow TV Coverage

Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Report on 4 October Paris news conference given by French President Francois Mitterrand and CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev; from the "vremya" newscast; Mitterrand speaks in French with superimposed Russian translation unless otherwise noted--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand held a joint press conference. The press conference was opened by Francois Mitterrand. [Video shows Gorbachev and Mitterrand seated at table]

[Mitterrand in French, fading into superimposed Russian report in his remarks.] In his speech, the French President gave high marks to the constructive nature and atmosphere of frankness and trust in which the Soviet-French summit talks were being held.

I consider, he said, that we have moved forward in the matter of mutual understanding. The president expressed the hope that the Soviet-French summit meeting would make an important contribution to the solution of the difficult problems facing the world today.

Speaking of the questions and problems constituting the main content of the talks, Francois Mitterrand named first and foremost the problem of disarmament. Mutual dis-

armament and equilibrium in arms, he stressed, is a most important condition for the maintenance of peace and is the way to make it possible to avoid the danger of war breaking out. Francois Mitterrand said the new Soviet proposal on the reduction of all strategic weapons by 50 percent had been received in France with great interest. The USSR and the United States should discuss that proposal, the president said. For this they have every opportunity; the experts, the corresponding figures -- in short, everything to enable them to move forward at the Geneva talks. That aim, he stressed, would also be promoted by the meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President next month. Francois Mitterrand (?stressed) the direct link between the question of disarmament and the problem of transferring the arms race into space. He pointed out that France would not take part in any form of stationing weapons in space. The transfer of nuclear weapons into space, the president said, will mean not only the end of the 1972 accord on antimissile defense, but also the transition to a new spiral in the arms race, one whose results are impossible to predict. France believes, he noted, that space can and must be conquered in a different way -- for peaceful purposes. The president expressed the hope that on this question, too, the Soviet Union and the United States would come to a reasonable compromise in Geneva.

Dwelling after this on the problem of medium-range weapons in Europe, Francois Mitterrand confirmed that France's policy is unchanged and France continues its independent policy in this sphere. At the same time he stressed France's desire for a balance in the nuclear forces in Europe at the lowest possible level. We are not rejecting an exchange of opinions, in particular with the Soviet Union, on this question. The dialogue which has started between us and which is continuing today appears to us to be a good method.

Speaking further on bilateral relations, Francois Mitterrand spoke in favor of the development in every possible way of Franco-Soviet links in all spheres -- economic, trade, social, cultural, scientific, technological, and others. He stressed in particular the fruitfulness and promising nature of cooperation between the two countries in the peaceful conquest of space and research in the sphere of controlled nuclear fission. After this, going over to the problem of regional conflicts, Francois Mitterrand said that France was ready to promote the soonest possible solution of those conflicts, and he stressed in particular the need for talks on the Middle East with the participation of all interested sides. In conclusion, Francois Mitterrand conveyed greetings to the Soviet people, stressing that it was thanks to their sacrifices during the Second World War that the liberation of France was possible.

[announcer] Then Francois Mitterrand gave the floor to Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev.

[Gorbachev] Mr President, it appears I take over where you left off. I return to the matter of why, for what purpose, we came to France. We in the Soviet Union proceed from the premise that the present situation in the world is at such a stage in its development where responsible decisions and responsible actions are needed, above all on the part of those countries whose international weight is enormous. I have in mind both the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as France, Britain, and other countries. Apparently the realities of the world today are such that we shall be able to build a better new world, and ensure progress and the strengthening of the idea of improving the world situation, if this becomes our common cause.

For all the differences in our political systems, ideologies, outlooks and traditions, we clearly all stand before the need, the crucial responsible need, to seek a way to a better world, one which would be characterized both by dialogue and by mutual under-

standing, and by trust and cooperation. At any rate, we in the Soviet leadership believe there is tremendous simple common sense in this: We must live in the real world, learn to live in the real world.

France is a very important partner for the Soviet Union in discussing these questions. First, there is a tradition, great traditions; This is nourishing our relations today, and something, I hope, which will always nourish our relations in the future. Speaking of tradition, in this case I do not only mean contacts of political nature, on the level of the state leadership; I mean, first of all, something which has united our peoples for many decades and centuries; it is that durable basis which has always enabled Russia and France -- the Soviet Union -- in the most difficult periods in development of the human history, to meet and to discuss the most burning, the most vitally important problems, to conduct a search for solutions to these problems. We had been proceeding from this very assumption, when we accepted the President's invitation to visit France, and this is exactly why I am visiting France and once more want to cordially thank you for that, Mr President.

Neither Mr President nor I had sent such tasks in order to change each other's faith in the course of the visit. But does the fact that we belong to different systems and military and political organizations really diminish the significance of the dialogue in which the Soviet Union and France, the general secretary and the president, are engaged? I think perhaps, in a way, even that has its own advantages -- and this is also what Mr President told you while describing the conversations which have been held. There have been many of them in the last few days. We have had three face to face meetings with the president, not to mention other conversations and meetings in the course of realization of the visit's program. We have also held meetings with other French political figures -- I should think that is the most important thing. And it seems to me that this idea we have in common with the president -- that we, the leaders of the Soviet Union and France have managed to rise up and get an overview of the processes going on in the world, to compare our assessments and views, to exchange opinions concerning the possible contributions by the Soviet Union and France to bringing about a change for the better in the world events, in the international situation -- this, I think, is evidence of the existence of a feeling of responsibility on the part of both the Soviet leadership and the French leadership for the destiny of the world. And this -- I think you will agree gentlemen, friends -- is by no means unimportant in order to be able to conduct a dialogue, and to outline ways for joint actions, parallel actions, interdependent actions, but in this very spirit, in the spirit of improving the situation in the world.

On the whole, we place a high value on the conversations which have taken place over the last few days with President Mitterrand and other French statesmen and politicians. I would describe them as being substantive [soderzhatelnyy]; they were distinguished by their constructive spirit; they were essentially open, being conducted in an open manner and in the spirit of mutual respect and good will.

Speaking briefly for my own part -- for the president has already touched upon the problems of the conversations that took place -- I would say that our conversations centered on the most urgent problems of the present dangerous international situation. Some wholly understandably differences in approach to a number of specific issues exist between us, as we discovered during the talks; but mutual understanding emerged on the necessity to do everything possible to improve the situation, to remove the threat hanging over the world, and to turn events and situations from confrontation to an improvement and to a relaxation of tension.

Mr President said that this word relaxation existed among us, and not just as a recollection of the past.

No, I would say that it seemed to me that this looked like more than a recollection, rather a definite lesson from the period of relaxation of tension.

We shall not now get involved in the reasons why this process was interrupted; but after living through a number of years when the process of detente has been to some extent strongly undermined and weakened we have all of us felt, including yourselves, that there is nevertheless a real need, if one judges things on the large scale and if one regards peace with great responsibility, to return to detente. It is precisely in this connection that detente has been mentioned here and in the course of our meetings.

I, of course agree that, as the president said, our talks were centered, as their main issue, on questions connected with the quest of how to bring an end to the unprecedented arms race that has developed. As you know, while we have been in Paris, we have informed the president, the parliament, the public, and the people of France of absolutely specific data about the proposals that we have submitted to the U.S. leadership and which have already become a subject for consideration in Geneva. These questions have taken up a lot of our time, but we do not regret this, because this is the main theme that is troubling both France and the Soviet Union and their leaders. Well, that is not saying enough; this theme is troubling all peoples and all sober-minded political leaders who have not gone crazy about the arms race, about confrontation and hostility, and these constitute a majority in the world. Naturally these were the central issues at our meetings.

I do not want to repeat the proposals; they are known to you. I should just like to say that after our exchange on these questions -- and the exchange was a very thorough one -- we heard from the French leadership and the president personally an awareness of the importance of our proposals and their constructive potential, their enormous constructive potential.

We have implemented what the Soviet leadership has been asserting and stating for several months now -- that we are prepared for radical cuts, on the condition that space strike weapons, nuclear strike weapons, are not allowed in space. That is the essence of the problem. It corresponds to the accord, the January accord, between the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

What sustains our position on this issue? We are receiving information even now that our partners in the Geneva negotiations, several weeks and months ago said: Where are these radical proposals? And now we hear from them: Why are you being so insistent with these proposals? Because we have come to the point where we decided on these radical proposals in order to give the Geneva process a constructive character.

Perhaps we know better than others -- at least no worse than the Americans -- what awaits us if we do not stop now. And this knowledge reinforces our responsibility. Now there are political values and there are certain restrictive factors [ogranichiteli], despite all the tension in the situation. If a new stage in the arms race begins, one connected with space, I don't know whether we shall be able to hold negotiations at all in that case. How could one approach them?

Incidentally, the press, too, should become more understanding of the seriousness of the current international situation. You serve not only the editors and those who finance you, but first and foremost the people, in the same way that the politician does. Thus

the general demand -- as we understand it in the Soviet Union and as we indeed feel it -- is that we must stop and think where we are, and act differently and take specific measures.

This is a simple formula, a simple scheme; but we think that it contains a feeling of responsibility for both the destiny of our own people as well as the destiny of other peoples; it contains an invitation to constructive quests, and we are ready for these.

I have been to a certain degree heartened by what I know about the results of the meeting between our foreign minister and Mr Reagan and Mr Shultz. This time, we did not hear the typical, stereotyped answer: No! propaganda! Well, perhaps they are still seeking the right arguments in order to take up that position against later. But it seems to me that common sense and realism are maturing in U.S. society as well as in U.S. political circles and Congress. It is difficult for me to speak for the United States of America, however.

Well, I share Mr Mitterrand's opinion that there are problems which directly concern the Soviet Union and the United States of America. And he, for his part, expresses the wish that all these problems be discussed in a constructive spirit, taking account, too, of the new proposals and of the forthcoming meeting so that the world process can be shifted from impasse and that headway can be made toward normalization.

We in the Soviet Union are serious about changing the world situation for the better. We have touched on the problem of medium-range missiles. We would like somehow to bring this question also out of the condition whereby it is difficult for us to get down to it and to get involved in this process. We are discussing all these problems with the U.S. side in Geneva, particularly since there are both the U.S. medium-range Pershing and cruise missiles directly in Europe. We are of the opinion -- and I said this to Mr President Mitterrand -- that in this way a new situation is being created. We have in fact never included, and do not intend to include, the French nuclear forces in the Soviet-U.S. inventory. That I have said to the president, and that I confirm publicly. That's the first thing. The second is that when we speak about discussing this problem, and now that we have submitted new proposals, the possibility perhaps arises for beginning an exchange of opinions which might subsequently at some stage lead also to talks on the question of the French and our medium-range missiles. And we proceed from the fact that we are not asking France to reduce its nuclear potential or to stop implementing its military programs. That is France's business, and it will determine its position taking into account how the whole process develops in the world. What we are saying is: let's start to talk, let's embark on negotiations, and let's start to study this problem as an interconnected one. Perhaps that would be some sort of equivalent, but at least it is an equivalent.

We have had an in-depth exchange of views. As I understand it, Mr President does not decline to continue exchange on these problems, and we are prepared for that. As for our offer on medium-range missiles, these missiles have been taken out of service. Anybody who wants to can photograph them. In a period of 2 months, we are dismantling all the structures [sooruzheniya]. Any suggestions that we transfer them to Asia are not serious. When it is a matter of reaching accord, the Soviet Union is always very serious in these matters, and I would ask you to bear that in mind.

In Asia we have as many missiles as are needed to balance the corresponding potential of the United States in that region, no more and no less. If the United States does not increase its potential, neither will we. If the situation changes for the better, we shall always react in an equivalent manner. This is the main question which has occupied us during our conversations.

delivery] You have said a very great deal here in Paris about the nonmilitarization of space. Regarding peaceful cooperation in space, are there new concrete plans for joint space flights like those 3 years ago? Did you speak of this?

[Gorbachev] Yes, we shall be continuing our cooperation with France in this area. We have had fine experience in this regard. We even, perhaps, were thinking about the further carrying out of a joint flight by our cosmonauts, when I had my exchanges with the president. We support the idea of the peaceful use and conquest of space, and in this regard great successes can be achieved. I think you know about our proposals at the United Nations in this connection, namely, that such an organization be set up and it be situated, oh, in Paris, and that the peaceful exploration of space be developed.

[Question in English, with superimposed Russian translation] Mr General Secretary, Walter Rodgers, I represent American television in Moscow. You say that there is an element of political demagoguery in the American reaction to your proposals on limiting armaments. Are you ascribing this political demagoguery to President Reagan, or to someone else? Who is responsible for this political demagoguery? Do your pronouncements not contradict your statement to TIME Magazine?

[This question is heard in English as follows: I would like to ask you, please sir: Your remarks this morning seemed to suggest that there was an element of political demagoguery in the American reaction to the arms control proposals, which you have just unveiled.

First, are you assigning that political demagoguery to President Reagan, and, if not, wherein lies the political demagoguery? And, secondly, sir, would you be so kind as to tell us that by raising the issue of political demagoguery aren't you rather contradicting your remarks in TIME magazine that it was time to lower the rhetoric going into the Geneva summit?]

[Gorbachev] I should like also to confirm now all that I said in the interview given to the TIME magazine representatives, and I should like to say straightaway that in that remark that I made on the basis of the information that had reached me it would be very irresponsible for my part, if on this occasion, someone who had been attempting to undertake serious and constructive steps were to transfer everything back as it were to the level of a propaganda shooting match. That would be irresponsible. As for Mr Reagan's position, I have indeed said that for the first time we -- and this was said by Comrade Shevardnadze, the minister of foreign affairs, who is here -- sensed in the conversation on the part of the President and those who took part -- I have in mind Mr Shultz, Mr McFarlane and others -- we sensed a serious attitude from them toward our proposals. We hope that this will be the case in actual fact. We do not want to damage the security of the United States of America. That does not enter our plans. We do not want to outplay the United States of America, and we do not advise the United States of America to do so.

[Moderator, in French with superimposed Russian translation] Ladies and Gentlemen, I shall give the floor to a few more journalists, but, you know, it is necessary to bring this to an end. It is difficult to choose between you. If you please, madame!

[Question in English with superimposed Russian translation] Heather Pick, of the LONDON GUARDIAN. Are you holding talks on reducing strategic armaments? Do they envisage the possibility of an agreement on the nondeployment of space weapons, or do you consider that these two issues are separate? To what extent will you agree with President Reagan on the outlines for the future talks in Geneva, when you meet him there?

[Gorbachev] Well, I do not think we should anticipate the Geneva meeting at this press conference. It is a serious matter, after all, and we, and I think the American side, understands this, and are making appropriate preparations. As for the specific part of your question, I will say this: that we must come to agreement on the nonmilitarization of space and on the radical curtailment of strategic nuclear weapons on earth.

[Speaker in French with superimposed Russian translation] We have a few moments left. Please be so good as to ask your questions.

[Speaker in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mr General Secretary, so there is no readiness for negotiations on medium-range missiles? Why not?

[Above translation was heard in English as follows: (?Teleglobe, Brazil) Secretary General, Mr Mitterrand was quite [words indistinct] that he is not prepared to enter negotiations with the Soviet Union on middle-range missiles. You don't seem to take the rebuff, though. Why is that?]

[Gorbachev] On the contrary, I think, as I said, on the contrary, that our proposals create new situations making it possible to extricate this issue and start this process. I do not understand why you have formed such an impression after both my speech and my replies. I insist precisely on the fact that with our steps we, so to speak, are moving this process along and putting movement into it, starting to move from deadlock. Opportunities are opening up both with the Americans and with France and Britain.

[Announcer] President Mitterrand thanked Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the journalists for taking part in the press conference.

GSG: 5200/1049

GENERAL

USSR'S ARBATOV ADDRESSES SAN FRANCISCO MEETING

PM121409 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "On Behalf of Normalizing Relations"]

[Text] San Francisco, 10 Sep -- A meeting has been held at the Northern Californian Council on World Affairs between representatives of American political and public circles and a visiting delegation of the Soviet public headed by G.A. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute.

The head of the Soviet delegation informed the representative American audience about the recent Soviet peace initiatives expounded in CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's answers to TIME magazine. He also spoke in detail on the most important aspects of the current state of relations between the two countries, and dealt with numerous questions.

Noting the increasing growth in tension in the world, he stressed that the present situation in which thousands of cities in the USSR, the United States of America, and other countries have become targets for nuclear missiles cannot be considered normal. "The more time that passes," he pointed out, "the more difficult the process of bilateral talks and the search for a way out of the complex situation becomes, and mutual distrust and suspicion grow." At present, the academic observed, even a minor incident could lead to the outbreak of an international crisis. Therefore, the need to abandon force and political indifference in international affairs becomes particularly urgent.

R. Barnet, a member of the leadership of the Washington Institute for Policy Studies, for his part, pointed to the need for very rapid normalization of Soviet-American relations. "Common security interests," he said, "demand that we shift from confrontation toward political dialogue and make progress in the process of arms control." The preceding period," has shown in his opinion, the low effectiveness of a security system based on a strategy of nuclear deterrence. "Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative," R. Barnet said in this regard, "is profoundly mistaken and dangerous and will further destabilize the situation in the world. It is an imperative dictated by the times and common sense that we develop a reliable system for the limitation and radical reduction of nuclear arms. And this problem can be resolved only on the basis of political efforts and goodwill." The speaker gave a high appraisal of the Soviet Union's recent peace-loving foreign policy initiatives.

The meeting confirmed the concern felt in the United States at the tension existing in Soviet-American relations and the continuing arms race.

CSO: 5200/1036

GENERAL

MOSCOW TV: FRG TV REPORTS U.S. TO DEPLOY NEUTRON ARMS

OW050047 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Sep 85

[From the Novosti Newscast; commentary by Vladimir Kondratyev]

[Text] The FRG Television program "Monitor," citing U.S. Congress documents, has reported that the Pentagon is preparing to deploy neutron weapons on FRG territory. Our commentary:

[Kondratyev] Hello, comrades. The question which, as you recall, produced a powerful wave of universal indignation at the end of the 1970's has once again been raised quite acutely. At that time President Carter was compelled to set aside the production of neutron weapons. However, President Reagan, who replaced him, gave the order on 6 August 1981 to begin production. While the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe was being pushed through, it was decided to hold the so-called humane weapons at U.S. warehouses in order not to complicate relations with allies.

Now, as FRG television asserts, a few hundred neutron warheads are awaiting shipment to West Germany from somewhere in New York State. At the same time the Pentagon is resorting to various ruses to mislead both their European partners and American legislators. For instance, the production has begun of a new type of artillery shell which can quickly be converted to a neutron shell.

I think it is no accident that the Pentagon has chosen precisely this moment for its provocative actions. The hawks on the banks of the Potomac are pursuing a definite goal: They want to complicate the already tense international atmosphere on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting and hamper reaching an agreement at the Geneva talks on space and nuclear arms.

As far back as 1961, the Soviet Union came out with a statement concerning American projects to create a neutron bomb. Since then our side has more than once advanced constructive initiatives directed at banning these barbarous weapons, which destroy people but preserve material possessions. The unwillingness of the United States to listen to the voice of reason also exposes it in the eyes of the world public as the true perpetrator of the arms race. There is no doubt that the implementation of the plans for neutron weapons would give rise to a new upsurge of antiwar demonstrations in Europe.

CSO: 5200/1036

END