

JPRS-TAC-85-033

20 September 1985

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

STATEMENT A  
Not to be released  
without

19980728 076

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10  
114  
ADG

#### 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 were 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.

20 September 1985

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. September ASAT Test Criticized (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	1
Impact on Geneva Talks, by B. Orekhov	1
U.S. Congressman Cited	2
USSR 'Released From Commitment', by Viktor Levin	2
Military Paper Commentary, by V. Dodonov	3
White House Statement Hit	6
'Trial of Strength' Deplored, by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov	6
'Peculiar' Preparation for Summit	7
Weinberger Role Criticized, by Eduard Mnatsakanov	8
Weinberger Justification 'Shaky'	9
 Gorbachev Interview With TIME Magazine (Moscow PRAVDA, 2 Sep 85) .....	 10
 Soviet Position for Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting Praised (Nikolay Pastukhov; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 7 Sep 85) ...	 20
 PRAVDA Editorial on U.S.-USSR Relations Stresses Space Arms (Moscow PRAVDA, 12 Sep 85) .....	 23
 Moscow: Change in U.S. Stance Key to Better Relations (Moscow World Service, 8 Sep 85) .....	 25
 TASS Criticizes Remarks by U.S. Officials on SDI (Moscow TASS, 11 Sep 85) .....	 26
Adelman 'Juggling With Facts'	26
Weinberger Interview Cited	27
 TASS: Further on U.S. Search for Allied Support of SDI (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	 29
Gen O'Neill in Italy	29
U.S. Pressure on Denmark	29
Canadian Resistance	30

Soviet Envoy at IPU Meeting Denounces 'Star Wars' (Moscow TASS, 6 Sep 85) .....	31
Moscow TV Calls SDI Concept 'Unfeasible, Utopian' (Georgiy Zubkov; Moscow Television Service, 8 Sep 85) ...	32
Reasons for USSR's 'Sharp Reaction' to SDI (Vladimir Kornilov; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 30, 4-11 Aug 85) .....	34
PRAVDA on FRG's Teltschnick, SDI Participation (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	36
Trip to U.S., by Yu. Yakhontov	36
Seeks 'Indulgence', by Ye. Grigoryev	37
PRAVDA Reports on Response to SDI in UK (A. Maslennikov; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 30 Jul 85) ....	38
Moscow Radio Talk Show: Arms, Issues, U.S.-Soviet Ties (Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 6 Sep 85) .....	41
Strategic Defense Initiative	42
U.S.-Soviet Relations	43
Moscow TV Talk Show Focuses on SDI (Valentin Sergeevich Zorin, Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin; Moscow Television Service, 7 Sep 85) .....	45
Geneva Meeting	45
Nuclear Weapons Tests	47
'Star Wars'	48
UN General Assembly	50
Western Europe-U.S. Ties	51
U.S.-Soviet Relations	52
Moscow Radio Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' (Aleksandr Bovin, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 8 Sep 85) .....	54
Gorbachev TIME Interview	54
Arms Race	55
Soviet-U.S. Summit	56
U.S. ASAT Tests	57
Nuclear Test Ban	58
U.S., Soviet 'Public Representatives' Discuss Space Arms (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	62
Opening of U.S.-USSR Meeting	62
Bilateral Relations Discussed	63
SDI 'Deepening Credibility Gap'	63
Joint Statement Issued	64

Soviet Commentary on Dual Nature of 'Eureka' Project (G. Dadyants; Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 30 Aug 85) .....	66
Canadian Parliamentary Committee 'Star Wars' Hearings End (Various sources, various dates) .....	69
Defense Expert in Montreal, by David Crane	69
Further Montreal Statements	70
Toronto First Day Hearings	71
Toronto Second Day Remarks, by Paul Taylor	72
Vancouver Hearings, by Debbie Wilson	73
Further Vancouver Statements	74
Calgary Hearings, by Kevin Cox	74
Ottawa Hearings, by Charlotte Montgomery	75
Committee Chairman's Assessment, by David Crane	76
Closed Committee Meeting, by Greg Weston	77
Canadian Views on 'Star Wars' Participation Mixed (Various sources, various dates) .....	79
Aerospace Association President	79
Poll Majority in Favor	79
Spar Aerospace Report, by Greg Weston	80
Center for Arms Control Report, by Greg Weston	81
Japan, USSR Differ on East-West Relations, SDI (Tokyo KYODO, 6 Sep 85) .....	82
SALT/START ISSUES	
Soviet Army Paper Hits Claims of SS-19 Test Camouflage (V. Sergeev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Aug 85) .....	84
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
Commentator on INF Siting, Peace Movement (Arie Kuiper; Amsterdam DE TIJD, 12 Jul 85) .....	85
NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
USSR's Bovin Lauds Idea of Nuclear-Free Zones (A. Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 6 Sep 85) .....	88
IZVESTIYA Views NFZ Movement in Nordic Islands (N. Ivanov; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 22 Aug 85) .....	91
PRAVDA Calls for 'Peaceful Mediterranean' (N. Kovalskiy; Moscow PRAVDA, 3 Sep 85) .....	94

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: Importance of Moratorium for Nonproliferation Treaty (Vladimir Baburov; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 27 Aug 85) ..	98
TASS Links Mitterrand Pacific Trip to Nuclear Testing (Moscow TASS, 11 Sep 85) .....	100
UK Opposition, Peace Group Support USSR on Moratorium (Moscow TASS, 27 Aug 85) .....	101
Soviet Scientists Stresses Importance of Moratorium (A. Petrosyants; Moscow PRAVDA, 16 Aug 85) .....	102

GENERAL

Gorbachev Discusses Arms Issues With FRG's Rau (Moscow TASS, 10 Sep 85) .....	107
--	-----

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. SEPTEMBER ASAT TEST CRITICIZED

Impact on Geneva Talks

PM280848 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Aug 85 Second Edition p 5

[B. Orekhov "Rejoinder": "Odd Logic"]

[Text] The White House has announced that the United States has decided to carry out combat testing of antisatellite weapons in the near future. A fighter will fire a missile-like "miniature device" which will hit a defunct satellite in near-earth orbit. In the words of a White House spokesman, President R. Reagan informed Congress that this test is a "boost to concluding an agreement on this and other questions with the Soviet Union in Geneva."

One can only be astonished at the levity with which Washington has made black out to be white and turned things upside down. The testing of a new type of combat weapon is termed a boost toward banning it! It is necessary to be at odds with basic logic to claim that.

As is well known, at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva the USSR is striving to reach agreement on completely banning the creation, testing, and development of strike space systems. Our country has also repeatedly taken unilateral steps intended to set the United States a good example. The moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union on putting antisatellite weapons into space has been in force for 2 years. The Soviet proposal that both sides should totally end work on the creation of new antisatellite means and that the means already existing in the USSR and the United States--including those on which testing has been completed--be destroyed is on the table in Washington. The implementation of the Soviet proposal would help not only to retain space for peaceful exploration, research, and scientific discovery but also to begin the process of sharply reducing and destroying nuclear weapons.

But Washington's logic, as we can see, is quite different. People over there try to make out that combat testing of antisatellite weapons will promote successful progress at the Geneva talks. Do not try to understand how the testing of space weapons can promote the nonmilitarization of space, on which an accord was reached between the USSR and the United States before the start of the Geneva talks. Do not try because it is simply impossible to understand it.

I think that this step by the U.S. side, whatever it is called--a "boost" or whatever--not only cannot promote success at the Geneva talks but, on the contrary, is aimed at complicating the course of the talks. That is what basic logic suggests.

#### U.S. Congressman Cited

LD291319 Moscow TASS in English 1247 GMT 29 Aug 85

[Text] New York, 29 Aug (TASS)--The U.S. administration's decision to test a new combat anti-satellite weapon system against a target in outer space may result in a dangerous and irreversible arms race in space, according to Joe Moakley, a member of the House of Representatives (Democrat, Massachusetts) of the U.S. Congress.

"If President Reagan is at all serious about arms control," he writes in THE NEW YORK TIMES, "he will postpone the proposed ASAT test--at least until after the Geneva summit meeting in November."

In his article, Joe Moakley disagrees with the Washington administration which argues that the United States "should carry on" anti-satellite weapon tests. The author recalls that the United States was the first nation to deploy an ASAT in the early 1960's.

The testing of a new American ASAT system to a point of operational readiness may well preclude the chance of a negotiated ban on these weapons, the congressman underlines. A mutual moratorium on ASAT testing would slow the momentum of the arms race in space, as well as set the stage for negotiations limiting such weapons. And a mutual ban on ASAT testing would not place the United States at any strategic disadvantage.

At present an opportunity presents itself to prevent a major extension of the arms race. But we must act now, Joe Moakley writes. History has shown that it is much more practical to ban weapons before they become operational.

#### USSR 'Released From Commitment'

LD051826 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 Sep 85

[Commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Text] There has been a broad response to the TASS statement expressing the Soviet Union's attitude to the U.S.'s intention to test an antisatellite weapon. Here is a news commentary by Viktor Levin:

[Levin] The White House makes no great secret of the fact that the test is not just, and not so much military in nature, as political. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, an administration spokesman has declared that the main thing is to "show resolve." Administration officials who have spoken out in favor of carrying out tests at the earliest opportunity, THE WASHINGTON POST reports, believe that successful tests will



give President Reagan the opportunity to declare at the meeting with the Soviet leader in Geneva that the United States has an antisatellite weapon. The only way to interpret this is that the tests are designed to create a basis for pressuring the Soviet Union. But such intentions are futile, as was indicated in clear-cut terms by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his replies to TIME magazine. The summit meeting, he said, is intended for negotiations, and, what is more, negotiations on the basis of equality, not the signing of anyone's capitulation document. All the more so, since we have not lost to America either in war or even in battle and we owe America precisely nothing.

But this is not the only point. Antisatellite weapon tests represent another real step on the road to the extension of the arms race to outer space. The American Administration seemingly does not hear the Soviet side's firm and clear statements to the effect that averting the militarization of space is the main and paramount task, and should it fail to be resolved, then other problems will not be resolved either. Representatives of the American Administration today allege that the United States must catch up with the Soviet Union in the development of an antisatellite weapon. But this is nothing but the latest version of the "Soviet threat" myth. As far back as 2 years ago, our country tabled a draft treaty on banning the use of force in space and from space against the earth, and it adopted a commitment at that time not to be the first to put antisatellite weapons of whatever type into space.

In other words, in a desire to demonstrate goodwill and sincere intentions, the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on such launches for as long as other states, including the United States, refrain from placing antisatellite weapons of any kind into space. This moratorium is being scrupulously observed. The Soviet Union is resolutely attempting to ensure that space remains peaceful. The recent proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization also has this end in view.

Should the United States carry out an antisatellite test against a target in space, the Soviet Union, as the TASS statement says, will consider itself released from its unilateral commitment to not put antisatellite weapons into space and the entire responsibility for subsequent developments will then rest totally on the American side. The Soviet Union prefers another way.

#### Military Paper Commentary

PM051331 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Sep 85 Second Edition p 3

[V. Dodonov article under the rubric "In Pursuit of Military Superiority":  
"What Is Concealed Behind the ASAT Tests"]

[Text] We know that Washington regards space as a potential theater of military operations.

Statements by a number of spokesmen for the influential militarist circles have repeatedly emphasized that the conduct of military operations in space fully accords with U.S. interests. With the adoption of Reagan's "star wars" program (disguised under the name of the "Strategic Defense Initiative") scientific research and experimental design work on the creation of various types of space arms have acquired great scope and their pace has increased.

Recently, to judge from American press reports, work on antisatellite strike weapons has been sharply intensified. A few days ago, the White House announced the U.S. President's decision to conduct flight tests of an ASAT system against a real target in space in September-October of this year. This antisatellite aircraft and missile system is designed to hit artificial earth satellites in low orbits; up to 1,000 km. The system includes a carrier aircraft based on a modernized F-15 fighter and a two-stage missile slung beneath its fuselage. The missile carries a small interceptor shell with several dozen small motors, an infrared guidance system, and an orientation system based on a laser gyroscope and a minicomputer. The interceptor shell homes in on the satellite's heat radiation.

To judge from American press reports, the process of intercepting a target satellite with the ASAT system appears in a general outline as follows. On a command from the ground control center, the carrier aircraft with an antisatellite missile ascends to an altitude of 15-20 km and heads for the projected launch point. The majority of operations to prepare for the missile launch are carried out by the aircraft's computer. After separation from the carrier aircraft, the missile is guided to the projected point in space with the help of its own onboard control system.

Toward the end of the missile's second stage, the system for homing on the target satellite's infrared radiation and the system of ensuring the interceptor shell's stabilization in flight begin functioning. At the moment of the interceptor's separation, infrared sensors surveying space capture the target. Then, the homing system ensures that the interceptor scores a direct hit on the target satellite and destroys it.

The development of this complex began back in 1977. A number of major firms are participating in it, including Vought, Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, and others. Two tests of the ASAT complex had already been conducted in the United States in 1984. Missiles were launched to the projected point without hitting a target. Then, the tests were deferred. But now, according to White House spokesman L. Speakes, the United States is to test an antisatellite weapon system against a real target in space for the first time. An American satellite whose active existence has ceased has been chosen as the specific target.

This year it is planned to conduct two more tests of the ASAT system; this time using special target satellites placed in a low orbit in advance. It is planned to impart a still more clearly expressed provocative thrust to these tests. This is indicated by the fact that the spherical target satellites being used will, according to American press data, have the potential to imitate the characteristics of the heat (infrared) radiation peculiar to Soviet satellites of various kinds.

A noisy propaganda campaign has been mounted in the United States to somehow justify the creation of antisatellite weapons and their testing. They go so far as to claim that the upcoming American tests will make the Russians "more complaisant" and even force the USSR representatives at the Geneva talks to agree to conclude an agreement advantageous to the United States. As has repeatedly happened before, it is groundlessly asserted that a ban on the testing and deployment of antisatellite weapons runs counter to U.S. security interests, since, it is said, the USSR is also testing an antisatellite means.

And this lie is being disseminated despite the fact that, as long ago as August 1983, the Soviet Union adopted a unilateral pledge not to be the first to put any type of antisatellite weapon into space as long as other states, including the United States,

refrain from putting antisatellite weapons of any kind into space. That unilateral moratorium is still in force. And, at the Geneva talks, we proposed the destruction of the antisatellite means which the United States and the USSR already have and whose testing has not been completed. The whole world knows of the USSR's proposal envisaging the prevention of the militarization of space: not to start a space arms race; to ban the entire class of space strike arms; to establish without delay a moratorium on their creation, testing, and deployment. The world public warmly welcomed that constructive initiative, for it accords with the interests and aspirations of the peoples of the USSR, the United States, and all other countries.

It is important to emphasize that, at present, control over the fulfillment of treaty commitments is based on data obtained by national technical means, above all space means. The existing U.S. and Soviet satellites are used for communications, navigation, warning of a missile attack, and other purposes. The practical deployment of an ASAT system, which will follow after the testing (a fact the Pentagon does not, in point of fact, conceal), would be a dangerous destabilizing factor in the international situation. For a direct threat to Soviet satellites would arise.

There is another circumstance of considerable importance. THE NEW YORK TIMES cites a statement by a Pentagon staffer who was involved in elaborating space policy. Emphasizing the great connection between antisatellite technology and the "star wars" program, he declared that the upcoming tests of antisatellite weapons "will provide valuable information on the miniaturization of sensors and computers, which will be needed to build orbital stations designed to destroy enemy missiles." In the future, according to that staffer, the U.S. Air Force also plans to conduct tests of beam weapons, including lasers, in the struggle against satellites. Such weapons are also considered one of the leading "candidates" for use in the "star wars" system.

Reactionary Senator B. Goldwater, known for his links with the Pentagon and the CIA, quite recently blurted out the true aims of the planned U.S. tests of antisatellite weapons. Replying to a question put by the CBS TV company as to whether these tests will affect the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, he declared with cynical frankness: "I don't give a damn how it affects them. The chief thing is that it should accord with the basic aims of the United States." Let us amplify: the aims of influential militarist circles and the military-industrial complex, whose interests are reflected by the senator "hawk."

The fact that the United States is now planning to test the second generation of anti-satellite means -- which is what the ASAT system is -- is fraught with serious consequences. It is essentially a question of testing certain elements of space-based ABM defense -- in particular, space strike weapons.

"Some people in the United States evidently thought that an opportunity had appeared to overtake us and bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev declared during his conversation with American journalists. "But this is an illusion. It failed in the past, and it will fail now. We will find a reply, and a quite adequate one at that." Washington will not succeed in upsetting the existing military-strategic parity.

**White House Statement Hit**

**LD061554 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1505 GMT 6 Sep 85**

[Text] Washington, 6 Sep (TASS) -- In connection with the TASS statement concerning the U.S. Administration's intention to carry out testing of an ASAT antisatellite system against a real objective [realnaya tsel] in space used as a target [mishen], the White House and the State Department have issued identical statements which say that the U.S. Administration intends to continue preparations for its launch.

With the aim of justifying this decision, the statement asserts that the ending of the Soviet Union's unilateral pledge not to put antisatellite weapons into space in connection with this, is of "little importance" from a practical point of view since the USSR, allegedly, has an operational system which can carry out the tasks it is set. The statement stresses that the United States intends to carry out the test in order to "promote discussion" of the corresponding issues at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons.

The administration's decision to test the antisatellite weapon means, in essence, that the United States has not responded positively to the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on placing antisatellite weapons in outer space. And assertions that the Soviet Union was the first to carry out such a test run counter to the factual side of the matter, which boils down to this: As early as 1959, the United States first effected the interception of the Explorer-6 satellite using a missile launched from a B-47 bomber and it carried out research into the building of interceptor satellites (projects "Bambi" and "Saint") in the 1960's. In 1963-67, the United States deployed an antisatellite complex based on the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile on Kwajalain Atoll and in 1964-75 an experimental-combat antisatellite complex based on the Thor rockets was built on Johnston Island.

Thus, the United States, in declaring its intention to carry out the launch of an ASAT system, is in fact embarking on testing of a second generation of antisatellite systems. And Washington's statement that such tests create a stimulus for conducting serious negotiations on space issues in Geneva, are intended to divert public opinion from the factual side of the matter. For it is the United States which is actively preparing the militarization of outer space. That is the context in which the planned tests of the ASAT system should also be viewed.

**"Trial of Strength' Deployed**

**LD080025 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2052 GMT 7 Sep 85**

**[From the "International Review" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]**

[Text] Comrade Gorbachev's statements in his talk with the journalists from TIME have been appraised in the White House. Its spokesman noted that the U.S. President is serious in his approach to the question of relations with Moscow and made it known that he is ready to meet the USSR half-way in an attempt to solve the existing problems. The present actions of Washington, however, bear witness to the American Administration's lack of willingness to respond constructively to our peaceful initiatives.

Take the question of antisatellite weapons. For 2 years now, the commitment undertaken unilaterally by the USSR not to put antisatellite systems in space has been in

operation. Despite this, the United States is taking a dangerous step to escalate the arms race and spread it to outer space. Washington has officially announced its intention to hold tests shortly of the ASAT antisatellite system. The first tests against targets in space are planned to be carried out this month.

As was noted in the TASS statement, this decision by the American Administration signifies nothing but an action directly leading to the start of deployment of a new class of dangerous armaments, of offensive space weapons. Thus, the United States is stepping up preparations for "star wars." This once again displays the true attitude of Washington to the talks on nuclear and space weapons at Geneva and its unwillingness to agree on real steps to prevent the arms race in space and halt it on earth.

The TASS statement stresses that in the case of the United States holding tests of antisatellite weapons, the USSR will consider itself free of its unilateral commitment not to put antisatellite weapons into space. All responsibility for further events will lie with the United States. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted in his talk with American senators, neither side will be reconciled to the other side gaining steady of decisive superiority. One conclusion can be drawn from this: There should not be a trial of strength; things should not be taken to a dangerous confrontation. In Comrade Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine and in his statements in his talk with American senators, millions of people in the world have seen a real hope for halting the nuclear arms race and keeping outer space free of weapons. Our country is doing everything for this hope to be justified.

#### 'Peculiar' Preparation for Summit

LD071525 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1416 GMT 7 Sep 85

['IZVESTIYA: 'What ASAT Is Aimed At?'"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Sep. (TASS) -- Washington is preparing for the Soviet-American summit meeting in a very peculiar way, writes IZVESTIYA's political observer Aleksandr Bovin today.

In August, a new nuclear explosion was carried out. Tests on the antisatellite system (ASAT) are planned for September. In both cases, the demonstrative nature of the American actions are stressed by the fact that they are being carried out against the backdrop of the Soviet Union's unilateral decisions to end tests of both nuclear and antisatellite weapons. And in both cases, the competent American authorities refer to the United States "lagging behind," the need to "catch up with" the USSR, to "straighten the balance," etc.

The United States' intensive efforts aimed at creating an antisatellite system should be seen against the background of unending attempts at gaining military-strategic superiority over the USSR. The purpose of antisatellite weapons is to guarantee the aggressor the possibility of surviving after inflicting a first strike.

To destroy others' satellites and preserve one's own -- that is the way the task is presented; and to preserve one's own means to considerably increase the accuracy and effectiveness of nuclear missile strikes and to maintain constant control over the nuclear potential. In other words, it means acquiring the capability, as American strategists suppose, of waging and "winning" not only "limited" but "protracted" nuclear war.

Here, the observer continues, we all confronted a curious characteristic of American military thinking: an overestimate of their own capabilities [vozmozhnosti] and underestimation of the "enemy's" capabilities. As a result of this, the American's calculus acquire an ephemeral character.

In general, ASAT is fully written into U.S. policy which is aimed at the creation of space strike systems of varying application -- that is, into a policy which makes our already none too comfortable world even more dangerous.

The Soviet Union, the article further states, actively struggles for another future. We proceed from the premise that provision for the safe operation of each state's satellites in current conditions serves as one of the elements of common military and strategic stability. We are prepared on a mutual basis not only not to test and not to create new antisatellite systems, but also to eliminate the already existing ones. By way of a good example, the Soviet Union announced in August 1983 a moratorium on all launching and testing of antisatellite weaponry. The moratorium will continue until such times as the other side refrains from similar activity. And, as TASS stated recently, if the United States carries out testing of the ASAT system, the USSR will consider itself free of its unilateral pledge.

In conclusion, writes Aleksandr Bovin, I would like to return to the thought with which I began the article. The United States is behaving very strangely in its preparation for the Geneva meeting. The impression is formed that both the nuclear explosions and the space experiments are not only tests of weapons but tests of our endurance, our long-suffering, and our good intentions. We have a lot of endurance and patience. The intentions, actually, are good. But I am afraid that the Americans' self-importance, their arrogance, their intoxication with their own strength could let them down badly.

#### **Weinberger Role Criticized**

**LD092154 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1912 GMT 9 Sep 85**

[From the "World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsaknov]

[Text] The Pentagon is actively continuing work on the development of ASAT, a second-generation antisatellite weapons system. It is known that testing of the system is planned for 13 September. But, as the American press points out, it was Pentagon chief Weinberger who played the leading role in the White House's decision to carry out this provocative test. In his view, the actual destruction of a target in space would supposedly show the Soviet Union the determination of the United States not to depart from the line it has taken and would enable the administration to conduct talks with the Soviet side on an equal footing at the summit meeting. The naive cynicism, as it were, of the U.S. secretary is mocked even by American newspapers with close ties to the White House. One of them directly maintains that Washington's present position is a very precarious one and may cost it dearly.

## Weinberger Justification 'Shaky'

PM101427 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Open Misrepresentation"]

[Text] Washington, 9 Sep -- The American press is continuing to publish articles exposing the ins and outs of the U.S. Administration's actions in preparing to test an anti-satellite system against a real target in space under conditions approximating combat. It has been pointed out that Pentagon chief C. Weinberger played the chief role in the White House's decision to conduct this test without even waiting for the defects in the target satellites specially developed for this purpose to be rectified. This militarist declares in his speeches that the actual destruction of a target in space will supposedly demonstrate to the Soviet Union the U.S. determination not to go back on its policy in matters of rearming America and will enable the administration to talk with the Soviet side on equal terms at the summit meeting.

This cynicism on the American secretary's part is derided even by the U.S. press. One newspaper frankly writes that Washington's present stand on this issue is extremely shaky and could cost it dear in the future. The theses and "arguments" which the White House uses to try to justify to the public and to Congress the need to conduct the said test urgently have been greeted here with undisguised ridicule in a number of cases and with frank indignation. As for the attempts to demonstrate the administration's desire to use these tests to improve their position at the Geneva talks with the Soviet Union, people here declare that the administration is resorting to open misrepresentation in its assurances about this. It is assumed the question of antisatellite weapons could once again be submitted for discussion at a full session of the House of Representatives, which will vote on the corresponding section of the draft law on military appropriations.

According to press data, the Pentagon plans to test the U.S. antisatellite system against a target in space on 13 September.

CSO: 5200/1397

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

GORBACHEV INTERVIEW WITH TIME MAGAZINE

PM020927 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

["M. S. Gorbachev's Replies to America's TIME Magazine]

[Excerpts]

America's TIME magazine has asked General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to reply to a number of questions and also to receive for a conversation the editor-in-chief of Time, Inc, Henry Grunwald, the managing editor of TIME magazine Ray Cave, the assistant managing editor Richard Duncan, and the magazine's Moscow bureau chief James Jackson. The conversation took place on 28 August of this year.

We publish below M.S. Gorbachev's replies and his conversation with the American journalists:

Question: How would you characterize U.S.-Soviet relations at this juncture and what are the primary events that define that relationship?

Answer Had you asked me this question some 2 months ago, I would have said that the situation in our relations was becoming somewhat better and that some hopes of positive shifts were appearing.

To my deep regret, I could not say that today.

The truth should be faced squarely. Despite the negotiations which have begun in Geneva and the agreement to hold a summit meeting, the relations between our two countries continue to deteriorate, the arms race is intensifying, and the war threat is not subsiding. What is the matter, why is all this happening? My colleagues and I are quite exacting and self-critical when it comes to our own activities not only in this country but outside it, and we are asking ourselves again and again if that is somehow connected with our actions.

But what is there that we can reproach ourselves with in this context? Indeed, in this crucial [otvetsvtennyy] situation Moscow is trying to practice restraint in its pronouncements with regard to the United States. It is not resorting to anti-American campaigns, nor is it fomenting hatred for your country. We believe it very important that even in times of political aggravation the feeling of traditional respect harbored by Soviet people for the American people should not be injured, and, as far as I can judge, that feeling is largely a mutual one.



And is it bad that, at a time when the disarmament negotiations have resumed and preparations are under way for the first summit in 6 years, we are persistently seeking ways to break the vicious circle and bring the process of arms limitation out of the dead end? In particular, that is precisely the objective of our moratorium on nuclear explosions and of our proposal to the United States to join it and to resume the negotiations on a complete ban on nuclear tests as well as of the proposals regarding peaceful cooperation and the prevention of an arms race in space. We are convinced that we should look for a way out of the current difficult situation together.

It is hard, therefore, to understand why our proposals have provoked such outspoken displeasure on the part of responsible U.S. statesmen. Attempts are known to have been made to portray them as nothing but pure propaganda.

Anyone even slightly familiar with the essence of the matters would easily see that behind our proposals there are very serious intentions and not just an attempt to influence public opinion.

All real efforts to limit nuclear weapons began with a ban on tests -- just recall the 1963 treaty which was a first major step in that direction. A complete end to nuclear tests would halt the nuclear arms race in the most dangerous area, that of qualitative improvement. And it would, besides, seriously contribute to maintaining and strengthening the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

If all that we are doing is, indeed, viewed as mere propaganda, why not respond to it according to the principle of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"? We have stopped nuclear explosions. Then you, Americans, could up and take revenge by doing likewise. You could, to boot, deal us yet another propaganda blow, say, by suspending the development of one of your new strategic missiles. And we would respond with the same kind of "propaganda." And so on and so forth. Would anyone be harmed by competition in such "propaganda"? Of course, it could not be a substitute for a comprehensive arms limitation agreement but it would, no doubt, be a significant step leading to such an agreement.

The U.S. Administration has regrettably taken a different road. In response to our moratorium it defiantly hastened to set off yet another nuclear explosion as if to spite everyone. And to our proposals concerning a peaceful space it responded with a decision to conduct a first operational test of an anti-satellite weapon. As if that were not enough, it has also launched another "campaign of hatred" against the USSR.

What kind of impression does all this make? On the one hand, that of some kind of confusion and uncertainty in Washington. The only way I can explain this is anxiety lest our initiatives should wreck the version of the Soviet Union being the "focus of evil" and the source of universal danger which, in fact, underlies the entire arms race policy. On the other hand, there is an impression of a shortage of responsibility for the destinies of the world. And this, frankly speaking, gives rise again and again to the question whether it is at all possible in such an atmosphere to conduct business in a normal way and to build rational relations between countries.

You asked me what is the primary thing that defines Soviet-American relations. I think it is the immutable fact that whether we like one another or not, we can either survive or perish only together. The principal question which we must answer is whether we are at last ready to recognize that there is no other way but to live at peace with each other and whether we are prepared to switch our mentality and our mode of acting from

a warlike to a peaceful track. As you say, live and let live. We call it peaceful coexistence. As for the Soviet Union, we answer that question in the affirmative.

Question: What do you think will be the results of your Geneva meeting with President R. Reagan in November? What specific actions should the U.S. and the Soviet Union take to improve their bilateral relations?

Answer: In fact, I have already set forth the reasons why today I look at the prospects of the Geneva meeting with more caution than I did at the time we gave our agreement to that meeting. Its outcome, after all, will depend to a great extent upon what is taking place now.

Everyone would probably agree that the political atmosphere for talks takes shape well in advance. Neither the President nor I will be able to ignore the mood in our respective countries or that of our allies. In other words, actions today largely determine the "scenario" for our November discussions.

I will not hide from you my disappointment and concern about what is happening now.

We cannot but be troubled by the approach which, as I see it, has begun to emerge in Washington from both its practical policy and the statements made by responsible White House staffers. That is a scenario of pressure, of attempts to drive us into a corner, to ascribe to us, as so many times in the past, every mortal sin -- from unleashing an arms race to "aggression" in the Middle East, from violations of human rights to some scheming or other even in South Africa. This is not a state policy, it is a feverish search for "forces of evil."

We are prepared to have a meaningful and businesslike talk; we can also present claims. I wish to assure the readers of this magazine that we have something to say about the United States being responsible for the nuclear arms race, and about its conduct in various regions of the world, about support to those who in effect engage in terrorism, and about violations of human rights in America itself, as well as in many countries close to it. But here is what I am thinking about: Is it worthwhile for the sake of that to set up a summit meeting with which our nations and people on all continents associate their hopes for peace, and for a secure and tranquil life? Abusive words are no help in a good cause.

I see the concept of such an important meeting differently. We in Moscow, naturally, are well aware of how profound is all that divides us. Look at what U.S. political leaders have been saying in recent years. We could not disregard statements with which we do not agree and which, frankly speaking, in many cases we are indignant about. At the same time we have not lost hope that, after all, points of contact, areas of common or parallel interests can be found. Indeed, there are reasons for this. Take, for example, the statements to the effect that nuclear war must not be waged and that it cannot be won, or that the United States is not seeking military superiority. In other words, I have been reckoning on having an honest and unbiased conversation imbued with a desire to find a way leading back from the edge of the nuclear precipice; to discuss not myths and stereotypes of which we have had enough, but the real problems, the real interests of our countries, our future and the future of the entire world community.

But there is every indication that the other side is now preparing for something quite different. It looks as if the stage is being set for a bout between some kind of political "supergladiators" with just one thought in mind: how best to deal a deft blow at the opponent and score an extra point in this "bout". What is striking

about this are both the forms and the content of some statements. The recent "lecture" of Mr. McFarlane is a case in point. It contains not only the full "set of accusations" we are going to be charged with in Geneva but also what I would call a very specific interpretation of the upcoming negotiations. It appears that even the slightest headway depends exclusively upon concessions by the Soviet Union -- concessions on all questions: on armaments, on regional problems, and even on our domestic affairs.

If all this is meant seriously, then it is evident that Washington is not preparing for the event we have agreed upon. The summit meeting is designed for negotiations, for negotiations on the basis of equality and not for signing an act of someone's capitulation. This is all the more true since we have not lost a war to the United States, or even a battle, and we owe it absolutely nothing. Nor, for that matter, does the United States owe us.

But if they are not meant seriously, then the bellicose outcries are all the more inappropriate. Why flex muscles needlessly, why stage noisy shows and transfer the methods of domestic political struggles to the relations between two nuclear powers? In them the language of strength is useless and dangerous. There is still time before the summit meeting; quite a lot can be done for it to be constructive and useful. But this, as you well understand, depends on both sides.

Question: What is your view of the Strategic Defense Initiative research program in the context of U.S.-Soviet relations? Can you envisage a mutual agreement prohibiting the development of such systems? And what kinds of verification would the Soviet Union agree to in such a case? If an agreement cannot be reached, what do you foresee in other aspects of arms control?

Answer: Responding to critics of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, official Washington likes to advance an argument it believes to be a clincher -- it is after all the Russians that oppose "star wars". If this is so, then it has to be a good and proper program. But if this logic is followed in the nuclear age, a rather gloomy future awaits us.

Our approach, and I hope that of many Americans, to this question is different. There are, we believe, situations in which both sides are losers. They are nuclear war, the arms race, and international tensions. And, accordingly, there are situations in which they are both winners. Those are peace and cooperation, equal security, and elimination of fear of a nuclear catastrophe.

As to the evaluation of the "star wars" program, we cannot take in earnest the assertions that the SDI would allegedly guarantee invulnerability from nuclear attack weapons thus leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the opinion of our experts (and, to my knowledge, of many of yours) this is sheer fantasy and a pipe dream. However, even on a much more modest scale at which the Strategic Defense Initiative, according to experts, can be implemented as an anti-missile defense system limited in its capabilities, the SDI is very dangerous. This project will, no doubt, whip up the arms race in all areas, which means that the threat of war will increase. That is why this project is bad for us and for you and for anybody in general.

We approach what is called the SDI research program from the same point of view. First of all, we do not consider it to be a research program. In our view, it is the first stage of the project to develop a new ABM system prohibited under the relevant treaty of 1972. Just think of the scale of it alone -- 70 billion dollars to be earmarked for the next few years. That is an incredible amount for pure research as emphasized even by U.S. scientists as well. The point is that in today's prices those ap-

appropriations are more than four times the cost of the Manhattan Project (the program for development of nuclear weapons) and more than double the cost of the Apollo program which provided for the development of space research for a whole decade -- up to the landing of man on the moon. That this is far from being a pure research program is also confirmed by other facts, including tests scheduled for space strike weapons systems.

That is why the entire SDI program and its so-called research component are a new and even more dangerous round of the arms race which will inevitably lead to a further aggravation of Soviet-American relations. To preclude this it is necessary, as was agreed in January by the minister for foreign affairs of the USSR and the U.S. secretary of state, to prevent an arms race in space. We are confident that such an agreement is possible and verifiable. (I have to point out that we trust the Americans no more than they trust us and that is why we are interested in reliable verification of any agreement as much as they are.

Without such an agreement it will not be possible to reach an agreement on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons either. The interrelationship between defensive and offensive arms is so obvious as to require no proof. Thus, if the present U.S. position on space weapons is its last word, the Geneva negotiations, and one has to be forthright about it, will lose all sense.

XXX

Mikhail Gorbachev: I would like to express some views which, I believe, are of great importance for a correct understanding of the problems dealt with in this text. I must say that lately I have received quite a few requests for statements and interviews from the mass media of various countries. Why was the decision taken to respond affirmatively to TIME magazine's request?

When I read your questions I thought that the very wording of these questions contained an expression of a certain concern in connection with the nature of relations that are now taking shape between our two countries. It is not often that we hear from representatives of American political and other circles an expression of alarm on this score. I thought that this nature of the questions that were presented to me (if I understood it correctly) was a very important element.

Then there is yet another reason, a no less important one. It is connected with our assessment of the present-day situation in the world. This situation is complex and tense, and I would even say explosive. Besides, it has a tendency to become still worse. I will not speak here about the causes of this process. You know very well our viewpoint on this matter. I would rather reply to the question of where we all are at present, in what world we are living. The least of my intentions is to dramatize the situation. But I intend to be frank with you because much depends on the assessment of the situation by both sides. We hold that when we deal with leaders of such powers as the United States and the USSR their analysis of the situation and their practical policy should be permeated with a sense of the tremendous responsibility that rests on them before their own peoples and the whole of mankind.

The reality of our time is that the level of development of science and technology makes the origination of a totally new situation, the commencement of a totally new stage of the arms race, possible. I tried frankly to reply to your questions and I ask you not to treat my replies as a new portion of "propaganda." For it is a fact that already now it is very difficult for the United States and the Soviet Union to come to terms, to take some steps toward each other. The mutual mistrust is so great. And if the arms race enters a new stage, if the latest achievements of science and technolo-

gy are used in practice for these aims, will not one of the sides feel tempted to use the imagined superiority over the other side in order to get a free rein and make the fateful step? A very responsible stage.

But however acute our bilateral relations are, some limitations nevertheless continue to operate today: the existence of military-strategic parity that ensures for both sides a certain degree of security, the ABM treaty, the SALT II treaty that is being observed in practice, the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, and the treaty banning nuclear tests in three environments. These limitations do exist and exert their influence. But, as is known, attempts to undermine them are already being made: Forces have been brought into play that strive to remove these limitations that impede a further development of the arms race.

Were all these restraining factors to vanish, the competition in the development of ever-newer types of weapons would proceed with unprecedented force, because all the steps taken here by one side would be countered by steps taken by the other side. The appearance of a poison is followed by the appearance of an antidote. Such is a lesson of history that must not be ignored.

At what, then, will we arrive?

I would put it this way: Time is running out; the train might leave if we do not act fast enough. Such is the second motive of my consent to reply to the questions of TIME magazine.

All people want to live, nobody wants to die. So it is necessary to muster political courage and stop the developing sinister process. It is necessary to stop the arms race, to start disarmament and the improvement of relations.

I have already had the opportunity to say, during the conversation with the delegation of the United States Congress headed by Speaker O'Neill that visited Moscow, that we are emphatically for an improvement of Soviet-American relations. Such is the viewpoint of our leadership. We draw sober realistic conclusions from the current situation. It is an indisputable fact that we not only call for an improvement of the situation, for an improvement of relations but also make absolutely concrete proposals and also take on our part practical steps in that direction. It is only natural that in doing so we count on an appropriate response of the American side.

Alas, in response to all our attempts to escape the vicious circle of the arms race and mutual suspiciousness we hear only a negative answer: "No, no, no, propaganda, propaganda, propaganda." But that really is not the way serious politicians behave with their partners.

Nevertheless, we hold that all that we have heard from Washington about the latest steps of the Soviet Union, including our proposals designed to move from a standstill the talks on the nonmilitarization of space, on strategic nuclear arms and on medium-range arms, our decision to end nuclear explosions, etc, is not the final say of the American administration. We hope for this.

Esteemed gentlemen, I regard this part of our conversation, when we are talking here, looking each other in the eyes, as the most important one. We hope that the American public will be clearly and conscientiously informed of our understanding of the current situation in the world and in Soviet-American relations, our understanding of how one must act in this situation.

Our countries simply cannot afford to allow matters to reach a confrontation. Herein lies the genuine interest both of the Soviet and American peoples. And this must be expressed in the language of effective politics. It is necessary to stop the arms race, to tackle disarmament, put Soviet-American relations into a normal channel. Honestly, it is time to make these relations between the two great peoples worthy of their historic role. For the destiny of the world, the destiny of world civilization really depends on our relations. We are prepared to work in this direction.

The situation is acquiring special acuteness also because the political atmosphere in Washington, judging by the information that reaches us, is being fanned up more every day. Statements are being made that cannot but give rise to surprise and indignation.

The White House and some representatives of the U.S. Administration are intimating that any accords with the Soviet Union on the limitation of the arms race are out of the question. The most that one can hope for, they declare, is the mutual acquaintance of the leaders of the two countries and the drafting of an agenda for discussion in the coming years and even decades. For example, an interview by such representatives of the United States Administration as Armacost and Tower, published a couple of days ago, is couched in this spirit. In short, everything is being done to ward off in advance any possibility of accords between the United States and the USSR on ending the arms race and preventing the militarization of outer space. It is stated in Washington with utter frankness: Whatever the Soviet Union does, the United States under all circumstances will create strike space weapons and antisatellite systems. That's what I call nailing something. First they break off the nailheads and then want somebody to pull them out with his teeth.

What is to be done in such a situation? It is necessary to stop this process. That will be in the interests both of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Countless attempts that were made in the past to force the Soviet Union to its knees, to exhaust it; all that had failed and all such attempts will fail in the future as well.

As for us, we are not declaring the United States an "evil empire." We know what the United States is, what the American people are, and their role in the world. We stand for a new, better stage in our relations. But if matters reach a qualitatively new stage of the arms race, which I have referred to, it will be much more difficult to solve such a task, if possible at all. That is why we call on the United States seriously to reach agreement with us on strategic nuclear arms, on medium-range arms and on problems of outer space.

Well, it seems I have said what was most important. Now I would like to hand over to you the signed text of my replies to TIME magazine's questions so nobody can accuse you of printing anonymous replies. (laughter) I draw your attention to the green cover: There is not even a hint of any export of revolution. (laughter)

Henry Grunwald: Mr. General Secretary, we are extremely happy to be here to get this interview, and specifically for the reasons you have stated for choosing to convey these thoughts to the American public.

You have given us your time generously. We are concerned about U.S.-Soviet relations, very much so, but we are not alone in that concern. You have spoken just now about certain people in Washington who seem to you to be trying to undermine U.S.-Soviet relations, but President Reagan himself has said on a number of occasions that there is no hostility toward the Soviet Union, that he is seeking an improvement in relations

with it and does not seek military superiority over your country. Do you accept these assurances? And more broadly, what are your impressions so far of President Reagan?

Mikhail Gorbachev: To a certain extent I have already mentioned this in the written replies. We took note of a number of the President's positive pronouncements in 1983 and 1984, including his speech in the United Nations. We took note of his remarks that nuclear war is impermissible, that there will be no victors in it. This is very important. We also paid attention to his words that the United States does not strive for attainment of military superiority over the USSR. This and other positive points in the President's remarks, as it appears to us, offer the possibility to peer into the future together, to overcome the present negative phase in our relations. We believe that it is still possible to set many things right by covering our parts of the road towards each other. That is why we consented to the meeting with the President in Geneva. For the same reason, we react so acutely to what is being said today in Washington in connection with that meeting. As an American woman journalist put it, it is intended to work up the American public to such a state that even if the accord reached in Geneva is only on an exchange of ballet companies, people will applaud.

We are in a serious mood and are preparing serious proposals for that meeting -- whatever is said by right-wingers and other personalities around President Reagan. We would not have agreed to the meeting if we did not have faith in the possibility of its positive outcome. Such is our position.

You have also asked about my personal opinion of the President. I have not met with him and it is difficult for me to express my opinion of him in human terms. But in political terms we proceed from the premise that the President was elected by the American people, which is respected by our people, and we are prepared to do business with him.

Henry Grunwald: I would like to ask a question concerning space weapons. In your written replies to our questions and in the conversation with us you said the Soviet Union wished to reach accords in three areas: strategic offensive arms, medium-range nuclear arms, and space arms. Yet, from the commentary that one reads coming from Moscow, there seems to be really no room for talks on the problem of space weapons because the only thing you want with regard to space weapons is to stop them, to stop all research. So I want to ask if the Soviet Union is prepared to conduct talks on space weapons? For it is known that you, too, have conducted and are conducting extensive research in this field and, therefore, evidently realize that it is impossible to stop this activity entirely on the strength of talks. One can only reach accord on some agreed-upon levels or limits.

Mikhail Gorbachev: A very fundamental question. If there is no ban on the militarization of outer space, if an arms race in space is not prevented, then there will be nothing at all. This is our firm position. And it is based on our most responsible appraisal that takes into account both our interests and those of the United States. We are prepared to conduct talks, but not on space weapons; not on what specific types of these weapons it will be allowed to deploy in outer space. We are prepared to conduct talks on preventing an arms race in outer space.

The Soviet Union proposed that agreement be reached in Geneva on the prohibition of the development, including research, testing and deployment of strike space weapons. It is necessary for a ban to embrace every phase of the inception of this new class of armaments. Research, indeed, is a part of the program to develop space weapons. So when we see that the United States appropriates tens of billions of dollars for this research, we absolutely clearly realize the real plans of the authors of those programs, and the

eventual goal of the policy on the deployment of weapons in space that stems from those programs.

When we speak about research and the need to ban it, we naturally do not mean fundamental sciences. This research is going on and, obviously, will continue. What we speak about is development projects in the United States carried out under assignments and contracts from the Pentagon; moreover, about those which have reached a point when there are bound to appear models and experimental prototypes and when out-of-laboratory, field experiments, and tests are to be conducted -- in short, when everything necessary for the subsequent stage of designing and producing appropriate systems is being done. When the United States asks us if it is possible to verify compliance with an appropriate ban, we say it is. Verification with the help of national technical means is possible at the stage I have just described. If we now can discern car license plates from space, we will most certainly be able to monitor out-of-laboratory, field tests. The main point here is that if the process is stopped in the initial phase of the so-called research, any interest in the subsequent stages of the development of space weapons will evaporate. Who will then be willing to squander resources?

However, if tens of billions of dollars are spent on research, no one, naturally, would like to stop halfway. And when weapons are ultimately placed in space, the process will get out of hand altogether and we will reach, as I have already said, a situation the consequences of which will be impossible to predict.

And you can be certain that the other side will not be sitting on its hands.

Talk about a purely research character of the SDI is basically meant to conceal the extensive process of the development of space-based weapons systems.

The fact that the United States is now planning to test second-generation ASAT systems is fraught with serious consequences. We will have to react to this adequately. In fact, what it amounts to is the testing of certain components of space-based ABM systems. Moreover, we have to reckon with Washington's negative response to our proposal that the United States join our moratorium on nuclear explosions.

The U.S. Government also refuses to stop tests because it needs them to develop nuclear pumping for laser-based ABM systems. But these are components of a future space-based ABM system. And what if the program is put into top gear? Let America think seriously about the consequences of this.

Perhaps someone in the United States has decided that the possibility of overtaking us has put a hold on the Soviet Union. But this is an illusion. It was not achieved in the past, and it will not be achieved now. We shall find a response, and quite an adequate one at that. But then all the talks will be buried and I do not know when it will be possible to return to them. Perhaps, this prospect is to the liking of the U.S. military-industrial complex but we, anyway, are not going to play into its hands.

Our proposals are meeting the interests of both the Soviet people and the people of the United States. And this is precisely what riles representatives of the military-industrial complex most of all. And, one must say, there are many of them in the United States, quite a few in the government, too; and we feel that, of course. But I must say that we have a huge reserve of constructiveness. We will continue to urge the U.S. Government to take a different approach. Great opportunities would then be opened in the field of strategic nuclear arms and medium-range systems alike and the way would be clear for a serious process of improving relations between our countries and for resolving other international problems.



When I was in Dnepropetrovsk recently, a worker asked: What are these "star wars" plans made by President Reagan? Will the United States not deceive us? I replied: Do not worry, we will not let ourselves be deceived. But if our partners in the talks show readiness to look for mutually acceptable solutions, we will make every effort to reciprocate.

I think our position is humane and unselfish: It fully meets the interests of the Soviet Union, the United States, and all other peoples as well.

Don't you Americans have any better use for your money? We know that you have problems that must be solved. Perhaps, we do not know them as well as we do our own -- but we do know them.

Ray Cave: I would like to ask two questions. I have sensed in your words concern over certain events related to U.S. statements and actions during the past few weeks. I have in mind, specifically, the announcement of the forthcoming ASAT tests and also the very strange case of chemicals with which Americans were supposedly dusted in Moscow. Apparently, these two events cannot be considered auspicious in the context of intensive preparations for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. Have these two events come as a surprise to you and have they seriously damaged summit preparations?

Mikhail Gorbachev: As for preparations for the Geneva summit, I can assure you that we are preparing seriously for it, attaching immense importance to that meeting, and pinning serious hopes on it. True, we do hear the pronouncements of our partners which show that Washington attaches a more modest importance to the summit and characterizes it as a mere "get acquainted" meeting and a possibility to draw up an agenda for some future, remote talks. But it is too great a luxury for the leaders of the two such states as the Soviet Union and the United States to go to Geneva merely to get acquainted and then admire Lake Geneva and the Swiss Alps. When the international situation is so tense, it would be an unpardonable luxury.

In short, we are seriously preparing for the meeting and will do everything possible for it to yield tangible results for the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Ray Cave: In a magazine article to be released this weekend, former President Nixon says that an agreement limiting or reducing arms, but not linked to restraints on political conduct, would not contribute to peace. In effect, he is saying that the first priority of a summit should not be arms control, but potential flash points and pressure points between the United States and the Soviet Union. Do you share that view?

Mikhail Gorbachev: It was interesting to hear from you about Mr Nixon's viewpoint. As for specific issues we will discuss with President Reagan in Geneva, we are working on them in conjunction with the U.S. Department of State and the White House. This process is continuing and I would not like to go into details at this stage.

But I have associations of a different nature with Nixon's name. There was a time when, despite a complex situation, we managed to find possibilities and ways for developing cooperation with the U.S. Government under Nixon. Very important decisions were made at that time.

Recall the 1960's. The international situation was not relaxed at that time either. But it was in 1963 that a very important treaty banning nuclear tests in the three media, still effective today, was concluded.

All this belongs to history. But history is good when its lessons are not wasted. So now we must look at the situation from responsible positions of statesmanship and find ways to improve the situation and to put right Soviet-U.S. relations.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET POSITION FOR REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING PRAISED

PM091557 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Sep 85 p 3

[Political observer Nikolay Pastukhov "View of Events": "Moscow's Clear-Cut Position"]

[Text] There is a little over 2 months left before the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva. Time is slipping by. A great deal must be done in a short period, and the main thing is to make headway on the acute problems that have pushed present-day international relations onto the road to a dangerous U.S.-USSR arms race and confrontation. Whether mankind travels the path of detente or rolls closer and closer to the brink of the abyss depends on the positions of these two powers....

As for the Soviet Union's position, it has again been clearly reflected in Mikhail Sergeyeovich Gorbachev's recent replies to TIME magazine and in a number of his other statements. The broad response triggered worldwide by our country's clear-cut and consistent foreign policy line is no accident either. People in all countries are tired of the militarists' drumbeat. They are suffering from the arms race, which consumes immense resources drawn from their pockets. Moreover, the arms race deprives them of their main right -- the right to life....

That is why the new Soviet initiatives are meeting with such ardent approval in all corners of the globe and are inspiring mankind with the hope that peace and security can still be saved and detente and mutually advantageous international cooperation resumed.

"Moscow's foreign policy strategy," AP was forced to admit, "has been assessed positively by Western news and public opinion organs. Moscow is continuing to conduct a peace offensive." These laconic phrases express the essence of the historic role which the Soviet Union plays in the international arena.

Here is another admission. Commenting on the reception of U.S. senators by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, R. Byrd, leader of the Democratic faction in the Senate, stated in an interview with NBC: "The Soviet leader implied that progress must be achieved during the Geneva meeting and that we must avoid war. He also hinted that, as soon as agreement is reached on the 'star wars' problem and this agreement is on the table in the form that the Russians have been striving for, the Soviet side will be prepared, as M.S. Gorbachev put it, for radical proposals in the area of arms reductions. In general, the Soviet leader sharply criticized the very concept of 'star wars,' pointing out that these are first strike weapons." M.S. Gorbachev, Byrd said in conclusion, "showed interest -- and I want to stress this once again -- in Soviet-U.S. dialogue. He is looking forward to the Geneva meeting."

The other day I met with James Jackson, head of TIME's Moscow bureau. He was one of the organizers of the interview and personally attended the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. Sharing his impressions, he said:

"I was pleased to come to Moscow again (some years ago J. Jackson worked in Moscow as CHICAGO TRIBUNE correspondent -- N.P.). I have a great love of the Russian language and want to improve my fluency. I understood a great deal of what M.S. Gorbachev said without an interpreter. Your leader made a very great impression on me with his dynamism and sincerity. We published his replies virtually in full in our magazine and thereby, so we hope, made our own contribution to establishing mutual understanding between the American and Soviet peoples."

To the question of what he currently considers to be the most important aspect of tense present-day international relations, James Jackson replied:

"Only constructive U.S.-Soviet summit talks can reduce this tension."

In Moscow recently I met with Lane Palmer, chief editor of Philadelphia's FARM JOURNAL magazine, whom I have known since 1975. He first visited this country as a member of the U.S. agricultural delegation headed by U.S. Secretary of Agriculture J. Block and he is now traveling around the Soviet Union with the aim of familiarizing himself in more detail with our agriculture and the social gains that have been achieved in the countryside during socialist building.

Lane Palmer is well acquainted with almost all U.S. farmers, understands their needs and problems, and defends the needs of farming America in his magazine. He has great respect for our country and does everything to organize good U.S.-Soviet cooperation and mutual understanding.

"M.S. Gorbachev's replies to TIME," he said during our talk, "made an enormous impression on me. My heart bleeds when I think of the senseless waste of funds caused by the preparations for 'star wars.' Militarism is unnatural to the way of thinking of farmers, who produce food for people and guarantee their lives. Encroaching on those lives is a crime in itself..."

The entire world ardently welcomes the Soviet Union's peace initiatives. The reader can be sure of this from the widespread responses published in the Soviet press. But the present situation in the world gives no grounds for complacency. Imperialism is persisting and continuing to swell the bellows of militarism.

This is attested by the fact that Washington has officially announced its intention to test an ASAT antisatellite system against a real target in space in the near future. Thus, Washington is taking yet another step to escalate the arms race and spread it to space. And, it is doing this despite the fact that the commitment unilaterally adopted by the Soviet Union not to put antisatellite systems into space has been in force for 2 years now. At the end of August the Soviet side again called on the U.S. Administration to weigh up the inevitable negative consequences of its planned tests for political and military stability in the world and prospects for the Geneva talks. The TASS statement on this subject published the other day points out: "In the event that the United States tests antisatellite weapons against targets in space, the Soviet Union will consider itself freed from its unilateral commitment not to put antisatellite means into space. The entire responsibility for the further development of events will lie wholly with the U.S. side."

But that is not all. West German TV recently carried an expose of the U.S. military's highly dangerous militarist preparations. The "Monitor" program broadcast extracts from Congressional documents and speeches by Pentagon chief Weinberger and General Rogers, supreme commander, NATO allied Armed Forces, Europe, which reaffirmed for the umpteenth time that the Pentagon is preparing for war using the monstrous neutron weapons. And, finally, the United States is continuing to push ahead with the work to implement the "star wars" program.

All these facts attest that the world's peoples must show the greatest vigilance and not be taken in by the unctuous and false claims by the Washington administration about its "desire for peace."

The statement that war will never proceed from the USSR is not "propaganda," as certain circles in the West are trying to say, the eminent Ecuadorean statesman Juan Isaac Lovato said. The Soviet initiatives have been dictated by the USSR's genuinely sincere desire to ensure peace, curb the arms race, and prevent nuclear war. Under these conditions, the statements by Washington administration spokesmen aimed at justifying the development and creation of new types of mass destruction weaponry and the transfer of the arms race to space are blasphemous. Mankind cannot live on a nuclear volcano.

Some 7 years ago, John Hackett, a British general with a NATO service record, forecast that World War III would start at dawn on Sunday 4 August 1985. The prophecy did not materialize. However, 40 years without a war are not a gift from the gods. They are the result of the tireless actions of our country, the other socialist states, and all the world's peace-loving forces.

The militarists' old and new prophecies will not materialize either! The guarantee of peace is the clear-cut foreign policy position of Moscow, which is ardently interested in strengthening peace and international security.

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ON U.S.-USSR RELATIONS STRESSES SPACE ARMS

PM111602 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Sep 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Following a Leninist Course of Peace"]

[Text] The Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries are tirelessly struggling for peace and international security. Socialism needs peaceful conditions for its development and for the increasingly extensive satisfaction of the people's new and varied needs.

The dynamic and constructive foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and the USSR's bold initiatives accord with the vital interests and profound aspirations not only of the Soviet people, but of all the world's peoples and inspire them with real hope of changes for the better. This was borne out utterly convincingly by the world public's widespread positive response to M.S. Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine and his statements made during his talk with a group of American senators. The analysis of the international situation contained in them and the setting forth of the USSR's position on the main problems of the day and its practical policy are imbued with a sense of the Soviet leadership's immense responsibility to its people and all mankind.

The truth must be faced. A tense and explosive situation has arisen in the world. Despite the talks that have started in Geneva between the USSR and the United States and the agreement on a Soviet-U.S. summit, relations between the two countries continue to deteriorate, the arms race is intensifying, and the military threat is not abating.

A reality of our time lies in the fact that the level of scientific and technological development makes possible the emergence of an entirely new situation and the start of an entirely new stage of the arms race. The schemes of U.S. militarist circles to achieve military supremacy over the USSR at all costs, including by means of creating first-strike space weapons, are fraught with consequences that threaten world peace.

Obviously someone in the United States thought that an opportunity would arise to overtake us and pressure the Soviet Union. But that is an illusion. That did not succeed in the past, nor will it succeed now. We will find an answer, and an entirely adequate one at that. However, if the arms race enters a new phase and is transferred to space, and if the latest achievements of science and technology are used to that end, the danger of a fateful outcome will grow still further.

Breaking this vicious circle, getting the arms limitation process out of deadlock, and ensuring a switch toward peaceful development and mutually advantageous cooper-

ation is now the task of the day. The Soviet Union persistently seeks ways of solving it. It not only calls for the improvement of the situation, but makes concrete proposals and takes practical steps in this direction.

A graphic example of this is provided by the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions introduced from 6 August, and the call to the United States to follow this example and resume the talks on total ban of nuclear tests. The same can be said of the USSR's proposals at the Soviet-American talks on space and nuclear weapons, the proposal submitted at the United Nations for international cooperation in the peaceful development of outer space under conditions of its nonmilitarization, and the measures we propose for military detente and confidence building. The materialization of these proposals would contribute to a radical solution of the problems of the nonmilitarization of outer space and reduction of nuclear weapons, and would provide a good incentive for practical movement toward the ultimate goal: liquidation of nuclear weapons and consolidation of universal security.

In Washington, however, one can sense an obvious shortage of the necessary sense of responsibility for the fate of peace. In "response" to the Soviet moratorium, the U.S. Administration demonstratively hastened to carry out another nuclear explosion. It responded to the proposals for a peaceful outer space by the decision to conduct the first combat test of an antisatellite weapon, although it is well-known that stubbornness in the implementation of the "star wars" program and refusal to ban the creation of space weapons will bury any talks. Washington has also launched another "hate campaign" against the USSR. There is a certain confusion and anxiety lest the peaceful Soviet initiatives totally undermine the fabrications by imperialist propaganda which is trying to depict our country as the source of universal danger, because the arms race policy is essentially founded on this slander. It may be that such an approach suits the representatives of the U.S. military-industrial complex, but it generates concern and protest among the peace-loving forces.

Of course, Moscow is fully aware of the deep divide between us and the United States in terms of fundamental differences between our two systems. But the main and determinant factor in Soviet-American relations is the immutable fact that, whether we like one another or not, we can survive or perish only together. There is no other way but to live in peace with one another. Our countries simply cannot let themselves carry matters to the point of confrontation.

The USSR calls on the United States to achieve serious accords on strategic nuclear weapons, on medium-range weapons, and on space problems. One would like to hope that everything negative that has been heard from Washington in response to the Soviet Union's new peace-loving steps is not the U.S. Administration's final word. A quest for points of contact and zones of common or parallel interests is possible. There are grounds for this. Had matters stood otherwise, the USSR would not have agreed to go to the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva in November.

The Soviet Union is in a serious mood and is preparing serious proposals for this meeting. It is getting ready for the meeting with sincere good will and the desire to do everything possible to strengthen peace. Our country has a vast reserve of constructiveness.

The USSR's new peace initiatives have given a mighty additional impulse to the antiwar movement. Soviet people, engaged in the implementation of the ambitious plans of communist building, ardently approve and unanimously support the Leninist course of peace and peaceful coexistence followed by the party. The demand by millions echoes with growing strength over the planet: Curb the arms race and avert the nuclear threat from mankind.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW: CHANGE IN U.S. STANCE KEY TO BETTER RELATIONS

LD081812 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 8 Sep 85

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union's unilateral suspension of all nuclear explosions has now been in force for 1 month. Our commentary is by Yuriy Solton.

When the Soviet Union announced its moratorium it called on the United States to follow suit. A joint Soviet-American moratorium would unquestionably break the stalemate in nuclear arms limitation. Realistic efforts in this direction have always begun with a ban on nuclear tests.

A total ban on nuclear tests, and this is the objective of the Soviet moratorium, would stop the race in the most dangerous area, the area of quality. Unfortunately the United States responded to the Soviet call by beginning another series of explosions at the nuclear proving ground in the State of Nevada.

If the Soviet Union has stopped nuclear explosions unilaterally, this shows how very much it wishes to curb the nuclear arms race. Other Soviet proposals have the same purpose. Some have to do with the extremely important problem of keeping weapons out of space, because if weapons are allowed into space the arms race will have the green light everywhere on earth too. At the Soviet-American talks in Geneva this country has proposed a total ban on strike space weapons, including antisatellite weapons. Two years ago the Soviet Union declared a unilateral moratorium on antisatellite systems, and this has remained in force to this day. Yet Washington says that no matter what the Soviet Union does, the United States is going to prepare for "star wars," and that includes developing antisatellite weapons. The plan to stage the first test of this kind in the current month of September, says Washington, remains unchanged.

This can only mean that the United States will move directly to begin deploying strike space weapons. Someone in Washington must be thinking there's a chance now to get ahead of the Soviet Union; now this is an illusion. The Soviet Union has never allowed that and never will. It will find a fitting response, but that will spell the end of all negotiations and no one can say when they will ever be resumed.

Still and all, the Soviet Union has a tremendous reserve of constructive effort, as Mikhail Gorbachev told the American TIME magazine just recently. The Soviet Union, he said, would continue to urge the United States Government to take a different approach. Then great opportunities would come to the fore in the areas of strategic nuclear weapons and medium range facilities and the way would be clear for serious efforts to better Soviet-American relations and settle other international problems.

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS CRITICIZES REMARKS BY U.S. OFFICIALS ON SDI

Adelman 'Juggling With Facts'

LD112127 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 11 Sep 85

["Adelman Advertises Futile Fantasies"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 11 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Kenneth Adelman asserts that predictions of leading scientists of the world about technical unfeasibility of Reagan's plans of "star wars" are allegedly irrational and based on unsupported conclusions.

Addressing the Council on World Affairs of Cleveland, Ohio, he declared in protection of the deployment in the USA of large-scale anti-missile defence with elements of space basing. Adelman specifically stated that in the past, too, scientists had been mistaken in trying to prove that it would be impossible to implement some or other technical projects. He recalled that great American scientist Thomas Edison had believed that practical use of alternating current will be impossible. In 1932 Albert Einstein called in doubt the possibility of man's using nuclear energy. Other scientists rejected the idea of television. Adelman turned to history in an effort to prove that reliable and economically feasible anti-missile defence is not a futile fantasy and empty dream.

Indeed, even famous scientists made errors in their predictions in the past. But the director of the U.S. agency is on purpose juggling with facts, for instance, by placing on par a debate on the advantages and disadvantages of alternating or direct currents, the debate which in the long run had the aim of finding the most rational way of using the electric energy, and the problem of two means of armed struggle pursuing diametrically opposite aims.

The illusory but nevertheless extremely dangerous plans of the militarisation of space harboured by Washington, are aimed at creating technical means that would ensure the "safety" of the aggressor dealing the first nuclear strike. The means of penetrating the destabilising large-scale anti-missile defence have the aim to prevent the adventurists, who hope that their aggression will go unpunished, from unleashing nuclear war.

Adelman justly notes that "human ingenuity overcame human expectations and even expert predictions". But for understandable reasons he prefers to exert efforts to prove that technical breakthroughs are, allegedly, possible only during the implementation of the U.S. programme of "star wars". A legitimate question arises, is there no



room for success in the sphere of creating means of neutralising the U.S. plans of inundating space with arms? The entire experience of humanity over the past two millenia refutes the "argumentation" of the director of the U.S. agency that is built on sand.

Contrary to what is asserted by the representatives of the Reagan administration, the creation of the large-scale space-based anti-missile defence in the USA is not at all aimed at making nuclear weapons useless and obsolete. The arms race in space will only aggravate the arms race on earth, will remove the prospects of achieving agreements on the whole complex of problems of arms limitation and reduction. Contrary to Adelman's assertions, Reagan's "Strategic Defence Initiative" remains a futile undertaking, which is nevertheless very dangerous for humanity.

#### Weinberger Interview Cited

LD111732 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 11 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, 11 Sep (TASS)--TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

The U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger gave an interview to a group of journalists from NATO countries, in which he set forth with utmost frankness and cynicism the stand of the Reagan administration towards space militarization plans.

The head of the U.S. military establishment unambiguously stressed several times that the United States does not intend to discuss with the Soviet Union the question of any limitation on the development of components of a large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements and of attack space arms under way in the United States within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative." In the process, C. Weinberger made it clear that the Reagan administration is determined to bring them at least to the stage when the United States would be ready to deploy these systems in near terrestrial orbit.

Abandoning the "strategic defense system" is something to which the President, as the latter declared on more than one occasion, is not ready to go, said C. Weinberger. According to the U.S. secretary of defense, the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is so important to the President that "it cannot and should not be a bargaining chip" at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva. He noted that the administration holds a very tough stand on this issue. At the same time, Weinberger did not conceal that the United States intends to work towards getting a reduction in the Soviet defensive missile potential. So, Washington has made another attempt to distort completely the key element of the accord, reached last January, to address and tackle at the Geneva talks the entire complex of issues pertaining to nuclear and space arms.

The Washington "hawk" also tried to convince West Europeans that work under "star wars" programme allegedly fits into the framework of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. Such arguments are obviously meant for simpletons and incompetent people. George Brown, a member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, has recently emphasized that the development of space arms, including strategic systems and anti-satellite weapons, threatens the very foundation of control over nuclear armaments, laid down by the ABM Treaty.

The very fact that the White House has officially proclaimed the "Strategic Defense Initiative" a state research programme is in conflict with the Treaty on the Limitation

of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the more so in conditions when experimental models of attack space arms are already in development in U.S. laboratories and some of their types are in testing at U.S. proving grounds.

The U.S. secretary of defense used the possibility to promise governments of West European allies, which, as he admitted, do not express so far particular zeal to become accomplices in Washington's provocative venture, almost a "fortune" if they agree to take part in scientific-technical cooperation to implement the "star wars" programme. However, wittingly or unwittingly, he has in actual fact admitted that the United States is eager to use in its selfish interests technical and manpower resources of its allies.

The Reagan administration, he said, is interested in involving as many people as possible, the best brains in the world, in the work on the project. According to Weinberger, the United States is pressing Western Europe for, above all, "brains contribution" to the "star wars" programme.

The Pentagon chief began justifying for one hundredth time the course of militarizing outer space, embarked on by the Reagan administration, by a certain "humane" purpose of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" and false statements to the effect that the United States is allegedly "catching up" with the Soviet Union in this field. But all these fabrications collapse like the house of cards when compared with real facts. What remains is the poorly disguised striving of Washington to achieve, by creating a "space shield" with the simultaneous build-up of U.S. offensive armaments, a strong military superiority over the Soviet Union.

CSO: 5200/1391

**SDI AND SPACE ARMS**

**TASS: FURTHER ON U.S. SEARCH FOR ALLIED SUPPORT OF SDI**

**Gen O'Neill in Italy**

**LD052146 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 5 Sep 85**

[Text] Rome, September 5 TASS -- American military and technical experts, led by General O'Neill, who are members of the organisation for realising the "Strategic Defence Initiative", have arrived in Rome to study the prospects of Italy's participation in the "star wars" programme and choose specific fields for American-Italian cooperation within the SDI programme which would bring the most substantial results.

The trip's programme includes meetings with representatives of state and private owned industrial companies and of military firms.

The development and production under the SDI of electronic optical equipment, highly effective computers and various components for space satellites are regarded by the United States as the most promising field for American-Italian cooperation.

**U.S. Pressure on Denmark**

**LD111503 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 11 Sep 85**

[Text] Washington, September 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Alexander Lyutyy reports:

Talks between U.S. President Reagan and Danish Prime Minister Poul Schluter, who came here on an official visit, were held in the White House. The talks centered on East-West relations, strengthening of NATO and trade and economic relations.

Welcoming the Danish prime minister in the White House, President Reagan pointedly lauded the "active role" of Denmark in the NATO bloc. During the talks, as it became clear from the explanations by a top administration spokesman, the Danish prime minister was told about the need for complete unity among NATO members, especially on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting due in November.

The U.S. Administration wants its allies to unswervingly follow its unconstructive position on the recent important foreign policy initiatives of the USSR. The White House is especially keen on involving them in Reagan's "star wars" plans. However, as the White House talks showed, resistance towards plans of militarising outer space is not waning on the continent. Judging by the pronouncements of the administration's

spokesmen, Schluter, despite crude pressure, refused to toe Washington's line on the issue.

The Danish Government is known to have decided not to take part in the "star wars" programme.

At the same time the Danish premier reaffirmed his government's commitment to strengthening "cooperation" with Washington in other military fields within the framework of the NATO bloc.

Discussions of trade and economic problems revealed for the umpteenth time serious differences between the two countries. Poul Schluter pointed to the destructive effect on the economies of West European countries of the tough protectionist measures adopted by the Reagan administration in this bid to burden the partners with its own economic problems.

### Canadian Resistance

**LD092211 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 9 Sep 85**

[Text] Moscow, 9 Sep (TASS) -- TASS observer Vladimir Vashedchenko writes:

Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney has stated that "Canada's policies and priorities did not warrant the country's efforts on an intergovernmental level in support of research work within the framework of the Strategic Defense Initiative" program.

Canada is the sixth NATO ally to say "no" to the U.S. proposal to take part in preparations for "star wars."

France, Norway, Greece, Denmark, and Australia have also rejected the Reagan administration's promises. Italy's position, as THE LONDON TIMES reports, remains vague and even the FRG Government is now showing increasing doubt about this project. Essentially, to date only the Tory government in London has given outright support to Washington's plans, which are dangerous for universal peace.

Resistance to American plans to transfer the arms race into space has gripped countries on all continents. It is gathering strength and is widening on an official, interstate level. Mass antiwar demonstrations are taking place in Europe, America, Asia, and Africa.

This is, perhaps, one of the most large-scale nationwide movements, dictated by the desire to prevent a nuclear war and to save mankind. In the world it is now being more clearly perceived that the SDI program and its so called research portion is a new and even more dangerous round of the arms race, which will inevitably lead to a worsening of the international situation, and which will make it even more complicated and explosive.

The Canadian prime minister explained his decision to turn down Washington's invitation for SDI participation by the fear that if Canada participated in this program it might "find itself in a position in which the situation would get out of our control and the Canadian Government would find itself unable to regain [regulirovat] it."

A similar anxiety exists not only in Canada but also in the countries of Western Europe. Broad sections of the public in these countries understand that, in joining the American program of "star wars" preparation, they will find themselves hostages of the United States, which will undermine their sovereignty and independence.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ENVOY AT IPU MEETING DENOUNCES 'STAR WARS'

LDO62103 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 6 Sep 85

[Excerpt] Ottawa, September 6 TASS -- It is necessary to struggle against war before it breaks out, and by joint efforts. Peace should be established by united, concerted and vigorous efforts of all nations, said Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Parliamentary Group and chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He addressed the 74th conference of the Interparliamentary Union, in session here. Lev Tolkunov denounced Reagan's "star wars" programme and stressed that the Soviet Union suggests solving the problem radically, that is by banning and eliminating space arms.

In this connection of the speaker drew attention to the importance of the Soviet proposal "on international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space in conditions of its non-militarization", which was submitted to the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

CSO: 5200/1391

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### MOSCOW TV CALLS SDI CONCEPT 'UNFEASIBLE, UTOPIAN'

LD082236 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 8 Sep 85

[From "International Panorama" program presented by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Excerpts] World public discussion of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to the U.S. TIME magazine has become an important and large-scale event of the past few days. The "Vremya" program has quoted excerpts from commentaries in the foreign press and utterances of prominent political and public figures. My colleagues on the "World Today" program have also talked about this. Now I would like to dwell on one very vital aspect connected with the replies of the Soviet leader. What I mean is the appraisal of the U.S. so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. Comrade Gorbachev's interview notes that it is impossible to take seriously the assertion that this initiative guarantees invulnerability from nuclear attack weapons [sredstva] and that it, at the same time, will even lead to the liquidation of nuclear arms. This, as Comrade Gorbachev stressed, in the opinion of both our specialists and U.S. specialists, is a fantasy which cannot be realized -- a castle in the air.

Where does the unfeasible and utopian nature of this program and, at the same time, its extreme danger lie? I will tell you the opinions of U.S. and West European scientists. In their common view, the creation of an antimissile defense with spaced-based elements requires such a complex system of computers on earth and in space that it turns into utopia. They assert that the effectiveness of this computer system could only be tested during a military conflict and that, in itself, is madness. Errors are not only possible, but probable. Computers have to react to a missile launch within only a few seconds; they have to process the warning signals coming in from detectors, analyze them, and give the command for laser weapons to be trained on the target. It is conjectured that the warning detectors will react to the hot exhaust gases of missiles. But how easily they could be taken for many natural phenomena. It turns out that all this is to happen without intervention from man. A qualitatively new situation will arise. The question about war and peace will thus be dealt with not by people, but by computers. We people of the 20th century make wide use of the achievements of scientific-technical progress. Without its acceleration and advancement, the resolution of major economic and social problems is inconceivable. However, putting one's trust in computers in the question of war and peace is sheer adventurism. In the self-same United States, in the space of only 6 months, the alarm was sounded by mistake 47 times and nuclear weapons were brought to combat readiness. This is why there are scientists in the West who consider the realization of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative dangerous.

These scientists are declaring that it is impossible to set up some sort of impenetrable shield; it is impossible to put up an impenetrable umbrella over the Western hemisphere. The Strategic Defense Initiative is nothing but another round of the arms race. It will inevitably lead to new aggravation of Soviet-U.S. relations, and bring the world to the brink of war.

However, it would be wrong to think that there are no scientists who zealously support Reagan's initiative. There is the selfsame Edward Teller, considered the father of the atom bomb. He is actively standing up for the "star wars" program by trying to convince his colleagues in the United States and traveling to West European countries winning specialists from other countries over to his side.

CSO: 5200/1391

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

REASONS FOR USSR'S 'SHARP REACTION' TO SDI

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 30, 4-11 Aug 85 p 7

[Article by Vladimir Kornilov, Secretary, Soviet Peace Committee]

[Text]

It has taken quite a considerable time in the US itself, in Western Europe ~~and other parts of the world~~ for public opinion to begin to realize that the practical implementation of Washington's "strategic defense initiative" may prove to be a ticket for the last show of "star wars".

Many people in the West frequently ask: why do the Soviet Union, the Soviet peace movement, and the people of the other socialist countries react so sharply and resolutely to the US initiative? After all, it is a defence initiative aimed against nuclear missiles, not people, so there is no cause for alarm, they reason. Sadly, this kind of reasoning is current amongst certain sectors of the antiwar movement.

Recently, Geneva hosted an earnest and competent dialogue of international public opinion on how to avoid an arms race in outer space. The dialogue was sponsored by the International Liaison Forum of Peace Forces, which for more than ten years has brought together people of the most diverse political persuasions of the East, West, North and South in the name of peace, detente and disarmament.

The key objective of the meeting was to give a thorough, unbiased and well-reasoned analysis of the situation which had arisen as a result of the material preparations for the militarization of outer space in accordance with the American "strategic defense initiative", to show the consequences that a practical implementation of the "star wars" programme could lead to, to offer well-

grounded alternatives aimed at the peaceful use of space. It was considered no less important to make public the conclusions reached during

the discussion. The Geneva dialogue was remarkable in that it brought together around the conference table prominent scientists, state, political and public figures of countries of Western and Eastern Europe, the USA and of countries of the Third World, such as India, Mexico, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco and Senegal.

It is worth mentioning that the meeting was attended by Richard Caborn, a Labour MP, Mustapha El-Menif, chief of the Cabinet of the Secretary-General of the Socialist Destourien Party of Tunisia, Heinz-Günther Franke, a noted nuclear physicist from the FRG, Prof. Aulis Aarnio, chairman of the International Association for the Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy (Finland), Prof. Satish Dhawan, chief adviser to the Department of Space of the Government of India, Prof. Gverdtsiteli, member of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR, Dr. Robert Bowman, director of the Institute for Space and Security Studies from the USA, etc.

The discussion of the matters on the agenda and the concluding document of the meeting testify to the following:

- President Reagan's "strategic defense initiative", disregarding a number of the doubtful aspects of its technical implementation, is a direct threat to peace and the process of disarmament;



● If implemented, the SDI will prove to be an immense destabilizing factor in the overall strategic balance between East and West, between the USSR and the USA, which would add another extremely dangerous and costly spiral to the arms race;

● For those who possess a system of space defence, it would become a first-strike weapon; it would increase not only the risk of an accidental nuclear conflict but also of

a deliberate start of war, because in possessing such a system a country may come to believe in its own impunity;

● The continuation of scientific research, tests and deployment of space systems runs counter to the Treaty on Anti-Missile Defence and is incompatible with the aims and the subject of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons now taking place in Geneva;

● The United States should take the Soviet Union's lead in declaring never to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as well as support the Soviet proposal on halting the development of strike space weapons and freezing the already available nuclear arsenals for the duration of the Geneva talks. These measures would clear the way for deep cuts in both strategic weapons and medium-range nuclear missiles, and also the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons.

The Geneva dialogue participants came to yet another conclusion: the world's nations, political, state and public figures, businessmen and scientists should understand that the turning of weapons of war to peaceful purposes may provide the real key to the resolution of the urgent problems of today.

And finally, the last conclusion: the SDI is in fact a "space sword", not a "space shield". There should be joint efforts by all people of goodwill to prevent the arm of its initiators from raising this sword over our planet.

As a result of these conclusions, the meeting in Geneva reached an accord on the continuation of cooperation between scientists, political and public figures of different orientation in preventing an arms race in space and on joint search for ways and forms of using space for peaceful purposes.

PRAVDA ON FRG'S TELTSCHNICK, SDI PARTICIPATION

Trip To U.S.

PM051425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "As a Distraction"]

[Text] Bonn, 4 Sep -- A West German delegation headed by H. Teltschnik, chief of the Foreign Policy Department at the Federal Chancellor's Office, left for the United States today. The 30 delegation members, the newspapers say, are to specify the details of the FRG's possible participation in developing the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" plan (SDI) and the conditions of this cooperation.

The delegation, as is being reported in order to calm FRG citizens who are justifiably alarmed at the intentions of the country's leadership, are taking a whole portfolio of questions with them. In informing the public of this fact the aim is clearly to stress that the FRG leaders, before making a final decision on involving the country in working on the Reagan "star wars" plans, want to study the problem "comprehensively and thoroughly."

This, for instance, is what Bonn would like to know: What will be the nature and scope of the possible West German participation? Who will give the West German side orders and through whom? Will the FRG's industry obtain the information required for its participation? Will the federal government receive regular reports on the progress of the work on the "Strategic Defense Initiative"? Will West German subcontractors enjoy patent [avtorskiy] rights and the right to deal with the results of research work on a par with the U.S. side? And so on.

Thus, there are many questions. But the main question remains the same: To what extent will this influence the final decisions?

Although there is no united opinion in the ruling coalition on whether to participate in this extremely dangerous Washington adventure or not, the more influential figures, on whom the decision will largely depend, are in favor. Last February Chancellor H. Kohl unambiguously came out in favor of participating in SDI. It is no accident that the reservations which he made were assessed here as a tactical move.

The majority of FRG citizens, including even many parliamentarians, have a poor conception of the consequences which the development of the "star wars" program would entail for the world as a whole and for the FRG in particular. The lightweight, unconvincing arguments to which certain figures on the Rhine resort in justifying their support for

SDI and the talk about some kind of "equality" with the United States are simply distorting the main facts. Since the conservative-liberal bloc came to power, the FRG has set its sights on unconditionally toeing the line of Washington's adventurist policy. Second, the United States does not need outside financial help of "foreign brains." If it does need something it is support of a political nature. That is why Washington is holding talks with its NATO allies on SDI and by no means because it is incapable by itself of implementing its plans for the militarization of space.

That is why, as sober-minded people here believe -- and there are many of them -- the FRG Government must understand that in whatever form or on whatever scale, be it within the framework of an intergovernmental agreement or some other way that the FRG participates in SDI, it will be an accomplice of the White House in its activity aimed at wrecking strategic equilibrium in the world and undermining all agreements hitherto reached on restraining the arms race. Consequently, it will shoulder an enormous responsibility for the calamitous consequences of this step with all its attendant costs, both political and military-strategic.

### Seeks 'Indulgence'

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 20 Aug 85

[Article by Ye. Grigoryev: "Interview for an Indulgence"]

[Text] Horst Teltschik, head of the foreign policy department of the Federal Chancellery, is known in Bonn as an expert on U.S. 'Star Wars' plans. He has been to the United States to study the programme and is now coordinating the working out by various West German ministries and companies of requirements, attitudes and policies with regard to the White House's notorious Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI). So it was natural that the radio station Sueddeutscher Rundfunk decided to interview him.

The interview was granted. It was a blockbuster. Mr. Teltschik said, for instance, that West German participation in SDI "research" had no military implications. What other implications can a purely militarist programme for the development of space strike weapons have?

Mr Teltschik spoke about some "absolutely clear" assurances by the United States that no part of SDI research would cut across the ABM Treaty. However, if he had read the Treaty, it would have been "absolutely clear" to him that the aims of the American programme were incompatible with its provisions.

It was an interview for the naive, the credulous and the uninformed. Its aim was to mislead the West German public into believing that West Germany's planned participation in the 'Star Wars' programme would not mean its complicity in subverting the ABM Treaty and strategic balance.

It appears that Bonn wants to secure an indulgence in advance. That won't help it however. It is impossible to make black appear white and it is just as impossible to camouflage the aggressive objectives of SDI and, consequently, any part in that venture which is a threat to the future of the world.

(PRAVDA, August 20. In full.)

CSO: 5200/1397

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA REPORTS ON RESPONSE TO SDI IN UK

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 30 Jul 85 pp 1-4

[Article by A. Maslennikov, PRAVDA own correspondent in Great Britain: "A Look at 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] As the sharp political struggle around Washington's "Star Wars" programme proceeds on the international scene, one characteristic feature is becoming ever more pronounced. The more vigorously and persistently the White House is pushing through this programme, the higher there rise the waves of public protest, the more intense and better argued is the criticism of Pentagon space militarisation plans from those who understand the gravity of the danger impending over mankind. In Britain, as, by the way, in other Western countries, scientists march in the frontline of this mounting criticism, being by the nature of their occupations obliged to grasp the essence of technical and strategic military problems connected with the realisation of this programme.

Expressing scepticism over the desirability of participation in the American programmes of space militarisation, representatives of the political, business and academic circles also take into account the fact that the current Washington administration is tightening the restrictions on the export of so-called "defence technology" not only to the socialist countries, but also to the states which are U.S. allies. Over the last year the British press has more than once carried reports on the doors to U.S. university and state agency conferences on new materials, the production processes and other theoretical and applied problems being ever more often closed before representatives of Britain and other West European states.

It is precisely this reluctance of the U.S.A. to share its inventions and discoveries that lies, at least partially, at the base of the increasing tendency towards the organisation of "European" programmes for the development of newest technologies, as is exemplified by Eureka, the project advanced by France. Significantly enough, it has evoked a positive response in most West European capitals. The most restrained, it is true, was the attitude in London, which political commentators have interpreted as yet another attempt by the Thatcher government to stress its special relationship with Washington and on this basis receive advantages in the distribution of orders for the American space programmes.

In reality, however, this special relationship is of little help to Britain. Specialist on military-strategic problems at the London University King's College Lawrence Freedman has estimated that in the distribution of orders for the Trident programme British industry received only 30 million dollars out of the total sum of contracts of about 4,000 million dollars. The rest went into the coffers of American arms manufacturing corporations. As to the now promised "fabulous profits" which the U.S. "Star Wars" programme will supposedly bring, even those who in varying degrees are already involved in the implementation of specific projects of the programme express doubts and reservations on this score.

Finally, as the discussion of various projects included in the "Star Wars" programme enters a practical stage, it increasingly turns out that many of them are of dubious and even negative value, while at times they are simply inadequate in the scientific sense. Most recently this has graphically transpired in the field of computer support of the American space weapons plans.

So it was not by coincidence that U.S. research managers have applied for assistance in the development of the computer part of the "Star Wars" programme to the University of Edinburgh, where they have a group of specialists who have been effectively working on the theoretical and practical problems of computer technology for several years now. So Washington research administrators have tried to ensnare them in their nets, but the attempt has suddenly failed. Whereas some of the researchers, tempted by the opportunity to secure additional allocations for their own research programmes, have got down to work even though with some reservations, their colleagues from the organization called "Computer Technology and Social Responsibility" have come up against the discoveries made by Edinburgh scientists being used for spreading the arms race into space.

Having analyzed the conditions under which computer systems are meant to operate, they came to the conclusion that the attempts to build an automatic missile defence systems were doomed to failure. They outlined their conclusions in a letter addressed to U.S. Vice President George Bush, who came to London in the beginning of July to advertise and win support for the "Star Wars." The letter was signed by the leading experts in the field of computer technology.

Since the first announcement of the "Star Wars" programme in March 1983 the government of Britain, just like the governments of a number of other NATO countries, has made quite a few controversial statements in a bid to take up a position which, on the one hand, would not "offend" the mighty American military. This is exactly why the Whitehall declares that although it is not against the implementation of the "research part" of the SKI programme, it would still be desirable to avoid the spillover of the arms race into space.

In these conditions the voice of the peace-loving public acquires special resonance and significance. In Britain, this voice comes increasingly stronger at meetings and manifestations organized by progressive political parties, trade unions and various antiwar organizations whose role and public prestige have grown immeasurably in recent years.

There is a growing conviction in the broad socio-political circles of today's Britain that the hopes of the American hawks for the establishment of global supremacy through the militarization of space must be dispelled.

London, July.

(PRAVDA, July 30. Abridged.)

CSO: 5200/1397

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW RADIO TALK SHOW: ARMS, ISSUES, U.S.-SOVIET TIES

LD061928 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 6 Sep 85

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, foreign political commentator, with Nikolay Shishlin, political observer; Boris Andrianov; Valentin (Agarkayev), Madrid correspondent; and Mikhail Smetanikov, Lima correspondent]

U.S.-Soviet Summit

[Excerpt] [Shishlin] A comparatively new argument has been put forward in the American mass media recently: Handed down by the White House, the claim is being made that the United States is indeed trying to put pressure on the Soviet Union in the preliminaries for the Soviet-American summit meeting, but that this is normal political practice and a normal political ruse. They are also saying that the Soviet Union is doing roughly the same thing and putting pressure on the United States.

I believe this argument is nothing but propaganda, a mere package of flimsy American tactics to toughen the American positions in the 10 weeks prior to the Soviet-American summit meeting.

I believe that comrades will have a practical picture of Soviet-American relations, especially since this picture of Soviet-American relations was described quite thoroughly in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recent replies to questions put by the American TIME magazine. But, in point of fact, if you look at what the Americans are doing and their approach to Soviet-American relations, then what we have is a pretty dismal picture. I would like; first and foremost, to make the point that the United States has not followed the Soviet example as far as ending all nuclear tests is concerned. The Soviet Union is unilaterally observing a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Furthermore, the United States -- and this is a very serious thing -- intends, as you know, to carry out a routine test of an antisatellite weapon. The United States knows perfectly well that since August 1983 the Soviet Union has been unilaterally holding a moratorium in this area too. The present American Administration has been importunately pursuing this whole line toward an arms race in all directions.

Nor can I fail to note that the United States approaches conflict situations by demonstrating neither restraint nor responsibility. As an illustration one may cite the dramatic events that are now unfolding in southern Africa. As you know, the apartheid regime is a regime of shooting, terror, and violence. And although virtually the whole world looks on with repugnance at what is happening in southern Africa, to this day the United States voices its support for a policy of constructive engagement with the Pretoria regime.

What is going on here? This is exactly what our listeners are asking. What lies behind this American line? There are, of course, many reasons for this. However, as far as the purely practical question is concerned -- the refusal of the United States to follow the Soviet example regarding a moratorium on nuclear explosions -- the United States has practical objectives in mind here. One lies on the surface: That is to perfect their armaments, in particular those nuclear warheads for the new MX intercontinental ballistic missiles and the missile which the Americans plan to put into production, the Midgetman multistage missile, also an intercontinental missile. President Reagan, incidentally, has already promised to carry out these tests.

But as for what the Americans are keeping silent about, these are nuclear tests being carried out in the United States linked with the "star wars" program. They, of course, constitute part of the work that is being carried out in the United States to create space strike systems. To go on, this U.S. line, when it refuses even to discuss these initiatives or to seek any kind of solution on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security of the sides -- this line is, of course, linked with the United States' intention to somehow achieve a breakthrough and gain military superiority over the Soviet Union. If they cannot achieve a breakthrough and gain military superiority over the Soviet Union, then the United States will at least attempt to drain [istoshchit] the Soviet Union and prevent it from concentrating those resources it would like to devote to the pursuit of peaceful construction.

Present-day Washington is also not free of the primitive belief that a demonstration of American military might will have a strong impression on the Soviet Union. Well, generally speaking, it has to be said that this belief really is a primitive one, a flimsy one, inasmuch as it seems to me that, even in the United States, they ought to realize that the Soviet Union has at its disposal military potential equally as great as that of the United States and is capable of inflicting what is known as "unacceptable losses" on the United States.

It seems to me that in the United States' actions in the 10 weeks up to the Soviet-American summit there is a certain element of nervousness, since the American line, in both the propaganda and the political sense, does not add up. There is evidence of a definite wave of sympathy and understanding with the actions that are being taken by the Soviet Union to create a better atmosphere in Soviet-American relations. This nervousness is giving rise to a desire to cool the interest being aroused by the actions and ideas put forward by Moscow.

In this connection I would like to quote one fairly typical remark from the truly immense outpouring of reaction to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine's questions. Here is one of them: This is an observer of the French TF-1 television program. He pointed out that in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies, the tone, style, and form of the conversation were different; it was often improvised and could be readily understood. In the final analysis, this observer says, the Soviet leader wants America to witness its goodwill and the American people, of course, to feel this. It would appear that immediately after Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine and after all this broad international reaction came out, something akin to certain amendments, at least at the level of words, in the position of the present administration are being made.

#### Strategic Defense Initiative

[Lavrentyev] Nikolay Vladimirovich, among the questions is this one: What is Washington aiming at by pushing ahead with the Strategic Defense Initiative program? It is being asked by Sukharev, Petr Viktorovich, from Yaroslavl.



[Shishlin] Well, regarding this program, which is called the Strategic Defense Initiative or "star wars," the picture is essentially this: According to the assessment of the overwhelming majority of leading scientists, this is a pretty fantastic project; to create some kind of "space broom" which would in the most reliable way wipe out all nuclear weapons in space is not realistic. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated in replying to questions by TIME magazine, even if this program were implemented on an even more modest scale, this Strategic Defense Initiative, or "star wars" program, would still be a very dangerous one, very dangerous. The conclusion would be the same: In the long run, the arms race would be whipped up in all directions.

It seems to me, however, that the danger is not just in this "star wars" program. Behind the framework of this program lies the danger of a serious destabilizing effect on the whole military-strategic situation in the world. One more thing: Of course, work on this program would introduce a massive element of lack of confidence in Soviet-American relations, and, if this work is allowed to continue and no barriers are placed before it, then quests for a settlement on such vitally important questions as limiting and curtailing strategic armaments or medium-range armaments lose all meaning -- that is, if outer space is militarized.

I believe the United States is pursuing an objective in its "star wars" program which involves tying its partners up, hand and foot. It is no accident that the United States is trying to draw its North Atlantic bloc allies into implementing this program and it is natural that the United States wants to keep the more valuable results of the program for itself -- to accomplish a technological breakthrough, to carry out some kind of technological revolution. In this way the United States is hoping that it will be able to strengthen its own political positions in the Western world, and, no less important, its economic positions. That is why it is grasping this dangerous project; that is why it is saying "no" over and over again to the persistent Soviet proposals to put an end to this program, including at the research level.

#### U.S.-Soviet Relations

[Lavrentyev] Nikolay Vladimirovich, of course the Soviet people would like to live in peace with other peoples, including the American people. How could Soviet-American relations be improved?

[Shishlin] As far as necessary actions in leveling out Soviet-American relations are concerned, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a very clear answer both in his replies to questions put by TIME magazine and quite recently in his conversation with some American senators. Of course, what is needed above all is restraint and responsibility and an introduction of elements of confidence in Soviet-American relations. Let's take one step as an example. As you know, the Soviet Union long ago announced that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons. Here the United States stated that it would not undertake such a commitment. Let us suppose for a moment that the United States had reacted to the good Soviet example with a similar decision of its own. Of course, a new positive and quite substantial element would have immediately occurred in Soviet-American relations.

To go on, I would like to say that to level out and improve Soviet-American relations on a better keel can only be done if an answer can be found to the major problem of our time: ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space. I believe that this problem has been and will, undoubtedly, be the central one in our relations with the United States, and it will, of course, occupy a dominant place at the November summit with the United States.

As you know, the USSR has, at the most authoritative level, come out in favor of a new and better stage in mutual relations with the United States and it is to this end that, strictly speaking, that all the practical and concrete actions taken by the Soviet Union to create the proper atmosphere for a fruitful meeting in Geneva are geared. And, as far as the Soviet Union, the Soviet proposals, and Soviet actions are concerned, there is no doubt that the Soviet Union is working for fruitful results at the Geneva meeting. Of course, much will depend on the American position. One would think that the very logic of today's political events would increasingly and strongly prompt the United States to make certain corrections in its foreign policy. But will the present American Administration show enough will, enough political courage to introduce such changes? We will, of course, only get the answer to this question in November.

CSO: 5200/1392

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TV TALK SHOW FOCUSSES ON SDI

OW071400 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0620 GMT 7 Sep 85

["Studio 9 Replies to Television Viewers" program, presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Excerpts]

[Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting with you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center at a very important and responsible time from the point of view of world politics. The particulars of the current political situation have been dealt with extensively and convincingly by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his answers to questions from TIME magazine, and the days that passed since the publication of this interview show that it has made a great impression in the world and aroused very great interest. This is shown by the reactions of all the world's leading press organs and in the reactions from world capitals. In their letters, our television viewers expressed their unanimous support for the political course being followed by our country's leadership. It has to be said that Studio 9 has received a great deal of mail. Many questions you have asked in your letters have accumulated lately. I think that answers to these questions are of common interest, and for this purpose have decided to devote our discussion today at Studio 9 to answering your questions. I have asked Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee, to do this.

Geneva Meeting

I would like to begin our discussion today with the letter from Vasilii Petrovich Kuznetsov, an engineer in Leningrad, who writes: The Soviet Union has come out in the last few months with some important foreign policy proposals. Yet in connection with each of these proposals, U.S. leaders took negative positions. How can it be explained? How would you answer this question, Leonid Mitrofanovich?

[Zamyatin] When Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met journalists of the U.S. magazine TIME, in that deep and frank analysis of Soviet-U.S. relations, he actually answered this question. Our relations with the United States have not only not improved but they have considerably worsened in the last few months despite the fact that an agreement had been reached that, within 3 months, a summit meeting will be held in Geneva between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President.

What is the matter? Why does this happen? I would say the following: In the United States there is a very powerful group in the upper echelons of the U.S. Government which actually does not want to allow this meeting to take place. They are mainly people who are in the government itself, in the U.S. Congress, and in the military-industrial complex now exerting tremendous influence on the Reagan administration. There are three groups: The first group thinks that there should be no summit meeting at all. It is formally led by U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and his deputy, a certain Perle. Literally every day they come out with statements of an inciting character, distorting Soviet peace initiatives and insisting on a sharp increase in the arms race. It is Weinberger who said recently that there are and can be no agreements at all on the space program, and that the U.S. President will not give up his SDI, [Strategic Defense Initiative].

There is a second group that pays more attention to U.S. moods, I mean public opinion in the United States. And it occupies the following position: Yes, the talks have to be held, the talks must be held, but any agreement reached at them must be conditional -- that is what was said by McFarlane, the President's national security adviser -- and must be based on a study of the Soviet Union's behavior in various regions of the world and even on issues of not only foreign but domestic policy of the Soviet Union. In other words, this group -- and by the way, it is in charge of the committee for organizing the summit meeting in Geneva -- includes McFarlane and a second aide, Regan, who have been appointed by the U.S. President as its leaders.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, is it possible to generally assess this position as an attempt to set certain preliminary conditions on the Soviet Union?

[Zamyatin] Of course, preliminary conditions are set that everything must depend on a change in the Soviet Union's policy. They consider that even minor progress at Geneva can be achieved only through Soviet concessions.

[Zorin] Now you have named two groups. What about the third?

[Zamyatin] The third group essentially reflects the sentiments of the second group. It mainly includes congressmen and representatives of big business linked to military industries. They are not entirely opposed to the meeting, but they consider that this meeting and its results must be reduced to a minimum for U.S. public opinion. In other words, they say that there can be a meeting, but only minimal results must be expected. They are even saying that this meeting must primarily deal with questions not relating to the essence of the problems but to questions of working out an agenda for future talks between the Soviet Union and the United States over, say, the next 10 years. This is how they want to delay the real necessity of constructive solutions that should be discussed and adopted at the summit.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, now in connection with this, it would be interesting to know how the White House, how the U.S. President, has reacted to the thoughts, the assessments, the analysis given by Mikhail Sergeyevich during his talk with the American journalists?

[Zamyatin] The President's point of view was outlined the other day by Mr Speakes, the White House press representative. He said that the President had acquainted himself with the replies made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and that he welcomes the general secretary's statement that he is prepared to present serious proposals that will permit the improvement of relations.

Speakes reiterated that the President approaches the question of relations seriously, and told journalists that Reagan is ready to meet the Soviet Union halfway, in other words to proceed his half of the way toward the Soviet Union. All of this sounded generally positive as outlined by Speakes, but when journalists began questioning him about concrete Soviet initiatives, about concrete Soviet proposals, well, at this stage no positive shifts could be discerned in his replies.

#### Nuclear Weapons Tests

[Zorin] I understand. Leonid Mitrofanovich, another question posed by Novosibirsk students Veselov, Krylova, Fomin, and several others. In their letter they write as follows: It is clear to every sensible person that the Soviet decision to introduce a moratorium on underground nuclear weapons tests is based on goodwill and sets a good example. A refusal to follow this example must be detrimental to the Washington leaders in the eyes of the entire world. yet they are implementing this unpopular course. Why? Now this an interesting question. How would you answer it?

[Zamyatin] It is known that the Soviet Union recently made a proposal on a unilateral halt to any nuclear explosions. What does this mean? It means that a state has adopted an obligation not to carry out nuclear tests or any other underground nuclear explosions. This is a practical measure aimed at slowing down, at halting, the accumulation of nuclear weapons and their continuing improvement.

Indeed, the longer we go without nuclear weapons tests the faster the process -- which we call the weapons aging process -- will proceed. This means that the moratorium will create favorable conditions for achieving agreement both on ending nuclear tests as well as on promoting the ideas of liquidating nuclear weapons in general.

How did the United States respond to our proposal? It carried out an underground nuclear test. It was carried out on 17 August near Los Vegas at a depth of 300 meters. The power of the blast was about 20 kilotons. Why am I citing these figures? To show our television viewers, with this example, that the reasoning used by the United States, that it cannot accept the Soviet proposal because there are insufficient controls, means that would permit this agreement to be controlled.

[Zorin, interrupting] This reasoning is bankrupt insofar as we know exactly what it has done.

[Zamyatin] Because not only the Soviet Union but, for instance, Sweden, Finland, and the United States possess national means for detecting nuclear explosions. Therefore, a monitoring system does exist, so this is not the point.

[Zorin] A reliable system.

[Zamyatin] Now you ask: Why, after all, do they reject our proposals? Why do they not agree to these restrictive processes? Well, with underground nuclear explosions, it is apparently connected with the fact that the United States soon intends to continue conducting nuclear tests -- that is, to improve its nuclear weapons. And the measures being taken now include conducting research and practical work through underground tests for the excitation, nuclear excitation, of a chemical laser [khimicheskii lazer]. A chemical laser is needed precisely for one of the elements that will be deployed in orbit near the earth by Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. In other words, to answer briefly: They will continue tests, therefore improve their weapons, and therefore they do not want to halt the nuclear arms race.

[Zorin] And for the sake of this they are prepared to disregard the political losses that are connected with this line.

[Zamyatin] They are proceeding toward this.

'Star Wars'

[Zorin] Yes. Leonid Mitrofanovich, the authors of a number of letters ask us to discuss the so-called "star wars" program, or the SDI, as it is called in Washington, and assess it.

[Zamyatin] The U.S. President, who introduced his so-called SDI -- it is more correctly called the "star wars" program -- is implementing it with quite fanatical persistence, so to speak. He considers that the realization of this program will give the United States the opportunity to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union, which is the lifelong dream of American militarists.

What does the "star wars" program comprise? The goal of this program is the creation of an antimissile defense that would cover the entire territory of the United States. This is a goal in itself, just as all the work being done in the United States to achieve this is incompatible with the crucial provisions of the antimissile defense treaty that the United States concluded with us in 1972.

Look at the diagram that shows how the United States imagines the SDI. You see that the direction of the first strike is shown at the bottom. In other words, the United States is not reducing by even one its strategic nuclear missile weapons which must inflict the first strike on the Soviet Union. This arched diagram shows that the United States also wants to have a preemptive strike, which would inflict losses on the Soviet Union's defense system.

In other words, Reagan reasons that this is a defense initiative because it defends the United States from Soviet missiles. He does not say that U.S. military strategists, with the help of this SDI, want to inflict a preemptive strike on the Soviet Union. This, essentially, is the U.S. plan. Is it a defensive plan? No!

The process is now under way to create [sozdaniye] space strike arms and their elements, which are to be deployed on special satellites or platforms orbiting in space. In other words, everything is being done now to utilize new types of weapons, such as lasers, kinetic energy, chemical lasers, and a whole series of other new energies for military purposes, and to create increasingly more powerful weapons that are dangerous to peace.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, all that looks impressive; large expenditures and a large amount of work are involved, but serious scientists express great doubts about the effectiveness and the practical feasibility of this entire system. And in particular, a most prominent Soviet physicist and academician, Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, speaking here in our Studio 9, expressed serious doubts concerning this system's effectiveness -- that it is not at all as effective as they try to present it in Washington. And this point of view is shared by many specialists abroad and in particular in the United States.

[Zamyatin] I think that it is more obvious for Academician Velikhov. Concerning an assessment of the "star wars" program, I would like to refer to the statement Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made to U.S. journalists. He said that we cannot take seriously the allegation that the SDI will ensure protection from nuclear attack and will thus lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons. This is what Reagan says. In our view and, as I know, in the view of many U.S. specialists -- and this is confirmed by what you have just said -- this is an infeasible fantasy, an empty dream.

Even on a considerably more modest scale, in which specialists consider SDI feasible as an antimissile defense system with limited possibilities, it is still very dangerous. Mikhail Sergeyevich told U.S. journalists that this project will undoubtedly spur an arms race in all directions. And this means that the threat of war will grow.

[Zorin] The following question also arises: We are coming out with a demand to prevent the transfer of the arms race into space. And in reply we hear: What is the Soviet Union actually talking about! The arms race in space has long been an accomplished fact, so what the Soviet Union is offering is unrealistic. What could you say in this connection?

[Zamyatin] This is a completely incorrect assertion, from beginning to end. The Americans are moving toward the militarization of space on the basis of the creation of a new class of offensive space weapons. The statement to the effect that the militarization of space began with the launching of the first Soviet Sputnik...

[Zorin, interrupting] Yes, this is precisely what they allege.

[Zamyatin] Yes... is incorrect because the placement of satellites in space orbit does not mean that some kind of weapon has been deployed. In the direct sense satellites are not weapons; they carry out weather observations, observations in various scientific fields, and they also evaluate the possibility of a sudden missile attack on the state's territory. That is what they do. But the satellites do not carry weapons; they fire neither in space nor from space to earth, and therefore they are not weapons. And what are the Americans doing now? The Americans are now deploying in space, and I repeat, a new class of weapons, space strike weapons. So you see what the difference is!

[Zorin] Here is another question concerning what we are talking about which TV viewers ask in their letters. According to statements made by present administration leaders, the Americans intend to carry out tests in the not too distant future, which can be considered the beginning of the practical implementation of the militarization of space. I would like to ask you, Leonid Mitrofanovich, what will happen in this case to the moratorium which the Soviet Union has announced in this field.

[Zamyatin] Well, you see the Soviet Union, at the beginning of talks in Geneva on nuclear missile weapons and space weapons, offered to introduce a moratorium on the creation, including scientific research work; testing; and deployment of space strike weapons during the entire period of the talks in Geneva. The Soviet Union proposed a freeze of strategic and offensive weapons, a stop to deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe, and a corresponding stop to the implementation of our retaliatory measures during the period of these talks. We outlined this entire package to the Americans, and they failed to respond to it. Actually, I think that there is no progress at the Geneva talks because the Americans still refuse to discuss one of the main elements of these talks -- the nonmilitarization of space. And the agreement reached by the U.S. secretary of state and the USSR foreign minister in Geneva before the beginning of the talks stated that it is necessary to discuss in an inter-related way all three types of weapons which we have just mentioned in our discussion.

[Zorin] I understand. However, what will happen to our moratorium, after all?

[Zamyatin] Questions need to be discussed now, at the beginning. We hope there will be some sort of progress on these questions in Geneva. However, a moratorium does not mean that, if the United States uses the talks to accelerate research work in space, as they now call it... [changes thought]. But research work is not being done in the sphere of fundamental sciences or the sphere of research into new kinds

of energy, but according to the task of the military-industrial complex with a quite definite goal.

Well, because there is no U.S. proposal on space does not mean that we will endlessly sit and wait and do nothing. We cannot be deceived on this question. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said this when he answered the question of a resident of Dnepropetrovsk about what Reagan's "star wars" involves. We have stated and do state that we will not give the Americans an opportunity to gain superiority over the Soviet Union, including in this sphere. We shall take adequate measures; we shall take adequate measures.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, can one consider what you have said as an answer to the television viewers who are quite understandably concerned and pose the question: Will the constructive steps, the unilateral moratorium that we have proclaimed harm the Soviet Union, our defense capability?

[Zamyatin] I already mentioned at the beginning that we, in introducing these proposals, believe that their acceptance by the United States would create progress along the path of gradually halting and limiting the arms race. But this does not mean that, if we announce a moratorium and the United States does not join it... [change thought] Take antisatellite weapons: In 1983 we announced a moratorium on putting antisatellite weapons into space. Moreover, we said at the time that this moratorium would operate for the entire period that other states, including the United States, refrain from putting any kinds of antisatellite weapons into space. At that time we proposed to the United States that we reciprocally and fully halt work on creating antisatellite weapons and abandon tests of the systems being developed, to ban new systems and to destroy, destroy existing ones.

The United States quite recently, during preparation for Geneva, announced that they would conduct tests, combat tests, at the end of September of an antimissile system based on an F-15 aircraft and a two-stage missile. The last stage will be directed at an American satellite. Moreover, this last stage has a homing warhead. So the United States is throwing out a challenge to us that it will conduct antimissile weapons tests. Appropriately, our decision should proceed from this, adequate to what the United States is doing. This is the answer to our television viewers who ask: Will our announcement of moratoriums on certain types of weapons harm the defense of the Soviet Union?

#### UN General Assembly

[Zorin] I understand, thank you. Now another group of questions. In a little over 2 weeks the 40th session of the UN General Assembly will begin in New York. One often hears accusations directed at this organization about its insufficient effectiveness. Leonid Mitrofanovich, what would you say in this connection on the eve of the UN General Assembly session?

[Zamyatin] I would say this: The 40th session of the UN General Assembly is a momentous event of great international significance. This session coincides with the 40th anniversary of the creation of the United Nations and with the 40th anniversary of the victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism.

The UN organization was created as an instrument of upholding peace, and we have always regarded it as this and regard it so now. We think that all states must follow and support the high principles that this organization has maintained, and which must create conditions for peace and security in the world. The representatives of these states speak and express the viewpoints of their peoples. And not only express, but the very process of voting shows -- say in the last session -- that 72 resolutions were adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes directed at



strengthening peace, upholding peace, and halting the arms race -- that is, all that is connected with curbing the processes of confrontation in the world and the arms race. In this I see the great meaning of the activities of the United Nations.

Of course it does not adopt obligatory decisions, but it has an instrument that can be used for fulfilling one or another decision. This is the charter relating to the powers of the Security Council.

What are we taking to this session? Just a couple of words about this. We are taking a big new proposal on the development of space in terms of its nonmilitarization. Our initiative is calculated toward a prospective program and at uniting the efforts of all nations in the cause of the peaceful use of space and the application of space technology to satisfy the economic and social tasks of people. We are even proposing the creation of an international organization for the peaceful use of space. These are major proposals, but they can only be realized in terms of the nonmilitarization of space.

#### Western Europe-U.S. Ties

[Zorin] Thank you. Leonid Mitrofanovich, there are quite a lot of letters in our mail devoted to the problems of Western Europe. There are questions about various aspects of this problem. Today I would like to select a letter from a Kharkov physician, Comrade Smirnova, who writes: More and more often the press carries reports on differences between the United States and its Western European NATO partners. Washington is succeeding in getting Western European support for its important political actions. So, what presently dominates U.S.-Western European relations, discord or a desire for unity? That is the physician's question.

[Zamyatin] This is a very big question and it is hard to answer it briefly. I would like, however, to note two points: First of all, if we view relations between states in the capitalist world, then we must not forget the well-known Lenin formula, that two contradictory trends exist in the capitalist world: a disuniting, centrifugal one that leads to an exacerbation of contradictions; and a uniting, centripetal one that makes an alliance of all imperialists inevitable. This is Lenin's wise definition of the situation in the capitalist world, and it is completely applicable to the modern world situation.

The common character of strategic class aims remains, and from the point of view of ruling circles in the capitalist world, this question is, so to speak, a definite cementing basis of the entire community of leading capitalist countries. On the other hand, factors are operating which cannot fail to weaken [as heard] contradictions between the capitalist countries. I would consider the economic factor as the primary one in this category.

The United States, for instance, has attempted in recent years to solve its economic difficulties at the expense of its Western European allies. We have spoken many times at this table about the inflated exchange rate of the dollar, about the high interest rates that have led to an outflow of capital from the banks of Europe to U.S. banks. And this is what is interesting: You know that the state debt of the United States at present amounts to about \$2 trillion. In other words the 40th President of the United States had accumulated more debts than all 39 U.S. Presidents before him.

[Zorin] And which the next 10 presidents may not be able to pay off.

[Zamyatin] Probably. And now, if the question of a payoff arises, say a quick payoff, then 40 percent of this debt consists of debts to Western Europe. Can you imagine this? At the same time the United States wants to crush Europe, so to speak, as a competitor; it is opening markets for itself and closing markets for the European states. In other words, interimperialist contradictions are growing, and this factor cannot be escaped and this factor will grow.

Of course, recent years have taught the imperialist states to somehow find various levers that balance this process, and particularly through trans-Atlantic monopolies. But economic questions are not the only ones causing contradictions. I would say that the "star wars" program is far from enjoying applause in Western Europe. The leaders of West European countries understand that on the one hand the Americans want to create a brain drain from Western Europe to the United States to solve their problems, while on the other hand they want to attract private West European monopolies to finance these costly programs.

And finally, it is not clear where the deployment of these U.S. space weapons over Europe and over its own territory will lead. Europe may find itself in a zone of military activities and therefore many states oppose "star wars" plans while the United States exerts pressure, both economically and politically, on its allies to help solve this issue.

#### U.S.-Soviet Relations

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, I would like to close our discussion today with the following question. How would you now, at the end of summer and the beginning of autumn of 1985, in a most general way assess the international situation developing at present?

[Zamyatin] You know, I shall say the following, using again materials from Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev's talks with U.S. journalists. He said then that there are situations in which both sides lose, and these are nuclear war, the arms race, and international tension. And of course there are situations where both sides win, and these are peace, cooperation, equal security, and removal of fear of a nuclear catastrophe.

And now a stage has come when the United States and the Soviet Union really should try to come to an agreement. Preliminary agreement on the summit meeting is not yet agreement in substance. No. The talks must be conducted on specific problems, mainly problems connected with ensuring security in the world, and that means stopping the arms race, stopping attempts to militarize space. It is not by accident that Mikhail Sergeevich said that if we do not come to an agreement on ending militarization of space, and preventing this, then we shall not come to an agreement on strategic weapons or other types of weapons. They are mutually related issues. And truly, how can you come to an agreement on, let us say, the reduction of strategic weapons, or Euro strategic weapons, when during this time the Americans will be dangling over us in space elements of new types of weapons, space strike weapons targeted at space and against the earth.

We understand the seriousness of our relations with the United States. We also understand that great differences in the approach to solving problems that exist between our countries. But history shows that even in the most tense moments -- and history bears witness to this -- there were opportunities for our two countries to come to an agreement on specific major issues. I could quote here a whole series of agreements that reduced tension between our countries. Naturally, in order to get ready for the new summit meeting, it is necessary that the United States not conduct hostile propaganda against the Soviet Union, so that the American people are not incited to feel hatred for the Soviet people. But see, we have already talked about this here, how many different campaigns have been conducted lately for just one purpose: that of poisoning the general situation and atmosphere in the process of improving relations. They used to invent all kinds of nonsense -- that we dust U.S. diplomats in Moscow with chemical

powder. And when this sensation was pushed by the CIA to the U.S. television and propaganda market, it immediately drew attention, and this was the object of U.S. propagandists, away from our proposals for a moratorium on underground nuclear tests.

All the news media were occupied for several days with talks and discussions, showing various representatives who spoke on this subject. In actual fact, it is a bluff. And the Americans themselves admit that it was a bluff. I could quote a large number of U.S. sources which have realized this. It was especially realized in Western Europe that this is being done first of all as an attempt, with new vigor, to poison relations between the Soviet Union and the United States to create an unfavorable atmosphere for summit meeting preparations.

Several days ago I read about another absurdity of this sort. Some U.S. senator, apparently trying to win a laurel wreath, announced it is necessary to completely curtail trade between the USSR and the United States and to prohibit the sale of Soviet goods on American territory. Of which goods? Boxes with miniature paintings, carved chess sets, and so forth. In other words, items that represent our national Soviet arts, and are bought in the United States. So what has entered the senator's head? That all this is allegedly produced by the use of slave labor in the Soviet Union. You have to have an unrestrained imagination to invent such things, spread them throughout the entire U.S. propaganda machine, and poison relations between our two countries.

I think that it is worth ending our discussion today by drawing the attention of our television viewers to the words of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who said that despite everything happening now in the United States, we think it is still possible to find points of contact, zones of common or parallel interests. There is a basis for this. Let us take, for example, statements that it is not possible to wage a nuclear war or to win victory in a nuclear war; or that the United States is not seeking military superiority. In a word, said Mikhail Sergeyevich, I count on honest and unbiased talks permeated with a desire to find a path away from the brink of the nuclear abyss; myths and stereotypes, which have become fairly tiresome, should not be discussed at the summit meeting but real problems, the real interests of our countries and other nations, our future and the future of the entire world community. This is the aim of our party and state at this very difficult time -- a tense international moment, maybe a turning point in relations between states.

[Zorin] Thank you very much, Leonid Mitrofanovich. Thank you comrade television viewers. Naturally we have been able to deal today with only a small number of the questions you have asked. Well, this is not our last meeting in Studio 9. Thank you. And until we meet here again for our program, thank you. All the best.

CSO: 5200/1392

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW RADIO WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD082031 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 8 Sep 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Bovin, political observer for IZVESTIYA, current affairs commentator Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political observer for Central Television and All-Union Radio]

Gorbachev TIME Interview

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello comrades. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's answers to U.S. TIME magazine have attracted the most intent attention throughout the world. The reactions and commentaries in the mass media of all countries are, without exception, too numerous to count. And there is a reason for this. In the answer to TIME magazine, against the wide and clearly defined background of international events, the Soviet foreign policy course is outlined clearly and very distinctly. Listeners probably remember how former U.S. Secretary of State Haig announced: There are some things slightly more important than peace. Haig has been out of the U.S. Administration for a long time now, but the foreign policy principle that he set out has remained fundamental for the administration. With the present development of armaments, with the present nature of nuclear conflict -- if it broke out -- peace cannot be viewed as just one possible alternative. The question can only be put as follows: either peace or war -- War, moreover, as a total catastrophe. Therefore, now there is nothing more important than peace, and Comrade Gorbachev made this point simply and very clearly by saying: Whether we like one another or not, only together can we survive or perish.

[Shishlin] Vladimir Yakovlevich, I should like to say this too. Evidently these answers to questions from TIME magazine are still attracting great attention simply because they have been given as we approach the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, and the break between summit meetings between the United States and the USSR is no more and no less than 6 years. And if we ask ourselves the question: What has happened during these 6 years? Then we see that the situation has worsened. It has become worse regarding the continuation of the arms race, as new kinds of qualitative elements in this arms race can be seen to be continually increasing. Not one of the crisis situations which have darkened international relations during the course of this 6-year period has been solved. On the contrary, new crises have been added to old ones. And as far as relations between the USSR and the United States are directly concerned, to be frank, they have of course deteriorated. And having been frozen generally, they have not been preserved, so to speak, but rather spoilt, these Soviet-U.S. relations. And therefore, strictly speaking, this question of breaking this vicious circle of confrontations, trying to open up today's clouded horizons

of international politics, and really trying, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has already been quoted, to find a way, so to speak, of surviving together, and finding a way of making some kind of sensible compromises, has become all the more imperative.

[Bovin] And here, apart from the question of policies, so to speak, there is also the question of the politician carrying out these policies. For the West this interview is the first major meeting with our new general secretary. And this aspect is also actively stressed in many of the pronouncements that followed the interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich. Here for example is a typical one: THE WASHINGTON POST writes: The Soviet leader, in his interview with TIME magazine this week, demonstrated persuasive speech and vigor. He managed to create an exceptional image of a Soviet leader, possessing a lively mind, with detailed knowledge of the U.S. political situation. Generally, Western journalists and politicians often accentuate precisely the personalized side of political activity.

[Shishlin] Although, of course, they have taken this interview very seriously. Nonetheless, evidently for lack of arguments, they are saying: Yes, serious things are expressed there, but of course these things must be expressed at the negotiating table, as if fundamental problems, when outlined at the highest political level, lose their significance if they are expressed openly and in public and not just at the negotiating table where talks are exclusively confidential!

[Bovin] And it is here, particularly...

#### Arms Race

[Tsvetov, interrupting] One of these fundamental problems, which you have mentioned, Nikolay Vladimirovich, is the problem of the foolishness and the harmfulness of the race for military and strategic superiority that is now being conducted by the United States. You see, Einstein once said that the epigraph for U.S. nuclear strategy could be the following words: The atom bomb has changed everything except man's way of thinking. The thinking of the U.S. Administration has not changed much since the time when the United States had a monopoly of nuclear weapons. Remember 1945? The United States had the atomic bomb and used it on the one hand as a means of political blackmail, and on the other hand it planned, with the help of the atomic bomb, to destroy the USSR and restore capitalism in our country. The USSR caught up with the United States. The United States created the hydrogen bomb; the USSR caught up with it again. To take more recent examples: The United States started developing independently-targeted multiple warheads, fully convinced that the USSR wouldn't be able to do this -- but the USSR did it. The United States made cruise missiles, also in the hope of getting superiority, and the USSR made them too.

[Bovin] You see, the issue here isn't even that they did something and we caught up with them. We could perfectly well imagine what these multiple warheads, for example, would mean, and when we were conducting talks with them in the years 1969, 1970, and 1971, we said to them: Let's come to an agreement not to do this, and it will be better for us. But they refused. The scenario repeated itself with cruise missiles: Again we said to them, we must not go ahead with cruise missiles because then all problems, including the problems of verification, will become terribly complicated. Again they said no, because they thought that they were, so to speak, overtaking us technically. But things turned out just as we said they would. They have cruise missiles; we have cruise missiles. But this has not made it easier for them or for us. On the contrary, everything has become more complicated and more confused.

[Tsvetov] And the same situation is now developing with regard to space weapons.

[Shishlin] As regards the level of fundamental knowledge, if we talk about the potential of U.S. science and Soviet science, then here also there is probably a certain parity. In any case, those examples that have been mentioned -- and these are no longer just scientific examples but scientific and technological examples as well -- show that in this area too a breakthrough by the United States is not possible. But there is another very important consideration here. Most scientists are inclined to think this plan to create a so-called space umbrella, or if you like, a space broom which would sweep away all missiles and all warheads from space, is a fantasy. Then the question arises: Why are we alarmed? Why are we objecting to this fantastical plan which cannot be implemented in even 10 or 20 years time? But the fact of the matter is that this program is extremely destabilizing and it will have repercussions on the arms race in all areas.

[Tsvetov] That it is not just offensive but also defensive.

[Shishlin] All kinds; any kinds. And of course here you have to present the problem, as they say, quite sharply and starkly. If a line isn't drawn on these plans to create a nuclear space umbrella, if a line isn't drawn at putting space strike systems -- nuclear ones -- into space, then of course talks between the USSR and the United States, at least the present talks, will lose all meaning.

[Tsvetov] Mikhail Sergeyevich said this...

[Shishlin, interrupting] Yes...

[Bovin, interrupting] At this point I would like to stress a more general side of the question. The "star wars" program is an example of that very pre-nuclear way of thinking that you have already talked about. Security, now, cannot be one-sided; for just as the Americans in a certain sense hold the key to our security in their hands, so we hold the key to U.S. security in our hands, and therefore the only real true security is a mutual one. And for this we need to come to an agreement to hold talks, to see, as Mikhail Sergeyevich said, common areas of parallel interests.

#### Soviet-U.S. Summit

[Shishlin] And of course we must not pass over in silence the circumstance that, with just some 10 weeks to go before the Soviet-U.S. summit, a perfectly evident difference is emerging in the actions of the USSR and the United States as far as practical preparations for the Soviet-U.S. summit talks are concerned.

[Tsvetov] You mean the testing of antisatellite weapons?

[Shishlin] No, not just that. I have in mind, first and foremost, the level of political statements. The replies to TIME magazine say that the USSR is developing serious proposals for the Soviet-U.S. summit. U.S. journalists are inquisitive people, and have repeatedly asked not just Reagan but also Reagan's people whether any new proposals will be put forward in connection with the Soviet-U.S. summit. And there has been no mention of a single statement from Reagan's entourage about preparations for any new fundamental proposals for the Soviet-U.S. summit whatsoever.

[Tsvetov] They are saying, more or less: Why is the meeting needed? So that the two leaders can get personally acquainted.

[Shishlin] For an exchange of views, to discuss and map out a program for subsequent discussion.

[Bovin] Undoubtedly all of this must be discussed and a program must be mapped out. But of course, if this is to be approached seriously, then surely something more concrete, more substantial, needs to be prepared for the meeting.

[Shishlin] If we now take the agenda of the Soviet-U.S. summit, then it is conditioned by the situation itself. And of course it is perfectly clear that the dominating position should be taken up by the questions of limiting and curtailing the arms race in the first instance, nuclear, space, weapons, that is.

[Bovin] Well yes, that is the main thing.

[Shishlin] That's the central thing. Of course it's clear that crisis situations should be discussed since here also there is a difference in approaches. While the Soviet Union comes out for the use of political and diplomatic means for overcoming conflict situations, the United States, as is known, sets its hopes on its military, through direct or indirect presence, for supporting its bellicose clients, no matter which region is concerned.

[Bovin] (?Concerning the) interview then, one of the impressions, one of the main ones perhaps, is what I would call harsh realism. For you see colossal contradictions do indeed exist between us and the Americans, real existing contradictions, an enormous ideological and political abyss which divides our countries. But realism also consists in the fact that when just these kinds of circumstances do in fact exist, one should seek some mutually acceptable solutions, seek some compromises, on the very basis we were talking about: either we will live together, as Mikhail Sergeevich said, or we will perish together.

#### U.S. ASAT Tests

[Tsvetov] If the Soviet Union is preparing for these negotiations by drafting certain definite proposals, the United States is preparing for them by planning antisatellite weapons tests. Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev has warned of the serious consequences of the U.S. plans to test second generation ASAT systems. In essence, said Comrade Gorbachev, it is a question of testing certain elements of space-based antimissile defense. The TASS statement also points out this feature of the test.

I think our listeners will be interested to learn what the planned tests will consist of. The United States intends to launch a missile, which, it is planned, will hit a target in space, from an F-15 fighter flying at a high altitude. The target will be a satellite.

[Shishlin] So far the United States has already carried out 40 flight tests of various kinds. Various things are being developed. And an ASAT weapon test was to have been carried out now, but the defunct U.S. satellite that they want to hit in space is simply in an unfavorable position.

[Bovin] The point here is that a legal nuance has arisen. The President is obliged to inform Congress 15 days before these tests are conducted, and the President has notified Congress that he intends to carry one out. They wanted to do it on Wednesday, 4 September, but some fastidious lawyer in the White House worked out that the 15-day period ends exactly at midnight on Wednesday. The test has been postponed, naturally, and now 9 days will have to pass before the satellite reaches the spot they need to have it in. Then they will conduct the test and then...

[Shishlin, interrupting] And as a result they put the USSR in the position of having to make highly responsible political decisions.

[Bovin] Yes, of course, of course, of course.

[Tsvetov] That is the technical aspect of the tests, but they also have a political aspect. Antimissile weapons tests are banned by the Soviet-U.S. treaty concluded in 1972, restricting antimissile defense systems. There are, however, no agreements which might pose an obstacle to tests of ASAT weapons, and the United States is exploiting this to get around the Soviet-U.S. treaty of 1972. ASAT weapons tests will provide information that is absolutely essential for the construction of orbital battle stations designed to destroy enemy missiles.

U.S. Congressman Jim Courter, an ardent "star wars" supporter, has stated plainly that no clear line can be drawn between the capacity to destroy satellites and the capacity to destroy missiles. The United States is undertaking its tests at a time when the USSR has adopted a unilateral pledge not to be first to put into space weapons similar to those that the United States intends to test. At the Geneva talks, the USSR is proposing the destruction of antisatellite weapons, testing of which is not yet finished.

The U.S. actions run counter to all this, and consequently introduce a new danger into the present, already volatile international atmosphere.

[Bovin] We announced a moratorium in August 1983, and have not conducted a single test since then. But it was stated then that we would maintain our moratorium until such time as the other side carries out such actions. And our present statement says clearly that if the Americans carry out this test of their ASAT system, we shall consider ourselves released from our unilateral pledge, which, to my mind, is fully logical.

[Shishlin] Fully logical.

#### Nuclear Test Ban

[Tsvetov] In his replies to U.S. TIME magazine, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said: All real efforts to limit nuclear armaments have begun with bans on nuclear tests. That is to say, a total ban on nuclear testing would halt the arms race, in the sphere of quality.

[Bovin] And, incidentally, in that of quantity.

[Tsvetov] But nonetheless especially that of quality. And now that the situation has arisen in which it is difficult to achieve restrictions on nuclear armaments -- that is bound up with prolonged and complex negotiations -- a ban on all nuclear tests is still probably the most feasible arms control measure.

[Bovin] But the whole point is that a practical treaty banning all nuclear tests was 95 percent ready. We were then conducting negotiations with the British and the Americans. We had reached agreement on practically all points, including verification. There were some technical details outstanding which still had to be finally agreed. But as soon as Reagan was elected, the Americans immediately called a time out. They said: A new administration has taken office and we must study everything again. And as late as virtually the last lap, they broke off negotiations, and then declared formally that they would not resume them.

[Shishlin] One further detail: At the Geneva conference, where problems of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons are now under discussion, what is highly indicative is who now opposes a moratorium on all nuclear explosions -- the United States, Britain,



and West Germany. The overwhelming majority of states, not to mention the nonaligned and neutral countries, welcome the Soviet decision. And of course a certain psychological and political pressure is now being exerted on the United States and those of its partners which follow it in this connection.

Incidentally, it absolutely must be said that the USSR is not simply talking about imposing a moratorium and leaving it at that. No, the USSR is proposing the conduct of full-scale negotiations culminating in the drafting of a treaty on banning all nuclear explosions...

[Bovin, interrupting] All, meaning underground explosions...

[Shishlin, interrupting] Yes, yes.

[Bovin] ...Because all others are banned. Only underground tests remain. And again the Americans say: verification! What is the problem over verification? They say: What if there's an earthquake and we are unable to distinguish an earthquake from a nuclear blast?

The scientists, both ours and those of the United States, incidentally, are unanimous in saying that existing teleseismic apparatus is so sophisticated that already the nature of the waves produced by, let's say, an earthquake and a nuclear explosion is distinct in practical terms, and this can be registered on instruments.

[Tsvetov] You know, I would like to add something to that. On 12 August, when that Boeing 747 crashed in the mountains in Japan, seismic stations in Japan registered the shock. In other words, the level of the equipment is so high that it can distinguish an explosion, an aircraft crash, and an earthquake.

[Bovin] And incidentally, when we were holding talks with the Americans and the British, a whole well-developed monitoring system was proposed. We were to exchange, for example, geological data, and we were to carry out calibration blasts, in order to adjust our instruments. And there was to be a whole series of other measures, such as international seismic information banks. But they said: We have no verification. Of course they refused to sign the treaty, as there was no verification. But if everything had been done then, we would now have had everything long since. In Nevada they exploded a new nuclear charge underground. That was the start of it. We proposed a moratorium, and a few days later they conducted their 766th explosion. And they keep saying: We're lagging behind you. But we have only had 556, so how are they lagging behind, given that difference? And, incidentally, they are also trying to justify their ASAT test by saying that it simply is that the USSR has overtaken the United States, and the United States is now working to catch up.

[Tsvetov] If a ban on all nuclear tests had been achieved earlier, then the world would not now be faced by a threat such as MIRV warheads. And if this treaty on banning all nuclear tests is not concluded in the near future, then this will provide an impetus for the development of neutron weapons and laser weapons. That is, the arms race will acquire such an all-embracing, uncommonly broad nature that it may turn out to be simply impossible to stop it. That is why it is being said that in today's conditions, probably one of the most important and most cardinal decisions in the sphere of banning nuclear weapons would be, first and foremost, the banning of all nuclear tests.

[Bovin] And then I think about what is going on now. Speaking frankly, with the character and policies of the present U.S. Administration it is very difficult to put oneself into an optimistic frame of mind.

[Shishlin] Well, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, in general I also feel fairly serious reservations concerning the measure of political goodwill that the United States has. Unfortunately, in this department the U.S. Administration reminds one of the most niggardly characters in world literature. But at the same time, I would like to pose this question as well: The USSR and the United States have gone 6 years without summit meetings. They were difficult years, nervous and hard ones, extremely difficult ones. But all the same, something irreparable has not happened. It has not happened because the USSR has conducted a clear, consistent, peace-loving line and has done everything to protect the world from catastrophe; because we have reliable friends and allies; because there is a vast political expanse of the most varied states with differing social systems that also support curbing the arms race and smoothing out international relations. The experience of those 6 years shows that for all the importance -- the immense, gigantic importance -- of Soviet-U.S. relations, which of course are of key significance for the destinies of international politics, there exist shock absorbers for the aggressive course apart from the Soviet Union. There are also shock absorbers for the aggressive course and for resisting the aggressive course in other countries as well, in other political circles.

[Tsvetov] When you talk about shock absorbers, this is what comes to my mind: Comrade Gorbachev said that we can only survive or perish together. Together means not just the USSR and the United States. Tens, or perhaps even hundreds of countries could perish together with these countries. There you have the reason for the emergence of shock absorber countries, as you have correctly expressed it, Nikolay Vladimirovich. This is the picture that emerges here: Up until now, the basic provisions of U.S. strategy have always become the basic provisions of the strategy of the West European NATO member-countries. Recall the U.S. concept of total nuclear war. The concept of mass reprisal appeared in NATO. The United States devised the concept of limited nuclear war, and the concept of flexible response was created in NATO. But when the United States announced its so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, it was met with caution in Western Europe. The latter saw in the U.S. plans the threat of unequal security zones being formed. The United States is protected, albeit with negligible effect, but not Western Europe. The question arose: In such circumstances, is there equality among the allies?

The United States is now trying to draw the West European allies into preparations for "star wars," but apart from Britain and the FRG, the remainder either refuse to join in with the Strategic Defense Initiative or they do so with reservations. But even in the FRG, there are voices such as this to be heard: GENERAL-ANZEIGER newspaper, for example, wrote: There is no trace left of the previous euphoria over the philosophical concept of defense in space. It has been replaced by cautious restraint. In the FRG, there is a fairly sober assessment of the possible political consequences of participation, and the "star wars" plans do not enjoy popularity and universal approval.

Let us compare the situation today with the situation in 1979 when the United States embarked on stationing Pershings and cruise missiles in Western Europe. Then the disagreements between the United States and the allies concerned the question of when, how many, and where the Pershings and cruise missiles should be sited. Now it is a question of whether a whole category of strategic defense weapons should be approved or rejected. That is, the unity of the strategic principles at the foundations of NATO has been put into doubt.

[Bovin] But all the same, I think that at the bottom of their hearts they know that war would mean suicide for them. And that, of course, is the fundamental shock absorber, in addition to those we have spoken of.

[Shishlin] And of course, the political effect of the replies from Mikhail Sergeyevich to TIME magazine's questions has proved to be such that the President of the United States has found it necessary to state -- indirectly so far, it is true -- that he is ready to meet the USSR halfway in an attempt to resolve the problems, and the President hopes that the meeting in Geneva will lead to precisely such a result. But, naturally, the final answer to this question has to be provided by the meeting itself and the weeks that will pass before the meeting, which, I hope, will be distinguished not only by words but also by deeds from the United States.

[Tsvetov] Here I would like to end our roundtable discussion.. All the best.

CSO: 5200/1392

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

U.S., SOVIET 'PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES' DISCUSS SPACE ARMS

Opening of U.S.-USSR Meeting

LD060833 Moscow TASS in English 0808 GMT 6 Sep 85

[Text] San Francisco, September 6 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Algunov reports:

The fourth meeting of representatives of the Soviet and U.S. public devoted to outstanding problems of today's international affairs has opened here. The Soviet delegation is led by Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The agenda of the four-day plenary meetings of the conference includes major issues of Soviet-U.S. relations, problems of regional politics and activities of international organizations. A central discussion at the meeting will be devoted to security for all and general disarmament as an alternative to the arms race, star wars and inadequate arms control.

Participants will also discuss papers on the U.N. role in the solution of the political problems, on international security and settlement of conflict situations in the world's "flashpoints," on prospects for cooperation in the Pacific, on the ideological competition of the two socio-political systems and on the characteristics of the world situation on the threshold of the 21st century.

Addressing a press conference after the opening ceremony, Academician Arbatov stressed that representatives of Soviet and U.S. public attached importance to forthcoming discussions in view of the further aggravation of the international situation and the escalation of the arms race. "This meeting should provide opportunities for honest exchanges of opinion and contribute to the overcoming of mutual mistrust and to the initiation of dialogue between the two powers," he said.

The U.S. co-chairman of the meeting, Marcus Raskin, a senior official of the Institute for Policy Studies, noted the pressing need for a search for peaceful solutions to crises and impasses in international relations. One of the tasks of the meeting, according to him, is to formulate a basis for further joint research and exchange programmes of the USSR and the USA.

The delegations to the meeting, co-sponsored by the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Washington-based Institute for Policy Studies, include notable public figures and scholars of the two countries and leading political observers.

LD071404 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0954 GMT 7 Sep 85

[Text] San Francisco, 7 Sep (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Algunov reports:

Ideological contradictions should not hinder the normalization of Soviet-American relations. This is the opinion expressed in conversations with journalists by the participants in the meeting taking place here between representatives of the public of the USSR and the United States devoted to topical problems of international life.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of the United States and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences and head of the Soviet delegation, pointed out that ideological struggle must not be allowed to grow into psychological warfare. "A policy of declaring 'crusades'" against communism, he noted in an interview with a TASS correspondent, inevitably leads to a worsening of Soviet-U.S. relations and returns the world to the gloomy times of the "cold war." An alternative to this should be the creation by joint efforts of a social and psychological atmosphere between the USSR and the United States that would facilitate an improvement in bilateral relations.

The U.S. participants in the meeting came out in favor of stepping up the search for common "points of contact" between the two countries and for them to be used as foundations for expanding contacts and achieving mutual understanding. They noted that the drafting of compromise solutions can act in favor of constructive cooperation between the USSR and the United States. Stress was also laid on the usefulness of studying the positive experience of the history of Soviet-U.S. relations. The mutual help and cooperation within the framework of the anti-Hitler coalition, it was pointed out in this connection, convincingly showed the possibility of a change for the better in the current situation. Particular attention is being paid to the baneful consequences for bilateral relations caused the U.S. leadership stirring up anticommunist moods and by the growth of religious-conservative tendencies in U.S. political circles.

The work of the meeting is attracting considerable interest on the part of U.S. political and public circles and is being extensively covered by the mass information media. The leaders of the Soviet and U.S. delegations were received by Dianne Feinstein, mayor of San Francisco.

During the conversation which took place it was stressed that the achievement of progress in relations between the USSR and the United States would facilitate a radical improvement in the international situation as a whole.

#### SDI 'Deepening Credibility Gap'

LD081410 Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 8 Sep 85

[Text] San Francisco, September 8 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Algunov reports:

A meeting of representatives of Soviet and American public devoted to topical international issues is continuing in session here. The discussions of the third day of the meeting are centered on problems pertaining to preventing militarisation of outer space and strengthening universal security.

The American participants in the meeting have expressed support on the whole for the idea that it is necessary to search for an alternative to the Reagan adminis-

tration's policy of spreading the weapons race to outer space. They expressed concern over the further growth of tensions and military threat in the world. Much attention has been devoted to outlining criteria making it possible to distinguish between basic research and development of technology within the framework of specific military space programmes.

The members of the U.S. delegation pointed out that the definition spelled out in that connection by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his replies to the American TIME magazine opens favourable prospects for the holding of talks on that issue and resolving the complex problem. The participants in the meeting also drew attention to the fact that the volume of appropriations on the "star wars" programme is at present greater than the federal budget of the U.S. National Science Foundation, the head organisation financing research programmes in the country. The "star wars" programmes and space weapons testing are deepening the credibility gap in American-Soviet relations, the TASS correspondent was told by Professor Marcus Ruskin, of the Washington-based Institute for Policy Studies, co-chairman of the meeting from the American side. There will be a way out of the present-day situation only if the creation of space weapons is repudiated and joint programmes for exploration of space for peaceful purposes is adopted. The so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" cannot ensure international security, the scientists stressed. This takes not military technology, but political will, the wish to work for an improvement of bilateral relations and international climate.

#### Joint Statement Issued

LD090946 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0841 GMT 9 Sep 85

[Text] San Francisco, 9 Sep (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Algunov reports:

The fourth meeting between representatives of the public of the USSR and the U.S., devoted to topical problems of Soviet-American relations and the international situation, has completed its work here.

The meeting participants adopted a statement. "It is a requirement of the times," it says in the document, "to turn back the arms race and create the basis for the process of disarmament." Named as a task of leading importance at the forum was the prevention of the militarization of outer space.

The representatives of the public of the two countries," the statement points out, "come out in support of conducting joint space research for peaceful purposes; they consider that the use of the near-Earth space for military purposes will lead to catastrophic consequences." Both delegations supported the idea of a full and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapons testing and research in the sphere of chemical and bacteriological weapons and expressed support for expanding cultural links and scientific exchanges between the USSR and U.S.

"The participants in the meeting," said Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of the United States and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences and head of the Soviet delegation, in an interview with a TASS correspondent, "rate its results as positive and useful. A special stamp was laid on our work by the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting and the new peace initiatives of the USSR raised by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his replies to the American magazine TIME. This gave a constructive and businesslike character to the entire procedure of the plenary sessions. Common concern was expressed at the intensification of tension on the international scene and the desire by joint efforts to achieve an improvement in Soviet-American relations."

We give a positive rating to the results of the discussion, a TASS correspondent was told in conversation by co-chairman on the American side, Marcus Ruskin, professor of the Washington Institute for Policy Studies. There was a fruitful and sincere exchange of views. "By their joint efforts Soviet and American scholars," stressed M. Ruskin, "are called upon to make a discernible contribution to working out new concepts and ideas on the level of bilateral cooperation, on the basis of which the USSR and U.S. could enter the 21st century in an atmosphere of peace and mutual understanding."

CSO: 5200/1399

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON DUAL NATURE OF 'EUREKA' PROJECT

PM061039 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 30 Aug 85 p 3

[International observer G. Dadyants commentary: "Double-bottomed Project"--  
uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] "Eureka!" "I have found it!" Archimedes exclaimed 2,200 years ago, on discovering the basic law of hydrostatics. In Paris the word "Eureka" is now on everybody's lips, though the solution to the problem is still far from being found. The French-proposed project for the technological rearming of West Europe, despite the assertions of the newspaper LIBERATION, is still very hazy although it was approved in principle at the July intergovernmental conference of 17 West European Countries.

The "Eureka" project was put forward following the Reagan "star wars" program and was perceived in the first place as a purely political act -- a "peaceful alternative" to Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative," in which, as is known, France flatly refused to take part and which produced misgivings in all the West European countries. It was a kind of reply to the impudent ultimatum of C. Weinberger, who proposed that the West European countries join in the research work on the "star wars" program "within 2 months." Europe recalled that it had not yet been turned into a U.S. protectorate, nor West European industrial companies into Pentagon subcontractors.

The "purely civilian purpose" of "Eureka", which was stated at the very first, naturally attracted the attention and sympathies of the European public. However, it soon became clear that "Eureka" is not an alternative to the U.S. program. At first this was stated by General J. Abrahamson, in charge of implementing the SDI program, and then by West European leaders themselves, who admitted that "Eureka" was completely "compatible" with SDI. What is more, people began to say, as if incidentally, that there are both civil and military aspects to the French project.

Even before the Paris intergovernmental conference, which marked the official birth of "Eureka," leading West European firms working in the electronics sphere France's Thomson; Holland's Philips; West Germany's Siemens; and Britain's General Electric Company announced their inclusion in this program. These four giants today control 9.6 percent of the world production of electronic components, 14 percent of television and radio receiver production, and 12 percent of the world production of electronics FOR MILITARY PURPOSES. Here the latest microprocessors, high-speed integrated circuits, microwave apparatus, large-capacity electronic memories, flat screens, and sensors of all types were declared to be "strategic components" determining the future of technical progress.



Already, this unification of military-industrial concerns around "Eureka" has of itself started to launch it into an orbit far removed from that planned. LE MONDE wrote in this connection that "'Eureka'" must mobilize scientific potential in Europe around a definite number of projects designed to promote the development of hardware and systems which interest the consumer and which may have a DUAL (our emphasis -- G.D.) civil and military application."

The dual purpose of "Eureka" became even clearer when Britain's space concern, British Aerospace Corporation, with its "civilian plans", expressed the desire to associate itself with the cooperation already taking place between West Germany's Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm and Aeritalia in the military sphere (the Tornado aircraft).

"Eureka" began to diverge even further from the originally proclaimed direction when the multinational and transnational corporations began to get interested in it. Agreements of principle within the "Eureka" framework were concluded between France's Matra, Italy's Societa Generale Elettronica, and Norway's Norsk Data, in the sphere of complete sets of components for electronics and information technology. The Compagnie Generale d'Electricite concluded agreements with 10 European partners in spheres such as artificial intelligence, lasers, robot engineering, and electronic communications. And the Societe Nationale Industrielle Aerospatiale concluded agreements with the Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm group.

By means of these different agreements the major concerns are not only lending definite form to the "Eureka" project but are imposing on it definite content which, as the press stresses, "takes us beyond the solemn statements of principle."

The French Defense Minister C. Hernu also made some quite unambiguous remarks about the "purely civilian" significance of "Eureka" when he said that its implementation "meets our interests both in the industrial and scientific sphere and in the military sphere."

Nor does very much remain of the idea of creating a "technologically independent Europe." In actual fact, Siemens, while entering into alliance in the information technology sphere with France's Thomson and SII-Honeywell Bull, at the same time is concluding similar alliances with Japan's Fujitsu and America's General Electric. The close interweaving of European, U.S., and Japanese capital could ultimately lead to a "technological Europe" working for the Americans, without Europe being aware of it.

This is all the more probable since, at the same time as the process of the consolidation of European firms around "Eureka," the process of their association with SDI is under way. France's Societe Europeenne de Propulsion, which produces rocket engines, has stated bluntly that it is interested in research within the SDI framework. (Reoks), a company producing precision optical devices, has already obtained a major contract for manufacturing a large mirror for the U.S. Naval Forces to conduct an experiment with lasers, and it expects to obtain new U.S. orders. A number of British companies are holding talks with U.S. military-industrial and aerospace concerns -- Lockheed, Rockwell, TRW, and Hughes -- in the hope of becoming "junior partners" in consortiums for implementing the "star wars" program. "Theoretically," E. Brancaccio, a high-ranking employee in the Italian National Association of the Electronics Industry, stated, "we should give preference to the 'Eureka' program. But in practice we consider cooperation with the Reagan administration in implementing the SDI program is more likely."

In France, Britain, and the FRG officials are calling on European scientists and firms to take part in implementing the "Eureka" project. But, at the same time, they state that "there can be no question" of preventing those European companies which so desire from

cooperating with the Americans on the SDI project. One can imagine what competition the U.S. program poses for "Eureka" in these conditions. So far F. Mitterrand has allocated FR1 billion to "Eureka," while \$26 billion have already been allocated to SDI.

Neither the proposed organizational structure nor the system for financing projects promote the aims originally proclaimed for "Eureka." In actual fact, it was decided at the Paris Conference that the main role in organization should be played by the industrialists themselves. It is they who will propose joint scientific research projects, which are then financed both at the state level and by the private sector, taking individual account of the programs' specific aims and time frames. This whole complex structure, which is known as the "variable geometry" method, will result in the projects and work programs being determined by the industrial companies and, without any doubt, by the multinationals standing behind the European companies; or to put it more simply, by American monopolies.

It is with good reason that the French democratic press bluntly calls the "Eureka" project a "real trap" which will lead not so much to the creation of a "technologically independent" Europe, as to renunciation of whole spheres of national research in favor of the transnational companies.

There is another side to the question too. "Technology," L'HUMANITE writes, "is presented as society's foremost important stake. But the scale of its development and the means of its application in certain spheres require broad cooperation and, consequently, renunciation of attempts to isolate the socialist countries." Let us note that the "Eureka" project does not envisage cooperation in the sphere of new technologies with Europe's socialist countries.

That, strictly speaking, is all that can be said today about the two-sided project called "Eureka". Some observers believe that this project has been made especially hazy in order to obscure its real essence. The 17 countries' ministers of foreign affairs and scientific research will next discuss the fate of "Eureka" in the FRG in the fall. Perhaps then it will finally become clear why this project was put forward -- whether it was really to ensure the technological self-sufficiency and independence of West Europe, or whether it is a question of a program which is not an alternative to, but parallel with SDI, with these parallel lines destined to meet in the infinity of space.

CSO: 5200/1397

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE 'STAR WARS' HEARINGS END

Defense Expert in Montreal

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 24 Jul 85 p A3

[Article by David Crane]

[Text]

MONTREAL — U.S. plans for a space-based system to shoot down incoming nuclear missiles will force Canada to make tough choices on its future role in defending North America, a Canadian defence expert says.

Albert Legault, a University of Montreal political scientist, told a parliamentary committee here yesterday that Canada cannot avoid being drawn into the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, popularly known as Star Wars.

**Unified command**

Canada will be drawn in because the U.S. defence department has decided to establish a Unified Space Command to co-ordinate all continental air and space defence, Legault said.

Key questions for Canada, he said, will include whether it should:

□ Help defend land-based U.S. nuclear missile silos against a preemptive Soviet strike.

Star Wars research probably will lead to a new system to defend such missiles, Legault said. And Canada could be asked to permit delivery vehicles for missiles that would shoot down Soviet missiles to be based on Canadian soil.

Alternatively, Canada could be asked to establish radar and data-gathering and processing systems to detect and identify incoming Soviet missiles;

□ Allow squadrons of U.S. Air Force F-15 interceptors to operate from bases on Canadian soil.

These missile-carrying, high-altitude interceptors would fire large bursts of pellets, like space-age shotgun shells, to knock out Soviet satellites;

□ Decide whether and how Canada would participate in anti-cruise missile defence.

Would Canada want to retaliate only against cruise missiles launched by Soviet aircraft over Canada, or also against those launched from naval vessels and undersea submarines in Canadian waters?

By the early 1990s, Legault said, the Soviets will have developed supersonic cruise missiles and anti-cruise missiles will be needed to shoot them down.

Legault, who from 1980 to 1982 was special adviser to the defence minister on Canada's defence options, told the parliamentary committee that many of these issues will have to be addressed when the Canada-U.S. agreement on the North American Defence Command (NORAD) comes up for renewal in 1986.

**Could participate**

Canada could specialize in North American air defence in detection, surveillance and data management systems, Legault said.

And, with Canada's defence role clearly identified, he said, Cana-

dian companies could participate in Star Wars research and development on radar, sensors, computer systems and satellites.

Legault warned the MPs and senators that Canada's sovereignty could be affected if it is unwilling to participate in this expanded system of air and space defence.

"If we have no ships to protect our coast" against sea-launched cruise missiles, "U.S. ships will be there," he said.

And if Canada lacks the necessary air defences, "the U.S. will not hesitate in time of emergency to fly into our air space."

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 24 Jul 85 p A4

[Text]

MONTREAL (CP) — Canada should participate in initial Star Wars research and decide later whether to help build the controversial U.S. anti-missile system, says a top Canadian electronics manufacturer.

John Simons, executive vice-president of Canadian Marconi Co., said Tuesday the \$35-billion strategic defence initiative commonly known as Star Wars will be "the technology driver for the next few years" and Canada cannot afford to miss out on it.

"SDI research will certainly spin off new products in areas as diverse as communications devices, industrial robots, laser cutters, space factories and self-repairing computers," Simons told the travelling Senate-Commons committee on international relations.

"SDI will be the biggest stimulant to technology since the Apollo moon program ... Without access to leading-edge technology, Canada will fall behind its international competitors."

Simons suggested that Canada pinpoint specific areas in Star Wars research that jibe with its existing high-technology talents, such as microwave, radar and computer software.

At the same time, however, Canada should wait for the research phase to end in the 1990s before deciding whether to help build the actual anti-missile system, he said.

The focus can be put on sectors acceptable to public morality, Simons said. In any case, Canada lacks the expertise to develop missile-zapping particle beam lasers, while current U.S. law would prohibit Canadian involvement in nuclear aspects of Star Wars research, he added.

Simons rejected a suggestion from Jean Chrétien, a former Liberal external affairs minister who opposes Star Wars participation and sits on the committee, that Canada work instead on its own anti-missile warning systems.

"Nothing in surveillance will protect us," Simons said. "It will give us a few moments notice — but it will not protect us."

Michel Fortmann, a University of Montreal specialist in strategic affairs, said limited participation in

non-weapons aspects of the Star Wars program could ensure Canadian input into U.S. strategic policy.

"The only decision we have to make clear to the Americans is that we won't accept any active weapons systems on our territory," he said.

The Quebec Peace Council, a coalition of 48 public groups, said Canada should reject any partnership in U.S. strategic defence policy.

"If a tiny country like New Zealand can stand up and defend its own future, we feel Canada can do so as well," said spokesman Ed Sloane. He was referring to New Zealand's ban on U.S. warships carrying nuclear weapons from entering its ports.

Dr. Don Bates of Physicians for Social Responsibility, a national anti-nuclear lobby, said Canada should act like "a best friend" and advise its American neighbors against Star Wars development.

"I think we can be influential if we are credible," Bates said, "and we can become credible if we act in our own best interests."

Bates doubted the strategic defense initiative would entice the Soviet Union towards a disarmament pact, as many of its advocates claim. He also warned against any "technological blackmail" the U.S. might attempt if Canada doesn't join the research effort.

"What we hope is that the Reagan administration will go away some day," he said.

Dimitri Roussopoulos, a veteran of Montreal left-wing movements and spokesman for the Quebec Pacifists Union, predicted civil disobedience and even terrorism if Canada accepts Star Wars.

From another perspective, the Canadian Coalition for Peace Through Strength, a Toronto-based group with 500 members nationally, said Star Wars will strengthen nuclear deterrence between the superpowers — even if scientists say it might not be 100 per cent effective.

"Would you not buckle up the seat belt in your car if you knew it was only 90 per cent effective?" asked chairman Miroslav Matuszewski.

The joint committee — including five senators and 12 MPs — has two days of hearings scheduled for Toronto, opening today on free trade and continuing Thursday on the Star Wars issue.

More hearings are planned for Vancouver, Calgary and Winnipeg before its report is delivered to External Affairs Minister Joe Clark in mid-August.

### Toronto First Day Hearings

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 26 Jul 85 p 2

[Text]

TORONTO (CP) — It is a moral outrage for the United States to consider spending \$1 trillion on the Star Wars plan when there are millions of sick and starving people in the world, says the Canadian Council of Churches.

"Pouring billions of dollars into military hardware rather than into the development of ways and means for meeting the basic needs of millions of people, just so they can survive, is obscene," Russell Legge, past president of the council, said Thursday. "It is a moral outrage and the people of Canada need to know that."

Legge told the Commons-Senate committee on international relations that it should recommend Canada play no part in the Reagan administration's plan for a strategic defence initiative, more commonly known as Star Wars. The plan, now in its research phase, would deploy space technologies to combat Soviet missiles.

The committee, which is holding hearings across the country on Star Wars and Canada-U.S. trade, must present recommendations to the federal cabinet by Aug. 23.

Legge noted the council, representing 13 churches in Canada, passed a resolution in May condemning the \$27 billion allocated in the U.S. for research on Star Wars. The Reagan administration estimates it will require \$1 trillion to deploy the system.

In its condemnation, the council said the \$27 billion represents wealth and resources desperately needed for food, water, housing, roads, energy, medicine, schools and transportation for sick and

starving people.

In addition, said Legge, the Star Wars plan will dangerously escalate the international arms conflict because it will abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, widely regarded as one of the most significant arms pacts between the superpowers.

The treaty, based on the premise that nuclear war is not survivable, bans anti-missile weapon systems such as Star Wars.

"The present balance of terror is far from desirable, but there is a degree of stability that exists in the status quo," said Legge, adding the ABM treaty is an important reason for the present stability.

"If Canada agrees to participate in SDI we will simultaneously be participating in the destruction of this important treaty."

The Toronto Disarmament Network, a coalition of groups representing about 1,000 peace activists, told the committee the Star Wars plans makes the world less, not more, secure.

In a brief to the committee, the network said the plan will encourage the U.S. to launch a so-called first strike of nuclear weapons, without waiting for the Soviet Union to launch first.

The reason for this is that Star Wars will increase the United States' ability to repel a counter-attack from the Soviet Union.

"In a time of high international tension, such as a regional crisis, this could lead a country with a strategic defence into thinking it could launch a first strike and get away with it," said the network.

Toronto Second Day Remarks

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 27 Jul 85 p 3

[Article by Paul Taylor]

[Text]

Canada could be violating treaty obligations and international law by taking part in the U.S. Star Wars program, a parliamentary committee was told in Toronto yesterday.

"There are strong moral and legal reasons for Canada not to participate," said David Wright, president of Lawyers for Social Responsibility.

The Strategic Defence Initiative, commonly known as Star Wars, represents a violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States, he said.

"Canada's role in aiding and abetting the United States to violate the ABM Treaty is itself, arguably, a violation of international law," Mr. Wright told the parliamentary committee which is holding a series of cross-country hearings into Canada's role in Star Wars and into freer trade with the United States.

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark has pledged that the Government will not make a decision on the two issues until after the committee reports to Parliament Aug. 23.

Mr. Wright said his organization, which has 435 members across Canada, has just completed a legal study of Star Wars and found that the proposed weapon system could violate many other international agreements.

These include the Outer Space Treaty, Non-Proliferation Treaty and Partial Test Ban Treaty as well as the United Nations Charter and UN Declarations that Canada has signed.

After addressing the committee, which has just completed three days of hearings in Toronto, Mr. Wright told reporters that many international agreements have "no enforcing mechanisms." It is up to individual nations to "adhere to the spirit of the treaties."

But he added that "the security of the entire world depends upon the rule of law." If all nations act as if the treaties do not apply to them, Star Wars will have a destabilizing influence on the arms race, Mr. Wright said.

He told the committee that Canada should take a leading role in urging other countries not to participate in Star Wars.

France, Australia and several other countries have already refused to go along with the scheme.

So far, the United States has asked its major allies to take part in just the research phase of a space-based weapons system that would be able to shoot down Soviet missiles with laser beams.

However, Mr. Wright said it is almost impossible to draw a meaningful distinction between research and actual development. "It is incredulous, that \$33-billion would be spent on research if no further steps will be taken."

The Canadian Government should not only reject all involvement in Star Wars, but Canadian industries should also be prohibited from receiving research contracts, he said.

Robert White, president of the United Auto Workers of Canada, added his voice to those opposed to Star Wars. He also told the committee that the Canadian Government should not try to strike a free trade agreement with the United States.

Free trade and Stars Wars "are linked in a fundamental way," Mr. White said.

"Choosing free trade means accepting still greater economic integration into the United States and this threatens to limit even further our political sovereignty — whether in domestic policies or whether on international issues like Star Wars."

But Jake Warren, vice-chairman of the Bank of Montreal, said Canada should be looking to the widest practicable trade liberation, "to help increase trade between Canada and the United States and combat the growing trend to trade protectionism."

Even so, other businessmen told the committee yesterday that the United States might not be willing to give Canada what it wants.

"The fact that most of the drive for free trade has come from Canada has in fact scared many of our U.S. colleagues," John Allan, president of Stelco Inc. said.

He explained that U.S. industries are primarily interested in protecting their domestic markets from international competition — including competition from Canadian companies.

Vancouver Hearings

Vancouver THE SUN in English 31 Jul 85 p A14

[Article by Debbie Wilson]

[Text]

The U.S. Star Wars program was called both a possible first step to reducing the world's nuclear weapons stockpile and a "fraud" by speakers who appeared Tuesday before a federal committee on international relations.

The special joint committee on Canada's international relations was in the first of two days of hearings in Vancouver into the issue of Canadian participation in the Strategic Defence Initiative program and bilateral trade with the U.S. The committee is composed of senators and MPs from all three political parties.

University of Victoria computer scientist David Parnas, a member of an advisory panel to the Strategic Defence Initiative Organization until he resigned last month, said the program may already be violating the most important arms control agreement in the world.

The U.S. government has asked Canada to take part in Star Wars research.

Committee member Lloyd Axworthy, (L-Winnipeg-Fort Garry), said outside the hearing room that claims by Parnas that development and testing of the system are taking place means the program is violating the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union.

Axworthy said Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has pledged that Canada will not become involved in the program if it violates the treaty.

However, retired Lt.-Gen. Reginald Lane, representing the Federation of Military and United Services Institutes, told the committee the program is consistent with the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Lane, who is also former deputy commander of the North American Air Defence Command, said the treaty "does permit research short of testing a prototype system or component."

He said his interpretation of the treaty's ban on development and testing was pro-

vided by a negotiator of the treaty.

"The U.S.S.R may have already broken this treaty with the construction of a large phased-array radar which has ABM potential," Lane said.

The treaty bans development and testing on anti-missile systems but it does not restrict research. The U.S. has said any work it plans on the Star Wars program will just be research and will not violate the treaty.

But Parnas, who said he does not know about the legal intricacies of the treaty, said he has an SDIO report to the U.S. Congress at his Victoria home "that lists things that sound to me like development and testing.

"One of the things they were telling us is that they did do one test of sending up a missile and another thing that opened up like a big umbrella and the missile hit right in the middle of the umbrella. That sounded like a test to me."

But he said the U.S. government may dispute that interpretation and argue that although the systems being tested would be part of the Star Wars program they are, in fact, being tested as part of another defence program that would not violate the treaty.

Lane said his federation strongly recommends Canadian participation in the research phase of SDI, "and so give our research resources a chance to participate in a program we could never hope to emulate on our own."

He said the program may allow "the first step in reducing existing nuclear stockpiles while ensuring the security of West and East."

Parnas told the committee the computer software required for SDI cannot be adequately tested to ensure its proper functioning. Even a nuclear battle would test only one of an endless number of scenarios it might have to cover, he said.

"I couldn't go on participating in something that seemed so obviously fraudulent," Parnas said, in explaining the reason for his resignation from the advisory panel.

### Further Vancouver Statements

Vancouver THE SUN in English 1 Aug 85 p A17

[Text]

The Canadian government should pursue a "middle-ground" approach to Star Wars research, a University of B.C. strategic analyst told a federal committee on international relations Wednesday.

"There is a middle ground. You don't have to say 'yes, but' or 'no, but'," to the U.S. invitation to participate, Prof. Douglas Ross told the 17-member member committee comprising MPs and senators from the Progressive Conservative, Liberal and New Democratic parties.

Some aspects of the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative are useful, he said, but a comprehensive space-based weapons system threatens arms-reduction talks and increases the chance of nuclear war.

Ross said the Canadian government should monitor potential Soviet and U.S. violations of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty relating to space-weapons research and ensure Canadians research only ground-based ballistic missile defence systems.

The committee held the last of three days of hearings in Vancouver into Canadian participation in Star Wars and bilateral trade with the U.S. The committee expects to receive more than 200 briefs on each topic at cross-Canada hearings during the summer.

The majority of Star Wars presentations have opposed Canadian participation in the multi-billion-dollar program as escalating the arms race and being technologically impossible, while some groups have argued Canada cannot pass up the technological and economic advantages.

The committee's report will be complete by Aug. 23. External Affairs Minister Joe Clark has said he does not see any situation where the decisions would be made before then.

"The scientific and technological community is almost unanimous in condemning it (Star Wars),"

Ross said. He said U.S. leaders continue with it because they fear the Soviet Union's ability to "win" a nuclear war and fear the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries.

But Bill Campbell, president of an organization called the Canadian Conservative Publishers, wholly endorsed the Star Wars concept, arguing it is an essential part of the "free world's" struggle to combat the Soviet Union's goal of world domination.

Campbell said a policy of peace through strength — instead of appeasement, pacifism, and the nuclear-freeze movement — is necessary. Referring to the rise of Nazi Germany, Campbell said the Soviet Union "is an even more dangerous totalitarian state with even more clearly articulated goals of world domination."

Star Wars will deter the Soviet Union from launching a first-strike nuclear attack, he said.

Canadian Federation of Students researcher Nick Wotheford told the committee that allowing Star Wars research in Canada would reshape the nature of the university environment.

The U.S. would likely require such research to be classified, he said.

"Such censorship pollutes the academic atmosphere."

Wotheford said students in computer science, physics and engineering may find their research opportunities tied to a scheme they find ethically wrong and technologically nonsensical.

Other groups testifying Wednesday against Star Wars included Physicians for Social Responsibility, UBC Students for Peace and Mutual Disarmament, OXFAM and the B.C. Chapter of Science for Peace.

### Calgary Hearings

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 2 Aug 85 p 4

[Article by Kevin Cox]

[Text]

CALGARY — Canada should participate in the Star Wars program with the United States because it would create jobs in the Alberta electronics industry, the



Edmonton Chamber of Commerce says.

Officials with the business lobby group clearly shocked some members of a Parliamentary committee studying the issue when they suggested yesterday that the economic benefits justify joining the \$26-billion (U.S.) program to create a defensive arsenal in space.

Bruce Campbell, head of the Edmonton chamber, told the committee and an audience dominated by peace groups opposed to the Star Wars initiative, that Canada should be the first nation in the world to join the U.S. program in order to get a jump on bidding for contracts.

"Already, over \$1-billion in contracts have been let. None to Canadians," Mr. Campbell said. "If we get in early we will have the benefit of being in the research phase, as well as production . . . we could be the first to commit, a big advantage over very tough European and

Asian competition."

Scarborough MP Reginald Stackhouse said that he was "shocked you would recommend participation in this program for economic reasons. I would have thought Canadians would want the issue settled on the grounds of peace and security."

Mr. Campbell agreed that jobs could be created by other space programs besides Star Wars and added that many Alberta companies are ready to go to work in high-technology space endeavors.

MP William Kempling said that he was "fascinated by the brashness" of the Edmonton approach which, Mr. Campbell said, is shared by the Calgary and Alberta chambers of commerce.

The Alberta Federation of Labor called on the Government to prohibit Canadian companies from participating in the program, calling it "a threat to world security."

#### Ottawa Hearings

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 9 Aug 85 p 5

[Article by Charlotte Montgomery]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Canada will have to make a financial contribution to the U.S. Star Wars program if it hopes to get anything useful from it, the head of a Canadian computer company told a parliamentary committee here yesterday.

Only a financial commitment, perhaps as much as \$300-million, might ensure that the results of the research were available to this country, said Thomas Allan, president of Control Data Canada Ltd.

And if the United States would not agree that Canada be given access to the technology developed in the program, he said, "then I agree, don't get involved in it."

But Mr. Allan, who urged that Canada accept the invitation to participate in the Star Wars research, told the committee of senators and MPs that the program is the best available way for the country to catch up with international competition in such fields as micro-electronics.

As the committee ended a series of public hearings yesterday which have taken it on a fast tour through six cities,

Mr. Allan warned that the U.S. Government is unlikely to share commercially useful technology developed under the program unless Canada kicks in some money and drives a hard bargain. Regardless of the success of the program as a military venture, he said, whoever controls the research data on such technology as micro-electronics will control much of the industry.

"Canada is spending a few millions of dollars per year in micro-electronic research versus hundreds of millions in the USA and Japan," the head of the wholly owned U.S. subsidiary told the committee. "In short, we are falling behind the competition. We cannot afford to catch up by throwing money at the problem. We must take a different approach: co-operate, joint venture, partner with someone. Why not with our closest ally, neighbor and greatest trading partner?"

For Canada to turn down the invitation issued by the United States to join in the research before giving the project a fair chance, Mr. Allan said, would be "immature."

He told reporters later that the money to be contributed by Canada should come

from existing programs and he estimated that the work may provide as many as 50,000 job opportunities for Canadians.

The committee, set up by the Government to review foreign policy, won the right to examine the proposal to join in Star Wars research after opposition parties insisted. It is to report its recommendations on the issue to the Government by Aug. 23. It will then continue a longer study of other foreign policy issues.

Liberal MP Jean Chrétien, former external affairs minister and now his party's critic on that policy area, told reporters that he believes the committee hearings on Star Wars have produced mostly criticism of the prospect of Canadian involvement.

"The Government cannot claim they have the support of Canadians (to join) after these hearings," Mr. Chrétien said.

The Liberals and the New Democratic Party have already made clear their opposition to the program — officially called the Strategic Defense Initiative — on the grounds that it is destabilizing and will not contribute to peace.

Mr. Chrétien said he thinks Conserva-

tive committee members will have a difficult time deciding what to say. One of them, Conservative MP Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West), told Mr. Allan during yesterday's meeting that he did not believe that the economic benefits possible under the research program were the proper grounds for deciding on participation.

"It does bother me that we would want to deal with something essentially military for economic gain," Mr. Stackhouse said.

The Government has also assigned senior civil servant Arthur Kroeger to prepare a report on the implications of the U.S. offer to join in the research. That report is not to be made public.

Mr. Chrétien said yesterday that Mr. Kroeger was unlikely to have delivered a positive assessment of Canadian participation or the Government would have given it to the committee.

Sixteen other countries besides Canada have been invited to join in the \$26-billion U.S. program that is to design a space-based, anti-missile defence system.

#### Committee Chairman's Assessment

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 12 Aug 85 pp A1, A4

[Article by David Crane]

[Text]

The parliamentary committee that has just finished cross-Canada hearings on possible free trade with the United States and Canadian participation in Star Wars has only 11 days left to submit its recommendations on the two complex subjects.

And its chairman, Tom Hockin, the Progressive Conservative MP from London West, says the 17 senators and MPs are more likely to be stumped by the Star Wars issue than the trade issue.

The 10 Tories on the committee, in particular, are finding it difficult to arrive at a consensus on the emotionally charged issue of Canadian involvement in U.S. President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative, popularly known as Star Wars.

The Senate-Commons committee, which spent a month hearing

public views from Halifax to Vancouver, must report to Parliament by Aug. 23.

It received more than 540 briefs and heard more than 330 witnesses. The hearings were marked by heavy attendance and emotional pleas against Star Wars.

"The process did attract participation and in a way that was far more profound than I anticipated," Hockin said in an interview.

The more than 200 anti-Star Wars witnesses made their cases on three counts:

- Insufficient proof exists that it would work;
- Even if it did, it would only help further the arms race; and
- It is immoral to spend billions of dollars on it while pressing human needs here and around the globe are neglected.

### Impassioned pleas

The impassioned pleas have had an impact on Conservative thinking, some Tory members have acknowledged in private conversations.

The Liberal and New Democratic parties are strongly opposed to Canadian participation, but the Conservatives had been expected to support the government's previously stated defence — that Star Wars is only a research project, and one that could generate a significant number of jobs in Canada.

But the Tory members have been influenced by the depth of feelings expressed by a wide variety of groups on the issue.

And they have been struck by the fact that groups opposing Star Wars have done a great deal of detailed research, and represent a broad range of interests and professions — engineers, doctors, theologians — young and old.

In an interview yesterday on the CTV program *Question Period*, Hockin said one witness drove 1,900 kilometres (1,180 miles) to speak for five minutes "with tremendous passion" against participating in research on the space-based, missile defence system.

On the other side, some people feel that possible participation "is a test of helping the Americans, a test of being on the cutting edge of where technology is going to be in the future," he said, "so I think I do have to report to the government that on SDI we do have a rather high temperature in the country on the issue."

What hit the Tory MPs about the Star Wars opponents was that they were not all leftists, but people who support Canadian participation in such Western military alliances as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the North American Aerospace Defence command.

At the final committee hearing in Ottawa on Thursday, Tory Reg. Stackhouse (Mississauga-West) openly disagreed with Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's stated position that Ottawa may consider involvement in Star Wars if it means many jobs for Canadians.

The Tory government's private polls show that, while Canadians are fairly evenly divided on the issue, those opposed feel much more strongly and oppose it even if it means many new jobs.

### 'Harder to tell'

Hockin said he's reasonably optimistic the committee could come together on the trade issue, but Star Wars may prove more difficult.

"I think there is room for having us all speak with one voice on trade," he said, but on Star Wars, "that's harder to tell."

If the Tories on the committee do not arrive at a quick consensus on Star Wars this week, they'll find it that much more difficult to negotiate with the Liberals and New Democrats on what the committee should recommend to Parliament, the government and the nation on such a profound issue.

In the CTV interview, Hockin said he does not believe the two issues are linked.

### Closed Committee Meeting

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 21 Aug 85 p A1

[Article by Greg Weston]

[Text]

A special parliamentary committee meeting behind closed doors Tuesday came within one vote of recommending that Canada refuse to participate in the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, commonly called Star Wars, *The Citizen* has learned.

At the same time, sources say a major rift in the Conservative ranks prevented the committee from suggesting Canada solidly endorse SDI.

Instead, the committee's final report, to be released Friday, will "just toss the ball back at the government to make a decision," said one MP.

One member said the final recommendation on Star Wars, proposed and backed by the Tory majority on the committee, is "a lot of marshmallows and fence-sitting."

Another member, Liberal MP Lloyd Axworthy, said the split in opinions among the 10 Conservative committee members forced them to come up with a compromise recommendation he calls "a cop-out, a real abdication of responsibility."

Axworthy said the Mulroney government had asked the committee to decide clearly whether Canada should participate in Star Wars research, "and that obviously hasn't happened."

One MP on the 17-member committee said a move by the Liberals and New Democrats to have the report state a "flat rejection" of Canadian participation in SDI was defeated by the slim margin of 9-8.

All of those who voted down the motion were Conservatives, although at least one Tory MP broke ranks with his party and threw his support with the Liberals and New Democrats in calling for rejection of SDI.

While no one is publicly naming the recalcitrant Tory MP, sources on the committee said at least four of the ten

Conservative members are opposed to Canada endorsing the \$26-billion American research program.

One of those Tories, Patrick Crofton, said the two months of public hearings have convinced him that Canada should oppose SDI on strategic, moral and economic grounds.

He said the research plan launched by U.S. President Ronald Reagan would only escalate the arms race while offering no foolproof program of defence against a nuclear attack.

Moreover, he said, Canada and the other Western allies cannot credibly endorse Star Wars research while at the same time trying to rally world opinion against the arms race.

On top of it all, Crofton added, SDI offers "little likelihood of meaningful job creation in Canada."

Crofton acknowledged his party's split on Star Wars, saying it's no different than the wide diversity of views expressed to the committee by various other groups of Canadians.

"I appreciate the public was expecting us to say yes or no (to Star Wars)," the Tory MP said.

"On the other hand, it was not our purpose to vote just on the public expectations."

Crofton predicted SDI is not an issue that is going to vanish just because the committee has finished its work.

NDP committee member Steven Langdon promised that Friday's report would indeed be only the beginning of the controversy.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CANADIAN VIEWS ON 'STAR WARS' PARTICIPATION MIXED

Aerospace Association President

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 5 Aug 85 p 4

[Text]

OTTAWA (CP) — The federal Government should decide soon whether to participate in Star Wars research, the president of the Aerospace Association of Canada says.

Ken Lewis said other countries, such as Britain and Israel, have already accepted an invitation from the United States to participate in research on the space-based anti-missile system.

"The opportunities for Canada will diminish as every month goes by," he said in a weekend radio interview.

The United States has asked Canada and 16 other countries to take part in the \$26-billion project, known formally as the Strategic Defence Initiative.

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark has said the Government will make a decision later this summer or early in the fall. A Parliamentary committee that wound up hearings on Star Wars last week is to report to Mr. Clark by Aug. 23.

Mr. Lewis said Canada will miss out on important technological developments if Ottawa chooses not

to participate. "It's going to put us further behind if we don't take part," he said. "We've got to be able to compete, and that means we can't allow any opportunity to go by."

Defence Minister Erik Nielsen has said it would be difficult for the Government to stop private companies from accepting Star Wars research contracts.

Mr. Lewis said Canadian companies will lose out if they bid for Star Wars contracts without the Government's backing: "If we rebuff this invitation of the United States, it would seem logical that that attitude might be reflected negatively with respect to opening up markets for Canada."

Canada should make sure it has the option to pull out of Star Wars once the research has ended and development has started, he said.

He estimated Canada's participation would result in up to 50,000 new jobs by 1992 and 100,000 jobs by the year 2000, assuming Canada gets 1 per cent of the research money for Star Wars.

Poll Majority in Favor

Ottawa THE WEEKEND CITIZEN in English 10 Aug 85 p A4

[Text]

TORONTO (CP) — A majority of Canadians would approve of the country participating in the U.S. Star Wars research program — and almost two-thirds favor involvement if it means more jobs, a national poll suggests.

A CROP poll conducted for the *Toronto Globe and Mail* indicates 57 per cent of Canadians believe the country should participate in research for the strategic defence initiative, or Star Wars program, proposed by U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

Sixty-five per cent think Canada should play a role in the research if it means more jobs for Canadians.

The poll indicates 35 per cent oppose Canada's participation, two per cent are indifferent and six per cent have no opinion.

The proportion of those opposed drops to 24 per cent of all Canadians if participation

would mean more jobs in this country, and 11 per cent are indifferent or undecided.

The poll by CROP — *Centre de recherche sur l'opinion publique*, a Quebec-based polling organization — was conducted from June 10 to 30 among a national sample of 2,058 adults.

The *Globe* says a survey this size is estimated to be accurate within two percentage points, 19 times in 20.

Sixty-five per cent of male respondents, compared with 49 per cent of women, support Canada's participation in Star Wars, the poll suggests. Thirty per cent of Canadian men are opposed, compared with 40 per cent of women.

The poll also indicates opinion is divided along political party lines. Most Progressive Conservative supporters favor participation, while Liberals and New Democrats are split.

### Spar Aerospace Report

Ottawa THE WEEKEND CITIZEN in English 10 Aug 85 p A1

[Article by Greg Weston]

[Text] Canadian high technology firms expect few jobs or new commercial products from involvement in Star Wars, despite optimistic claims at a special Parliamentary committee examining the \$26-billion U.S. research project.

A confidential Spar Aerospace report prepared for the federal cabinet suggests Star Wars contracts probably wouldn't generate more than about 1,000 jobs a year in Canada — mostly for highly skilled scientists already in short supply.

The report commissioned by Spar, Canada's leading company in the field, says the only way Canada could reap major benefits from Star Wars research would be to launch its own "Canadian Defence Initiative."

The report recommends Canada develop projects that could be justified politically as simply space-based additions to traditional Canadian defence roles such as northern surveillance.

President Ronald Reagan held out a massive grab-bag of research contracts to entice Canada and the other Western allies into offering their political support for his controversial Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI).

Industry lobbyists have been trying to convince the special parliamentary committee that Canada's endorsement of SDI would bring a windfall of money, jobs and new commercial products.

But leading hi-tech companies surveyed this week say even the most enthusiastic response from Canada towards Reagan's scheme isn't going to create any bonanza for industry in this country.

"While it (SDI) looks like a fantastic opportunity, when it comes right down to it there aren't likely to be big fortunes made in Canada," says Joyce Wells of SED Systems in Saskatoon.

Although SED Systems specializes in space communications — a major component of any Star Wars scheme the Americans might design — Wells said the company isn't holding its breath.

"It should be perfectly obvious that all the major contracts will go to American companies."

A spokesman for the Pentagon in Washington said the degree to which Canada might benefit from SDI contracts would "all be negotiable." The hitch is that the Americans won't negotiate until after Canada has given its public blessing to Star Wars.

The executives of six other hi-tech firms whose research specialities should make them prime candidates for SDI contracts all agreed that Star Wars is likely to be more of a bust than boom.

All said any major SDI research contracts would have to be matched with subsidies from the Canadian government, and that commercial spinoffs would be minimal.

A senior executive of Spar said, "Most of the work being discussed from SDI is very far removed from the normal commercial activities that we can see over the next five or 10 years."

To get the biggest commercial return on research, the Spar report notes, Canada must choose space projects it could deploy even if the U.S. decides to scrap its Star Wars program in the future.

### Center for Arms Control Report

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 20 Aug 85 p A4

[Article by Greg Weston]

[Text]

A study commissioned by the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament concludes that the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative — known as Star Wars — would not generate a significant numbers of jobs for Canadians.

"It is evident that the employment which could be generated by SDI would be marginal to Canada's high-technology sector and negligible to the economy as a whole," said the report prepared for the Ottawa-based information agency which is funded by government, industry and private research foundations.

The report, prepared by a group of economists and defence analysts, was released Monday.

Several recent polls have indicated that a majority of Canadians would favor participation in SDI research if it meant a significant number of new jobs.

But the report suggests that SDI would generate an average of only 420 jobs a year directly in each of the five years of the program, with a possible 1,280 more being employed in work indirectly related to the project.

A special committee of MPs and senators is expected to make a recommendation later this week on whether Canada should join in the controversial research project aimed at zapping nuclear warheads with space-based ray guns.

One of the most pervasive pro-SDI arguments made to the committee during its July hearings was that it was an economic offer Canada simply couldn't refuse.

Aerospace industry spokesman Kenneth Lewis, for instance, told the committee that involvement in Star Wars research would mean a windfall of national wealth and upwards of 50,000 jobs in Canada.

But far from being a boon to the Canadian hi-tech industry, the most recent economists' report concludes, participation in SDI could drain off the <sup>No wealth of jobs</sup> already scarce supply of scientists working on more worthwhile projects.

Their report echoes the findings contained in a confidential study prepared for the federal cabinet by Spar Aerospace and a consortium of consultants in that industry.

That study, reported recently in *The Citizen*, estimated SDI wouldn't mean more than about 1,000 jobs a year in industry.

A recent *Citizen* survey of executives in hi-tech industries also found that most aren't expecting any significant economic gain from SDI contracts.

John M. Lamb, executive direc-

tor of the arms control centre, said in releasing Monday's report that he hoped the economic arguments in favor of Canada joining in Star Wars research "would now be put to rest."

SDI should have been debated strictly on its strategic implications for the arms race, and not on the basis of its possible economic benefits, Lamb told a press conference.

But since those lobbying for Canadian participation raised the issue, he said, the report simply shows that "the economic arguments do not stand up to scrutiny."

U.S. President Ronald Reagan has been holding out the carrot of potentially huge research contracts in an attempt to lure Canada and the other NATO allies into giving SDI their political blessing.

But Lamb said Canada's involvement in SDI research would be limited out of "American fear that U.S. technology will end up in Soviet hands."

Lamb said the panel of economists also expressed serious concern over potentially devastating effects on Western economies if the U.S. decided to proceed from research to actual Star Wars deployment at an estimated cost of a trillion dollars.

"Above all," Lamb concluded, "the concentration on economic issues in the Canadian SDI debate has been excessive and should be ended."

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN, USSR, DIFFER ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS, SDI

OW061153 Tokyo KYODO in English 1145 GMT 6 Sep 85

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 6 KYODO -- Japan and the Soviet Union ended two days of high-level Foreign Ministry talks Friday with the sides unable to bridge the gap on substantial issues dividing the two countries despite their publicly-expressed "common desire" to improve relations. "Basically the Soviet views on Japan have remained unchanged," Japanese Foreign Ministry sources said.

However, the Foreign Ministry appeared satisfied with the outcome of the two days of talks on East-West relations and bilateral ties. "This was after all a working-level meeting," a Foreign Ministry source said. "There was a willingness on both sides to improve relations but they couldn't agree on things when it came to specifics," he said. However, both sides agreed it was important for the two countries to "understand each other's views even if we can't agree with them," the source said.

The principals representing the two countries at the talks were Mikhail Kapitsa, the deputy Soviet foreign minister in charge of Far East Affairs, and Shinichi Yanai, the deputy Japanese Foreign Minister in charge of political affairs. The most glaring difference in opinion between the two parties came on East-West relations with the Soviet delegation launching an attack on the U.S. strategic initiative, repeating the Kremlin's line that the SDI plan marks a U.S. attempt to develop an "offensive" weapons system in outer space. The Soviets also lambasted the U.S. naval build-up in the Pacific, with the Soviets characterizing it as an American attempt to turn the Pacific into "domestic waters," Japanese officials said.

The two sides clashed again on the Soviet military build-up off northern Japan as they did on most issues raised during the talks. The Japanese side expressed "concern" over the Soviet build-up but the Soviet delegation shrugged the issue off, describing the Soviet military presence as "patrol level," Japanese officials said.

Japanese military intelligence says the Soviets maintain division-level armed forces in the "northern territory" -- the four Japanese islands the Soviets have occupied since the end of World War II. The Japanese side brought up the territorial issue during the talks, only to meet with a standard Soviet denial on the existence of any territorial dispute. "As we have told you many times, there is no change in our position," the Soviets were quoted as telling the Japanese. Japan regards the territorial dispute as the biggest obstacle to improved relations, holding back the signing of a peace treaty between the two countries.



The search for better bilateral ties also seems to have foundered on the territorial issue as the Japanese turned a cold shoulder to a Soviet proposal to set up a mechanism for regular political consultations as Moscow has with France and Italy. The Japanese line is to get negotiations for a peace treaty started first, Foreign Ministry sources said.

Political differences also hampered discussion of long-term economic and trade relations, with the Soviet delegation expressing dissatisfaction over the low level of trade. "The volume of our bilateral trade is at about the same level as our trade with Austria," the Soviet delegation noted in calling for expanded trade.

The Japanese, however, held off prospects of a major boost in trading relations, linking expansion of long-term economic ties to improvement in political ties.

CSO: 5260/023

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER HITS CLAIMS OF SS-19 TEST CAMOUFLAGE

PM301331 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Sergeyev "Rejoinder": "Why Operation 'Canard' Was Needed"]

[Text] Citing anonymous military experts, reports have appeared in the pages of American newspapers that some kind of camouflage is being used during SS-19 launches on Soviet test sites "especially for the purpose of misleading" U.S. monitoring facilities which, they say, prevents them from determining the accuracy of these missiles.

The question arises: Why has this false information appeared right now, and why does it concern precisely SS-19 missiles? The explanation is quite simple: Some time ago the American press reported that, according to CIA data, the assessments made earlier of the SS-19 missiles' accuracy were overstated (and, consequently, these missiles' potential for hitting small, strongly defended targets was greatly exaggerated). It is clear that these articles alarmed the Pentagon. For they could cast doubt on its whole spurious concept of a "Soviet military threat," under cover of which the United States has mounted unprecedented militarist preparations. Of course, the U.S. military department could not admit this. And so a new "canard" has appeared, designed to "explain the reason" for the differences of opinion between the Pentagon and the CIA regarding the SS-19 missiles' accuracy with reference to some "deliberate actions" by the Soviet Union.

However, lies don't get you very far, as the saying goes. The flimsiness of the Pentagon's fabrications is obvious. For the SS-19 missile was created many years ago, and since then, the United States has had repeated opportunities to observe its launches. Therefore, allegations that some kind of "camouflage practice" has begun in the Soviet Union are beside the point. It is clear even to the nonspecialist that there is no sense in starting to camouflage what had not been camouflaged for a long time.

The initiators of the dishonorable fabrication have once again gotten themselves into a mess.

CSO: 5200/1399

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

COMMENTATOR ON INF SITING, PEACE MOVEMENT

Amsterdam DE TIJD in Dutch 12 Jul 85 p 17

[Commentary by Arie Kuiper: "No Humor in the Kremlin"]

[Text] One thing is lamentable: the leaders in the Kremlin have no sense for humor.

If I were the boss in the Soviet Union, I would know what to do and I would make sure that on 1 November 1985 exactly 378 SS20 missiles were in position, not one more. With my arms folded, and shaking with laughter I would subsequently observe the results.

It is easily guessed--panic in The Hague, a little on the part of Prime Minister Lubbers (he would know how to get out of the problem) and a lot on the part of Minister Van den Broek, the right wing of the CDA [Christian Democratic Appeal] and the entire VVD [People's Party for Freedom and Democracy], for according to the simple addition which has been sold here since June 1985 as creative foreign policy, we would then not be able to place cruise missiles in Woensdrecht.

It would be extremely interesting to watch that The Hague panic, approximately equal to that of the Likud party in Israel if the PLO unexpectedly should decide to recognize the Jewish state--the gentlemen would lose their last framework of reference and no longer have a leg to stand on.

But alas, the Soviet leaders have something to worry about other than watching the Netherlands. The three large West European NATO countries have made their choice, with the powerful support of France, and therefore there are now already over 400 of those medium-range monsters in the Soviet Union.

Neutralism

Thus, if two times two is four, on 1 November the Netherlands will make the decision to place cruise missiles, on the basis of the simple addition mentioned above. But someone who knows what is going on in The Hague (and who himself is an opponent of the siting) told me 14 days ago that he'll believe it when he sees it happen. "Lubbers still hasn't exhausted his bag of tricks."

If we do not site the missiles, which is possibly the wisest course in view of all the bungling of the past 6 years, it will be proved once again how ironical history is. In the sixties, anyone who was leftist and progressive in the Netherlands forcefully opposed (the right did too, for that matter) the "arrogant" proposal of French President Charles de Gaulle to create a type of directorate of large countries within NATO. The small countries were furious; the plan was dropped, and that was partly the reason for De Gaulle's decision to leave the NATO structure.

In the meantime it is 20 years later and we see that directorate come closer and closer with our own eyes; yes, in fact it exists already, and the Netherlands is returning, without but also with cruise missiles, at a uniformly increasing speed, to the situation which suits our people the best: neutralism. Only, it may no longer be called that; these days it is called "the Netherlands, Leading Country" or something like that --all nuclear arms out of the world, and we start in the Netherlands. General de Gaulle would call that our profound vocation, as Professor H.L. Wesseling said once, and that is right.

Mient Jan Faber

"Why was the peace movement able to get such an enormous response in the Netherlands?" Mient Jan Faber wonders in the epilogue of his book "Minus times Minus is Plus." As a possible answer he sets up a complicated argument about the lack of an individual Dutch political vision (and policy) in the area of peace and security. According to Faber we know rather precisely how to define our economic, ecologic and other similar interests, "but in the area of Peace and Security we are invisible, as it were; we are a member of an alliance without our own identity."

It is a pleasant theory which is indeed somewhat true, for indeed, after a long period of neutralism before the second world war we let go of our neutralism after that war and plunged ourselves body and soul into NATO (and the West European Union and the European Community), and especially once we had lost Indonesia, we became the United States' most faithful ally.

There is a theory which says that by acting in that manner we acted against our most profound conviction, against our "profound vocation," that deep in our heart we really want to get rid of all that involvement in the big East-West world conflict, and that is why the peace movement was so successful here. Mient Jan Faber appears to adhere more or less to that theory--his thesis comes down to the success of the peace movement--which wants to give the Dutch foreign policy an individual appearance--being a reaction to our uncritical love for NATO.

Faber forgets one thing, however--the peace movement might have had so much success because in the Netherlands, when it is a matter of carrying out the NATO dual decision, we have had, for 6 years already, governments which do not govern. Only when governments do not govern and continue to make conditions, place footnotes, think up delaying tactics and sell other excuses to avoid their responsibility, does public opinion count. It was in the first place

the succession of Dutch governments which have increased the peace movement since 1979.

"I think leadership is the most important thing. Public opinion is much more influenced by leadership than leadership by public opinion," said the former Israeli minister of Foreign Affairs Abba Eban a year ago in an interview with HET VRIJE VOLK (8 July 1984).

#### A Monster

That, I believe, is the crux of the matter. Public opinion is a monster which wants either strange things or every time something else, and usually both of these at once; the country where public opinion prevails is an unfortunate one. If public opinion had always had its say here, then we would still be in the period of witch burnings. The British House of Commons abolished the death penalty although 80 percent of the public opinion was fiercely against doing so, and when Margaret Thatcher wanted to restore the death penalty 2 years ago, 80 percent of the (in this respect consistent) public opinion was still fiercely in favor of that. But the House of Commons said: that doesn't concern us, and Thatcher lost, fortunately.

In the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany the peace movement died a sudden and clean death once the first cruise missiles had arrived, and if those monsters had been placed here 2 years ago, public opinion would have come to terms with that a long time ago and would now be occupied with other matters.

But possibly Faber is right after all, and we must say that our governments have not been governing since 1979 because they themselves are a little tired of our unconditional NATO allegiance.

8700

CSO: 5200/2714

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

### USSR'S BOVIN LAUDS IDEA OF NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES

PM061339 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Zones of the Future"]

[Text] As IZVESTIYA readers already know, the 16th session of the South Pacific Forum held at Avarua, the administrative center of the Cook Islands, decided to declare that region a nuclear-free zone. Thirteen states banned "in perpetuity" the deployment, production, and testing of nuclear weapons on their territories and the dumping of radioactive waste in the Pacific. A special protocol is attached to the treaty, intended to be signed by the nuclear powers and requiring them to respect the status of the nuclear-weapon-free zone.

This fact on its own is interesting and significant. It demonstrates the strengthening and the extent of antinuclear sentiments. They are seizing not only people, but also governments. They show that people are choosing a future free of nuclear weapons, the only future option which guarantees life and the preservation of humankind.

At the same time, the aforementioned fact does not exist "on its own" but in the context of a long and stubborn struggle to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and create zones where they cannot be located or used.

The history of nuclear-free zones dates back to 27 March 1956. On that day, in a subcommittee of the UN Disarmament Commission, the Soviet Union proposed creating in Europe an arms limitation and inspection zone. The idea was to ban the deployment of atomic military formations and any types of atomic and hydrogen weapons on the territory of the GDR, the FRG, and their neighboring states. Since then, proposals have repeatedly been put forward and discussed by very different states on the creation of nuclear-free zones; in central and northern Europe, in the Balkans, in the Mediterranean region, in the Near East, in Africa, and in the Indian Ocean basin.

All of these projects are based on the desire to reduce the probability of nuclear catastrophe, limit the territorial sphere of nuclear weapons, and protect states belonging to a nuclear-free zone from the prospect of being drawn into a nuclear conflict. Extensive documents have been elaborated. Corresponding resolutions have been adopted. But matters have moved extremely slowly.

The reason is simple. The United States, its NATO allies, and countries such as Israel and South Africa have seen and continue to see nuclear-free zones as a threat to their strong-arm policy. And they are rigidly blocking plans precisely aimed at limiting strong-arm methods in politics and narrowing opportunities favoring intimidation, blackmail, and threats.

Speaking informally, the first nuclear-free zone was the Antarctic. At a conference on 1 December 1959 in Washington, a treaty banning any activity for military purpose in the Antarctic was approved.

A major breakthrough toward a world without nuclear weapons was made on 12 February 1967: A treaty was concluded in Mexico City banning nuclear weapons in Latin America (the Tlatelolco Treaty). In accordance with Protocol II added to it, which was signed and ratified by all the nuclear powers, the latter adopted pledges to observe the status of nuclear-free zone and also not to promote its violation in any form.

There is no single model common to all the possible nuclear-free zones. But the Tlatelolco Treaty, the Avarua Treaty, and other documents relating to nuclear-free zones outline quite clearly the legal workings of such zones. States belonging to a given zone undertake not to produce, not to stockpile, not to import for their own purposes, not to permit the deployment on their territory of all types of nuclear weapons, and not to set up nor permit to be set up on their territory backup equipment and installations for nuclear weapons. States which possess nuclear weapons undertake not to have nuclear weapons in the armory of their forces if, in accordance with international agreements, they are stationed in the zone's territory, not to transfer nuclear weapons to governments on that territory, and not to use nor threaten to use nuclear weapons against zone members.

Thus, a nuclear-free system constitutes a sum of undertakings both by nonnuclear and -- necessarily! -- nuclear states. Incidentally, it will be interesting to see how certain nuclear powers react to the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. For the Soviet Union there is no question here; nor for China -- I hope. So far official circles in Washington and London have been cautiously silent. But France has already stated unambiguously that it will continue nuclear explosions on Mururoa Atoll, which is in the zone.

For the inhabitants of the Pacific islands this is, literally, a painful problem. Employees of Fiji University have established that radioactive contamination of the environment, caused by more than 210 French and U.S. tests, has already resulted in an increased number of cancer cases, the birth of children with congenital defects, and genetic abnormalities. Those who carry out the tests usually assert that today's explosions are "clean" and harmful to nobody. People retort: If that is so, why is it necessary to remove the test sites thousands of kilometers from those who arrange them? In my opinion, it's logical...

Recently, the practice has been established of creating mini-zones free of nuclear weapons. Many cities, villages and other administrative units in NATO countries have declared themselves zones within the bounds of which the local authorities ban the manufacture, deployment, and transport of nuclear weapons. These countries' governments are ignoring the decisions of the municipal organs. But that does not reduce the moral and political significance of such acts. They symbolize the growth of political awareness among broad sections of the population and their nonacceptance of the arms race.

All countries and all peoples can and must do everything possible to reduce the threat of war and then, completely eliminate that threat. The creation of nuclear-free zones is a contribution to the resolution of this task, a contribution which nonnuclear countries are making to the strengthening international security. The creation of nuclear-free zones is a substantial obstacle in the way of the dissemination of nuclear weapons. It is no accident that Article VII of the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons says: "No clause of the present treaty affects the

right of any group of states to conclude regional treaties with a view to fully ensuring the absence of nuclear weapons on their corresponding territory."

The skeptically minded reader may think: Well, what is the point of talking about nuclear-free zones; that is not where the course of world events is determined; if there is a big war nobody will survive, whatever zone he lives in... This stance may not seem very consoling at first glance, but perfectly realistic. However, there is realism and realism. Reconciling oneself to circumstances is no doubt realism. But overcoming circumstances is also realism. What has been created by mankind can be changed by mankind. For this reason the threat of war is not fatal. For this reason there is a point in any action, great or small, which works against war. And our future will be what we make it now, today.

CSO: 5200/1398



NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA VIEWS NFZ MOVEMENT IN NORDIC ISLANDS

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 22 Aug 85 pp 1-4

[Article by N. Ivanov, IZVESTIYA own correspondent in Helsinki: "Nordic Countries Seek Non-Nuclear Status"]

[Text] The Faeroes came into focus of world attention when it declared itself a nuclear-free zone last year, said the Norwegian newspaper FRIHETEN. That decision was preceded by an event which made headlines in Scandinavia. A Danish magazine told its readers that some 20 kilometres off Torshavn, the principal city of the Faeroe Islands, the United States had an electronic intelligence station.

The report caused serious concern on the islands. Activists of the anti-war organization "People and Peace" demanded that the authorities provide full information about the activities of the "American specialists" working at the station. Later the leader of the Republican Party, Erlendur Patursson, said that that was one of the crucial moments that changed the moods of the Faeroese. In broader terms, the case of the secret station was merely one of the numerous facts that determined their position.

In the autumn of 1983 the leaders of "People and Peace" held a meeting to discuss a non-nuclear status of the Faeroes. At the initiative of the Republican Party, the matter was submitted to the Faeroese parliament, the Logting, and a little later the Faeroese MP's almost unanimously voted for granting the islands a non-nuclear status.

In November 1984, that is 10 months later, Greenland's parliament followed their example that stated that it would not allow the deployment of nuclear weapons in the country in peacetime or in time of war. "There is no place for Pershing or Tomahawk missiles or any other nuclear weapons in Greenland," Jonathan Motzfeldt, the country's prime minister, told me later.

Several months later a similar decision was taken by the Iceland parliament, the Althing. Ten years after the idea of making Iceland a non-nuclear zone was first put forward the MP's voted for a resolution banning the deployment of nuclear weapons on the island. Those three events, which took place in a short space of time, gave reason to Scandinavian commentators to speak about a new impetus in debate on a non-nuclear status.

The example set by Greenland, the Faeroes and Iceland, which demanded a non-nuclear status, is significant, though one should not overestimate its importance. Unlike independent Iceland, Greenland and the Faeroes are part of the Kingdom of Denmark and the Danish Government refuses for the time-being to discuss the problem of granting a non-nuclear status to the islands.

No matter how things will go, the islanders' decision marks a significant change in the debate on a non-nuclear north.

More than 20 years have passed since President Urho Kalevi Kekkonen of Finland proposed creating a zone free from nuclear weapons in the north of Europe. The discussion of this problem has been going on since then, though, as a commentator of AFTENPOSTEN put it, it has been conducted at the level of four capitals--Oslo, Stockholm, Helsinki and Copenhagen. Reykjavik was from the start left outside the debate on grounds that there was an American military base at Kefavik. The Icelanders' attempts to find out whether there were nuclear weapons or not produced no results. Washington stubbornly dodged the question.

On the other hand, the Americans are doing everything to incite pro-NATO sentiments in a bid to turn Icelanders against the idea of creating a non-nuclear zone in Nordic Europe.

However, in spite of the efforts of the NATO leaders to bury the idea of creating a non-nuclear zone, it has survived. The events of the past few years have shown that the discussion of that important proposal has moved outside the walls of diplomatic salons and government offices. The newspaper THJODVILJINN said that as the proposal on a non-nuclear North gained ever wider acceptance in Nordic Europe, Icelanders became increasingly concerned that their country might find itself in isolation. According to the paper, if the idea of creating a non-nuclear zone is put into practice, Iceland will be the only island in the North Atlantic where the Pentagon will be able to deploy its nuclear weapons "legally."

Subsequent developments showed that those fears were not unjustified. The Pentagon reportedly has drawn up a plan envisaging the deployment in Iceland in the event of a "crisis situation" of 48 nuclear-tipped depth charges. The news about the American generals' intentions raised a storm in Reykjavik. Prime Minister Steingrímur Hermannsson went on record saying that without the consent of the Iceland Government the United States had no right to bring nuclear weapons to the island, even in the event of war. Iceland's foreign minister said that the ban also applied to nuclear-weapon aircraft and ships. The Althing later confirmed this in its decision.

The inhabitants of all the northern islands seeking a non-nuclear status have the bitter experience which allowed them to see a bit farther than their own borders. Greenlanders remember an accident when an American bomber dropped four H-bombs near Thule. Icelanders had a shock when they learned about the Pentagon's "nuclear plan." The American intelligence-gathering station is a source of constant anxiety for the Faeroese.

At a conference of Mp's and leaders of major political parties and trade unions of Nordic Europe, which was held in Copenhagen, Iceland's representative G. Torarinsson said that 86 percent of Icelanders supported the idea of creating a non-nuclear zone. He emphasised that the Icelanders wanted to make a practical contribution to the implementation of that major initiative. The Faeroese and Greenlanders spoke in the same vein.

New voices are being heard in the discussion about a nuclear-free Nordic Europe. Though people who participate in this debate have different views, the decisions taken by the parliaments of Iceland, the Faeroes and Greenland constitute a major step forward in carrying out a plan designed to bar nuclear weapons from the north of Europe.

(IZVESTIYA, August 21, Abridged.)

CSO: 5200/1398

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

### PRAVDA CALLS FOR 'PEACEFUL MEDITERRANEAN'

PM051357 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[N. Kovalskiy article: "For a Peaceful Mediterranean"]

[Text] The buildup of the U.S. military presence in the Mediterranean and the U.S. political pressure on the governments of several Mediterranean countries are causing concern among the peace-loving public and encountering growing opposition by it. Evidence of this can be seen in the mass wave of antiwar demonstrations which have spread in recent months from Portugal and Spain to the shores of Greece.

What is it that generates alarm among, and the protest of peace-loving forces?

It is primarily the enhancement of the role of the military aspects of the United States' Mediterranean policy. The threat against peace originates in the perception by U.S. militarists that the Mediterranean is the southern flank of NATO armed forces, which has been assigned a substantial role in aggressive plans aimed against the USSR and other socialist community countries, against some Arab states, and against the forces of the national liberation movement.

The continuing deployment of new U.S. cruise missiles on the Italian island of Sicily, which pose a threat not just against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries but also constitutes a new factor that has significantly enhanced the military importance of the Mediterranean and boosted the United States' nuclear offensive arsenal. Although the flight range of the 112 U.S. nuclear cruise missiles in Comiso enables them to reach only the western regions of the USSR, the journal AFRIQUE-ASIE noted in this connection that it nonetheless fully covers the Balkan peninsula and, on a wider scale, the approaches to the eastern Mediterranean, the entire Mediterranean, and North Africa. This means that the United States is acquiring the means of military deterrence [ustrasheniye] in an extensive region where it would like to be an all-powerful master. Thus, the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in Italy is turning the Mediterranean into a new knot of tension with a great explosive potential. The plans to impose membership in the North Atlantic bloc's military organization on Spain are also aimed at changing the correlation of forces prevailing here.

Because U.S. and NATO military activity here has been put on an almost permanent footing exacerbates and complicates the situation in the Mediterranean. This activity takes the form of militarist actions by the U.S. 6th Fleet off Lebanon's coast, provocations against Libya, and regular maneuvers not only at sea but also on land. The purpose of these maneuvers is stated to be a check of joint actions and the combat readiness of NATO forces and of the possibility of coordinating their actions with

other theaters of combat operations in Europe. "Display Determination" and "Distant Hammer" are just two of the largest maneuvers staged in the Mediterranean. The "Bright Star-85" maneuvers were held in August and were described by the Paris LE MONDE as unprecedented in size.

A significant threat against peace is posed by the U.S. bases and other installations located in the Mediterranean. Over 12,000 American servicemen are stationed at the 4 U.S. military bases in Spain alone, while the Rota base at the gateway to the Mediterranean is a key center for providing material and technical backing to the U.S. 6th Fleet. Some of the United States' Mediterranean bases are meant especially for intelligence gathering operations and shadowing of North African countries.

The network of U.S. bases is being expanded, in the opinion of the journal AFRIQUE-ASIE, so as to enable the United States to "lock up the Mediterranean." Thus, in the journal's opinion, this network poses a threat to the sovereignty of Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Cyprus, Syria, and several other countries. It is the region's geographical location that explains why the United States is so interested in involving Spain and Portugal in military cooperation. This is the goal pursued by the plans to lay an oil pipeline from Lisbon to Montijo Air Force Base, the construction of an American satellite tracking station in the Almodovar region, and several other similar measures.

The global aggressive nature of the U.S. "star wars" plans envisages the involvement of some Mediterranean NATO member-states in them. This would enhance these countries' military dependence on the United States and would increase the possibility for utilizing their scientific and technical potential to transfer the arms race into space.

The U.S. militarist policy has resulted in the Mediterranean being threatened by the danger of becoming a real concentration of "hot spots." The fire of war is still raging in the Mediterranean part of the Near East, where the United States is obstructing the peaceful settlement of the complex situation and is de facto encouraging the aggressive intoxication of its "strategic ally," Israel. One cannot fail to mention the problem of Cyprus, which has been for a long time the object of imperialist intrigues. Libya has become the target of constant threats and provocations by the United States.

Striving to implement its militarist schemes, the United States is supporting the region's right-wing conservative forces and is interfering in the internal affairs of peoples in Mediterranean countries. The stance of some socialist parties and of revolutionary-democratic and other progressive public forces in the region is also causing irritation across the ocean.

The actions by U.S. militarist circles in the Mediterranean are threatening Europe's security and constitute a departure from the Helsinki Final Act. It is, therefore, no accident that dissatisfaction is growing in countries situated both on the northern and the southern shores of the Mediterranean and there are an increasing number of demonstrations against the U.S. military presence and the U.S. military-political course there.

This takes shape on several levels. One of them concerns the contradictions between the United States and its Mediterranean partners in NATO or under other treaties. For example, obvious alarm was caused in the Pentagon by the Greek Government's official statement about a review of its military doctrine, which was formerly based on the premise that the potential enemy was to be found to the north of Greece's border, and

also by the statement by that country's prime minister concerning the need to withdraw the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpiled in Greece. In Spain, according to the French newspaper LIBERATION, the population sees "nothing more absurd than the idea of a Soviet threat."

The stance of nonaligned Mediterranean countries, expressing the interests of peace-loving forces, is another level at which difficulties arise for the U.S. military-political course in the region. This stance was formulated in particular at the meeting of foreign ministers and other representatives from Malta, Libya, Syria, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Yugoslavia, Cyprus, Algeria, and the PLO. The document they adopted expressed "profound concern in connection with the numerous U.S. provocations that violate Libya's sovereignty and territorial integrity and constitute a threat to international peace," contains a condemnation of the "strategic alliance" between Israel and the United States, and notes that this alliance "furthers Israel's aggressive role."

Finally, the United States' militarist plans in the Mediterranean are encountering opposition by the influential political force that is the antiwar movement. This movement has acquired a mass nature and expresses the will of the broadest public circles. For example: According to public opinion polls, 70 percent of Spain's population are in favor of the liquidation of U.S. military bases on Spanish territory, and 54 percent in favor of the country's withdrawal from NATO.

Despite the considerable variety of the antiwar movement's forms, the composition of its membership, its members' political and philosophical orientation, and the specific action programs, they are all united by a common demand: to transform the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and cooperation.

The same demand is raised at the regular conference of progressive parties and movements from Mediterranean countries. It was echoed at several international meetings in Comiso, Sicily, and at the Athens conference "For a Nuclear-Free Europe." It is chanted by the columns of demonstrators protesting the whipping up of tension in the region. A struggle for the attainment of this goal is being waged by communist parties in the Mediterranean countries, and the conference of representatives of communist and workers parties from the eastern Mediterranean, the Near and Middle East, and the Red Sea region declared itself in favor of it.

Rendering this demand more specific, the fighters against the threat of war are demanding U.S. abandonment of the deployment of cruise missiles in the region, a ban on the stockpiling of nuclear weapons there, and the liquidation of foreign bases.

Calls for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans are becoming increasingly widespread. The peace-loving public has welcomed the first steps taken in this direction, which took the form of convening a meeting of experts from Balkan countries at the state level. In the western Mediterranean, Portuguese and Spanish champions of peace are calling for the proclamation of a nuclear-free zone in the Pyrenean peninsula.

An anti-imperialist content abounds in the program stipulations of the regional antiwar movement as regards Lebanon, Cyprus, the threat to Libya's sovereignty, the rights of the Palestinian Arab people, and Israel's policy of conquest. Many of the movement's members see a guarantee for success in their struggle in their further cohesion, in the involvement of new political and social forces in the struggle, and in the development of cooperation with all forces of social and national liberation struggling for peace, democracy, and social progress against imperialism.

In its approach to Mediterranean problems, the Soviet Union pursues goals that are identical with those pursued by all peace-loving forces in the region. Our country declares its commitment to a policy aimed at turning the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace, security and fruitful cooperation, and draws attention to the unbreakable link between security in this region and European security.

During the recent visit by Italy's Prime Minister B. Craxi to the USSR, the Soviet side declared that seats of tension, including the Mediterranean, must be eliminated by political means. The USSR is in favor of a continuation of the process of narrowing the gap between positions, of more active cooperation in the attempts to settle regional problems around the negotiating table, and of protection of the sovereign rights of states and peoples subjected to pressure and crude interference in internal affairs. During the visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to Spain, both sides noted in their joint statement the importance of maintaining relations of peace between Mediterranean states and transforming the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and friendly cooperation.

The Soviet Union has put forward an entire package of proposals whose implementation would help ease tension not only in the Mediterranean but also in Europe as a whole. This program envisages a ban on the establishment of foreign bases in the Mediterranean, the spread of agreed confidence-building measures in the military sphere throughout the region, the reduction of armed forces there, the withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons from the Mediterranean, the renunciation of the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear Mediterranean countries, and the pledge by nuclear powers not to use nuclear weapons against these countries.

The USSR's realistic proposals are encountering growing understanding and support both in Mediterranean states and beyond the region's boundaries. The Mediterranean can and must become truly a sea of peace.

CSO: 5200/1398

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: IMPORTANCE OF MORATORIUM FOR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 27 Aug 85 pp 1-2

[Article by Vladimir Baburov, under the rubric "News and Views": "Soviet Disarmament Expert"]

[Text] One simple fact to indicate the importance of the conference, opening in Geneva on 27 August, is that 129 nations are now parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Article 6 of the treaty called for negotiations about effective measures for ending the nuclear arms race in the immediate future and for nuclear disarmament. The treaty reaffirmed the determination of the parties concerned to seek the termination of all nuclear test explosions for good and to continue negotiations to that end. The Soviet Union has been consistently pressing for the treaty's objectives to be realized.

The Soviet Union's announcement of a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions as of 6 August, Hiroshima Day, has been a clear indication of its constructive approach to the objectives involved. Whatever some Western observers and political sceptics may claim, they can hardly play down the importance of this bold move. It has been prompted by a sincere desire to create favorable conditions for a total nuclear test ban under a treaty. That the Soviet Union has sincere intentions can be seen from that having unilaterally suspended all nuclear explosions, the USSR has made a certain economic sacrifice because some of such explosions for peaceful purposes were essential, for example, for the construction of gas condensate storage capacities.

Contrary to all hopes and expectations of the peoples, the U.S. has rejected the Soviet peace initiative, Washington's reaction can hardly be seen as becoming to a permanent member of the Security Council. After trying to misrepresent the meaning of the Soviet move and to bring in question the sincerity of Soviet intentions and actions, Washington found no better response than to carry out yet another nuclear test in Nevada on 18 August.

As to US administration spokesmen's claims that it would be difficult to monitor a test ban, these have been totally disproved by special studies in Western countries and by American experts as well. One can see that, notably,



from a letter of 26 July, 1985, to President Reagan from the U.S. Research Defence Information Center. It contained convincing references to seismic data obtained by scientists of the U.S., Britain and Sweden, indicating that the Soviet Union observed the 150-kiloton-yield limit established by the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests.

The ending of nuclear tests would be the first indispensable and practical step towards slowing down, ending and reversing the nuclear arms race. This move would meet the interests of all nations without exception and, unquestionably, those of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(APN, Aug 26. In full.)

CSO: 5200/1402

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS LINKS MITTERRAND PACIFIC TRIP TO NUCLEAR TESTING

LD111628 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 11 Sep 85

[Text] Paris, September 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Tregubenko reporting:

According to an official announcement made in Paris, on September 13 President Francois Mitterrand of France will visit Mururoa Atoll in the southern Pacific where the French center for underground nuclear tests is situated.

En route to Mururoa the French president will stop at France's space research center near Kourou, French Guiana, where he will see the launch of 'Ariane', the rocket that is to place two communication satellites in near-earth orbits.

The French press regards the presidential tour in the context of forthcoming French nuclear weapon tests on Mururoa. The newspaper LIBERATION links the visit with the scheduled arrival into the region, in mid-September, of ships carrying anti-war activists who are working for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific. The paper describes the president's visit as a move "which clearly falls within the framework of the tough presidential directive issued to the Armed Forces." The directive of August 18, 1985 instructs the Armed Forces to "block, if necessary with the use of force, the crossing of marine and air boundaries of France in the region of the Polynesian atolls of the Mururoa sector."

The meaning of Francois Mitterrand's trip, LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS comments, is clear: To reiterate France's strategic choice in favor of the atom and to make it plain that Paris intends to continue maintaining its presence in that region of the world.

CSO: 5200/1402

NUCLEAR TESTING

UK OPPOSITION, PEACE GROUP SUPPORT USSR ON MORATORIUM

LD270901 Moscow TASS in English 0842 GMT 27 Aug 85

[Text] London, 27 Aug (TASS)--TASS correspondent Viktor Borodin reports:

Spokesmen for opposition parties and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament demanded at a press conference here that the government support the Soviet Union's decision to introduce a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and contribute to the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

Denzill Davis, a member of the Labour shadow cabinet, stated that the Conservative Government was violating provisions of the nonproliferation treaty, signed among others by Britain. During the past few years the Conservative cabinet, far from having taken positive steps towards disarmament, is contributing in every way to the buildup of the country's nuclear potential.

The Conservatives' policy is downright hypocritical, they are merely talking about the need to curb the arms race. If the Tory cabinet is really seeking nuclear disarmament, it should immediately renounce its present militarist policy, CND Chairman Joan Ruddock stressed.

The Liberals' defence spokesman, James Wallace, pointed out the need to count Britain's nuclear potential at the disarmament talks and urged the government to contribute to the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

CSO: 5200/1402

## NUCLEAR TESTING

### SOVIET SCIENTISTS STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF MORATORIUM

PM261110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Aug 85 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Hero of Socialist Labor A. Petrosyants, full member of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences: "The Moratorium Is an Important Step Toward Nuclear Disarmament"]

[Text] A total ban on nuclear weapon tests is one of the most important tasks in the sphere of limiting the arms race and of disarmament and in the package of measures to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. The need to resolve it without delay is spoken of in the resolutions of many international forums and of such authoritative organs as the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament, and others. The question of banning nuclear weapon tests has become particularly acute under the conditions of the growing danger of war and the intensification of military preparations.

In resolving the question of whether to produce a new type of weapon and equip an army with it, tests of this weapon are the most important, determining aspect. And nuclear armament is distinguished by the special feature that it requires tests not only at the time of creation but also in the process of long-term storage. The ending of nuclear weapon tests would be a real obstacle in the way both of the further improvement of nuclear weapons and of the development and creation of new kinds of them. That is obvious. Precisely this is why the Soviet Union's decision, announced in M. S. Gorbachev's statement of 29 July this year, to cease unilaterally all nuclear explosions as of 6 August 1985 elicited such a broad positive response in the world. The world also awaits a similar attitude from official Washington, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary pointed out in reply to questions from a TASS correspondent.

As is known, the first agreement in the sphere of limiting nuclear tests was the 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water, to which more than 100 states are party. One of the positive consequences of that treaty was the ending of radio active contamination of the environment. However, the treaty did not ban underground tests, which remained a means of further improving nuclear weapons.

Soon after the Moscow treaty's validation a USSR Government memorandum published in January 1964 expressed, as previously, readiness to ensure that a future

accord on a ban would extend also to underground nuclear tests. However, owing to the Western states' position, the talks at the Geneva Disarmament Committee on the Total Cessation of Underground Tests became deadlocked. Then the USSR expressed readiness to conclude even a partial agreement bringing the final goal nearer--a ban on nuclear explosions in all environments. As a result, in July 1974 the USSR and the United States signed the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests, which banned underground tests with a yield of more than 150 kilotons. The 1976 treaty also set a yield ceiling for peaceful nuclear explosions. In the opinion of the U.S. and Soviet delegations, the system of control measures provided for in those two agreements fully accorded with the aims of limitation. However, through the fault of the United States neither of these agreements has yet been validated.

In 1975 the first conference of countries which are party to the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty confirmed in its final declaration the desire to achieve an end forever to all test explosions of nuclear weapons.

In 1977, under pressure from the world public, the United States was forced to agree to talks with the Soviet Union with a view to drawing up an agreement on a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. Britain also joined in those talks.

In June of the same year the three countries published a joint communique to the effect that they "agreed to begin talks with the intention of concluding a treaty on a general ban on nuclear weapon tests...." Yes, that intention really was voiced by the U.S. and British delegations, not to mention the Soviet Union--the initiator of the talks.

The author of these lines participated as head of the Soviet delegation in the tripartite talks between the USSR, the United States, and Britain. In May 1978 Warnke, leader of the U.S. delegation, declared at a plenary session of the talks that President Carter was seeking to ensure that those talks were accelerated as far as possible, since he regarded them as an exceptionally important matter.

In February 1980 Earle, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said the following: "We believe that these are vitally important talks, at which significant progress has already been made...."

Indeed, very impressive progress was made by the three delegations at the talks on drawing up the draft treaty. The report on the course of the talks, which they submitted in July 1980 to Disarmament Committee, stated in particular: "The three participants in the talks have forged far ahead in preparing a sound treaty and continue to believe that tripartite talks are the best way to make further progress. They are fully determined to make every effort and to display the necessary will and persistence in order to bring the talks to a speediest, successful conclusion." Then, too, the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks declared that "the U.S. administration has also approved the joint report and accepts it in full, without any reservations." It seemed possible to reckon on a quite rapid and positive outcome to the talks....

Their 12th round ended in November 1980. Taking into account the entire complexity and capaciousness of the draft treaty banning nuclear weapon tests and also the contradictions between the sides' positions, much had been done in that generally short space of time. The draft which had been prepared envisaged a ban on all test explosions of nuclear changes in any place and in any environment. The text of the treaty, a protocol on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, and a protocol on the principles of the international exchange of seismic data were agreed on during the talks. Questions of monitoring were resolved not only in principle but to a considerable extent in detail. National technical means were to constitute the basis of monitoring, and they would be supplemented by an international exchange of seismic data and by verification of nuclear seismic phenomena on the spot.

At the final plenary session on 11 November 1980 Ambassador H. York, leader of the U.S. delegation, made the statement that his side was "very satisfied that we have reached agreement." Ambassador Edmonds, the British representative, expressed himself in the same spirit.

Meanwhile, another administration had acceded to power in the United States, and it totally abandoned all intentions of ending the improvement, modernization, and production of new types of nuclear weapons.

It was at just that time that official and unofficial U.S. spokesmen began actively exploiting the monitoring problem, depicting the matter as though the USSR were opposed to monitoring.

In order to understand the Soviet Union's attitude to monitoring issues it is sufficient to familiarize yourself with the document "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on a Total Ban on Nuclear Weapon Tests," submitted by the USSR for examination by the 37th UN General Assembly Session in 1982. The bulk of the provisions embraced precisely questions of verification. It was envisaged, for example, that monitoring of observance of the treaty's provisions would be built on a combination of national and international measures. The former included the use of national technical means of monitoring, the placing of the data obtained on the basis of those means at the disposal of the other parties to the treaty, and a pledge not to impede national technical means of monitoring. The international measures proposed primarily an exchange of seismic data, which are the most effective instrument for getting a fix on a nuclear explosion. A communications system, the setting up of centers to process seismic data, and so forth were also provided for. To organize the exchange of seismic data it was proposed to set up a special committee of experts of the states participating in the treaty.

The 1982 Basic Provisions provided for on-site verification as a constituent monitoring measure, and it was proposed to draw up in detail the procedures for such verifications and the order of carrying them out, including a list of the rights and functions of the verifying personnel and the role of the receiving side during verifications. What is more, it was proposed to include in the future treaty a provision enabling any two or more participant states to agree on additional monitoring measures.

No, the Soviet Union is not against monitoring, as certain Western figures are inclined to claim. And it certainly was not because of the inadequate efficiency of monitoring that the U.S. administration unilaterally announced in July 1982 the ending of the talks on banning nuclear weapon tests. The desire to achieve military superiority over the USSR and a new twist to the nuclear arms race spiral were undoubtedly the determining factor in that U.S. decision.

Instead of further concrete steps to reach accords the present Washington administration has adopted a policy of developing new nuclear warheads for MX, Trident, Midgetman, long-range cruise, and Pershing-2 missiles, neutron weapons, ammunition for the new B-1 and Stealth strategic bombers, and others. Naturally, the development of new types of nuclear weapons required intensive new tests, and therefore the real prospect of reaching an accord at the tripartite talks--a prospect which became apparent at the beginning of 1980--in no way suited the Pentagon strategists.

Statements by U.S. administration officials on this score are very frank. In their opinion, the continuation of nuclear weapon tests is absolutely essential for the creation of an X-ray laser with nuclear excitation--one of the key elements of the U.S. President's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative"; for research into all elements connected with waging a protracted nuclear war, for the creation of new nuclear warheads, and also for verifying the combat effectiveness of the nuclear arsenals already accumulated.

Kerr, director of the U.S. Los Alamos National Laboratory, frankly declared at a session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "the prohibition of and a moratorium on nuclear weapon tests could have negative consequences for U.S. national security." And further: "As long as the United States relies on nuclear weapons, they must be tested, for there are no means of experimentally modelling all the processes in the operation of a new nuclear weapon." According to Kerr, talks and a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests will lead to a loss of confidence in the reliable operation of American nuclear weapons and to an end to the desirable modernization of the American nuclear arsenal.

This, in fact, is the whole root of the question. The United States does not want to end tests. This is why its spokesmen do all they can to emphasize the need, above all, for "more effective" monitoring: First, they say, let us agree on its "essence," organization, and methods, and only then proceed to ending nuclear weapon tests. Here they are fully aware that this is an opportunity to drag out for years the resolution of the issue.

The Soviet Union's unilaterally announced moratorium on all nuclear explosions also means ending those for peaceful purposes. This includes contained [kamufletnyy] explosions (that is, deep below the earth's surface, without a crater being formed or radioactivity being released into the atmosphere), which the USSR has carried out for the purpose of creating underground storage capacities for gas condensate--which produced a great saving compared with the conventional methods of constructing similar structures. Nonetheless, we have undertaken this too.

Our country is ready to ratify at any moment and on a mutual basis the Soviet-American treaties on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests and underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The USSR advocates the immediate resumption of the tripartite talks to complete the drafting of a treaty on a total ban on nuclear weapon tests.

CSO: 5200/1402



GENERAL

GORBACHEV DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES WITH FRG'S RAU

LD101106 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 10 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September TASS -- General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin today Johannes Rau, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), prime minister of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (the Federal Republic of Germany), on an official visit to the Soviet Union.

During the conversation, marked by an atmosphere of mutual understanding and constructive spirit, the two sides noted that the present-day international situation gives rise to serious anxiety of the peoples since the arms race and the mounting West-East confrontation are enhancing the risk of new war, whose dimensions and character would have destructive, fatal consequences for all of mankind. It was stated that leading representatives of the CPSU and the SPD share the understanding of the need to act vigorously and persistently in favour of peace, detente and constructive cooperation in order to prevent the sliding towards catastrophe.

Speaking of the internal development of the USSR and the large-scale tasks tackled by the USSR in the economic and socio-political fields, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed that our plans are plans of peacetime construction and that we need peace to carry them out. The top-priority task of our country in the world arena is prevention of war, termination of the arms race and arms reduction. That is the reason why the Soviet Union comes out persistently for an end to the stockpiling of nuclear arsenals, for curbing military rivalry, for strengthening confidence and peaceful cooperation. Our proposals for scaling down the arms race, involving arms of all types, are on the conference table, he said. And if the states concerned, the USA in the first place, are willing to come to terms on all these issues affecting the destinies of whole peoples, this can be done effectively and without delay.

The Soviet Union's words are not at variance with deeds, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed. This is evidenced by our country's decision to stop unilaterally all nuclear explosions starting from August 6 this year -- the 40th anniversary of the day an atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima -- and not to resume them after January 1, 1986 if the United States acts likewise. The USSR is strongly opposed to the spread of the arms race into outer space and to "star wars" preparations. We offered the world community another option -- broad cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space.

Johannes Rau pointed out that the SPD favours East-West partnership on questions of ensuring security and rejects the course towards confrontation, towards gaining military superiority by one of the sides. The SPD leadership welcomed the Soviet Union's mora-

torium on nuclear blasts, it actively backs all proposals and steps leading towards the prevention of the militarization of outer space.

Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out that Europe, with all the complexities of its destiny, possesses vast historical experience of fruitful cooperation between states, which should not only be cherished, but also multiplied.

It was stressed that the USSR advanced in recent years a package of proposals directed at improving drastically the situation in Europe and enhancing the level of mutual security. The Soviet Union stands for ridding the continent of nuclear weapons -- both medium-range and tactical. The Palme Commission's proposal for establishing a "nuclear-free corridor" on the line of contact between NATO and Warsaw Treaty Organization accords with our policy, we favour its implementation. In case of the establishment of a zone in Central Europe that would be free from chemical weapons, the USSR, guided by its basic foreign policy principles, would be ready to guarantee and respect the status of the zone. The guarantee would enter into force if the United States acted likewise on its part.

The main thing is, M.S. Gorbachev said, that Europe should be regarded not as an arena of mutually beneficial peaceful cooperation of states and peoples. This presupposes abandonment of any revanchist claims and strict observance of the principle of inviolability of frontiers.

For his part, Johannes Rau stressed the desire of the SPD for a stable and lasting peace on the European continent and the formation of such a policy under which the threat of war for neighbouring peoples would never come from the territory of the FRG and peaceful cooperation between them would be encouraged.

M.S. Gorbachev and J. Rau pointed out that, as was shown by the seventies, the USSR and the FRG, though belonging to different socio-economic systems and military-political alliances, can well cooperate as partners in solving cardinal problems of peace and security.

The conviction was expressed that relations between the two states can develop onwards on the basis of observance of the letter and spirit of the Moscow Treaty, in the interests of the peoples of the two countries and of peace in Europe.

M.S. Gorbachev stressed that Soviet people have no hostile sentiments towards the population of the FRG. There is not a grain of truth in assertions, circulated in the West, about a menace allegedly coming from the Soviet Union. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee conveyed to all the population of the FRG and the working people of North Rhine-Westphalia wishes to peace and well-being and expressed the hope that mutual understanding between the peoples of our countries would steadily grow stronger.

The two sides noted with satisfaction the fruitfulness of contacts between the CPSU and the SPD and expressed themselves in favour of further deepening and developing these contacts.

CSO: 5200/1399

END