JPRS-TAC-85-045

1 November 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

JPRS-TAC-85-045

1 November 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA HITS REAGAN RADIO ADDRESS ON SOVIET SDI PROGRAM

PM151103 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Lies and Hypocrisy Again"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Oct--Faced with the Soviet Union's new large-scale proposals for a radical reduction in nuclear arms and the non-militarization of space, which have aroused a positive response in many countries, the White House is resorting to increasingly unscrupulous attempts to justify in the eyes of the world and the American public its own policy of wrecking accords in the sphere of lessening the threat of nuclear war, which hangs over the planet, and militarizing space. U.S. President Reagan's latest radio address was a graphic example of such a ploy.

Not treating the listeners to any variety, the head of the Washington administration first of all once again intimidated Americans with the notorious "Soviet military threat." Arguing about the USSR's so-called "unprecedented buildup" of strategic nuclear arms, the President attempted to depict the matter as though the United States were "lagging" behind the Soviet Union and no balance of power existed at present between the two countries. "We must restore military equilibrium between the United States and the Soviet Union," he declared. The White House Chief and his advisers have evidently forgotten or are making out that they do not know about the corresponding conclusions of their own Joint Chiefs of Staff, which emphasized as recently as this year in a report to Congress that "approximate nuclear parity" now exists between the two countries. If we are to speak of an "unprecedented buildup" of offensive nuclear arms, including first-strike arms, these words are more suitable for defining the massive nuclear programs of the Reagan administration itself, which, immediately after acceding to power, drew up the well-known "strategic modernization" program embracing the construction and deployment of the latest nuclear systems, including MS missiles, long-range heavy bombers, Trident-2 nuclear missile-carrying submarines, and cruise missiles. According to assessments by the American press, this program of building up nuclear forces really has no precedents in the postwar period in terms of scale.

However, President Reagan put his biggest effort into "proving" that the Soviet Union is implementing its own "Strategic Defense Initiative," that is, a program for creating [sozdaniye] space defenses. Descending to the role of publicity agent for the propaganda forgeries of the Pentagon and the State

Department, he urged Americans to "send off" for the provocative forgery "Soviet Strategic Defense Programs," which was published by these two departments last week. But for those who have no intention of familiarizing themselves with this State Department and Pentagon brochure he persistently tried to din it into them that "the Russians possess the only working antisatellite weapons system in the world," that the Soviet Union "spends almost as much on strategic defense as on offensive nuclear forces," has "already gone far beyond the framework of scientific research," and "has long been conducting sophisticated research within the framework of its own version of SDI," and that the Soviet Armed Forces "possess the world's biggest strategic air defense network," and at the same time, in order finally to intimidate his listeners," he questioned the USSR's allegiance to the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. In other words, acting in the spirit of Goebbels' propaganda, he laid at the USSR's door precisely everything that his own administration is doing. Here he went so far as to allege that the Soviet Union is engaging in "dangerous deception" regarding his "strategic defense" programs. However, in this case it is precisely Washington that is lying, and this lie has already been exposed repeatedly by the Soviet Union. Right at the start of the Geneva talks the USSR proposed introducing, for the entire duration of the talks, a moratorium on the creation [sozdaniye] including research work--testing, and deployment of space strike arms, and freezing its own strategic offensive arms. The United States rejected those proposals and did not make a positive response. The administration also hushes up this fact, concealing it from the public. It certainly was not the Soviet Union that gave a boost to the arms race in space and the creation [sozdaniye] of ABM and antisatellite weapons systems. It may be recalled that ever since 1959 the United States has been developing [razrabatyvat] and testing antisatellite weapons, and in the sixties it was the first to create [sozdat] two ground-based antisatellite systems on the Pacific coast. And a series of tests of fundamentally new strike systems was conducted recently.

Why has the President needed to resort once again to deceiving Americans? His address leaves no doubt about this. Traveling a well-trodden path, the head of the American administration used such slanderous references in order to provide a basis for his own administration's highly dangerous plans in the sphere creating [sozdaniye] a large-scale space defense system. Arguing about the "threat to the West," the President frankly declared: "If you look closely at what the Russians are doing, you will understand that our SDI research program is critically important in the sphere of maintaining military equilibrium and defending the West's freedom in all senses of this word." Here the President repeated the lulling fairytales that SDI "will help to show the way to a long-term defense capable of protecting millions of people" and that it will help to "get rid of nuclear arms." Nothing is so far from reality as such statements. Replying to them, (D. Keldi), a prominent American scientist from the University of Connecticut, urged American scientists and politicians to halt the implementation of SDI before it is too late. He emphasized that the creation [sozdaniye] of such a system will lead to "the total destabilization of the situation in the world" and will "put the United States and the world in an extremely dangerous position." SDI, the scientist points out, will only lead to a new spiral of the arms race.

Once again using another very dubious "argument," the head of the American administration claimed that "America is conducting its research and tests within the SDI framework in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems." If the President's advisers had looked at that agreement, they would have seen that, under Article V of that treaty, "each of the sides pledges not to create [sozdavat], test, or deploy systems or components of sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based ABM defense." Thus, having begun research work in space on missions for the Pentagon, the United States is directly violating the ABM Treaty in fact with the definite purpose of creating [sozdaniye] weapons, testing them and putting them into space. It is significant that Pentagon Chief C. Weinberger, who appeared on television the same day, frankly made it clear the SDI provides, in the final analysis, for the deployment of corresponding strategic defense systems with space-based elements.

In his address the President tried to portray the matter as though his administration seeks to limit arms. He even hypocritically called on the USSR to "join" with the United States and agree to "equal and verifiable reductions" of nuclear arms. What I mean here is substantial reductions in offensive nuclear arms, the President emphasized specially. If this is really so, then the head of the American administration is clearly at variance with logic, for radical measures in this sphere are proposed precisely by the Soviet Union, which has called for a 50-percent cut in the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms which can reach each other's territory. However, the White House still has not given a positive response to this USSR proposal, thereby graphically demonstrating that its ostentatious love of peace is just a screen designed to conceal the pursuit of a mythical military superiority over the Soviet Union.

CSO: 5200/1055

TASS ATTACKS REAGAN BOISE REMARKS ON SDI DEFENSE PURPOSES

LD161743 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 16 Oct 85

["'Star Wars' Repackaged"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 16 Oct (TASS) -- TASS observer Vladimir Matyash writes:

The head of the White House has stated that "certain forces" have distorted the essence of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) by characterizing it as a type of "star wars" program. Speaking in Boise (Idaho), he asserted that his "initiative," which is known to be directed at the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of strike weapons systems in space, "is highly moral and corresponds to the basic interests of the United States and its allies" and even "to the cause of peace." In his words, SDI should be called the "Strategic Defense Shield" or "Strategic Space Shield..." [TASS ellipsis]

A legitimate question arises: Is the essence of SDI altered even to the slightest degree as a result of the verbal rope-walking resorted to by the U.S. President? The answer is clear: There is nothing defensive about SDI; an offensive system is being created which is directed at stationing weapons in space which can be put into operation against objects in space and also from space against ground objects. That is the "star wars" concept in action and one cannot get away from this fact by any clever tricks.

At the same time, Reagan stated that SDI will not be a "subject of bargaining" at the upcoming Soviet-American summit talks; absolutely ignoring the indisputable fact that it is a question not of bargaining, but of a sensible decision aimed at not permitting the creation [sozdaniye] of a new class of weapons which will give rise to a fresh round of the armaments race -- an even more dangerous round that will have unpredictable consequences.

Thus giving a militarist tone to U.S. policy, the White House is opposing the agreement proposed by the Soviet Union on the nonmilitarization of space, that is, on the nonstationing of any types of weapons in space. This militarist course reflects the interests of the military-industrial complex which keeps tirelessly reiterating that strike weapons should be put into space.

The USSR's principled position is to halt this senseless process, which may lead to dire consequences, and to fulfill mankind's mandate to keep space peaceful.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: BUSH DISCUSSES SDI WITH PRC LEADERS

LD171823 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 17 Oct 85

[Text] Beijing, October 17 TASS -- United States Vice-President George Bush, speaking at a press conference here, has pointed out, in particular, that during his stay in Beijing he met practically all representatives of China's top leadership, the XINHUA news agency has reported.

He stressed that his meetings are evidence of the consolidation and expansion of relations between the United States and China. According to Bush, his visit confirmed that China and the United States established strong relations on a broad scale in recent years. These relations, the vice-president said, are "strong, both economically and strategically". As an example, Bush cited statistics on a substantial rise in China's access to American export licences, noting that the process has a tendency towards further development. He said further that his visit to China pursued the aim of enhancing understanding between the United States and China on strategic problems, and stated that the sides discussed the question of the American "Strategic Defence Initiative." With regard to the so-called "Kampuchean problem", Bush said that this subject was also raised during the talks with the Chinese leaders.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: MORE ON OPPOSITION IN U.S. TO SDI

NEWSWEEK Cited

PM011347 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 85 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Clinging to the 'Star Wars' Plans"]

[Text] New York, 26 Sep--Among the American press items criticizing the U.S. administration's positions, in particular its plans to militarize space, particular attention was attracted by an article in NEWSWEEK magazine. It says: Now we know--President Reagan has excluded the possibility of any agreement whatever which would restrict the development [sozdaniye] and testing of American antisatellite weapons in space; he is clinging to his dream that science will find means of making nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete"--a dream which many specialists consider a dubious and even dangerous illusion. He will not renounce the "Star Wars" program for anything.

If that is the President's last word on the subject, the article says, the prospects for the whole world will be gloomy. The continuation of this line would have fatal consequences for Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms and for the forthcoming summit meeting in Geneva.

The commencement of the implementation of the defense program with the simultaneous development [sozdaniye] of missiles designed to hit hardened targets, the article goes on to note, cannot but be regarded as a threat. The Russians' response can be predicted in advance: They will further increase their effort in the defense sphere and at the same time will deploy new missiles. In this event the arms race will be continued at an even more rapid rate. Arms control will be the first victim of the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The second victim will be the prospects for lessening tension and developing cooperation between the two great powers. It would be a mistake to suppose that Washington and Moscow will be able to conduct fruitful talks on settling regional conflicts in seats of tension in the world, if they do not reach agreement on the main issue that binds them fatally together--sensible control of the arms race...

If confrontation between the two powers is no longer restrained by hopes for an improvement in relations, but is further intensified by despair arising from failures, a new cooling will begin in the world.

You do not need the gift of prophecy to predict that in this event the third victim will be the West's unity. The Atlantic Alliance has just withstood a storm over the NATO two-track decision about the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. But this storm is nothing compared to the hurricane which will break out if as a result of Reagan's obsession with the idea of "Star Wars" a new arms control agreement is wrecked. If the Geneva talks end in failure, an arms race will begin which will be unrestricted as to expenditure, duration, or danger--and a new "cold war" will break out.

In conclusion, the article, written by Theo Sommer, editor of the West German weekly DIE ZEIT, notes that "Western Europe has never shown enthusiasm for the 'Strategic Defense Initiative'," and that, of course, "Europeans have many reasons to restrain their enthusiasm in connection with the 'Star Wars' program."

The prospects are fairly gloomy, unless, of course, Reagan changes his mind, the author believes. There are people in Washington who are advising him to do so, and many people in Europe would approve such a reappraisal. If he does not change his mind, the world will have to prepare for a cold winter.

Congressional OTA Reports

PM041044 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Political Observer's Notes:" "Commotion in Washington"]

[Text] A curious battle has flared up in the Washington political arena. Its chief participants are certain circles in Congress and the Pentagon, and its target is the "Star Wars" program which, in order to deceive the peoples, is hypocritically called the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The strife was sparked off because the inhabitants of Capitol Hill--forced, particularly in connection with the approach of the midterm elections to Congress, to reckon with the fact that the administration's new militarist venture is causing increasingly great alarm among the voters--asked the Office of Technology Assessment, which functions under Congress, to assess the aforesaid program.

Thus two reports appeared, entitled "Technology of Defense Against Ballistic Missiles" and "Antisatellite Arms, Countermeasures, and Arms Control," containing 324 pages. The investigation created a considerable stir inside and outside the United States. Some newspapers stated that "the report has put the American administration in an extremely awkward position," and U.S. Defense Department spokesman R. Sims had to admit that the administration was "alarmed at this report."

What, then, caused the commotion? Finding themselves between two fires--the White House and the concerned public--the investigators could not bring themselves to tell the whole truth. And they themselves admit that their investigation "contains more questions than answers." Pointing out that the decision to continue realizing the President's initiative was "connected with an analysis of the risky consequences in the face of uncertainty" the compilers of the reports nonetheless arrived at the conclusion that the system as conceived will not totally protect the United States from the strike which will inevitably follow in response to nuclear aggression and that it will not only give a boost to a new offensive arms race but could also increase the threat of nuclear war.

These half-admissions greatly displeased the advocates of "Star Wars." The Pentagon was entrusted with publishing a "counterreply"--intended for the mass media--to the report by the Congress Office of Technology Assessment. The compilers of this opus were urgently required to issue "denials" that they had not even had time to investigate properly the report which they were opposing. "We have not yet had time to study it in full," a Pentagon spokesman candidly announced.

For want of "arguments," they again seized above all on the hackneyed thesis that the "Star Wars" program is a "response" to some "Soviet threat." Of course, the Washington misinformers are well aware that the Soviet Union is not creating [sozdayet] space strike arms. Nevertheless, they still try to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's policy, at the same time claiming that the United States "displayed restraint in its program of offensive and defensive systems." But this is how this Washington-style "restraint" appears in reality.

Appropriations for the development [razrabotka] of space weapons were allocated in the United States back in 1957. W. Dornbergere, a colleague of Werner von Braun in the development of German rocket weapons and later vice president of the American Bell Corporation, called in 1958 for a sharp increase in the volume of U.S. military activity in space, openly proclaiming: "I did not come to this country to lose World War III. I have already lost two!" In October 1959 the United States tested a system which could be considered the prototype of the modern ASAT antisatellite system. In the same year there appeared in the U.S. Air Force regulations an instruction that the air force operating in aerospace "is a basic element of the country's armed forces..."

As for the Soviet Union, it is sufficient to recall that as long ago as 1958--straight after the emergence of the first artificial earth satellites--it suggested that the UN General Assembly examine the question of prohibiting the use of space for military purposes. The adoption of that suggestion was thwarted by Washington. Why? The answer to this question can be provided, for example, by a statement by R. Henry, commander of the U.S. Air Force space group: "For us, space is above all a theater of military operations."

The claim by the compilers of the Pentagon memorandum that the United States is "seeking to draw the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks into a discussion of the correlation between offensive and defensive potentials" is also thoroughly spurious. As is known, it was precisely the USSR that was the initiator of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms, and the efforts of its delegation at the talks are aimed precisely at persuading the American delegation to act in accordance with the spirit and letter of the accord already reached by the sides on the essence of these talks.

The Pentagon's efforts to "refute" the arguments of the Congress' Office of Technology Assessment proved so inept that the U.S. State Department hastened to the rescue. For its part it urgently disseminated a "crib" instructing journalists how to reply more or less plausibly to the "tricky" questions which are being asked increasingly anxiously in the United States.

However, these attempts are in vain. The truth that Washington's militarist program poses a very serious threat to the cause of world peace is making its way into the awareness of millions. And no twisting and turning by the idolaters of space weapons will help there.

Senators, Congressman Support ABM Treaty

LD082041 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 8 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 8 (TASS)--TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy reports:

The 1972 Soviet-American anti-ballistic missile treaty is the cornerstone of the arms limitation process. The attempts to undermine the treaty made by the U.S. will lead to the dramatic intensification of the arms race and the aggravation of the political situation in the world. This opinion has been expressed by prominent American law-makers in connection with the anniversary of the treaty observed recently.

Addressing the congress, the popular Senator Gary Hart (Democrat, Colorado) said that the 1972 treaty was one of the greatest accomplishments in the attempts to put the arms race under control and to reduce the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war. The treaty has demonstrated that bilateral and verifiable agreements in the sphere of arms limitation are the best hope of mankind to preserve durable peace in the nuclear age, the senator said. Pointing out that the 1972 treaty was in danger, Gary Hart urged Soviet and American leaders to reach the agreement at the coming USSR-U.S. summit meeting that would ensure further observance of the provisions of the document.

Senator John Chaffee (Republican, Rhode Island) urged in his speech to consolidate the 1972 treaty. He pointed out that the signing of the treaty had prevented the dangerous arms race in the sphere of the anti-ballistic missile defense. Moreover, the treaty is the embodiment of the thesis on the impossibility to survive in a nuclear war, he said. Pointing out that the "Star Wars" program of the Reagan administration put in jeopardy the 1972 treaty,

the senator urged congressmen to reconsider their position with regard to the financing and support for the program.

According to Congressman George Brown (Democrat, California), the 1972 treaty bans the deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elments which is being planned by the Reagan administration. Such a deployment would be an absolutely obvious violation of the main objective and provisions of the document, he stressed. G. Brown said that the 1972 treaty promoted the consolidation of U.S. national security and the prevention of the costly and dangerous arms race in the sphere of the ABM systems and urged to unswervingly observe it.

Boston Academic Conference

LD081116 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 8 Oct 85

[Text] New York, October 8 (TASS)--The Reagan administration's "Strategic Defence Initiative" will lead to a new dangerous twist in the arms race spiral and bring the world nearer to a nuclear confrontation. This is the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the participants in the "From Hiroshima to Star Wars" conference which was held in Boston. It was attended by more than 200 representatives of U.S. academic circles.

Analysing the U.S. administration's statements and actions, the participants in the forum came to the conclusion that the Strategic Defence Initiative is by no means a programme of defence, but a programme of aggression which is aimed at disrupting the existing approximate equilibrium of forces between the two great powers and creating a potential for hitting the first strike with impunity. They noted that space weapons, such as laser and beam weapons, are quite a new type of offensive weapons.

The participants in the conference emphasized that spreading the arms race to outer space will torpedo the efforts being undertaken with a view of holding efficient negotiations on reduction of nuclear armaments and, in the final account, will make impossible the process of establishing control over armaments. Noting the world-wide mounting actions for curbing the nuclear arms race, for non-militarisation of outer space, the participants in the forum called upon the American public to come out against Washington's violation of the existing agreements on limitation of armaments, which a realisation of star wars plans would inevitably entail.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR ASSAILS U.S. BROCHURE 'SOVIET STRATEGIC DEFENSE PROGRAMS'

'Libelous' Brochure

LD051747 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 5 Oct 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful Mulyakov]

[Text] The outcome of [Gorbachev's] visit is provoking much interest in the United States, too. Former U.S. director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Paul Warnke, called the new USSR peace initiatives a very promising approach and a very significant step forward meriting attentive discussion.

At the same time, the new Soviet peace proposals put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during the visit to France were received with great restraint and skepticism in official Washington circles, reports AFP. Put on the defensive by the Soviet leader, the agency says the U.S. Government has decided to mount a counter-offensive, claiming no more or less that for many years a star wars program has been allegedly under implementation in the USSR. This is how their mind works. The White House has tried to distract the attention of the international public from the new constructive Soviet initiatives and to justify its plans for the militarization of outer space.

At a news conference in Washington, a brochure entitled Soviet Programmes in the field of Strategic Defense, prepared by the Pentagon and State Department, was distributed. Evidently, experts of public disinformation worked up a sweat on this brochure. The authors of this libelous opus claim that the Soviet Union allegedly is carrying out a wide program to develop space weapons and the Reagan administration's strategic defense initiative is allegedly a reasonable and necessary U.S. reply.

Speaking at the news conference, Paul Nitze, adviser to the President and state secretary for the arms reduction talks and Richard Perle assistant to the U.S. secretary for defense, maliciously distorted the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

Observers note that all this deceit was needed by Washington to try once more to justify in the eyes of the public the Americans arms race on earth and the U.S. efforts to spread it to outer space.

And at the same time, the Pentagon is developing more and more new types of space arms. In the Texas University Engineering Center laboratories a space cannon is being created, a weapon [orudiye] to shoot targets in near-earth space. This cannon, instead of a powder charge, uses an electric charge of great power. It has been learned that work on creating this space tool was sanctioned by President Reagan personally. [Video shows briefly laboratory work with lights flashing.]

U.S. Seeks Space Militarization

LD192248 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1746 GMT 14 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, 14 Oct (TASS) -- The White House has issued a propaganda pamphlet under the title of "Soviet Strategic Defense Programs" containing various kinds of fabrications about the Soviet Union. The issue of the pamphlet is the latest attempt by the White House to justify the "star wars" program in the eyes of the public and to move away from talks on the banning of space strike weapons.

This kind of action by the U.S. Administration means that the United States, in evading an official response to the far-reaching and constructive Soviet proposals on the resolution of a whole range of issues under discussion in Geneva, is trying (?by means of) distorted, unconstructive positions to depict space research in the Soviet Union; saying the USSR is already allegedly implementing "strategic defense programs," implementing military initiatives like the U.S. ones, and is trying to acquire its own supremacy in this respect over the United States.

In defending the "star wars" plans, the United States is avoiding practical resolution of the task the Soviet Union has set, the task of preventing an arms race in space and curtailing it on earth. Precisely this would promote the strengthening of strategic stability, not the false conjectures of the U.S. pamphlet which the United States is using to substantiate the "need" for militarization of space.

The Soviet proposal to stop all work on the development, testing, and deployment of space strike weapons is the stance of the Soviet Union. However they may try to distort it in the White House, it remains unchanged and presented for talks in Geneva. This proposal is the main direction leading to a complete resolution of the issue of banning such weapons. Its implementation would also facilitate the curtailment or work on developing new kinds and types of nuclear weapons. Some U.S. politicians who advocate a sensible solution to the disarmament problem, stress that security cannot be guaranteed by military means, by military might; that talks have to be held on the basis of a freeze of existing nuclear missile potential, their reduction, and renunication of attempts to militarize space.

In a poll conducted by the newspaper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL and the television company (?NBC) slightly more than one-third of those Americans polled reacted favorably to the "star wars" program. "The President has not achieved great success in his efforts to secure support for the Strategic Defense Initiative" states THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

Document Full of 'Fabrications'

LD150314 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 14 Oct 85

[Text] The White House has put out a propaganda tract under the title "Soviet Strategic Defense Programs." A Washington correspondent of the Soviet news agency TASS reports that it contains all sorts of anti-Soviet fabrications. The booklet is yet another attempt by the White House to sell its "star wars" program to the public.

Just at the United States evades giving an official reply to the far-reaching and constructive Soviet proposals on the whole range of issues under discussion at Geneva, so it evades a practical approach to the task formulated by the USSR, that of averting an arms race in space and halting the arms race on earth. The Soviet proposal for stopping all work on developing, testing, and deploying space strike weapons is like a signpost pointing out the read leading to a complete solution of the problem of banning such weapons.

Its implementation would also put a stop to the development of new types and modification of nuclear weapons.

Some American politicians who favor a reasonable solution of the disarmament problem point out that the present crucial new stage requires an understanding of the fact that security cannot be assured by military means, by military strength, and that talks are needed on the basis of freezing existing nuclear missile potentials, scaling them down, and renouncing attempts to militarize space. A former head of the United States delegation at the Soviet-American strategic arms limitation talks, Gerard Smith, has told a news conference in Washington that the Reagan administration is trying to harpoon the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and remove all restrictions hampering the implementation of Reagan's "star wars" program. And the well known American astrophysicist and ecologist, Carl Sagan, has said Reagan's "star wars" program will not assure America's security. On the contrary, he told the paper USA TODAY, it could bring humanity to a nuclear catastrophe. Dr Sagan said the implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative, as it is termed, will considerably increase the danger of a nuclear conflict breaking out, a fact admitted even by many specialists in the Washington administration.

In a poll conducted by the WALL STREET JOURNAL and the NBC television network, barely one-third of the people questioned spoke favorably of the "star wars" program. This led the WALL STREET JOURNAL to conclude that the President had not been very successful in his efforts to secure support for SDI.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S BOGDANOV ACCUSES U.S. OF 'OUTRIGHT DECEPTION'

LD082028 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 8 Oct 85

["'Star Wars' Are a Threat to Peace"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 8 TASS -- The American Administration's assurances that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" pursues only defensive aims and does not contradict the Soviet-American ABM Treaty are an outright deception. The purpose of the SDI is to create a system that will protect the United States from a "strike of retribution". Such is the opinion of the Soviet scientist Radomir Bogdanov.

The deputy director of the institute of U.S. and Canadian studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR told a TASS correspondent that by pursing the SDI the United States Administration counts on unpunished nuclear attack. It is easy to imagine the following situation: The aggressor's military satellites put out of action the adversary's early warning systems. Hydrogen bombs explode over its cities and then "Trident" and "MX" missiles complete the total destruction while the ABM system with elements of space basing shoots down the enemy's surviving missiles should he try to deal a return strike. "The existence of such a 'space shield' might be a temptation to push the buttom", the scientist said.

He stressed that the United States Administration is accelerating the creation of arms for delivering the first crippling strike: electromagnetic rail guns and laser weapons are being created at a rapid pace.

By developing space weapons, Dr. Bogdanov went on, the United States acts with the same irresponsibility to mankind as when it adopted the decision early in the 1940s to produce the atomic bomb. "These actions contradict the letter and spirit of the 1972 ABM Treaty", the scientist stressed.

CSO: 5200/1055

TASS REBUTS WEINBERGER PHILADELPHIA SPEECH

LD041223 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 4 (TASS)--TASS correspondent Vladislav Legantsov reports: The Reagan administration has stepped up a propaganda campaign to convince the Americans it is essential to carry out plans to build a partially space-based missile defense as soon as possible.

Speaking to the Philadelphia World Affairs Council, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has said the administration believes continued research under Ronald Reagan's "strategic defense initiative" (SDI) is "an absolute necessity."

It followed from his statement that the administration is not going to make the SDI effort a subject of arms control negotiations. Weinberger made quite a try at persuading his audience that the United States needs the fundamentally new missile defense as a "deterrent" against a mythical "Soviet attack."

But he did not say the main thing, namely that it is the United States, not the Soviet Union, that has been initiator of the arms race. The Reagan administration has maintained a crash effort to develop new first-strike strategic and theater systems of nuclear weapons such as MX intercontinental ballistic missile, the Pershing-2 medium-range missile, the cruise, the B-1 strategic bomber and the Trident missile submarine.

The U.S. defense secretary made it clear that the administration looks at the projected missile defense as a lever of pressure on the Soviet Union to make unilateral arms reductions.

Calls for continuing work to develop the new missile defense were made today also at a special discussion sponsored by a reactionary public organization calling itself coalition for the Strategic Defense Initiative. Speaking there, extreme right-wingers claimed that ending the SDI effort would constitute a threat to U.S. national security. Fred Ikle, U.S. under secretary of defense for policy, said nothing would stop American research into the SDI.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA HITS GEN ROGERS ON SDI, WAR-FIGHTING CONCEPTS

PM081558 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Oct 85 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion": "B. Roger's 'Total [sovershennyy] War'"]

[Text] I do not know whether General B. Rogers would be as talkative as he is now if another Senator J. McCarthy -- that most zealous of witch-hunters -- were to appear on the Washington horizon. I am not sure. Much more distinguished figures were subjected to ostracism for far less frankness during the height of McCarthyism. So something does change in the United States with the passage of years, after all.

What is involved here? The October issue of the French magazine SCIENCE ET VIE published an extensive interview with B. Rogers under the title "A New Strategy for Europe." What is new and unusual about it?

First, the discovery that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), or, more simply, the "star wars" program, is a real blessing for Western Europe. Western Europe is even more suitable for space experiments than the United States. It is the best place "where it could be applied." Consequently, the Europeans should welcome U.S. "concern" for them, rather than protesting. And welcome it for several reasons.

Suppose the West succeeds in creating a range of systems capable of intercepting enemy missiles and the "Russians for their part do the same," both camps' armed forces will then "neutralize each other." Some of the weapons, the general promises, will become superfluous and it will be possible to discard them. The arms race will give impetus to disarmament in the same way a temperature of 104 forces a person to reach out for medicine.

But suppose that one or both of the sides fails to create an antimissile shield? This scenario is not excluded, so in order not to appear to fall down on logic, Rogers observes that there will nevertheless be some kind of spin-off from "SDI research" whatever the outcome.

"I would not be surprised by the appearance of something new in the sphere of air defense or in the sphere of attack by exploitation and relief forces [ataka sil razvitiya uspekha i zameny]," B. Rogers says. Let us make it clear that by "attack" he means a full-depth strike against the Warsaw Pact's defensive formations, about 500 kilometers, in order to deprive them of the possibility of carrying out active combat operations

(the "Airland Battle-2000" doctrine, recently renamed "Army-XXI"). Not bad, is it: If "strategic defense" does not work out, you get "strategic attack."

Second, Rogers restores the truth: President Reagan is not the founding father of the "star wars" idea. It all began much earlier. "When I was U.S. Army chief of staff," the general relates, "I sought out all the scientific research in the field of ABM systems... We were given the following directives: a) To actively continue scientific research in order to prevent the Russians getting an advantage over us, b) To create a prototype and test it whenever we discovered something interesting. In 1979, when I left that post in connection with my transfer to NATO, we had achieved such successes we thought we could intercept one rifle bullet with another."

Further, despite everything the President, vice president, secretary of state, secretary of defense, and others say, Rogers bluntly states that the United States has never stopped research in the ABM field nor scaled it down, and that relevant work has been carried out at full speed since the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems in 1972. As if fearful someone will belittle his merits, the general especially emphasizes that "SDI does not present anything new, anything that has just been invented." It is an old idea whose significance has simply been stressed and for whose implementation a leader and coordinator "has been appointed."

There it is in black and white. Washington windbags talk idly about "US restraint," which the Russians are said to have exploited; about America "lagging behind;" and about the "historic service" of Reagan, who has placed defense before attack in order to imprint the high "morality" of U.S. policy. But the NATO supreme commander in chief describes this as cheap propaganda and enfeebling demagoguery, and demands an end to it. He clearly takes the present administration's calumny of its predecessors personally and rejects the accusations that the preceding decade was characterized by amateurism which harmed national security interests as undeserved and insulting to all the generals' honor. There neither has been, nor is there any "restraint" or "lag" behind the USSR.

B. Rogers is also dissatisfied with the fact that the White House is creating inordinately high hopes regarding SDI's effectiveness. "No one is in a position to say whether it will work or not... If we go on discussing SDI at great length as we did last year," the general warns, "I very much fear that we will thereby neglect certain important aspects of our defense;" the "modernization" of the strategic and tactical nuclear arsenal, as well as nonnuclear arms. Reproaches about incompetence and flippancy are boomeranging on the Reagan administration.

Third, explaining his own concepts, the general remarks: "We want to make war total, nothing less." You will not immediately see what he is driving at. It transpires that it is the following.

War, in his words, does not amount just to aggression, invasion, and annexation. It is also "intimidation, coercion, and blackmail." NATO must be ready for everything. Constant high readiness on the part of troops and population for modern war in all its forms and variety. West European countries must expel from their houses all manifestations of "pacifism" or doubts about the rightfulness and expediency of siting the latest kinds of weapons on their territory. And siting weapons not just to admire them. No nuclear-free zones; no renunciation ever of the first use of nuclear weapons, for first use is "the very essence of our (American) deterrence."

Actively "implementing the doctrine of forward-defense" means being ready to "conduct operations as far ahead as the territory allows." Whose territory? That is not plain, but the likelihood is clear.

"If we are going all out, let's go all out." To the limit. "In the mid-seventies I championed binary chemical weapons," Rogers tells us. "I even encouraged their production." Let us stop here. It is highly interesting. The "yellow rain" which provided an accompaniment to the campaign to chemically rearm the United States started falling 5 years later. Rogers felt drawn to binary toxic agents long before it entered the mind of some fantasy-prone official in the Pentagon or National Security Council to accuse the USSR of using or assisting in the use of chemical weapons in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan. He (Rogers) "encouraged the production" of binary means before Congress defined its own attitude to him.

An old flame never dies. B. Rogers carried this chemical passion over to NATO and he is now trying to persuade the West Europeans that binary weapons will not poison their lives. He hinted, possibly only to reassure the readers of SCIENCE ET VIE, that it will most likely not come to regular battles. "The total war" which the general dreams about is to resolve all the main tasks "by an air strike using our (American) planes and our (American) missiles rather than on the land using ground forces." The enemy must, in other words, be destroyed before he realizes that the end of the world has come and tries to resist the violence. I do not think the commander in chief's dreams have consoled anyone. Europeans remember too well the lessons of the recent "total war."

Accuracy and clarity are useful in themselves even when they do not improve people's mood. From this standpoint B. Rogers has done a good deed. He has authoritatively shown what Washington is driving the "new strategy for Europe" toward. It is possible that the commander in chief of the NATO Armed Forces has been too frank for the President's taste. Something should be left between the lines. You should not think just about yourself and present others in a somewhat, to put it mildly, ambiguous light. That is unpatriotic. And, on the whole, the general should stay quiet for a while when the administration is flustered, not yet knowing how to sidestep with a bit more adroitness the new Soviet initiatives which present Europe and the peoples on all continents genuine peace rather than "total war."

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS ON SCIENTISTS' COLLOQUIUM TO PREVENT SPACE ARMS RACE

LD061723 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 6 Oct 85

[Text] Prague, October 6 (TASS)--"The Role of Scientists in Preventing the Arms Race in Space"--this is the subject of an international colloquium which is under way here. It is attended by representatives of socialist and a number of capitalist countries.

The duty of scientists is to actively take part in the work of nations for peace, for the prevention of a further escalation of the arms race, against the attempts to spread it to space, participants in the colloquium stress. They point out the danger for peace of the implementation of the so-called U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative." Any developments and tests of new weapon systems pose a threat to mankind in general.

Participants in the colloquium regarded the new far-reaching constructive proposals of the USSR as another proof of the sincere interest of the USSR in preventing a nuclear catastrophe.

J.M. Legais (France), president of the World Federation of Scientific Workers, winner of the Lenin Peace Prize, expressed in an interview with journalists high appreciation of those initiatives aimed at ensuring reliable security of all the countries and nations. Today when scientific research further penetrate outer space the duty of scientists is to prevent its utilization for military purposes, he said.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S AKHROMEYEV ON SIGNIFICANCE OF SDI, ABM TREATY

PM211335 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev entitled: "Washington's Claims and the Real Facts"]

[Text] The Soviet Union has advanced concrete proposals at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on the complex of problems related to space and nuclear (strategic and medium-range) armaments. These proposals are being examined by the delegations. Their essence was set forth by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in in his statements in Paris. Thus, they are known to the entire world.

These are the proposals for a total ban on space strike weapons and a radical, by 50 percent, reduction of the nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States capable of reaching each others territories; for concluding agreements on nuclear medium-range systems in Europe and direct talks with France and Britain on the European balance of nuclear forces; for working out an agreement on a range of interim measures designed to facilitate the early and successful completion of the talks in Geneva

Combined with the earlier advanced proposals, these new proposals constitute the Soviet program of realistic and far-reaching measures whose implementation may bring about normalization of the complicated and dangerous international situation. Implementing this program would ensure a substantial advance toward the goal considered most important by all peoples -- that of preventing the militarization of outer space, prohibiting and eliminating nuclear weapons, and saving mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet initiatives have received broad support from peace-loving public opinion, including Western Europe and the United States. It is recognized everywhere that the program put forward by the Soviet Union contains proposals which may bring the world out of the arms race deadlock and remove the obstacles on the path of achieving accords at the Geneva talks.

Having received the Soviet proposals, the United States now has the opportunity to move forward and try to bring the positions of the sides at the talks closer together. After all, Washington makes daily statements about its readiness and desire for a radical cut in nuclear weapons. The Soviet proposals go out to meet those desires.

But how does the U.S. react to the Soviet proposals? After making an initial assessment (it is impossible to study deeply and evaluate such fundamental proposals in a brief

period), many officials from the White House administration, as is now evident, embarked on a path of falsifying and publicly discrediting our initiatives, trying to misinterpret them, presenting them in a spurious light, and belittling their significance. Realizing that it is impossible to reject the Soviet proposals as a whole, they say in Washington that they recognize they "warrant further discussion" and could be accepted as "a starting point at the talks." However, this is said just as a disguise. In actual fact, something quite different is taking place. High-ranking U.S. Administration representatives have in the past few days actively come out against the Soviet proposals. They are letting it be known that such proposals are unacceptable to them and are attempting to discredit and reject, not the details, but the essence, the foundations of the Soviet Union's proposals.

U.S. Administration officials, considering the people's fear of nuclear weapons, declare the U.S. "star wars" program may, allegedly, rid the world of nuclear weapons. They in Washington flatly reject the idea of banning the development [sozdaniye] and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space strike weapons, while in order to cover up their aggressive designs, they have worked out a false concept of gradual transition from the deployment of nuclear offensive systems to the development and deployment of non-nuclear, so-called "defensive" systems. Its authors' line of argument is as follows: It is necessary to continue the deployment of strategic nuclear armaments, constantly threatening the Soviet Union with their use. Simultaneously, it is necessary to develop a "multitiered ABM' defence." This is how they describe space strike armaments. After the system is developed, "probably, in a few decades," it will be, purportedly, possible to come to an agreement on the reduction and even elimination of nuclear armaments.

It turns out that in order to eliminate nuclear weapons it is ncessary to plunge mankind into an arms race that is hard to even imagine today. The road to nuclear disarmament, according to this inside-out logic, lies in the buildup of nuclear offensive armaments and the militarization of space. It will take tens of years and the cost of innumerable material and other resources of mankind to accumulate the huge piles of weapons. There is no other way, nor can there be any, claims the U.S. Administtation.

Why all this is being done is understood in the Soviet Union. Deceiving peoples, diverting them from immediate measures for the reduction of nuclear arsenals are the aims of these manipulations. Washington transforms, turns upside-down, the objective need for a total elimination of nuclear weapons in order to gain an opportunity for an uncontrolled buildup of nuclear armaments. The United States is implementing this in practice. It is developing first-strike weapons; five new types of strategic delivery vehicles -- two types of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM), a submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM), two types of heavy bombers -- and is also deploying long-range cruise missiles of various basing modes and other systems of nuclear armaments.

If the propaganda is cast a side and the essence of the U.S. "star wars" program is revealed, it pursues the treacherous aim of giving the United States the potential to make a first nuclear strike at the Soviet Union with impunity and deprive it, by creating a national anti-missile defence, of the opportunity to make a retaliatory strike.

The Soviet Union suggested to the U.S. Administration a ban on the development of the two sides' space strike weapons. We are against the spread of the arms race into outer space. If that happens, mankind may find itself facing an unpredictable situation. The risk of war will grow many times. In order to prevent this, the USSR proposes renouncing, once and for all, the development and deployment of space strike armaments.

That is why an accord banning the development of space strike weapons is a key, fundamental questions. If no ban exists, an unchecked arms race will start, both of strategic offensive and space weapons. Such is the objective reality. There should be no misunderstanding on this point. The Soviet Union is far from naive and cannot count only on peaceful assurances by U.S. leaders, which serve as a cover for developing strike weapons in space. If that is continued, nothing will remain for us, but to adopt countermeasures in the field of both offensive and other, not excluding defensive, armaments, including those based in space.

The White House wants to present the Soviet Union with a fait accompli of the deployment of space strike systems which are aimed at it. But Washington underestimates the potentialities of the Soviet Union.

There will be no U.S. monopoly in outer space. General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev has declared this with all clarity.

In order to justify the militarization of outer space, Washington alleges that U.S. work on the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), in fact a "star wars" program is "something quite legitimate" and even almost allowed by the 1972 Soviet-American treaty limiting antiballistic missile defences. A "new interpretation" of the treaty has been offered, according to which, it allows, purportedly, the development [razrabatyvet], testing, and creation [sozdavat] of anti-missile weapon systems on the basis of "other physical principles," that is laser, particle-beam, and other types of weaponry, both land- and space-based.

Thus, the presidential assistant for national security affairs R. McFarlane, when appearing on an NBC television program on October 6, distorted the essence of the ABM Treaty. Trying to substantiate the "lawfulness of experiments" within the framework of the ill-famed "Strategic Defense Initiative," he contended that the treaty sanctions tests of any ABM system as long as they are based on other principles of physics." The ABM Treaty is also falsified by the "new confidential study" prepared by the Pentagon and concerning limitations envisaged by the treaty. It is contended in the study that provisions of the treaty supposedly can be applied only to radars and anti-missiles, but not to the development [razrabotka] and testing of "exotic" ABM systems (lasers, bean weapons).

Such "interpretations" of the ABM Treaty, to put it mildly, are deliberate deceit. They contradict reality. Article 5 of the treaty absolutely unambigously bans the development, testing, and deployment of ABM systems or components of space or mobile ground basing and, moreover, regardless of whether these systems are based on existing or "future" technologies.

In accordance with the agreed-upon statement "D" appended to the treaty, to which the administration now refers so often, the conduct of research, development, and testing of ABM systems or their components, based on other physical principles, is allowed in areas that are strictly limited by the treaty, clearly defined by it and use only fixed ground ABM systems (as they are defined in Article 3 of the treaty). Moreover, if either side wants to deploy its new systems in these limited areas, it cannot do so without preliminary consultations with the more side and without introducing the appropriate agreed-upon amendments in the treaty.

Only such and no other interpretation of the key provisions of the ABM Treaty, that was initiated by the United States itself, was worked out and adopted by the two sides in the course of talks on this treaty. The present aim of the U.S. Administration is clear: To prepare a "legal base" for carrying out all stages of practical work within the framework of the SDI program, that is the development [razrabotka] testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space strike systems.

The ABM Treaty is becoming an obstacle to the United States in the fulfillment of "star wars" plans. In striving to clear the road for the militarization of outer space, the head of the Pentagon Caspar Weinberger, when speaking at the National Press Club in Washington, threw aside the subterfuges of McFarland and others and bluntly stated, "We should study the possibility of really breaking with the ABM Treaty." Such is the actual position of the United States.

The Soviet Union is of a diametrically opposite opinion. The open-ended ABM Treaty is fundamentally important for the entire process of nuclear arms limitation; even more, it is the basis on which strategic stability and international security rest. We are convinced that everybody, including the United States, will stand to lose from a violation of this treaty.

The USSR is strictly observing all commitments under the treaty and is not doing anything that would contradict its provisions.

The Soviet stand on space strike arms was clearly formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev. It is necessary, he stated in the interview for TIME magazine, for a ban to embrace every phase of the inception of this new class of arms. This, however, does not deny the right and possibility of conducing basic research in outer space. But, it is one thing to conduct research and studies in laboratory conditions and quite another when models and prototypes are created and samples of space arms are tested. This is always followed by the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of arms. It is precisely such a line, backing it up accordingly with propaganda, that the U.S. Administration is pursuing as regards the "star wars" program. The USSR views as impermissible any out-of-laboratory work connected with the development and testing of models, pilot samples, separate assemblies, and components. Everything that is being done for the subsequent design and production of space strike systems should be banned.

The Soviet Union's approach is substantiated and realistic also from the point of view that out-of-laboratory work can be verified by national technical means. If this process is cut short at the initial stage of research, the possibility of developing [razrabotka] space strike arms will vanish.

The United States representatives pile up false arguments and distort the Soviet proposal on a very radical cut, by 50 percent, of the nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States capable of reaching each other's territory.

Flowing from Washington is a large stream of contentions that the Soviet proposal puts the United States in an unequal position because it will have to reduce not only the strategic "triad," but also its forward-based systems in Europe and Asia and medium-range missiles that are being deployed in Western Europe. As for the Soviet Union, it is contended account is only taken of strategic nuclear arms while the SS-20 missiles, deployed in the European zone and creating a threat to the West European allies of the United States, are supposedly ignored (taken out of the bracket of reductions).

The United States uses such arguments as a means of avoiding the main issue -- the genuine fact that apart from the strategic nuclear force, the Soviet Union does not have other nuclear systems capable of reaching the territory of the United States. However, the territory of the Soviet Union is under a dual threat from the U.S. strategic offensive force and U.S. medium-range missiles and forward-based systems deployed around the Soviet Union. We have never held an unconcerned attitude toward this dual threat, nor will we do so.

As for the Soviet SS-20 missiles in the European zone, our proposal is long known: The USSR is prepared to reduce them and leave no more than the number of corresponding missiles in the possession of Britain and France (counting by warheads). If the United States withdraws its medium-range missiles from Europe, the Soviet Union will immediately carry out such a reduction.

On the event of an accord in Europe, the USSR does not intend to deploy additional SS-20 missiles in the east of the country on the understanding that there will be no substantial changes in the strategic situation there and no additional U.S. nuclear systems capable of reaching the territory of the Soviet Union will be deployed.

Further, the U.S. Administration is trying to present matters as though, according to our proposal, the U.S. side, unlike, the Soviet side, will have to reduce its "triad" by more than 50 percent because, in view of its "allies commitments," the United States, supposedly, cannot renounce its medium-range missiles and forward-based systems.

But the USSR also has allies and corresponding obligations have also been signed between them and the Soviet Union that are being strictly observed. Why, after all, should the United States leave intact its medium-range missiles and forward-based systems that threaten the USSR and its allies? The United States wants to entrench itself with its first-strike systems near the borders of the Warsaw Pact states and thereby secure for itself strategic superiority. This is the crux of the matter.

A version is spreading within U.S. ruling circles, according to which the USSR, after the reduction, will preserve its "most dangerous" and "destabilizing" strategic armaments -- land-based ICBM's. The U.S. Administration has a rule of its own: The systems which are most developed in the USSR and which make up the backbone of its military might are designated as "destabilizing", while those which make up the strength of the United States, for instance, SLBM's, and heavy bombers, each with 20-28 long-range cruise missiles on board are systems of "stability and security". The Soviet Union does not agree with this.

Strategic offensive weapons are now approaching one another in their destructive capabilities. There is no difference as far as combat effectiveness is concerned, between the Soviet ICBM's and the American Trident SLBM's. That is why strategic armaments should be regarded and assessed in their entirety, as a single whole. This has always been the basic principle of negotiations. The new Soviet proposal proceeds from this as well. It stipulates that none of the elements of the strategic triad of each side -- either Soviet ICBM's or American SLBM's -- account for more than 60 percent of the sum total of warheads (6,000 units) remaining after the reduction. This means that, under implementation of our proposal, the reduction would apply to each of the elements of the triad, including the Soviet ICBM's.

In a bid to justify the escalation of war preparations and the Washington-instigated arms race, U.S. leaders are seeking to convince the public that no rough military strategic balance currently exists between the USSR and the United States; that the United States is allegedly "lagging behind" the USSR in strategic offensive armaments. Lately, they have been asserting that the USSR also allegedly leaped forward in the field of developing [sozdaniye] an anti-missile defense of the country's territory. The anti-Soviet propaganda about "Soviet military superiority" is continuing. The arguments are not new. Every thesis they contain is false.

The truth is that a rough balance in strategic armaments does exist between the USSR and the United States. This was verified during the seven years of work on the SALT II Treaty and was officially endorsed by Leonid Brezhnev and Jimmy Carter in 1979 during the signing of the treaty. At the present time, the number of strategic delivery vehicles on both sides has not changed in comparison with 1979. The USSR has somewhat more of them than the United States (2,504:2,210), but the United States still has a greater quantity of warheads on them. But, on the whole, there is a rough equality. This is confirmed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Its report to Congress (1984) notes: "In the present period, there exists an approximate nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union."

The approximate balance will still be preserved after 50 percent reductions in the corresponding nuclear armaments, though of course, at a substantially lower level. Although the number of delivery vehicles possessed by the United States will be somewhat greater than those of the USSR (1,680 and 1,250 respectively), the sides will be left with an identical quantity of warheads -- 6,000 units each, which will ensure approximate strategic equilibrium.

The statements by Washington officials about the USSR's purported three-time super superiority in ICBM's (warheads and their destruct capabilities) are one-sided.

As a matter of fact, the United States has roughly the same superiority in warheads on its SLBM's.

The United States' desire to "rectify" the nuclear armaments balance is aimed, in fact, at altering the rough equality in strategic systems in favour of the United States. It is very indicative that they want to "rectify" the nuclear balance. According to the Pentagon, a nuclear balance between the United States and the Soviet Union existed twenty years ago when the United States had in service more than 1,000 ICBM's, 656 SLBM's, more than 600 heavy bombers, and a considerable number of forward-based nuclear weapon delivery vehicles close to Soviet territory, while the USSR had only 600 strategic delivery vehicles.

In the opinion of the U.S. side, the "imbalance" appeared when the USSR acquired an equivalent capability of replying to a strike against its territory with a strike at the potential aggressor's territory. We got this capability mostly with the development [razvitiye] of Soviet inter-continental ballistic missiles. That is why the United States views our ICBM's as the "main source of the problem".

But we do not think the ability to respond equally with a blow to a blow against our territory is an imbalance. On the contrary, this is the foundation of supporting

equilibrium in nuclear forces, an important factor of maintaining peace and stability. Rough equality is also the necessary basis for the process of nuclear arms limitation. We know that in the United States some people are still dreaming about returning to the state when the invulnerable "fortress North America" could threaten any state with nuclear annihilation. There is no returning to the past. Neither will there be any unilateral disarmament of the USSR.

It is not difficult to understand what is concealed behind the inventions of the Pentagon and the United States Department of State that the Soviet Union supposedly has all but created an ABM system for the defense of the territory of the country: This is deception of the public. The Soviet Union is not engaged in the development [razrabotca] and, consequently, testing of any models of space arms whatsoever; we do not have programs for creating space strike systems nor plans of "star wars" analogous to the U.S. ones. The USSR is strictly fulfilling the indefinite ABM Treaty of 1972. We suggest that the United States should also join us in this and give up plans of militarizing outer space before it is too late. There are no strike arms in outer space now, and there should be none.

With an eye to the forthcoming Soviet-American summit, the question is being asked throughout the world: What are the Soviet Union and the United States taking to that meeting? The USSR is seriously and thoroughly preparing for it. Having made the proposals on space and nuclear arms it actually covered its half of the road. Moreover, the Soviet Union proceeds from the broad interests of European and international security. It is not seeking any military advantages whatsoever for itself and is pressing only for one thing -- just and honest agreements. Its proposals are a good basis for the talks in Geneva. The USSR is going to the summit with a firm desire to reach agreement on joint measures to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and strengthen security and stability.

What about the other side? There are no signs yet of businesslike and constructive preparations for the meeting on its part. On the contrary, the Soviet position is being distorted, real facts are being presented wrongly and attempts are being made to spread doubts in the world about the sincerity of the Soviet Union's intentions. At the same time, the United States has not made a single positive step, has not made a single constructive proposal. All this intensifies the growing concern of the peaceloving public.

The truth is that there can be no more marking time. Stressing the dangerous processes threatening the very existence of mankind, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Comrade M.S. Gorbachev said: "As a result, international developments have approached a line which cannot be overcome without making decisions of the highest level of responsibility in order to limit the arms race and halt the slide toward war". The time has come to adopt these decisions. And the world is awaiting these decisions.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY SESSION DISCUSSES SDI

Shultz Speech Criticized

LD152135 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT 15 Oct 85

["Shultz Displays the Same Unconstructive Approach"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 15 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes: Speaking at a session of the North Atlantic Assembly, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz plainly followed a uniform pattern set by the Washington administration lately.

His speech had all the familiar attributes of the latter's recent rhetoric, including lavish praise on U.S. policy, groundless diatribes against the USSR and, of course, "star wars" [word indistinct] and aimed to persuade the allies that the American Administration is preoccupied about enhancing their security, while the Soviet Union threatens it.

The secretary of state told the assembly there were American proposals, which he said had been tabled some time ago, lying on the nuclear and space arms negotiating table in Geneva.

But he chose not to tell it that the proposals are rather old and were first made way back during the previous negotiations.

He also failed to tell it that the American delegation to Geneva has been advised to drag its feet within those stands which proved themselves unfit for the purpose of reaching accords before the start of the current talks.

The two-year-old proposal on strategic forces reductions, now replayed in Geneva, is meant, for instance, to push the Soviet Union into carrying out a totally unwarranted structural overhaul of its strategic potential, first of all by cutting back drastically on its intercontinental ballistic missiles which form the backbone of its strategic forces.

So far as the nuclear payloads of strategic bombers and long-range cruise missiles are concerned, the suggested U.S. "reductions" in this area would leave the United States entitled to have more nuclear warheads on its strategic offensive systems [words indis] tinct] grand total today. [words indistinct] medium-range nuclear systems in Europe is no better.

The United States dragged up once again its lop-sided "zero option" and "interim agreement" proposals that do not take account of the nuclear armaments of Britain and France, which are objectively part of the balance of nuclear forces in Europe, and leave effectively all American medium-range aircraft in the European zone, including carrier-based planes, out of limitations.

And even though these proposals are patently intended to give the United States unilateral advantages, the American secretary of state claimed, his face straight, that equality was among the basic criteria guiding his country in its approach to the (?agreement) being negotiated.

Such contentions can only be meant for people who do not know anything about the subject.

When Shultz came over to the latest Soviet proposals, he made quite a try at washing out their substance and playing down their significance even though he started with a curtsey towards them, by saying the American Administration hailed them and thought they could become a step forward.

Judging by his statement, Washington is particularly troubled by the Soviet proposal to take account, in halving the armories of the USSR and the United States, of all nuclear armaments capable of reaching the other's territory.

Shultz appeared exasperated that the count should include all American systems capable of reaching Soviet territory but exclude the Soviet delivery vehicles which cannot hit American territory but can reach the territories of U.S. allies.

Ludicrously, it sounded like this: These things are mine and those of theirs are mine as well.

Shultz maintained that accepting the Soviet proposal would look very much like an American-Soviet deal to Europe's detriment and would make NATO more vulnerable.

But his argument overlooked the fact that the USSR proposed direct dialogues with France and Britain on the European balance of nuclear forces so that to try and find an acceptable way out by joint efforts [sentence as received].

It is clearly not to Washington's advantage to mention the two Soviet proposals together as this won't leave it any scares to frighten its West European allies with.

Shultz contended, without substantiating his words in any way, that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" gave hope for the future and reiterated the American rejection of the Soviet proposal to prevent the militarization of outer space.

He said the USSR's proposal for both countries to ban space strike arms was a Soviet attempt to retain a unilateral edge.

The secretary of state made it clear that the United States would continue pushing ahead with its "star wars" program in any case.

He claimed the effort was being pursued within the limitations of the ABM Treaty, although he admitted that people were giving most different interpretations of that treaty and the issue was contentious.

It would be useful to recall in connection with that statement by Shultz that in a perfectly unequivocal manner the ABM Treaty bans the deployment of ABM systems for a defense of the territories of the United States and the Soviet Union, that is large-scale ABM systems, and the (?providing) of a base for such a defense.

And so the "different interpretations" are being consciously thought up by those in the United States, who would like to cover up their own unseemly activities to erode the treaty and sap strategic stability. [words indistinct]

More on Shultz Speech

PM161324 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 16 Oct 85 p 3

[TASS report: "Stepping Up the Pressure"]

[Text] San Francisco, 15 Oct -- The Washington administration is stepping up the pressure on West European countries to force them to unconditionally support the White House's dangerous plans for the militarization of space. This was the tone of the speech by U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz at the North Atlantic Assembly session being held here.

Repeating the administration's grating "arguments" in defense of the "star wars" program, he claimed that the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative gives hopes for the future" and could ensure peace on earth. While verbally proclaiming "concern for peace," Shultz in actual fact, called for the further intensification of the arms race and made it clear that the United States intends to continue adhering to a course which obstructs the achievement of agreements to curb the arms race. A graphic reflection of the administration's obstructionist stance was provided by the negative statements which Shultz took the liberty to utter regarding the Soviet Union's new large-scale proposals envisaging radical reductions of nuclear weapons and the adoption of measures on the nonmilitarization of space. In an attempt to frighten the West European countries with an imaginary "global Soviet threat," the U.S. secretary of state claimed that the new Soviet initiatives are supposedly "aimed at undermining the security of U.S. allies."

Once again the secretary of state presented in his speech an "interpretation" of the 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems. He claimed, for example, that this agreement supposedly allows research work in the ABM defense sphere.

According to THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, this approach by the administration toward the arms limitation problems is encountering serious opposition during the North Atlantic Assembly session, not only from the parliamentarians from West European states, but also from members of the U.S. delegation. A large number of U.S. legislators have indicated that the "star wars" program is contrary to the Soviet-American treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems. Even such a conservative congressman as D. Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has been forced to recognize this fact. SDI is leading to a new round of the arms race, Congressman N. Dicks declared. T. Longstreet, one of the leaders of the Association of Arms Control Supporters, noted most Americans are seriously concerned by the fact that the implementation of SDI would lead to the further escalation of the arms race.

Nitze Rebutted on ABM Treaty

LD161644 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 16 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, 16 Oct (TASS) -- TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev writes:

In their attempts to still the protests from the West European public against the U.S. "star wars" plans, representatives of the U.S. Administration do not even draw the line at direct falsification of agreements currently in force and offer different audiences different interpretations, often contradictory ones, of the obligations of the sides in the Soviet-U.S. treaty limiting antimissile defense systems.

Speaking at a routine session of the North Atlantic assembly in San Francisco, Paul Nitze, consultant to the U.S. President on arms reduction talks, stated in particular to parliamentarians from the NATO countries that the United States would carry out development of antimissile systems based in space... [TASS ellipses] in complete accordance with the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems.

However, Article V of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on antimissile defense quite unambiguously bans the participating countries from creating, testing, and deploying systems or components of space-based antimissile defense systems.

Having undertaken the attempt to still the Western European public, which is alarmed by the destabilizing consequences of the creation of a large-scale antimissile defense for the territory of the United States under conditions of the Pentagon's preparations for "limited" nuclear war in Europe, the President's consultatnt promised an antimissile defense system for U.S. allies, also, again, allegedly, "without violating the very strict restrictions of the agreement" of 1972.

But Nitze knows very well that the antimissile defense treaty categorically forbids the transfer to other states or the siting outside their own national territory of antimissile defense systems or their components (Article IX).

One can suppose that the basic (?provisions) of the antimissile defense treaty are known to the legislators from Western Europe who attended the North Atlantic assembly in San Francisco. However, this did not prevent them from adopting a resolution approving "the Strategic Defense Initiative"... [TASS ellipses] if it "did not violate the 1972 treaty on antimissile defense."

The first part of this resolution is loyally addressed to the U.S. Administration; the second to the voters in the West European countries, counting on their inexperience in questions of the problems of limiting and reducing armaments. The U.S. "star wars" plan and the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems, even purely from a legal point of view, are absolutely incompatible phenomena.

The implementation of the U.S. plans for militarizing space [words indistinct] the hopes of the world public for achieving verifiable and effective agreements on limiting, reducing, and, finally, eliminating nuclear weapons and greatly increases the risk of a nuclear catastrophe on our planet.

Final Resolution Contradictory

LD160737 Moscow TASS in English 2229 GMT 15 Oct 85

[Text] San Francisco, October 16 TASS -- The 31st annual session of the North Atlantic Assembly has come to a close here. It was attended by representatives of parliaments of 14 West European countries, the U.S. and Canada. They approved plans of a further build-up of the military might of the aggressive bloc, including in the sphere of nuclear armaments. Under the pressure of the U.S. Administration the resolution "to render assistance to the United States in the research into strategic defense" was adopted by the majority of votes. At the same time, the resolution admits that there exist contradictions in NATO on the main aspects of the U.S. "star wars" program.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW COMMENTARY VIEWS JAPAN'S INTENTION TO JOIN SDI

OW101111 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 9 Oct 85

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] A Japanese delegation has paved the way for Japan to participate in the U.S. "star wars" program. In this connection, Moscow radio commentator Dmitriyev has made the following comment:

An agreement on Japan's possible participation in America's space militarization program was reached when a Japanese mission headed by Councillor Watanabe of the Foreign Ministry's North America Affairs Bureau visited the United States early this month. The purpose of this mission was to learn the details of the "star wars" program. Up to now, the Japanese leadership has not made known clearly its attitude concerning this program. But, the general impression is that, judging from all indications, Japan would in all likelihood concede to the U.S. demand.

When Prime Minister Nakasone met with President Reagan early this year, he showed Japan's understanding of the American program. Subsequently, the Japanese Government continued to maintain the same attitude, as it did at the Bonn Summit of the seven major industrial nations in May. In addition, Japan and the United States have until now engaged in active negotiations on the question of transferring Japanese military technology directly related to the "star wars" program to Pentagon.

The latest Japanese mission to Washington has taken the necessary steps to complete (?procedures) for the transfer of military technology. There are additional signs which serve as grounds for speculation that the Japanese leadership intends to show a positive attitude toward participating in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative -- the SDI. The United States has for a long time wanted such an attitude and approached Japan to that end.

If Japan should make up its mind to participate in America's dangerous plan, the Pentagon would be able to utilize the technological potential of Japan, a Far Eastern ally, on an extensive scale. Besides, Washington expects that Japan's positive attitude will have a due impact on other Western countries. Some Western countries, like France, are resolutely against the "star wars" program.

The United States is imposing on Japan the very unpleasant role of promoter or (?implementer) of U.S. military ideology. If Japanese ruling circles should succumb to the pressure from across the sea, Japan would become the first country to share with the United States the responsibility for unleashing a new, dangerous arms race.

CSO: 5200/1055

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NAKASONE SAID TO SUPPORT U.S. STAND ON 'STAR WARS'

OW181235 Tokyo KYODO in English 1226 GMT 18 Oct 85

[Text] Tokyo, Oct. 18 KYODO--Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone will support the position of the United States that its star wars program will fall within the terms of the 1972 U.S.-Soviet anti-ballistic missile (ABM) treaty when he attends next week's summit of major industrial countries in New York, official sources said Friday.

Nakasone is leaving for New York Saturday to attend the General Assembly of the United Nations as well as to participate in the summit meeting next Thursday to be hosted by President Ronald Reagan.

The star wars space-based defense program, or strategic defense initiative (SDI) as it is officially known, is expected to feature prominently in the New York summit.

Nakasone considers it necessary, particularly now, for Japan and West European countries to share a unified view on the SDI problem in order to back President Reagan, who is going to Geneva next month for a summit with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, the sources said.

Nakasone is determined to work on other participants in the New York meeting to encourage them to stand by the Reagan administration's position vis-a-vis the ABM treaty, they said.

Among the major Western countries, France has opposed Washington's star wars research, while some of them have expressed concern about a development of space weapons outside the restrictions of the treaty, according to the sources. French President Francois Mitterrand has said he will be absent from the New York meeting.

In the U.S., national security adviser Robert McFarlane reportedly said the SDI research would not be bound by the 1972 treaty, drawing criticism from U.S. allies as well as the U.S. Congress. Following an adjustment of views in the White House, the Reagan administration says it will continue to limit testing and development of space weapons according to a restrictive interpretation of the treaty.

CSO: 5260/010

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TASS CITES DJEREJIAN ON SDI TESTING--Washington, 18 Oct (TASS)--The White House has confirmed that the United States is not going to limit itself to research in its approach to the "star wars" program. It followed from a statement made by the U.S. President's personal spokesman Edward Djerejian that the program provides not only for research, but also for testing and deployment of a partially space-based ABM system. Washington (?thus is) prepared to violate the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 18 Oct 85]

MOSCOW ON U.S. LASER TEST--The Pentagon has carried out another test of a ground-based laser installation intended for the destruction of targets in space within the framework of the "star wars" program. During the experiment, a laser ray was aimed at a missile launched from a test range on the Hawaiian islands. According to a White House spokesman, the United States does not intend to confine itself solely to research within the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative: It envisages holding concrete tests. He thereby openly confirmed once again the willingness of the United States to violate the provisions of the Soviet-American treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems, which prohibits the development [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of antimissile defense systems or components based at sea, in the air, or as mobile facilities on land. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 18 Oct 85]

CSO: 5200/1055

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH POLL ON PETITION AGAINST CRUISE MISSILES

The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN in English 8 Oct 85 p 1

[Article: Govt. Should Heed Petition - Poll]

[Text]
H i l v e r s u m, October 8 - Nearly two out of every three Dutch voters want the government to heed the result of a nation-wide petition against Nato plans to site 48 medium-range nuclear cruise missiles on Dutch soil, according to results of an opinion poll released last night.

The poll, conducted by the Netherlands Statistics Foundation (NSS), showed that 62 per cent of the respondents, felt the Lubbers government should take the petition into account, while 27 per cent said it need not and 11 per cent had no opinion.

Anti-cruise campaigners expect millions of people to sign the petition to be presented to Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers on October 26, shortly before his government reviews its conditional decision of June 1, 1984, to deploy the missiles.

The government then decided to go along with deployment if by November 1 of this year the number of Soviet SS-20s exceed the 378 deployed at the time. Current Nato estimates put the figure at 441.

Meaningful

Fifty-three per cent of the respondents said they thought the petition, organised by the Anti-Cruise Missiles Committee (KKN), was meaningful, while 37 per cent said it was not and 10 per cent had no opinion.

Asked whether the Dutch government should deploy if the Soviet Union had more than 378 missiles sited on November 1 an equal number said yes and no - 42 per cent, while 16 per cent did not know.

Those who wanted the government to stick to its June 1 decision were subsequently asked whether the government should take an immediate decision or whether it should wait until after next May's general elections. Eighty-three per cent said now, while 13 per cent said wait and four per cent did not know.

Forty-six per cent felt that once the cabinet had decided to deploy cruise no further action against the decision should be taken. Forty-two per cent agreed with the KKN that protests should go on, mainly in the form of demonstrations.

Forms of Protest

Other forms of protest were, in declining order of popularity: Tax refusals and closure of roads close to cruise installations at 16 per cent, strikes, 12 per cent, while obstacles to military traffic, occupation of military bases and damage to military bases or objects scored nine, five and one per cent respectively.

With 42 per cent each the respondents were evenly split on the question whether a new government after the May elections could reverse the decision to be made by the Lubbers cabinet.

The major opposition Labour party has said it would not be a party to siting the cruise missiles on Dutch soil regardless of the decision taken on November 1.

CSO: 5200/2524

SOVIET JOURNAL CONTRASTS EAST, WEST PROPOSALS

AU171423 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 18 Sep 85) pp 89-92

[Article by V. Baburov: "The Words and Real Position of the West at the Vienna Negotiations"]

[Text] Twelve years ago, on 30 October 1973, negotiations began in the Austrian capital which are expected to pave the way to lowering the level of the military balance on the European Continent, where the armed forces of the two largest military-political groups confront one another. In accordance with the place where these negotiations are being held and the tasks facing them, they have been given the title of the Vienna Negotiations on the Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Arms and Measures connected with this in central Europe.

Let us recall that in the period of preparatory consultations preceding the Vienna negotiations (summer 1973), the borders of the region in which reductions would be made and measures implemented in connection with this reduction were determined as the aggregate of the territories of the GDR, the Polish People's Republic, the CSSR, and also the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. It was also decided that not only the personnel of the armed forces, but also the arms of states with troops in entral Europe must be subject to reduction, namely: The USSR, the GDR, the Polish People's Republic, and the CSSR, on the one hand, and the United States, Great Britain, the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands, Canada, and Luxemburg, on the other. The countries enumerated became direct participants in the negotiations, while all the remaining countries (the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, and also Italy, Norway, Denmark, Greece, and Turkey) were given special status.

As many as 36 rounds of the negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe have already taken place in the old Viennese Hofburg Palace. However, the negotiations are as yet still far from resolving the tasks set them.

The reason for this position lies in the unconstructive stand taken by the NATO countries which, from the very outset, have banked on using the negotiations to gain unilateral military advantages. Claiming that the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact supposedly exceed the armed forces of the North Atlantic bloc in entral Europe, the representatives of the NATO countries headed by the United States groundlessly aspire to an asymmetrical, considerably larger reduction in the troops of the Warsaw Pact member-states than in their own. In other words, they strive to impose on the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states unequal conditions and restrictive

obligations which, in the event of their being implemented, would give NATO one-sided military advantages.

At the same time, the "numbers discussion" on the numerical strength of the sides' armed forces in the region of reduction, during which there has twice -- in 1976 and 1980 -- been an exchange of troop figures at the negotiations in Vienna, has convincingly confirmed the existence of approximate parity. Thus, the situation on 1 January 1980 was such that the NATO states had 991,000 armed personnel in Central Europe, including 792,500 ground forces. The total numerical strength of Warsaw Pact Armed Forces in this region on 1 August 1980 (after the Soviet Union's unilateral withdrawal of 20,000 troops from the territory of the GDR) was 979,000, including 767,700 ground forces.

It should be noted that the Western participants in the Vienna negotiations frequently say they are in favor of overcoming the deadlock in the talks. However, analysis of their proposals attests to the fact that they do not pursue constructive aims. This also applies to the proposal submitted by the NATO countries on 19 April 1984, which in no way helps to eliminate the obstacles standing in the way of agreement but, on the contrary, raises new ones. First of all, it does not create a way out of the "number deadlock" artificially created by the West, and it hypertrophies measures of control to a scale known to be unacceptable to the other side. As before, the NATO countries refuse to reduce their arms or resolve other urgent problems, without which it is virtually impossible to conclude an agreement on a real reduction their arms or resolve other urgent problems, without which it is virtually impossible to conclude an agreement on a real reduction in the level of military confrontation in the center of Europe. In reality, this widely advertised NATO proposal is simply a new wrapping on their former position. It complicates the situation at the negotiations and leads to their being drawn out further.

A different stand is taken at the negotiations by the socialist countries, which are in favor of working out effective solutions on the basis of the principle of not damaging the security interests of any of the sides. They proceed from the existence of approximate military parity between NATO and the Warsaw Pact in the center of Europe, which has been confirmed by official data.

Striving to reach agreement, in February 1983 the socialist countries submitted new proposals at the Vienna negotiations, containing a constructive plan for reducing troops and arms in central Europe to equal collective levels of a numerical strength of 900,000 armed forces on both sides, including 700,000 ground forces, and also effective measures for controlling fulfillment of the agreement. The essence of their new approach lies in concentrating efforts on the main aim -- achieving a final result in reductions -- irrespective of any disputes or differences in estimations of the numerical strength of the sides' troops in the center of Europe.

With the aim of developing this initiative and striving to give the Vienna negotiations a positive impulse, on 14 February this year the Soviet Union, in the name of all the socialist countries that are direct participants in the negotiations, submitted the draft "Main Provisions of the Agreement on the Initial Reduction of Ground Forces and Arms in Central Europe by the Soviet Union and the United States, and on the Subsequent Nonincrease in the Levels of Armed Forces and Arms of the Sides in This Region." In this document the socialist countries propose carrying out, as a first step, a reduction in part of the Soviet and American troops in central Europe in mutual connection with a subsequent freeze in the levels of armed forces and arms in this region of all the direct signatories to the agreement. It is proposed doing this in legal treaty form, so that concrete results can be achieved at the negotiations

in the immediate future and the process begun of reducing the concentration of troops and arms in the center of Europe. The new initiative of the socialist countries envisages that, from the moment the agreement comes into force, in the course of a year the USSR and the United States will withdraw 20,000 and 13,000 varied personnel respectively, and that the aforementioned withdrawal would mainly be carried out with combat military units together with their authorized arms; up to 10 percent of these reductions could be achieved by reducing the numbers of detached military servicemen.

The draft reflects the logical legal treaty connection between the proposed agreement and further agreement on more major reductions in the troops and arms of all the states directly participant in the Vienna negotiations right up to the establishment of coordinated, equal collective levels.

The draft proposed by the socialist countries contains concrete measures for controlling observance of the future agreement. Thus, in addition to the use of the national technical means of control at the sides' disposal, concrete measures for ensuring fulfillment of the agreement are also proposed, such as the exchange of lists of reduced and withdrawn units, mutual notification of the beginning and completion of practical measures for reduction, and, during the period of troop withdrawal, the setting up by each side of three of four observation points in places through which the withdrawal would be carried out.

The new initiative of the Warsaw Pact member-states is, to a considerable extent, in the nature of a compromise, taking into account as it does a number of considerations and elements of the Western position. Its realization would have a beneficial effect on the future course of the Vienna negotiations and would help to reduce confrontation in Central Europe. Such a step would also be of useful significance regarding the strengthening of security and stability on the European continent as a whole. And a constructive repsonse on the part of the West to this initiative could, finally, get the Vienna negotiations moving.

The socialist countries actively pursued a consistent policy aimed at reaching agreement at the 36th round of the negotiations which came to a close on 11 July 1985. The GDR representative, A. Wieland, emphasized in particular in his speech that the proposal of the socialist states makes it possible to overcome the deadlock in Vienna and, without further delay, to begin the process of really reducing armed forces and arms in the center of the European continent.

The orginal reaction of the West to the aforementioned proposal of the Warsaw Pact member-states could be described as hopeful, attested to in particular by the verbal response of the US State Department. Thus, in connection with the draft proposed by the USSR, "Main provisions of the Agreement on the Initial reduction of Ground Forces and Arms in Central Europe by the Soviet Union and the United States, and on the Subsequent Nonincrease in the Levels of Armed Force and Arms of the Sides in This Region," a representative of the American diplomatic department described this draft as a further development of the position of the Warsaw Pact countries and as "a desire to renew serious dialogue in Vienna." In this connection, in February 1985 the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST wrote that the new Soviet initiative at the Vienna negotiations "attests to a certain narrowing of the vast chasm dividing the positions of the two sides."

Also giving a positive appraisal of the new, constructive step taken by the USSR, the FRG minister of foreign affairs, H. D. Genscher, noted that the dialogue on arms control is continuing despite the pessimistic assumptions of some. He stated that

the FRG Government and its allies would "carefully study the new proposal of the Eastern Countries" and that the West European states "must make a decisive contribution" to the negotiations.

During the 36th round of the negotiations, representatives of the Western states as usual tried to substitute businesslike discussion of the problem with debates on abstract themes, including measures of control in isolation from real steps in the sphere of disarmament. Repulsing this tactic, the Soviet delegation stressed that, without accord and a clear idea on both sides of how the basic, material part of the proposed agreement would look and of what precisely would be subject to control, it was pointless to undertake a discussion on control.

The absence of readiness in the West for businesslike discussion of the initiative of the socialist states was apparent at the 36th round of the Vienna negotiations and in the concluding speech of the U.S. representative.

How can one explain the "intractability" of the Western partners in Vienna and the discrepancy between their declarations and actions?

The reason for the West's unconstructive line lies in the fact that those in the capitals of the leading NATO states are more concerned about military preparations than about achieving positive results in Vienna. It is a secret to no one that this is already the third year in the period of negotiations that American intermediate-range missiles are being deployed on the territory of a number of West European U.S. allies in NATO. It is also worth recalling the large-scale military exercises recently carried out by the leadership of the North Atlantic bloc, which directly affect the region of Central Europe. These include the autumn 1984 maneuvers, the "refurger" exercises in February 1985, and the "Wintex" command-staff exercises in March 1985 (the most large-scale among the maneuvers of this series, which are carried out once every 2 years). It is no accident that Willi Wimmer, a specialist in military affairs from the Christian Democratic Union, which is incorporated in the Bonn government coalition, stated recently that the "Wintex" exercises showed that the combat efficiency of Western non-nuclear forces has increased. In this connection one must also not omit the fact that the West has still not renounced the infamous "Rogers' plan," which is aimed at the extensive use of conventional arms by the NATO bloc against objectives in Warsaw Pact countries located deep in their territories.

Thus, it is obvious that the obstructionist line of the representatives of the Western countries at the Vienna negotiations and their reluctance to seek mutually acceptable solutions are not accidental. They are a continuation and reflection of their current military-political concepts, which are clearly at variance with the aims and meaning of the negotiations.

CSO: 5200/1054

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

TASS: GDR DELEGATE URGES 'CONSTRUCTIVE RESPONSE'

LD101945 Moscow TASS in English 1028 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Text] Vienna, October 10 TASS -- The latest plenary meeting of the delegations taking part in talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe was addressed on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty member countries by Andre Wieland, head of the delegation from the German Democratic Republic.

He called the socialist countries' major new peace initiatives for normalizing the international situation, which have been made over recent time, to the attention of the participants in the talks.

Andre Wieland singled out the proposals and considerations voiced by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Paris as being particularly important.

Speaking about the state of affairs at the Vienna talks, the GDR's representative urged the Western negotiators to display the essential political will and give a constructive response to the socialist countries' proposal of February 14, 1985, for embarking on a practical reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, starting with a reduction of Soviet and American troops.

CSO: 5200/1054

GENERAL

USSR: MORE ON WORLD RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV PARIS PROPOSALS

PRAVDA Roundup 5 October

PM071516 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Roundup of "4 October Own Correspondent and TASS Reports": "For the Sake of Peace"]

[Text] The attention of the world's public and press is centered on the USSR's new major peace initiatives advanced in M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the meeting with French parliamentarians. Offering broad coverage and comment on M.S. Gorbachev's speeches at the meeting with the parliamentarians, the official dinner at the Elysee Palace, and the Paris City Hall, eminent politicians and public figures from different countries and the press emphasize that the USSR is displaying a truly peace-loving and constructive approach to the most important problems of war and peace and that the Soviet proposals signpost a real way of halting the "infernal train" of the arms race, beginning arms reductions, preventing the spread of the arms race to space, and averting the military threat hanging over mankind. It is emphasized that the Soviet-French talks are proceeding in a constructive and businesslike atmosphere.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit is the main subject in the French press. Noting the great significance of the new Soviet proposals, the newspaper LE MATIN, which is close to the ruling socialist party, emphasizes that the U.S. administration ought to pay attention to them. "From the very beginning M.S. Gorbachev's visit has assumed great international significance," L'HUMANITE writes. "This was also confirmed by the new Soviet initiatives advanced by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee aimed at disarmament, at more active participation by the continent's countries in the settlement of European problems, and at ensuring that our two countries' political interaction becomes more intensive." A package of important proposals has been put forward aimed at considerably reducing nuclear arms in the world and in Europe.

"The Soviet Union," LIBERATION notes, "is striving to ensure that West European countries take a responsible stance on key questions of war and peace and display independence." In LES ECHOS' assessment, the proposal advanced by M.S. Gorbachev that a total ban be imposed on strike space weapons for the

USSR and the United States and that weapons capable of reaching each other's territory be reduced really fundamentally--by 50 percent--will be attractive for politicians in West European countries.

The Soviet-French summit talks and the USSR's new large-scale initiatives are widely covered by U.S. mass news media. President R. Reagan and his closest aides, according to NBC-TV, are highly worried by the effect of the USSR foreign policy initiatives on political and public circles. The Soviet leader has presented the USSR's policy at the arms control talks in a new light. The Soviet Union proposes a mutual 50-percent reduction in nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory and a total ban on strike space weapons for both sides. The Soviet leader has declared that Moscow has no objection to the conclusion, outside the direct connection with the problem of space and strategic arms, of a separate agreement on medium-range nuclear means in Europe. Beyond all doubt M.S. Gorbachev is skillfully outlining Soviet foreign policy positions.

The WASHINGTON POST writes about the "new Soviet approach" to arms control problems displayed in Paris by M.S. Gorbachev's exceptional public diplomacy.

At the same time, observers note that, although official Washington has not yet responded to the new Soviet proposals, U.S. President R. Reagan, who is touring the state of Ohio, has attempted in an interview with journalists to play down the importance and distort the meaning of these initiatives by declaring that the Soviet proposals supposedly "do not cover the destruction of weapons" and claimed that Soviet missiles "targeted on Europe" allegedly pose a threat to West European countries. At the same time Reagan confirmed yet again that the United States intends to continue the implementation of the so-called "strategic defense initiative," better known as the "Star Wars" program.

A British foreign office spokesman declared that the British foreign policy department "is thoroughly studying" the Soviet proposals. D. Healey, member of parliament and member of the British Labour Party's "Shadow cabinet," assessed the new USSR peace initiatives as impressive and highly encouraging. He emphasized in an interview on British television that the proposal to conduct direct talks with Britain and France on problems of medium-range nuclear means in Europe has broken new ground in the quest for ways to control arms. "I very much hope that Prime Minister Thatcher will respond to this call," he declared. The BBC notes: "M.S. Gorbachev has shown that he has not come empty-handed to Europe. The Soviet leader's statement has become a major action in harmony with European public opinion. This is a very clever step toward West Europe."

J. Mortimer, one of the leaders of the "Labour Peace Campaign" organization and former Labour Party secretary general, declared:

"I am convinced that the new Soviet proposals are extremely timely, important, and totally necessary steps.

"The Soviet Union has done and continues to do much to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe. Unfortunately the West, and primarily the United States, is refusing to follow its example. It is, after all, a well known fact that the Reagan administration has rejected one Soviet proposal to curb the arms race after another. Furthermore, in an attempt to attain military superiority over the USSR, the United States intends to extend the arms race to a new environment--outer space--and this creates an extremely dangerous situation for peace on our planet."

West Germany's Social Democrats welcome the USSR's new proposals in the disarmament sphere advanced in Paris, K. Voigt, an expert from the Social Democratic Party of Germany Parliamentary Faction, declared in an interview with NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG. These proposals, he stressed, "have imparted momentum to the Geneva talks." Voigt called on the West to make a constructive response to the Soviet proposals, a response which ought to include a rejection of the deployment of weapons systems in space and a considerable reduction of strategic nuclear weapons.

The Netherlands Labor Party Parliamentary Faction called on the government to take "the new situation" into account when making a decision on the deployment of U.S. missiles in the country. The faction emphasized that the new Soviet proposals make it possible to impart dynamism to the entire process of arms limitation talks. A statement by the Communist Party of the Netherlands Parliamentary Faction notes that the Netherlands Government will be losing touch with reality if, in the light of present development of events, it nevertheless makes a decision to deploy the missiles in the country.

The new Soviet proposals envisaging a radical reduction of nuclear arms prove that the USSR sincerely desires to achieve progress at the Geneva talks and the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in November, Japan's ASAHI writes. The proposals outlined by M.S. Gorbachev will generate a positive evaluation in Europe.

In its desire to avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe from the world the USSR is taking far-reaching steps in the interests of disarmament, Poland's TRYBUNA LUDU points out. The Soviet Union's new major peace initiatives are dictated by a desire to strengthen peace and are aimed at reducing the level of armaments and raising a barrier to the creation [sozdaniye] of new weapon systems.

The new Soviet proposals are an impressive package of constructive and realistic measures whose implementation would lead to a real turnabout in the development of international relations for the benefit of peace, security, and cooperation among peoples, Mongolian Radio notes.

PRAVDA Roundup 6 October

PM071320 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Roundup of own correspondent and TASS reports dated 5 October: "Constructive Position"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union seriously intends to change the situation in the world for the better. The USSR's new large-scale constructive foreign policy proposals are aimed at averting the nuclear threat hanging over mankind, ending the arms race on earth and preventing its transfer to space, and ensuring the reliable security of all states and peoples. That was the theme of the widespread international reactions to the results of the official visit to France by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, M.S. Gorbachev's speeches, and the joint press conference between M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand in Paris. It is being stressed that for all the differences in political systems, ideologies, and philosophies, countries ae today facing up to the need to seek ways toward a peace that would be typified by trust, mutual understanding, and cooperation.

The French press is making a high assessment of the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit. The results of the visit are evoking great interest in the United States. P. Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, called the new USSR peace initiatives an "extremely promising approach" and an "extremely important step forward worthy of attentive study." Speaking on Canadian television, he stressed that it is now a question of the United States studying the Soviet proposals. Unfortunately, Warnke said, certain enemies of arms control in the Reagan administration are lightly rejecting these proposals without even understanding their essence. They are trying to torpedo the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union and distort them.

Concerning official Washington's reaction to the new Soviet initiatives, the U.S. mass media report that President R. Reagan, speaking in New Jersey, stated that the United States does not intend to abandon the plans for the militarization of space. "We will continue work in this sphere," the President said, claiming that the demands to end the implementation of this program "have nothing to do with the true struggle for peace." Observers are also drawing attention to the fact that the State Department has issued a statement clearly aimed at belittling the importance of the new Soviet proposals and slanderously claiming that Soviet missiles "threaten Europe." ABC TV stated: "A very large number of Europeans really believe that the Reagan administration reacts too hastily and too negatively to virtually any Soviet proposal in the arms control sphere. M.S. Gorbachev's statements were warmly welcomed in France and we have all gotten a better impression of his intentions at Geneva."

E. Bahr, the eminent FRG politician and public figure, stated: "The USSR's proposal to entirely prohibit space strike arms for both sides and to reduce really radically, by 50 percent, the nuclear arms capable of reaching each

other's territories is an enormous positive step in the direction of genuine disarmament." This initiative, he stressed, opens up "historic prospects" for the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms being held in Geneva.

Netherlands Prime Minister R. Lubbers described M.S. Gorbachev's statements as hopeful. In particular, he said, the readiness shown by the Soviet Union to discuss the question of medium-range nuclear means in Europe is a step in the right direction.

Belgian Minister of Foreign Relations L. Tindemans termed positive the proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev on disarmament issues. In a talk with journalists the leader of the Belgian foreign policy service said that there must be an in-depth and thorough study of the new Soviet proposals.

The British press and public are focusing on the new Soviet initiatives. Commenting on the proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev to cut by 50 percent the U.S. and Soviet arsenals of nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territories and to conclude an agreement on the non-militarization of space and the holding of direct talks with Britain and France on the problems of medium-range nuclear means in Europe, political observers here are noting that they open up a real prospect for ending the nuclear arms race and strengthening the atmosphere of peace and detente in Europe and the entire planet.

Britain's ITV reports that British Foreign Minister G. Hose assessed the Soviet ideas as "positive." In a television interview G. Hose stated: "We must seriously examine the Soviet proposals." The Soviet proposals, D. Steel, leader of the Liberal Party, said, "are a bold new step to which Western leaders should react more positively." Britain's DAILY TELEGRAPH writes: "Moscow has called on the United States to abandon political demagoguery and to embark with the USSR on reducing military arsenals on earth and banning them in space. It would not be sensible to view the Soviet initiative with cold cynicism. From whatever standpoint one looks at it the reductions it envisages are extremely tangible." "M.S. Gorbachev's optimism," THE TIMES writes, "is meeting with a favorable response in the West European countries, including Britain. The Reagan administration has been thrown into obvious disarray by the new Soviet proposals in the arms control sphere."

The Soviet Union, Japan's ASAHI notes, has clearly expressed its resolve to move forward toward improving the dangerous situation in the world, preventing the arms race, and ensuring an easing of tension. It stressed that the new initiatives serve precisely this goal. The results of the talks in France are increasing hopes still further of a favorable shift in East-West relations. The Washington correspondent of Japan's NHK TV noted that M.S. Gorbachev's visit has made a great impression in the United States. At press conferences, U.S. journalists are often asking administration spokesmen whether the United States is losing out in the diplomatic contest with the Soviet Union. "However the White House continues to perceive the Soviet peace initiatives as 'according with the interests of just one side' and rejects them."

China's RENMIN RIBAO has published a XINHUA report on M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France. Speaking in Paris, the report says, M.S. Gorbachev stated that East-West political dialogue is needed now more than ever. M.S. Gorbachev condemned the U.S. "strategic defense initiative," noting that if the United States persists in pursuing the dangerous path it has charted there will truly be grim times in store for the world.

FRG SDP Meeting

LD072050 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 7 Oct 85

[Text] Bonn, October 7 (TASS)--The Soviet Union's readiness to agree to 50-percent cuts in strategic nuclear weapons is a major step towards disarmament, the Executive of the Social Democratic Party of Germany has stated.

The SDP executive held a meeting in Bonn today.

The agreement on a simultaneous reduction by half of the strategic armaments of the USSR and the United States and the simultaneous prohibition of space armament in the opinion of the West German Social Democrats, would be a compromise taking into account the interests of both sides.

PRAVDA Roundup 8 October

PM091435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS roundup: "For A Peaceful Future"]

[Excerpts] 7 Oct -- The Soviet Union is not just appealing for peace but it is doing everything possible to halt the arms race, begin arms reductions, improve the international situation, and develop cooperation among peoples in order to ensure a peaceful future for the whole world. It is emphasized in foreign reactions to the results of the visit to France by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Prominent statesmen and public figures and the media in many countries, expressing a high opinion of the large-scale program put forward by the Soviet leader for improving the explosive international situation, emphasize in their commentaries: The Soviet Union has a right to expect the West to respond to its peace-loving proposals by going its part of the way toward detente and to put forward equivalent proposals aimed at strengthening international security, peace, and cooperation.

In its assessment of the political impact of M.S. Gorbachev's visit, France's L'HUMANITE writes: "The Soviet leader put forward concrete initiatives relating to the key problems of the present day... The most important thing at the present stage is to implement Moscow's proposals on reducing the U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenals and also on banning the militarization of space. Also of interest is the Soviet leader's invitation to begin bilateral talks with France and Britain at reducing military confrontation in Europe."

Another French paper, LIBERATION, calls M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France "the culmination of the Soviet Union's peace offensive on the eve of the Geneva summit. The visit

resulted in considerable success for the USSR. Indeed, any discussion in the world about the problem of disarmament has now been transformed by the Moscow initiatives." Touching on the economic aspects of the visit, the French business paper LE ECHOS notes: "The outcome of the talks in Paris inspires obvious optimism."

The results of the Soviet-French summit talks are regarded with great interest by the participants in the Stockholm conference on confidence-building and security measures and disarmament in Europe, Ambassador (P. Gashinyar), head of the French delegation at the conference, said. The Soviet leader's visit to France is a very important event. The statements he made in Paris will certainly impart positive new momentum to the work of the Stockholm conference, which has the responsible task of contributing to the cause of strengthening trust and generating an atmosphere of genuine security on the European continent."

The Washington correspondent of Britain's THE TIMES writes in the paper about the enormous interest the Soviet leader's French visit has aroused among broad circles of the U.S. public. "The reaction of Americans to the results of the visit has increased worries that President Reagan has a formidable opponent and that the White House head will have to work hard if he wants to avoid a serious defeat."

Trying to play down the significance of the USSR's peace initiatives, a number of senior U.S. Administration spokesmen have joined in a campaign to portray the Soviet proposals and M.S. Gorbachev's visit itself as a manifestation of the "propaganda war between Moscow and Washington" and to question the sincerity and peace-loving nature of Soviet foreign policy.

One notes the pronouncements by R. McFarlane, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs, who, according to an ABC announcer, is "engaged in trying to indoctrinate public opinion by indicating flaws in the new Soviet proposals on the reduction of nuclear armaments." In particular, R. McFarlane made the unsubstantiated claim that "the proposals made in Paris benefit only the USSR" and are "intended only to achieve success in the 'war of words'" aimed at "creating a split between America and its European allies and forcing Reagan to halt the implementation of his "star wars" program. In this connection, another announcer for the same U.S. television company admitted: "A very large number of people believe that Reagan's entourage has reacted too hastily and too negatively to practically every Soviet proposal in the arms control sphere. M.S. Gorbachev's pronouncements were warmly welcomed in France, and Americans have now been given a better idea of his intentions prior to the Geneva summit."

The Soviet leader again made it clear that world peace can be preserved and strengthened by deeds, not by words, and that the USSR is taking concrete steps on that path, the LOS ANGELES TIMES sums up. Moscow believes that the time has come for concrete action and that it is no longer enough to say. "Yes, we are for peace, we are following the path of normalizing the international situation." Unless these words are backed up by concrete actions, they are mere political demagoguery and deception of the peoples. By its whole series of initiatives in recent months, above all the unilateral steps, the USSR has given a practical demonstration that it is ready for reasonable compromises and expects a constructive response from the West.

A group of eminent U.S. political figures published a statement urging the Reagan administration to give a positive reply to the USSR proposal on endorsing its unilateral

moratorium on all nuclear explosions and also to try, via talks, to achieve the total cessation of nuclear tests. The document was signed by former U.S. ambassador to the USSR Averell Harriman, former special assistant to President John Kennedy Arthur Schlesinger, former U.S. Secretary of State George Ball, and former Atomic Energy Commission Chairman and Nobel Prize winner Glenn Seaborg.

U.S. Reactions Noted

PM101429 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin article: "Shrouded by Rhetoric"]

[Text] Washington -- Every day during the official visit to France by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, reports from Paris occupied a prominent place on TV and in U.S. newspapers. Viewing M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France as a very important international event, the Washington mass media analyzed in detail the remarks of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary; press representatives deluged officials with questions during briefings, demanding answers explaining Washington's reaction to the Soviet proposals.

The activeness of the U.S. press and television attests that it is becoming increasingly difficult for the U.S. Administration's propaganda machine to conceal the Soviet peace initiatives from the public. A number of U.S. politicans called for them to be studied seriously. Democrat Senator C. Pell, in particular, stressed: "Instead of completely rejecting the USSR's proposals, we must study them and give an answer."

The unseemly method is no longer working whereby any peace-loving step of the Soviet Union is declared by the White House to be a "propaganda act" and an attempt to "win over" public opinion. Nor is the U.S. public satisfied with the administration's attempts to present the Soviet initiatives as the USSR's "responses" to some imaginary U.S. "proposals."

A number of political observers see this verbal tightrope walking as the "weakness of the U.S. position," which has nothing to counter the Soviet Union's specific and constructive proposals. "The White House has been forced to occupy defensive positions in the face of the broad offensive of the Soviet peace initiatives," observers stress. Democrat Senator Carl Levin warns that the ignoring by the United States of the constructive process of talks on halting the arms race "could possibly lead Washington into political isolation."

Analyzing such remarks, journalists reproach the administration for its unintelligible replies. As a result, they point out, the world public sees that the Soviet Union is striving for disarmament while the United States is opposing this process. "Now is not the time to stonewall," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. "America risks losing trust and missing real opportunities. It must reply that its goal is to strengthen peace rather than the arms race."

Official Washington realizes that it is already difficult to simply brush aside the Soviet proposals, since broad circles of the U.S. public, many U.S. politicians, and West European allies advocate "a change toward progress come about in relations between East and West."

U.S. Administration leaders pay lip service to a "realistic approach" to the resolution of "complex international problems." THE WASHINGTON POST observer Don Oberdorfer called the tone of the latest Washington utterances "moderate."

But the "moderate tone" of the statements diverges from the practical deeds of the U.S. Administration. Its representatives juggle with figures and facts about each sides' armaments, understating the U.S. arsenals and groundlessly inflating the facts about Soviet armaments, as U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle did at a press conference. Political libels and forged documents are appearing and a campaign about alleged violations by the Soviet Union of international accords is being kindled, although it is in fact the United States which is doing this by unleashing an arms race in space by testing strike facilities there.

Finally, the old and tried method is being used: The United States is trying to "drown out" the vitally important problem of disarmament -- which the USSR has approached from serious, constructive positions and for the settlement of which it has provided specific proposals -- with a campaign about "human rights;" what is more, a campaign thoroughly permeated with lies and falsehood.

The U.S. Administration remains intransigent on the implementation of its military programs, primarily the plan for the militarization of space. Both Reagan and Shultz have currently restated that the question of "star wars" weapons will not be a "topic of discussion" at the Geneva talks. As for Pentagon boss Weinberger and his generals, rhetoric is totally alien to them and they continue to "speak off the cuff," openly rejecting realistic talks and at the same time, the whole process of disarmament. The defense secretary has even deferred his visit to Asia and deliberately stayed in Washington to keep a "vigilant" eye open lest the interests of the U.S. "hawks" are injured.

But you do not achieve disarmament on the wings of "hawks." Talks on the most topical problem of today require a judicious and honest approach. Ways toward real disarmament do exist. They are revealed in the specific Soviet peace initiatives. People in America today are learning more and more about them and discussing them, demanding answers from the administration -- practical and precise answers unshrouded by rhetoric.

Weekly Radio Roundtable

LD131822 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 13 Oct 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political observer; Vladimir Tsvetov, USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting political observer; and Nikolay Agayants, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator and program moderator]

[Excerpt] [Agayants] Hello, comrades! There are events whose significance and impact on the positive processes taking place in the world not only do not diminish with time, but, on the contrary, become even greater and stand out in even greater relief and even more clearly against the background of daily affairs and phenomena. Indubitably, among such events are the recent visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to France, the Soviet-French summit talks in Paris, and the new constructive peace initiatives put forward by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

These proposals, according to a report on the latest meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, which are aimed at preventing the militarization of space, curbing the race in nuclear and other arms, and at the development of fruitful international cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole, convincingly demonstrate the peace-loving foreign policy course of our state.

It was noted with satisfaction at the Politburo meeting, I will recall, that the new Soviet initiatives were met with approval by broad public opinion and by political circles and the leadership of many countries. They are rightly viewed as being an exceedingly important act which opens up the prospect of turning affairs on the international scene toward a radical improvement in the political climate of our planet and the consolidation of the security of all countries and peoples.

The Soviet Union has once again demonstrated convincingly that it does not limit itself to issuing calls and declarations for peace, that the foreign policy initiatives that it puts forward are of a concrete, practical, and palpable nature, and that they are filled with a sincere desire to shape a new course in international developments and direct it along the path of detente and peaceful coexistence. That is precisely how they were received by world public opinion. The press, radio, and television in many countries stressed that by its steps, taken unilaterally in the past few months, the Soviet Union has already demonstrated its readiness for reasonable compromise and is awaiting a constructive reply from the West.

[Tsvetov] Nikolay Ivanovich, while preparing for our conversation, I tried to sum up the assessment of the results of the visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to France by public opinion in the socialist countries. That assessment is as follows. The visit by the Soviet Union is convincing confirmation of the resolve by the Land of the Soviets to carry out a quest for fair solutions to international problems that are in the interests of all sides. It was confirmation of the Soviet Union's policy to push for radical arms cuts and strive to guarantee security and peace. I tried to do the same thing with the statements by West European public opinion. I also tried to make some sort of summary of the general response to the visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich. It goes roughly as follows. The Soviet Union is ready for a constructive dialogue and a quest for solutions to the European and world problems that have accumulated; first and foremost, the problems of returning to detente, preventing the arms race in space, ending it on earth, and emerging onto new levels of international cooperation.

[Kornilov] Yes, Vladimir Yakovlevich, here is just one of the many quite revealing statements. "The Soviet initiatives," the major Belgian newspaper LE SOIR writes, "have made an enormous impression on public opinion in the Western countries and have evoked a broad, positive reaction among interested governments. The whole package of the new Soviet proposals is impressive for its scale. This goes first and foremost for the proposal to reduce U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons capable of reaching the other's territory by 50 percent. That figure has literally seized the imagination of public opinion in the West," the Belgian newspaper LE SOIR sums up.

[Agayants] The leitmotif of the reaction by the foreign mass media today is the thought that implementation of the program put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for improving the explosive international situation that threatens the world would mean a substantial adv ce to the much -desired aim of banning and completely eliminating nuclear weapons. It would help to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear destruction.

The Soviet Union has done, and continues to do, a great deal to save the planet from the lethal danger, Mortimer, one of the leaders of the "Labor Action for Peace" organization and former general secretary of the British Labor Party, said a few days ago. Unfortunately the West, he continued, and first and foremost the United States, is refusing to follow that example. It is a well-known fact that the Reagan administration has rejected all the Soviet proposals on limiting the arms race, one after the other. Moreover, in its attempt to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union at any price, the United States intends to transfer the arms race into a new sphere, space, which creates an extremely dangerous situation for peace on our planet. That roughly is how many sober-minded politicians in the West are speaking today about the new peace proposals. What about the United States? What is the reaction there to our country's readiness to hold honest talks on the most vital problems of today?

[Kornilov] The reaction, it must be stated frankly, is not unequivocal. For instance, a group of prominent U.S. politicians -- among them Harriman, former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union; Schlesinger, former special adviser to President Kennedy; Ball, former assistant U.S. Secretary of State; and Seaborg, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Nobel prizewinner -- that group published a statement calling on the master of the White House to give a positive reply to the USSR proposals to join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions and to try, by means of talks, to bring about the complete ending of nuclear tests. On the other hand, the representatives of certain Washington circles who take an active part in the shaping of foreign policy, evidently striving to belittle the importance of the steps being taken by the Soviet Union, hastened to state that these steps are of a general nature. They try thereby, to accuse us of attempting to unleash some sort of propaganda war against the United States. It has to be said that it's an old formula, and a fairly hackneyed one.

[Agayants] One might pay no attention to the speech by Vice President Bush at the University of South Carolina where he tried by means of unsubstantiated rhetoric to call into question the sincerity and peace-loving aims of the Soviet initiatives, and one might also overlook the dubious outbursts by McFarlane, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs on the NBC television program "Meet the Press," if it were not for the fact that all this has been taking place on the eve of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva November 19-20, if it were not for the fact that these acts contradict Ronald Reagan's statements that the United States is ostensibly attentive to the new Soviet proposals and is studying them.

[Tsvetov] Yuriy Emmanuilovich was just speaking about the attempts to distort the essence of the Soviet proposals made in Paris.

I would like to dwell here on something slightly different: the desire by U.S. representatives of the military-industrial complex and certain other supporters of the cold war and the arms race to cast a shadow over the very idea of summit meetings between the Soviet Union and leading Western powers. My attention was drawn to a little observation in the British THE TIMES which said as follows: "Some NATO leaders are worried that the visit by the Soviet leader to Paris may damage the solidarity of the Atlantic alliance." But it is quite indicative that such fears are voiced by NATO leaders everytime Soviet initiatives give rise to hopes in the world of an improvement in the international situation and that bilateral meetings -- be they Soviet-French, Soviet-West German or any

other -- lead to an improvement in relations between the countries and an overall improvement in relations between the countries and an overall improvement in the international climate. I recall how nervously a representative of the U.S. State Department reacted to the news of a planned visit by Comrade Shevardnadze to Japan. I quote: "It's not too good an idea to improve Soviet-Japanese relations by means of such a visit," the official said. Similar dissatisfaction was aroused, too, for example, by the intentions of the USSR and Oman to establish diplomatic relations. In a word, the opponents of detente give a hostile reception to anything that may weaken their positions.

PRAVDA Weekly Review

PM141343 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Igor Melnikov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Generator of Detente

The week which has elapsed since M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France seemingly should have gradually moderated the interest in that event. But that has not happened. On the contrary, the greater the number of days separating us from the Soviet initiatives heard aloud in Paris, the broader and deeper their influence on the course of international life.

This influence is beneficial, making it possible to assert that our country has been and remains the architect and erector of detente. As the latest CPSU Central Committee Politburo session stated, the major proposals put forward by the Soviet Union aimed at preventing the militarization of space, curbing the race in nuclear and other arms, and developing fruitful international cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole, convincingly demonstrated yet again our state's peace-loving foreign policy course.

The Soviet Union made it clearly understood that peace on earth can be preserved by deeds and more deeds; that it is making specific steps on this path. In particular, the proposal addressed to the United States for a complete ban on space strike weapons by both sides and a 50 percent reduction of the nuclear armaments which can reach each other's territory is just such a step. This is a reliable framework for future agreements and unconnected with the words, verging on demagoguery, which some major Western politicians are prepared to utter.

Foreign observers have not failed to note that the proposals made public in Paris are directly tailored for the practical solution of the tasks set before the Geneva talks: not only halting the arms race, but also sharply reducing the level of armaments and at the same time preventing the militarization of space. The Soviet Union's expressed readiness to conclude an individual agreement on nuclear weapons in Europe and its decision to unilaterally reduce the number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone were also assessed at their worth.

The interest in the Soviet proposals is so great that the campaign launched by the press obedient to Washington and to NATO ruling circles to show the "disillusionment" which has allegedly once more gripped Western political circles has noticeably failed. On the other hand, those same mass media have had to reflect the confusion among NATO leading circles. For instance, they are upset by the very lively response encountered

in Belgium and the Netherlands by the Soviet statement that the number of SS-20 missiles, despite the calumny of NATO propaganda, has not increased. And moreover, that our country is prepared to embark on a reduction of the number of these missiles in the European zone.

People in Washington looked sourly at the television screen when a CBS correspondent reported from Amsterdam: "Protests are mounting here against the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in the Netherlands. Today the number of protesters has exceeded all expectations and people are far more confident that they can stop the U.S. missiles. One reason is Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on the reduction of the number of Soviet SS-20 missiles in operational readiness."

The backstage struggle unleashed around the convening of a meeting of the representatives of a number of Western countries is also evidence of conclusion.

Initially, the White House had decided to gather the leaders of the "big seven" -- it believed it would be easier to enlist support for its course in a narrow circle. But the result was discomfiture: On the one hand, France rejected the meeting and on the other, the minor NATO countries, once again "overlooked" by their "senior partner," were offended. Ultimately, it was decided to convene an emergency NATO session in Brussels 15 October at foreign minister level for consultations before the November meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President in Geneva.

Information on the White House incumbent's reaction to the recent Soviet peace initiatives is so far quite meager. But he has stated that the United States is treating them with attention and is studying them. NATO Secretary General Carrington's recent visit to the U.S. capital sheds some light on the reaction of Washington and NATO. After meeting with admiration leaders here he stated that he "welcomed" the USSR's new proposals in the nuclear arms reduction field and also did not personally believe that the Soviet proposal "on individual talks with Britain and France is merely an attempt to split the West."

In general, it should be noted that one of the Western press' dominant themes in recent days has been the powerful impetus given to the growth of the West Europeans' self-awareness by the Soviet visit to France. The Soviet Union, the Paris newspaper LIBERATION writes, has suggested to the old World that it should not wait for permission from the White House to resume the detente process if the United States feigns deafness. The invitation to the West European countries to take part in bilateral dialogue, the newspaper believes, is a great success for the USSR's foreign policy.

The Soviet generator of detente and peace initiatives is working increasingly fruitfully. The West, and primarily Europe, cannot fail to react to this fact.

A Little More Terrible than Hell

Today perhaps you will not find many overt troubadours of the "cold war" among West European politicians. But Franz-Josef Strauss, the "inveterate" of the West German right-wingers, is invariably among this cohort. Now, he has blurted out that the halving of U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear systems "would reinforce still further the nuclear imbalance in the USSR's favor." A statement of incredible irresponsibility!

Indeed, lacking arguments, other champions of a policy of strength are also behaving increasingly "incredibly." For instance, what is the worth in this respect of the zeal of R. McFarlane, the U.S. President's national security aide? Evidently urged on by the lobbyists of the military-industrial complex, he recently set about depicting the Soviet proposals as allegedly unfair to the United States and giving no grounds for future agreements. Why? Because these proposals conceal the USSR's desire to force the Americans to abandon the SDI project and at the same time to continue its own analogous program.

Here he has not even considered elementary logic, because it is clear even to a child that were this in fact the case, it would be all the more necessary to immediately accept the Soviet proposals to ban any deployment [razvertyvaniye] of weapons in space. But no, for McFarlane this step means a step into the abyss -- at any rate figuratively -- the abyss of the anger of the bosses of the military-industrial complex who have no intention of depriving some U.S. concerns of their multibillion dollar orders and profits guaranteed by the SDI project through the start of the 21st century; the abyss of the anger of the Pentagon military, which would otherwise have to bury the idea of achieving military superiority. To all appearances these "abysses" are more terrible than hell for McFarlane and his colleagues.

Some people in the U.S. Administration are also turning away from the proposal to halve the number of strategic nuclear armaments capable of reaching the territories of the United States and the USSR. Matters are presented as though the Pershing II and cruise missiles, including sea-launched missiles, deployed in the immediate vicinity of our borders and the aircraft carrier nuclear weapons systems have nothing to do with strategic equalization.

Such are the zigzags of militarist logic. They close their eyes to the fact that the Pershing II and cruise missiles transferred to Europe create a direct threat to our territory and that they are essentially offensive strategic weapons with respect to the USSR. At the same time, it is clear to one and all that the Soviet SS-20 missiles are not strategic as far as the United States is concerned because they do not threaten its territory.

Looking Ahead to the Meeting

On whatever plane the problems of security and disarmament are examined today, there is invariably talk of the forthcoming November meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva.

Here are the revelations made in connection with the meeting by one influential and by no means left-wing U.S. newspaper: "The fact that the hardliners in the defense department are awaiting the U.S.-Soviet summit meeting with fear and loathing is scarcely anything new. They have always been opposed to arms control agreements and of course, to summit meetings. The difference this time is that trembling at the prospect of the meeting has taken hold of the White House, the National Security Council, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the State Department; not without cause."

The reason they are trembling, the newspaper believes, is the meeting's agenda, which contains just one basic theme: arms control. And, the article says, if Reagan

adheres to the "star wars" program, he will be held up to shame -- not only by the Russians. The success of the summit meeting, the newspaper sums up, depends on Reagan's readiness to make concessions on the "star wars" program.

The U.S. press is now writing that "the most the President can hope for at the summit meeting is a draw," U.S. journalists could be forgiven their predilection for sporting terminology if it did not distort the aim of the summit contacts. The Soviet side is by no means going to the Geneva meeting for the sake of a propaganda gain. It is convinced that the interest in its success should be mutual, that the attention of those taking part should unfailingly be focused on the most important problem of the present day -- preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and consolidating strategic stability.

That is the point of the Geneva meeting. If this fundamental condition is observed, what importance could be attached to the "pinstriped suit" which the President intends to wear or to what the U.S. press again calls his "old-fashioned and simple" manner in conversation?

Something else puts us on guard. For instance, the White House's unceasing praise for the "star wars" plan. Although this militarist program leads only to the growth of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, the President pronounced recently: "The implementation of this program must continue. It will continue. It is not a means of extracting concessions at talks, we will continue to advance along that path."

But, you may ask, would it not be better to continue the path of detente and mutually acceptable accords on the basis of parity and equal security? This activity has to its undisputed credit the 1963 Moscow treaty on banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water, the 1968 treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems and the SALT I agreement signed in 1972, and finally the 1979 SALT II treaty. Thus, there has been at least some redemption of the sins of U.S. policy of recent years which have torpedoed the very laboriously created structure of negotiations which helped to strengthen strategic stability in the world.

CSO: 5200/1053

GENERAL

MOSCOW WEEKLY TALK SHOW CONCENTRATES ON ARMS ISSUES

LD120520 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1715 GMT 11 Oct 85

["International Situation--Questions and Answers" program presented by Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political observer of Central TV and All-Union Radio, with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer]

Bovin Interview

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello, comrades. The Moscow publishing house "Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya" has just put out a book whose title and subheadings, in my opinion, reflect its contents extremely accurately. The book is entitled: "Let's Speak to the Point: About Peace and War; About Detente and Confrontation; About Disarmament and the Arms Race, and About Other problems in World Politics." The author of the book is Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer. He is with us in the stuido now, but before I hand you over to him, I will just tell you about one particular feature of this book. It is a dialogue, a conversation to the point, between the author and you, esteemed radio listeners, -- yes, do not be astonished -- between the author and you, because Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich replies to those very same questions which are very frequently contained in your letters. We receive a great deal of letters from you. Since the available copies of this book is not great by comparison with the number of our listeners, I have invited Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich to the studio to reply to your questions, addressing himself directly to you.

[Bovin] The booklet, it must be said, came out during the summer and since then, events have been developing; there are no doubt issues which I did not manage to...

[Tsvetov, interrupting] Yes, they simply could not be included, because the booklet came out before such a major international event as the visit to France by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev...

[Bovin interrupting] So it is best to take a look first of all at those letters; then return to what the book says.

New Disarmament Proposals

[Tsvetov] That is exactly how I'd like to begin. Our listeners write in to say both the visit to France by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the proposals on disarmament which he put forward in Paris provide hope for an easing of international tension and a relieving of the atmosphere somewhat. To what degree is this so, listeners ask?

[Bovin] Well, this is, of course, a very interesting question and a question that is difficult to answer, because hope and relief are feelings, they are emotions. But, it is a well-known fact that politics is impossible without emotions; emotions go together with politics. Of course, I agree with our listeners, with you, comrades: This visit to Paris and everything that took place there, naturally, did indeed raise my own hopes that generally speaking we are not eternally doomed to finding ourselves in a state of confrontation, that it is possible to return again to the path of detente, so to speak. Moreover, the Paris visit showed very well that you can talk; you can talk calmly, you can seek agreement, and if we fail to find agreement -- such situations are quite possible and I must say that there were such situations in Paris -- it does not mean at all that you have to wave the cold war flag again. The visit confirmed this.

Well, you all know what the specific results were, comrades, and I shall not go over them again; they are common knowledge. But, I would like to stress this. The Paris trip showed a combination of firmness in defending our fundamental interests, on the one hand, and realism, a sober assessment of both our possibilities, the possibilities of our partners and the possibilities of reaching some kind of accords, on the other hand. It showed realism and sobriety combined with dynamism, flexibility, and a willingness to consider the interests of our partners. These features were particularly characteristic of the Paris trip and the talks which took place there, both the talks among politicians and the conversations between politicians and journalists. All this shows that if things go that way, and I think they will, it gives one greater hope.

[Tsvetov] Washington's first reaction to the Soviet proposals advanced in Paris was mixed. Listeners ask whether there is any foundation to the assertions of certain Washington leaders that the Soviet proposals are disadvantageous to the United States.

[Bovin] Let us look at their overall approach. This is what the Americans are saying: The Soviet Union has overtaken the United States in the military-strategic context. So the United States has fallen behind and she must catch up with the Soviet Union. That is their basic premise. They go on in the following vein: Allright, let's suppose we accept the Soviet Union's proposal: We reduce ours by 50 percent, and they reduce theirs by 50 percent. But since we are behind the Soviet Union, with this symmetrical reduction the present lack of symmetry will be preserved. So we will continue to be behind and they will be in front of us. For this reason, say the Americans, the Soviet Union needs to remove more arms than us. Then it will be fair. That is the U.S. position. In order to be able to assess this U.S. approach, you have to take a look at the structure of our strategic forces and the U.S. forces. There is no secret involved here; they are all known facts. When in 1979, in Vienna, as you will recall, the SALT II Treaty was being signed -- a treaty which was not, regrettably, ratified by the Americans -- a document was signed simultaneously with this under the title, Agreement on Basic Data. In other words, the sides exchanged official basic data on their strategic forces.

Let's take a look. The Americans, for instance, declared that they had 1,054 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. We declared 1,398 at that time -- land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, that is. The result is that it would appear that the Americans are right -- we have more of these missiles. But let's pursue this further and we shall see that we have 156 heavy bombers, for instance, while the Americans have 573. So, they have a nearly fourfold superiority. Let us look at another very important component: submarines carrying ballistic missiles. We have, it must be admitted, an advantage in numbers of submarines; we have more submarines than

the Americans and we have more launch tubes. But the point is that it is not submarines that hit the target and not missiles, but warheads. So the American strategic submarine fleet has a salvo comprising roughly 6,000 warheads, while our salvo is about 2,500. As you can see, this is quite a substantial difference in favor of the Americans. So there you have it. This strategic equality is the sum of inequalities in specific types of armed forces; that is how it must be understood. There is an old joke which goes something like this. There's this statistician and someone asks him a question. He says: I can prove that there are more Irish than Chinese. How can you do that, he is asked. He says: Try counting just the redheads. So when the Americans go on about this inequality in our favor, they very often count only the redheads: they count only what it is advantageous for them to count and not what is disadvantageous. The result is this distortion, which does not exist in reality. So, that is their general premise, that is why they say it is disadvantageous.

What they say is this: When you talk of this 50 percent, what is involved is weapons which can reach U.S. territory from the Soviet side and weapons which can reach our territory.

So, using this calculation, the Americans should also reduce their forward-based forces -- those located in Western Europe, for instance: the Pershings and cruise missiles -- because they can hit our territory. And we should not cut our SS-20 missiles, for instance, within the framework of this agreement, since they cannot reach U.S. territory. What they say is that this is unjust. But you have to look at the geostrategic situation of the two sides. The Americans, you see, have taken these forces right up to our borders; we cannot fail to take this into account. I would just like to stress that what we have proposed is not in the least an ultimatum. It is a proposal for conducting talks. We have placed our proposal on the table and it would now be interesting to hear the Americans' specific reply to these proposals.

[Tsvetov] Excuse me, may I interrupt you? There has been no specific reply for the time being, but some hints as to the possible contents of the reply have been made by President Reagan. What I have in mind is his statement, which I want to quote: We will continue to strive to cooperate with the Soviet Union in order to resolve existing problems, to try to achieve agreement on arms reduction which would be fair and verifiable and to lay the foundations for a more secure life in the present-day world, unquote. This is what Reagan said. But, on the other hand, there are also other voices to be heard in Washington. Representatives of the Pentagon, reflecting the interests of the military-industrial complex and other departments interested in the nuclear and space arms race, are trying to suggest to the public the impossibility of achieving positive results at the November meeting. Which position is to gain the upper hand will probably only become clear at the meeting itself. The letters which have just come in also include the following question: What new element has been brought to international relations as regards negotiations relating to nuclear disarmament by the Soviet proposal to have the Soviet Union discuss this issue separately with France and Britain?

European Arms Talks

[Bovin] Well, just look at the logic of the French and the British. Here is what they say: Yes, we have nuclear forces, we have the delivery means -- incidentally, they can reach the Soviet Union's territory -- but they are our forces, they are our independent strategic forces. We do not have the slightest desire to see our forces figure in the

context of Soviet-American discussions and talks. They are quite another matter, they say. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev did indeed say in Paris, Yes, he said, we understand this logic. We understand it very well. So let us discuss this topic directly. This is, so to speak, the new element introduced by our proposal: Let's talk directly. But for the French and the British this matter is, of course, admittedly a rather delicate one. What Mitterrand said was: We shall not hold talks, but as for an exchange of views -- yes, we are willing to hold an exchange of views. Evidently, I think, the British response will probably be couched in roughly the same tone. Well, that is not important in the present instance. What is important is to begin this discussion. If the Geneva talks do well and there are some sort of improvements in the overall correlation of strategic forces, so to speak, this will also create the basis for some sort of headway in Europe, if this problem is taken separately. Mikhail Sergeyevich did in fact propose that the problem of Euroweapons could be separated from the problems under discussion in Geneva and resolved separately. To some extent this perhaps makes it easier to approach this matter.

It is being said both in Paris and London: Why are you fretting over there? By comparison with, say, your potential or with the U.S. potential, we have a small number of nuclear weapons and means of delivery. Well, of course, relatively speaking it is a small number. Naturally, I do not know at whom and what the French and British missiles are targeted, but I can only suppose that the French missiles, for instance, are not targeted on New York, nor on London, and I think they are not targeted on Bonn.

The Western press says that currently the French strategic weapons can cover 100 targets on Soviet territory. If you consider the French modernization program which has been adopted and is being implemented in France at the moment, in 5 years these French systems will be able to cover 600 targets on Soviet territory. For instance, they have just launched the first submarine of the series; it is called "Inflexible." It has 16 launch tubes; that is, 16 missiles, each with six warheads with a capacity of about 150 kilotons. This is a total of 96 warheads on one submarine; by the nineties they intend to launch five such submarines. This is altogether something we must take into consideration; we cannot fail to take it into consideration, because both Britain and France are NATO members. That is why we are talking about these French and British missiles; this is quite understandable. We cannot, I repeat, fail to take into consideration this increasingly substantial addition to the U.S. potential. The proposal made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev provides an opportunity for discussing the situation and assessing what the prospects are in a calm atmosphere; for attempting to sound out some kind of mutually acceptable compromise.

U.S. Arms in Europe

[Tsvetov] A serious complication of the international atmosphere has arisen due to the siting [razmeshcheniye, here and throughout paragraph] in Europe of medium-range nuclear weapons in France. The United States declares that the siting of the Soviet SS-20 missiles in Eastern Europe sparked the siting in Western Europe of American Pershings and cruise missiles by way of a countermeasure. Several letters from listeners put the question in the following way: Perhaps it is worth our while, in fact, to renounce the siting of SS-20 missiles?

[Bovin] The Americans sited [razmestit] nuclear weapons in Europe long before the appearance of the SS-20's. Europe had, for instance, U.S. aircraft carrying nuclear

warheads -- both based on the decks of aircraft-carriers and at bases in Britain, for instance. Then, as we have already said, the British and French strategic forces appeared. As a reaction to this, we started to install the SS-20's. We also had our SS-4 and SS-5 systems -- let me say in passing, they were even more powerful than the SS-20 -- and no problems emerged.

[Tsvetov] So there was no distortion?

[Bovin] There was no distortion. Because if you consider not just these missiles, but also the overall position, including the aircraft, what you end up with is exactly what goes under the name of rough parity. Then we started to modernize. Our SS-4's, for instance, had been installed 20 years earlier and the missiles had become obsolete; and we began to replace them with new missiles. Yes, they are of course improved missiles, that is understandable: They have three warheads each; they are mobile. But they perform the same strategic tasks as were being performed earlier. However, when the Americans began to install Pershing-II's and cruise missiles, for instance, this was a qualitatively new situation, because these missiles, I repeat, can reach the Soviet Union's territory; in this sense they act as an addition to the U.S. central strategic potential. After all, what difference does it make to us what missile falls on Minsk; a missile launched from the territory of the FRG or from somewhere in the area of certain American states? It makes no difference to us. Thus, we react to these missiles quite strenuously. All the more so because there is the additional point that the closer the launcher is, the shorter the flight time. And, when the flight time is 6 or 8 minutes, as at present, there is practically no time left for any kind of reasoned reaction, you have to switch on the computers. The result is that political decisions are placed in the hands of machines, figuratively speaking. That is also highly undesirable; all kinds of mistakes and accidents are possible here. This is the reason for our reaction.

Our SS-20's, I repeat, are a means of counterbalancing U.S. forward-based forces and al the British and French potentials. As far as the Pershings and cruise missiles are concerned, there is documentary evidence that they were put into production, they began to be developed [razrabatyvat] long before we installed the SS-20's.

[Tsvetov] In this way, the siting [razmeshcheniye] of the SS-20 missiles was brought about by harsh necessity, by harsh reality.

[Bovin] Yes, because, of course, instead of 200 SS-20 missiles, it would be better if we could build perhaps 200 good hospitals, as well as 400 schools, and other things along the same lines. But, unfortunately, we live in a world in which we cannot fail to take account of what surrounds us and the security of the state is the number one priority for us, I would say. It is necessary, unfortunately, to spend money on missiles.

Strategic Defense Initiative

[Tsvetov] I should now like to touch on a group of questions concerning the American plan for so-called "star wars." Listeners draw attention to the fact that the U.S. Administration continues to assert that the Strategic Defense Initiative is an exclusively peaceful thing, a kind of panacea for the threat of nuclear war.

[Bovin] It is impossible to clearly differentiate between the functions of different weapons systems, dividing them into defensive and offensive. Let us suppose that the Americans put some sort of laser system for destroying our missiles into space. Unquestionably, if such a system comes into being it will be able to be used for destroying missiles and in this sense it is a defensive system: As Reagan says, it kil weapons, not people. But the whole snag is that it is a dual-purpose system: A laser can be used equally successfully to destroy our missile or any target on earth; it can be used to set fire to a town or to burn crops of some kind. So -- I repeat -- the effect is that these strike space systems are dual-purpose, objectively speaking: They can be a means of defense, and they can be a means of attack. This is the fundamental -- I don't want to say mistake -- but the fact is that the Americans are attempting to cover up this circumstance. Moreover, they will, of course, say: We have no intention of attacking you. We just want to defend ourselves.

The whole point, dear friends, is that in politics it is very difficult to take intentions as a guide. In politics you must consider not intentions, but objective possibilities. The systems which they want to make can, objectively speaking, serve as a means not just of defense, but also attack. This is what we must consider. The second point is that while developing [razrabatyvat] their so-called peaceful defensive systems, they are not curtailing the development [razvitiye] of offensive systems in the least. Moreover, in parallel with the start of research in the "star wars" framework, they are actively modernizing all of their offensive forces. And in what direction are they doing this? Well, take the MX missile, take the new missile for submarines. How do they differ from existing missiles? First, accuracy is enhanced. There is a concept known as CEP, the circular error probable. For these up-to-date new missiles this comes to around 90 meters. That is the pinpoint accuracy involved. The capacity is also being increased. What is the significance of the combination of accuracy and capacity? These are missiles which are designed for hitting, above all, military targets of some sort, launch silos or some sort of control bases. In other words, they are first-strike weapons.

In developing [sozdavat] these weapons -- which are, objectively speaking, first-strike weapons and, in addition, a shield behind which they can find cover from our counter-strike -- they are attempting to destroy the established balance of forces; to acquire an advantage which would enable them, in difficult circumstances of some kind to dictate their terms and to seek solutions to problems of one kind or another on their terms. That is where things are leading to. We cannot take any other approach to this program which they call the Strategic Defense Initiative. Although, formally, this sounds terribly defensive and thus peaceful, if we take a deeper look we will see various possibilities are to be found here, including the possibility of attack, which we cannot fail to take into account.

Soviet Arms Lead

[Tsvetov] The following question is asked by listeners in their letters: Is it true that the Soviet Union has taken a large lead over the United States in the field of antimissile defense, as Washington asserts, using this assertion as the basis for drafting new plans for the arms race?

[Bovin] The Americans have been playing that record for a long time now, alleging that we are overtaking them now in this area, now in that, and that the poor Americans are ceaselessly trying their utmost to catch up with us. Well, I have in front of me a study which was brought out 2 years ago in America, published by academics at the University of California. They say that in the years since the war there have been 14 turning points in the buildup of nuclear armaments; moments at which some sort of new systems appeared. They say that of these 14, 13 were initiated by the Americans. In other words, of the 14 systems, 13 were first started by the Americans.

They also say that in only one case can the attribution be put at something like 50-50. The reference is to intercontinental ballistic missiles. The reality was we conducted the first tests in August 1957 and the Americans in November 1958 -- more than a year later. We were supposedly ahead here; we began the thing. Let me say in passing that they sited [razmestit] their missiles more rapidly than us. This is the situation that emerges: Always at these qualitative stages, so to speak, in the arms race, the Americans were ahead and we had to catch up with them. That is not because we are weaker. No, it is because it is not our choice. We do not need to spend our money and expend our energies on this. But I repeat, we have already said this: In our harsh world, we are compelled to do this.

Now the same thing is happening with antimissile defense. Again they are saying that we have overtaken them. Of course, you will all realize very well, comrades, that, in general, we are also conducting research of various kinds; I mean research involving space. To be precise, not so long ago a brochure was published under the title "Star Wars: Illusions and Danger" [Avezdnyye Voyny: Illyuzii i Opesnost], by Voyenizdat. It expresses the, so to speak, semiofficial viewpoint of our Ministry of Defense. Let me read you a passage. Here is what it says: Of course, research work in the area of space, including the military sphere, is also taking place in the Soviet Union. But its purpose is not to develop [sozdaniye] space strike weapons or large-scale space antimissile defense systems. It is connected with the improvement of space systems for early warning and observation, communications, and navigation. The Soviet Union is not developing [sozdavat] space strike weapons. The Soviet Union does not intend to build an antimissile defense of the country's territory. That is our position; let me say that it has been set out in specific terms. What the Americans are going on about is that somewhere in the Krasnoyarsk area a radar station, a fairly big one, a major one, is being built. They keep saying: Look here, you're building this station.

It is banned; such systems are banned by the treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense. This means that you want to deploy [razvertyvat] a defense of this sort.

Let me quote what Marshal of the Soviet Union Ashromeyev has written on this subject. He says the following: The point, however, is that the radar station which is being built in the Krasnoyarsk area does not come under the restrictions in Article Six of the antimissile defense treaty. It has nothing at all to do with a system for providing early warning of missile attack. This station is designed for tracking space objects. The U.S. side has been informed of this. That is the way the matter looks. Of course, we have every potential for developing [sozdavat] laser weapons and beam weapons, but we simply do not want to. We do not want to and, if the Americans do not force it on us, we won't. Hence, the importance of the talks which are to be held in Geneva.

[Tsvetov] So, in other words, in making this completely unfounded complaint against us, the United States is trying to cover up its own deployment [rezvertyvaniye] of anti-missile weapons.

[Bovin] It is a type of alibi for them: Since the Soviet Union has done this, we must now do the same in order to catch up. I repeat: This is an old form of reasoning which has been shown to be incorrect dozens of times. But no, they continue repeating it.

U.S. Approach to Detente

[Tsvetov] Now, a question which crops up particularly frequently in radio listeners' letters: Who broke of the process of detente?

[Bovin] As for the requirements of detente, they are quite serious ones: If we have detente, that means you must stop interfering in the internal affairs of other states, you must negotiate on disarmament, you must lower the militarization of your society, you must know how to find some compromises with your opponents -- a state which you may not like -- and you must seek agreement. Now I fear that the Americans have not passed this test of detente. What has come about? They have suffered a defeat in Vietnam, they have been expelled from Iran, and they said: There, look, that's what detente means -- under detente, we are being beaten and driven from everywhere, poor America, victim of detente. That was their logic. It did not enter their minds that they were defeated in Vietnam or expelled from Iran not because there was detente, but because they were playing a game there which they could not win. Detente -- they say -- prevented them from asserting themselves there. If that is the case, then there is no need for detente and it is from here, so to speak, that this policy is derived; this policy, perhaps, of a kind of social-political revenge: to return those lost positions to America, to return to what was once called the Pax Americana, peace American-style, the American peace, and the simplest variation is, of course, force, the policy of force. America is a strong country; we have weapons, we have everything. Now the simplest variation -- I repeat it once again -- is to return from these complications of detente to the simple black-and-white world where the strong are always right and the weak are always wrong. That, the, was roughly their approach.

[Tsvetov] One of the arguments against detente is Washington's assertion that detente is impossible in conditions of a large number of regional conflicts of various types.

[Bovin] I will cite the following analogy: The year is 1972, you remember? Nixon is coming to Moscow. Well, literally 2 weeks before this visit, he gave the order to blockade and mine the port of Haiphong in Vietnam.

Our ships were there, our airplanes were there, the situation became very aggravated, and in Moscow the question naturally arose: Is it worth receiving him in Moscow in these circumstances? Still, they decided that, yes, it was worth it. No matter how important what is taking place in Vietnam may be, there are things such as, let's say, detente, let's say, the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations. One problem is more important, another problem is more significant, yet another is less significant, and let's say, the interests of detente on a global scale are of course more important than the regional problem which, per se, may be very important.

[Tsvetov] And, developing this issue, radio listeners also set themselves the following idea: To whose advantage in the United States it it to undermine the process of detente?

[Bovin] It is a capitalist society and it is advantageous to those for whom militarization yields a profit; that is primarily the military-industrial complex. By the way, it is very interesting -- well, many may know this, but maybe many do not know it -- that the very notion of a military-industrial complex was brought into usage by none other than Dwight Eisenhower, the President of the United States of America. As it happens, in this small book with which we started our conversation, I quote this: So, when Eisenhower was already retiring from his post -- this was 17 January 1961 -- he delivered a famous speech of his, a farewell speech, where he said precisely that there is a need to beware of the military-industrial complex establishing an influence unjustified by anything. Unfortunately, Eisenhower's warning was not heeded and this complex is currently one of the main forces which determines the flow of U.S. life. Militarization is advantageous for them, arms are advantageous for them, and if there is no tension, what is the point of upgrading armaments? There you are; of course, they are using their huge influence in order to undermine detente and to make profits from this.

Well, this is a narrow approach, but there is a wider one. For in America there are powerful enough circles who believe that in the conditions of detente it is difficult to stabilize capitalism: That is order to stabilize capitalism, stabilize the role of America in the world, it is necessary to turn from detente back to tension and this will allow America to use strong-arm methods more actively and bring greater influence to bear upon the revival of sorts of the role of the United States in the modern world. This also works against detente. There are leaders who say that in order to consolidate the position of capitalism, tension is not at all essential. But this is of course a difficult and hard path. It demands courage, intellectual and political. The traditional things are simpler. And so they are done: In order to stabilize capitalism, international tension is needed, a strengthening of militarism is needed.

'Myth' of Soviet Threat

[Tsvetov] At the press conference in Paris, one of the journalists putting a question to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that over the postwar period the Soviet Union has put forward almost a hundred peaceful proposals of one kind or another. Our listeners, pointing out the journalist's count, write: Why is it then that in the West they are always debating the Soviet threat. What are they up to?

[Bovin] I have had occasion to visit the West quite a few times. And I have asked many people with whom I have talked, journalists, politicians, scientists: Tell me, do you believe that the Soviet Union poses a threat to Europe, that it is contemplating an attack on Europe? Not one person, and these were all sorts of people, said yes, they believe this is possible. Here the paradoxical phenomenon occurs.

On the level of personal conversations, when you are talking to someone specifically, r one believes in this threat, but when the matter is being discussed on an official level, this very Soviet threat as a phenomenon of some sort of mass consciousness arises. It is apparent that some kind of inertia is present here. This inertia has been present since 1917, this political stereotype. Naturally, socialism poses a threat to capitalism on the ideological front, but it has been transformed into the Soviet threat precisely,

as if the Soviet Union would be prepared to send out its tank divisions and pass through the whole of Europe up to the Atlantic Ocean tomorrow.

[Tsvetov] Here one probably ought to point out that in conditions when the sphere of capitalism's domination is narrowing, when the political influence of the working class throughout the world is growing, and the effect of the ever growing strength of real socialism is being seen on the capitalist system, imperialism feels that it is losing the struggle of ideas. In order to slander socialism and consequently, its ideology, the argument of the Soviet threat is being hyped.

[Bovin] In this way this very myth about the Soviet threat is cultivated. Particularly [as there is hardly anyone] for whom detente is not advantageous. By the way, for those for whom detente is not advantageous, it is very advantageous for this myth about the Soviet threat to be maintained, because through this myth they receive quite real money for continuing the arms race; for new weapons systems, for militarizing society and, by the way, even for militarizing political thinking, which is perhaps the most frightening thing. This is what the myth about the Soviet threat is needed for; therefore, it is steadfastly supported by the huge apparatus of mass information and propaganda.

Summit Preparations

[Tsvetov] I have calculated that two of every three letters sent in by listeners deal with the forthcoming meeting of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with President Reagan. Listeners write that they can see how widely and intensively the Soviet side is preparing for the negotiations; but how is the American side preparing for them?

[Bovin] Let's take the organizational side. Reagan is meeting with his Western colleagues. He has already met with Lord Carrington, the secretary general of NATO, for instance. The National Security Council is holding conferences in the White House and 25 reports have been prepared for Reagan on various topics; about the Soviet Union, about our armaments, and about our psychology, by the way. Reagan has had three meetings with one lady, a prominent academic in America studying our domestic matters and what is called the Slavic soul, I suppose. So he invited her and she told him what the Russians are like and how one should approach them. By the way, this lady has quite a good opinion of us. So he talked with her. All these preparations are going on. Naturally, they are also going on here; we are consulting with our allies. But, the other side of it, is that we tried to take concrete steps to relieve the atmosphere, to ease the atmosphere around the Geneva talks; we proposed, for instance, not to test antisatellite weapons, not to continue nuclear blasts, and to freeze the present level of armaments. Everytime the Americans answered with a no and continued nuclear explosions; they continued testing antisatellite systems flexing their military muscles. The impression is formed that the Americans, preparing for Geneva, want to demonstrate their uncompromising attitude; they want to demonstrate that they are standing by this position. They have begun the "star wars" program and Reagan has announced that it cannot be a bargaining chip; whatever happens they shall be carrying out this program.

There should be a compromise. No political matter between countries which are so divided as we and the Americans are can be resolved by other than finding some kind of compromise. Recently, I came across a book with a preface written by former FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. The preface contains the following words: A cardinal necessity in politics is to see oneself in the other person's shoes. Anyone who cannot or does not wish to do

this is not suitable for peaceful foreign policymaking. Anyone who does not wish to take the goals and interests of another seriously is no good at compromise. Anyone who is no good at compromise is not in a position to preserve peace. I have a feeling that the Americans can in no way see our point of view. They do not want to consider our interests at all. Without this it is very difficult to come to an understanding.

But we are indeed -- Mikhail Sergeyevich has spoken of this -- we are indeed willing to try and sound out the possibility of this compromise to find some kind of field of common interests or of parallel interests between ourselves and America, because it it only within the framework of this field that one can reach agreement. They cannot psychologically master their own feelings and force themselves to take our legitimate interests into account.

It is interesting that in America now, they always say they have freedom of the press; but on the other hand, there is a kind of atmosphere of intellectual and political terror, I would say. Quite recently THE LOS ANGELES TIMES carried an article by Cohen, a Princeton University professor, and it's interesting what he wrote concerning Soviet-American relations. This is what he writes: Intellectuals are frightened by the new atmosphere of cold war and political intolerance, particularly towards the Soviet Union. Debate is again being cut short by crusader-censors, Cohen writes, and he goes on: Whole cohorts of publications in the spirit of the cold war are again sticking labels indiscriminately on any people who express disagreement with present policies saying that they are pro-Soviet, soft, fellow-travellers, or appeasers. That is the situation in America. On the one hand, there is a persistent hammering home of the idea that we've stood up for the "star wars" program and we're going to go on standing up for it; we've been carrying out our test program and we're going to go on doing so. That is on the one hand. On the other hand, there is the attempt to influence public opinion using severe methods, so there is no possibility of this policy being subjected to reasoned criticism. Well, of course, we too are all looking forward hopefully to Geneva; but let us be realists, comrades -- it is going to be a very difficult talk.

Possibility of Nuclear War

[Tsvetov] Finally, another question that crops up often in the letters from listeners. Is there a fatal inevitability of nuclear war?

[Bovin] In history it is difficult to talk about any fatal inevitability. I would put it like this: In abstract terms there are two possibilities. There is the possibility of a third world war -- this exists as a real possibility -- and there is the possibility of preventing this war. Of course, I understand this reply does not satisfy anyone and people demand an evaluation of these possibilities; which is more likely? Despite the real threat of war, I nevertheless think the likelihood of this war being prevented is greater than the likelihood that it will break out. The main guarantee here, the main guarantee of peace, is the military and strategic parity which exists between us and the Americans.

If this parity exists, then the aggressor understands perfectly that he will be destroyed; that starting that kind of war means suicide. Insofar as this is understood by everyone -- and the Americans understand it perfectly -- this is perhaps the best guarantee today, I repeat, against anyone deliberately starting that kind of war.

It is impossible to stop at this. There are, for instance, possibilities of an accidental beginning of a war, of some sort of mistaken calculations, of a computer somewhere malfunctioning or someone's nerves giving way, of someone pushing the button. Somewhere in the course of an escalation of events in some regional crisis -- the Middle East or Central America or wherever -- some kind of process might occur which could end in a nuclear attack which no one expected.

The Americans, by the way, are now reviewing their military doctrine. They are trying to feel about for some means of waging nuclear war which nonetheless would not mean suicide for them, but would allow them to gain victory. This is also very dangerous because if they believe such a thing, they may go ahead with this war. Therefore, of course, the threat of war is real, although I repeat that the probablity of preventing war, and I stand by this, is fairly great now and greater then the probability of a war starting. The balance of fear is not our ideal. It is a frightful world in which one has to live with this sword of Damocles of a nuclear threat hanging over us. To avoid this, disarmament is just what we need. It is the only sensible alternative. People have created huge piles of armaments and people can raze these piles to the ground. Disarmament is necessary for this. This will be the main topic at the negotiations in Geneva. Despite the difficulties that will be there, I am sure that if there is even the slightest chance of coming to an accord, this slightest chance will be used to feel about for some possibility of a compromise for a mutually acceptable solution, for a shift in Soviet-American relations to a new positive phase.

[Tsvetov] Thank you very much, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich. I thank you on my behalf and on behalf of our listeners. Now it's time to say farewell to those listening. All the best to you. We await your new letters with questions on the international situation. Good-bye.

CSO: 5200/1053

GENERAL

MOSCOW WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE' 20 OCTOBER

LD201726 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 20 Oct 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin and Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observers; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator]

New CPSU Program

[Excerpt] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades! The CPSU Central Committee Plenum can be called this week's No 1 event with complete justification. We are familiar with the report of Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at this plenum: Other documents revealing the wide horizons before our country and pointing out the way into the future are still to be published. The documents, and first and foremost, I have in mind the new edition of the party's program, also fully reflect the basic trends in world development: These are the further strengthening of the positions of real socialism and the growth of its authority and influence; the raising of the role of the popular masses which are coming out in favor of the renewal of life upon just principles; the buildup in the opposition to positive changes in the world from the reactionary and aggressive forces of imperialism; and the strengthening of the peace potential that unites the countries of socialism, the international workers' and communist movement, and tens of young independent states, and the broad antiwar and democratic movement. This document stresses that the root problem of the present day is the curbing of the forces of militarism and war, ensuring a firm peace and reliable security.

[Bovin] This is what I would draw attention to: On this occasion we are talking about international affairs and perhaps the main element is, I would say, the more realistic appraisal of what is taking place in the world, not just as a photograph of the present day -- what is important for the program is not a photograph -- but the very point from which you began, the trends in the development. Indeed, these trends are analyzed in all their complexity, in all their discrepancies, because real political life, if one tries to reflect the essence of it in that kind of very general concept, is the struggle between two directions in world politics. On the one hand, the strengthening of those forces which represent, let us call it, the progressive flank of world politics really is taking place -- you have spoken of these forces -- and on the other hand, that which we call an attempt at social revenge is taking place, an attempt to replay history using methods of force, with the help of attempts, say, to outstrip the Soviet Union militarily and strategically and with the help of different kinds of actions which interfere in the internal affairs of other states in an

effort to halt social progress there. The clash between these two tendencies can be traced not just along the East-West line, between the United States and the Soviet Union; on every continent we see clashes between these forces.

[Shishlin] I would like to add to that -- within the framework of these general appraisals of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program -- the fact that there is, I think, in the new draft edition of the program, in addition to the strict and considered reflection of the contradictory reality about which Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich has just been speaking, also a fresh and unprejudiced view of the way one has to behave in this very complicated world in the nuclear age. It confirms the unshakeable political aims which our party has been proclaiming from the moment it came to power during the days of October. At the same time, the Soviet Union is confirming perfectly clearly and unambiguously its will for a reasonable compromise, its will to curb the military danger, its will to remove the threat of war. I think it is quite right for the new edition of the draft CPSU program to be described as a program of action in the name of man and in the name of peace of earth.

[Levin] Our policy is completely predictable: it does not contain any riddles, it does not contain any uncertainties. It is a policy based upon the Leninist idea of the peaceful coexistence of two opposed...

[Bovin interrupting] I would only make one small comment here, when we speak about the predictability of our policy. Of course, we have in mind the main strategic directions because of one is talking about specific diplomatic work, then generally speaking we will sometimes astonish some people with surprises which cannot always be predicted at once, although all of this will indeed by within the common channel of the struggle for peace, for security, within this field.

[Levin] Of peaceful coexistence.

[Bovin] Of course, of course.

Relations in Europe

[Levin] I think that if one turns to the events of the past few days, to those events that have already taken place, or to those events which are about to take place shortly, then it is possible to see how the principles and aims of our party's foreign policy are being implemented. You know, comrades -- this has already been reported -- that a session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee is to take place in Sofia during the second half of October. It has also been announced that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will make a friendly visit to the Bulgarian People's Republic. These events are now attracting great attention by virtue of the fact that they reflect the main tendency and the priority line of Soviet foreign policy, the line toward stregthening and developing friendship.

[Shishlin] This is precisely where we leave the predictable category, Viktor Nikolayevich. The Soviet Union has always had a need not just for people to listen to it, but for itself to listen to others. There are many ideas which have been expressed and many views which have been set in the speeches of leaders of fraternal countries and in the speeches of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev which are of direct relevance, among other things, to Warsaw Pact's role in Europe and in international affairs as such.

In particular, I have in mind not just the various ideas which are expressed by the socialist countries on the problem of slowing the arms race, ending it on earth, and preventing the militarization of space; but also the issue of overcoming the division of Europe and the issue of improving the political climate on the Continent of Europe. In this respect, it seems to me that, in particular, the contacts which are still very modest, which are starting to be established at the level of political search between the CEMA and the Common Market, appear to be very promising. At any event, it would appear that during the last 10 days of October the European Communities' Commission has to determine its position on the ideas which have been expressed by the CEMA organization concerning the establishment of definite relations between the two major economic groupings in Europe.

[Levin] Together with its allies, the Soviet Union is in favor of overcoming the division of Europe into opposed groupings and of doing so in the more or less foreseeable future. Under conditions in which two blocks exist -- the Warsaw Pact and NATO -- there is the possibility of creating a modus vivendi of a kind which would blunt the sharp edge of the current confrontation. For example, there is no life-long taboo on the possibility of establishing contacts between the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic alliance as organizations. The creation of an atmosphere of security and trust on the Continent of Europe would provide an opportunity for also developing economic links even more widely and intensively, the kind of things we have just been talking about.

[Shishlin] Yes, and no doubt everyone has noticed the Soviet Union is supporting the idea of an exchange of plans for military activity in Europe, within the framework of the Stockholm meeting in particular. This is a practical foundation for what there is to talk about, for the type of contacts that should be established.

[Levin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, you mentioned that there is something for us to listen to in what is said by the leaders of the other socialist countries; this indeed so. As an example, one might quote the recent GDR and Czechoslovakian proposal on the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe. This is one manifestation of the initiative-taking policy of the fraternal socialist states which runs along the general channel of development of the process of detente and of improving the political climate in Europe. Undoubtedly -- this we know from history -- the conferences of the political-consultative committee have always put forward very bold, large-scale proposals on all painful problems of the present day.

At present, there are many such problems, but we want relations to be developed with all socialist countries -- this, too, is worth recalling -- and in this connection, the visit to Moscow this week by an SFRY Assembly delegation is worthy of attention. The representatives of the supreme Yugoslav organ of state power supported the new proposals of the Soviet Union on strengthening peace, which were put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Paris.

NATO Session in Brussels

[Shishlin] All relations have their own, independent value. Generally speaking, however, there is but one universal value, that is the preservation of peace. Of course, the fate of peace depends to a large extent upon the way in which Soviet-American relations are going to develop. Our actions, our proposals, our ideas, and, if you like, our highly considered approach as far as our reaction to different actions by the U.S. Administration is concerned, all this works toward making the atmosphere at the Soviet-American summit meeting such that it should be possible to seek solutions.

[Bovin] I am afraid that, unfortunately, the Americans are working in a different direction. Take this week, Reagan made a speech in the state of Idaho and he again stated there will be no questions about the "star wars" program, i.e. we will continue what we are doing irrespective of any meetings or talks. That's his position, and if there is no progress on this question, which is the main one in Geneva, then I find it hard to imagine how other questions can be settled.

I must say that, generally speaking, even America's allies in NATO are now rather worried; when they had this NATO session in Brussels -- it was called emergency because it was unplanned -- it is not for nothing that....

[Levin, interrupting] And it is very interesting to note that it was called at the request of Belgium and the Netherlands.

[Bovin] Yes, yes. Because they wanted to be consulted, too. Shultz was virtually forced to go around in a circle. He was put under pressure. They were saying: Look here, Moscow is making a proposal, Moscow is proposing a radical reduction in its offensive forces. Why are you keeping silent? Why keep silent? Come on, give us your counterproposals too, and propose something constructive. That's the sort of thing that was being said in Brussels.

[Levin] Judging by what was published in the West European papers, there was really some sharp talking there. This is how, for example, the British FINANCIAL TIMES described the situation at this extraordinary session of the NATO Council in Brussels: The European foreign ministers urged the United States to come out with positive counterproposals in the field of arms control in response to the Sviet initiative to reduce by 50 percent the strategic nuclear potentials of the USSR and the United States. The French paper QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS, in describing the situation there, had recourse to an even stronger expression: The U.S.' European allies in NATO, the QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS writes, put pressure on Shultz so that Washington might make appropriate responses to the recent Soviet initiatives.

[Bovin] There was a second interesting thing there, insofar as this "star wars" program is holding fast and everyone is getting anxious, McFarlane came up and said the U.S. Administration believes the treaty which prohibits antimissile defense permits not only research work, but also testing, including testing in outer space.

[Shishlin] He went further McFarlane beleives the ABM Treaty allows the United States to carry out research, testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] and that, he says, this interpretation in the President's opinion is the correct one.

[Bovin] The correct one, the correct one, yes.

[Levin] That's a deceitful way of putting it.

[Bovin] And they again put pressure on Shultz on this point in Brussels.

ABM Treaty Interpretation

[Levin] I think there is a point in dwelling on this question in more detail since it reflects the fundamental aims of the U.S. Administration.

The U.S. interpretation of the antimissile defense treaty is a deliberate fraud. This is not the way things are in practice. Article Five of the treaty quite plainly prohibits the creation [sozdavat], testing, and deployment of systems or components of antimissile defense based in outer space or as mobile land-based facilities; this is irrespective of whether these systems are based on existing or future technology. In accordance with the agreed statement D to the treaty to which the U.S. Administration so often refers, the carrying out of research, development [razrabotka], and testing of ABM systems, or their components, based on other physical principles -- here we are talking about laser and X-ray weapons, and so on; in America they talk about exotic weapons -- well, even the research, development [razrabotka], and testing of systems based on such principles are permitted in clearly marked areas, strictly limited by the treaty, and only on fixed land-based ABM systems, as determined in Article Three of the treaty. If, at the same time, one or other of the sides wishes to deploy its new systems in these restricted areas, they will not be able to do so without prior consultation with the other side and without entering the appropriate agreed amendments into the text of the treaty.

This interpretation of the key points of the ABM Treaty, an interpretation which was initiated by the United States itself in its day, is the only one that was worked out and adopted by both sides during the course of the talks on this treaty, and no other. Now, when the United States of America is resorting to quite a different interpretation, in so doing they are evidently striving to prepare a legal basis -- a pseudolegal basis, one should make it clear -- to carry out all stages of practical work within the framework of the SDI program, i.e. the development [razrabotka], testing, and deployment of space strike systems.

The Americans are taking upon themselves the function of unilateral interpreters of the treaty, interpreters who distort the essence of it. If this were an isolated thing, taking into account the importance of the problem, this would be very alarming, but what is even more alarming is the fact that it is not an isolated phenomenon in U.S. policy. Indeed, the policy of the White House is now being subjected to sharp criticism in Western Europe, too. For example, the London DAILY TELEGRAPH bluntly wrote: The Reagan administration's opinion that the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems allows it to test and develop space weapons in causing anxiety in London. It must be said that even in the United States of America itself such a liberal approach to the ABM Treaty has given rise to just criticism. For example, Dante Fascell, chairman of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, stated that the position set out by McFarlane, the President's national security adviser, poses a threat to arms control. Former ambassador Gerard Smith, who led the U.S. delegation to the talks at which the ABM Treaty was concluded, accused the Reagan administration of undermining the treaty; to back up this very serious reproach Smith cited a whole range of evidence which proves the U.S. Administration has no grounds at all for such a liberal interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

At the same time, this is not the only issue where the U.S. Administration is resorting to juggling and reshuffling the facts.

Strategic Parity

Take the problem of strategic nuclear armaments. The Americans are issuing figures which are intended to show that the United States is lagging behond the Soviet Union and they quote data, for example, which says they have 263 heavy bombers when in fact they have 509.

[Bovin] Well, they stated in 1979, when the figures were last collated, they stated 500 or more. Then they put some into mothballs and now they are not including these in the overall figure, so this figure remains 260 and a bit. But, indeed, it is perfectly possible to take the wraps off these machines and bring them into service, so you can see how cunning they are.

[Levin] But all this cunning is obvious and one may cite many examples of such cunning. It has to be said that while the United States tries to understate its own strategic means in every way, as soon as they start talking about the Soviet Union figures are produced which go over the top of the real ones. For example, the United States claims that the Soviet Union has 480 heavy bombers, whereas in fact we have 150. When it comes to submarines and heavy bombers, the United States names 2,832, whereas the Soviet Union actually has 2,504.

Now these actions, of course, characterize the U.S. attempt to distort the true picture. This really puts one on the alert. This poses a number of serious questions, although, of course, at the same time, to think in advance that the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva won't yield any results is probably premature -- there is still time, there are opportunities.

Summit Expectations

[Bovin] The political figure definitely has to be an optimist, and even if there is the slightest possibility, or probability, the slightest chance, he definitely must use this chance.

[Levin] If we can speak of the rest of the world, I noticed an interview which Genscher, thr FRG foreign minister, gave for Suddeutscher Rundfunk, one of West Germany's radio stations. He was asked, Genscher that is, what do you expect from the meeting between the U.S. President and the Soviet party leader? In your opinion, would just an accord on their part for more regular meetings in the future, be a success? Genscher's answer: Of course, if further regular meetings follow this meeting, then one can only welcome this. But it would be highly desirable, apart from this, for definite, fundamental directions to become more clearly manifested after the meeting, and here, I repeat, not only in disarmament policy but also in future mutual relations between the two great powers, and in relations between East and West in the sense of prospects for cooperation.

[Bovin] Almost a minimum program, because, after all, our program is a maximum and consists in agreeing on some major, real, concrete questions.

[Levin] But Genscher does not agree with the concepts of Reagan who thinks it is enough to get acuqainted, such an opinion has been expressed in the United Statess. Genscher believes this would be insufficient and it seems to me, this reflects Western Europe's aspiration for the U.S. side to show more activity. By the way, at the extraordinary NATO Council session, this thought was very loudly voiced.

This same thought about the need for solving urgent problems was very clearly voiced at the conference of the Socialist International on issues of disarmament, which took place this week in Vienna. It was held under the slogan: The topical problems of the world cannot be solved by weapons, and it is not superfluous to remind listners that the Socialist International comes out decisively against the Stragegic Defense Initiative, actively supports our decision to introduce a moratorium on nuclear explosions, and assesses highly the new Soviet Peace initiatives. In general, our slogan "'star peace' instead of 'star wars,'" is receiving very wide international support, both from eminent political activists and from public circles. It is hardest in this respect, of course, for the Americans themselves. In the United States it is far from simple to come out in defense of peace. At present, for example, according to available information, about 70 peace supporters are imprisoned in the United States for their actions against militarist policies, for their actions in favor of consolidating peace. But this factor of active influence by wide circles of the public on politicians, the factor of the struggle for peace, is making itself felt. It once again confirms that people understand very well. Just now we are in a very responsible period when it is necessary to make very serious decisions. We must now allow the militarization of space, and this element, it seems to me, can serve as a reassuring factor.

[Shishlin] Well, to summarize the general thoughts somehow, it appears that for today at least -- and I fear for tomorrow too -- the luggage of the forthcoming participants in the meeting is not at all the same, not at all the same. If the Soviet luggage is in fact, real political goodwill -- it is completely concrete large-scale proposals which would allow, really, setting about the curtailment of the arms race and now allowing the militarization of space; it is real, perfect, and constructive ideas about smoothing out Soviet-American relations in the name of the interests of the Soviet and American peoples and in the name of the interests of peace in the whole world -- then the American luggage still somehow or other, fits entirely into the formula loved by the U.S. Administration: peace from a position of strength. Strictly speaking, these elements of forceful pressure are present not only in the set propaganda phrases of the White House and its entourage, but also in the practical actions of the United States, although it is quite clear that this path leads to a dead end. But preparations for the meeting are of course not the meeting itself, and here, of course, we are entering the field of the unpredicable.

[Bovin] Yes, the U.S. optimists are writing as follows: One must, they say, take into account a peculiarity of Reagan: he takes hard lines, he says no, no, no the whole time, and then he may suddenly make a compromise, expectedly change his line and agree on something. These U.S. optimists put forward such a scheme. Well, frankly, I don't believe this very much, I don't believe it very much.

[Shishlin] Although, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, still, for the U.S. leader too, of course, the very accord on the meeting, the meeting itself, has a certain binding character. In any case, to comple out with set purely propaganda phrases in Geneva would be completely unthinkable.

[Bovin] It is said that everything is possible that does not contradict the laws of physics, so I wouldn't talk about the unthinkable so strongly here.

[Shishlin] Well, I am expressing my attitude and I think that, of course, the Soviet position at this meeting is dictated by a feeling of the highest responsibility for the fate of the world. It is reinforced not only by those practical ideas with which our radio listeners are familiar, but it is also reinforced, of course, by those decisions which were made at the recent plenum of our party's Central Committee.

Those precongress documents which have been approved by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum say quite clearly that on the plane of internal policy the Soviet Union chooses the path of creation and on the plane of foreign policy, it stands for peaceful cooperation, for an improvement in international relations. For this reason, it seems to me the wave of sympathy, understanding, and support with which the materials of the work of the October Central Committee Plenum have been met, also exists throughout the whole world.

[Levin] The new edition of our party program is an integral expression of our conception of establishing peace on earth, of social progress, and the national liberation of peoples. In it are formulated the fundamental foundations of policy, its main supports which remain unshakeable. At the same time, the program demonstrates the breadth of our party's approach to international affairs, its capacity to take account of changes in the situation at the right time, to look into the face of reality without bias, to evaluate what is happening objectively, and to react flexibly to the demands of the moment. This is confirmed by concrete practice. Here our program ends. Thank you, respected comrades for your attention, all the best.

CSO: 5200/1053

GENERAL

MOSCOW TO JAPAN: NAKASONE ASSAILED ON ARMS CONTROL

OW160432 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 15 Oct 85

[Commentary by Igor Vykhukhalev]

[Text] In Tokyo, the 103d extraordinary session of the Japanese Diet opened on 14 October, and Prime Minister Nakasone delivered a policy speech. Regarding that part of the speech dealing with international developments, Radio Moscow Tokyo correspondent Igor Vykhukhalev comments as follows:

Prime Minister Nakasone welcomed the scheduled November USSR-U.S. summit in Geneva, the first in 6 years. As for Japan, he said, it will continue to urge East-West dialogue, including that on arms control and disarmament, and at the same time carefully watch and support this U.S.-USSR dialogue in particular, to ensure that it is fruitful. As you know, however, no speech has true value unless backed by appropriate deeds. Then, what has Japan done this year to ensure the success of the USSR-U.S. summit from a global point of view, and in the interests of all mankind?

Early this year, the Japanese Government showed its so-called understanding for the U.S. space militarization plan known as the "star wars" plan, which meant Japan's basic support for the plan. Currently, things are progressing further in the direction of Japan's participation in the efforts to realize the plan.

In addition, Japan has been positively supporting the U.S. administration in every step the latter took to fan East-West military and strategic confrontation. One can see this, among other things, in the fact that Japan is offering increasingly larger parts of its territory to Washington for use as a nuclear strategic base against the Soviet Union. The deployment of F-16 fighter-bombers, capable of nuclear strikes against the Soviet Far Eastern areas, in Misawa is making steady progress. This alone proves our point.

Lastly, Japan assumed a negative approach to virtually every constructive proposal for peace which the Soviet Union made this year, including the latest one for a sweeping reduction of strategic offensive weapons.

Japan thus shares the same attitude as the United States on the question of the success of the Geneva summit meeting. In other words, they find that the more their strategic superiority is protected and the less the principle of parity upheld, the better. This means that their expectations of the summit's success are virtually zero.

Prime Minister Nakasone, referring to the New York visit to attend the UN General Assembly session marking the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, said that he is planning to elucidate to the world Japan's basic position and determination to contribute positively to the peace and prosperity of the international community. In this connection, we find it appropriate to point out the following fact:

Since 1968, Japan had abstained from voting on all disarmament resolutions at the UN General Assembly sessions; since 1971, it has always voted against the resolutions. This kind of support for world peace and the contribution to its strengthening can only be characterized as negative.

Prime Minister Nakasone also touched on relations with individual countries, including the Soviet Union. Compared with the policy speeches of the past several years, this speech contained a brief reference to the planned visit to Japan of Foreign Minister Shevardnadze.

On the other hand, it referred, as in the past, to settling the so-called Northern Territories issue, and conluding a peace treaty to build stable relations with the Soviet Union, based on mutual understanding. As you see here, Tokyo's position remains unchanged. The Nakasone speech links dialogue, as in the past, with having the unacceptable territorial demand satisfied. This kind of attitude has the effect of keeping the obstacle standing in the way of development of bilateral relations.

CSO: 5200/1053

GENERAL

MOSCOW NOTES PRC BACKING AT UN

OW050346 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Commentary by Sharkov]

[Text] The current session of the UN General Assembly is carrying out a general debate on current key issues in the world. As pointed out by most observers, the Soviet Union's constructive proposal for preventing a global nuclear holocaust is the focal point discussed at the session. Here is a commentary in this regard by our commentator Sharkov:

Commenting on the Soviet proposal, delegates from various countries stressed that the proposal covered all questions concerning the cessation of arms race on the globe. In fact, this is exactly the case. It involves the question of nuclear arms, including the discontinuance of nuclear tests, as well as the issues of chemical weapons, conventional weapons, and the numbers of men in the armed forces. Many delegates spoke on the essence of the Soviet proposal when speaking at the session. Some directly voiced support for this proposal.

The Chinese delegate's speech in this regard is worth mentioning. He said that China is opposed to the militarization of space and stands for the signing of an agreement on refraining from being the first to use nuclear weapons, for the reduction of conventional armaments, and for the prohibition of chemical weapons. Delegates from other Asian countries gave special attention to the need to establish nuclear-free zones in the world, restrictions on the naval armaments and military activities in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and stop the undeclared war initiated by the U.S. imperialists.

CSO: 5200/1053

END