

032483

JPRS-TAC-85-044

31 October 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

19980728 086

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10
62
A04

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.

31 October 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet Central Committee Journal Assails SDI (L. Tolkunov; Moscow POLITICHESKOYE SAMOOBRAZOVANIYE, No 7, Jul 85)	1
French LE MONDE Assessment of Gorbachev Visit (Jacques Amalric; Paris LE MONDE, 6-7 Oct 85)	11
Government Rejects Direct Participation in SDI (Various sources, various dates)	12
Parliamentary Committee Report, by Greg Weston	12
Report Excerpts	13
Southam News Poll, by Less Whittington	16
Visiting Soviet Official's Warning, by Jeff Sallot	16
Government Decision, by Bob Hepburn	17
Official Letter to Weinberger	19
Questions in Parliament, by Jeff Sallot	20
Nielsen on NRC Involvement	21
PRC'S Deng Xiaoping Speaks on SDI (Beijing XINHUA, 5 Oct 85)	22
Briefs	
French Firms Interested in Eureka	23

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GDR Lauds Soviet Arms Proposals (Various sources, various dates)	24
Support Intent of Geneva Talks, by Rolf Schiek	24
Prime Minister Stoph's Statement	25
Politburo Member Sindermann's Statement	26
Party Daily Commentary, Editorial	27

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Response to Gorbachev Call for Talks With France, UK (Moscow TASS, 4, 5 Oct 85; Moscow World Service, 9 Oct 85)	29
Reagan Criticism Rebutted	29
UK Position, by Nikolay Borin	30
FRG Politician	31
Situation in Netherlands as Deployment Decision Approaches (Various sources, various dates)	32
PRAVDA Commentary, by Vladislav Drobkov	32
NATO Pressure, by Eduard Kovalev	33
Antimissile Campaign Intensifies	34
Dutch Parties' Views on Cruise 'Letter' Outlined (Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT, 2 Oct 85)	35
Dutch Poll on Reversibility of INF Decision (The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN, 3 Oct 85)	37
Poll on Party Preference, Confidence in Leaders (The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN, 3 Oct 85)	38

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

IZVESTIYA Reports Conclusion of 36th Round of Talks (N. Novikov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 12 Jul 85)	39
--	----

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Further Criticism of U.S. Binary Weapons Plans (Moscow TASS, 20 Sep, 5 Oct 85)	41
Congressmen Cited	41
European Deployment Dangers	41
Warsaw Pact Seen Capable of Chemical Weapons Attack (Karl Feldmeyer; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 21 Aug 85)	43
Briefs U.S. Biological Weapons Use	46

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow Comments on Plan To Store Nuclear Arms in Puerto Rico (Moscow Domestic Service, 18 Sep 85)	47
--	----

USSR: Protests in Australia Over U.S. Ship Calls (B. Kirvoshey; Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 1 Oct 85)	49
More on New Zealand Ban on Nuclear Ship Calls (Moscow TASS, 28 Sep, 2 Oct 85)	50
'Irritates' U.S.	50
New Zealand Reaffirms Policy	50
Moscow on U.S. Battleship Iowa's Scandinavian Cruise (Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Sep 85; Moscow TASS, 8 Oct 85)	52
'Deliberate Provocation', by M. Kostikov	52
Nuclear Capability Stressed	53
Finnish Columnist: Form Nordic Zone Without Powers' Guarantee (Martti Haikio; Helsinki UUSI SUOMI, 11 Sep 85)	55

GENERAL

Officials, Others React to Gorbachev Arms-Talks Offer (David Bradshaw; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 3 Oct 85)	57
---	----

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET CENTRAL COMMITTEE JOURNAL ASSAILS SDI

Moscow POLITICHESKOYE SAMOOBRAZOVANIYE in Russian No 7, Jul 85 pp 71-79

[Article by Prof L. Tolkunov, chairman, Soviet Committee for Security and Cooperation in Europe: "Elimination of the Threat of Nuclear War--The Will of the Times"]

[Text] On more than one occasion in its long history mankind has found itself at a fork in the road, where its subsequent fate depended on the correct choice of which fork to take. But perhaps this choice has never been as important and decisive as today. The aggressive aspirations of international imperialism, which is raising the pace of the arms race, and the real danger that it would spread into new areas and go out of control are sharply increasing the risk of nuclear war. But the peoples of the world are fully resolved not to permit such development of events.

Utilization of the accomplishments of the scientific-technical revolution in military affairs and the existence of intercontinental missiles carrying nuclear warheads are making significant adjustments in traditional ideas concerning the resources and possibilities of state foreign policy. Nuclear war could threaten all human civilization.

While just 10-15 years ago the assessments of the possible aftermath of nuclear war were limited to the death of hundreds of millions of people and unprecedented destruction, today, after analyzing not only the direct but also the indirect consequences of using nuclear weapons, scientists declare that global ecological catastrophe and destruction of human civilization may become the consequences of nuclear war.

Nuclear war is also a war against the environment, which would suffer irreparable harm. Soviet scientists are certain that nuclear conflict would inevitably lead to gigantic fires and fill the atmosphere with smoke, which would weaken the flow of solar radiation to the earth's surface and bring on a "nuclear winter" and a "nuclear night." Enshrouding the planet, darkness and cold would have a disastrous effect on all living things.

These conclusions are confirmed by research carried out by prominent foreign scientists as well. The well known West German chemist (Paul Kruttsen) emphasizes that were an exchange of nuclear strikes to occur, the sun would become hidden by black clouds several kilometers thick, and darkness and cold would

descend upon the earth. Because of nuclear glaciation, all rivers and water basins will freeze, and animals and plants will die. If just a fourth of all available nuclear weapons were to be used in a nuclear war, the scientists calculated, the entire earth would be engulfed in fire. Thousands of large cities would be reduced to ashes. And these fires would rage for many weeks and even months. The researcher comes to a logical conclusion: "We must do away with nuclear weapons."

This laconic conclusion reflects the new realities of the world, and it is shared by all soberminded people. It is ignored only by militant forces in the USA and other NATO countries. Washington continues to lay its hopes on a policy of force. It bases its actions in this case on fundamental hostility toward the opposing social system and on rejection of peaceful coexistence with it, and on designs to use its military-technical and technological potential to achieve military superiority. Relying upon scientific-technical accomplishments and a powerful economic base, and creating an entire arsenal of the corresponding resources--"invisible" bombers and cruise missiles, "noiseless" deep-sailing nuclear submarines, mobile intercontinental missiles and underground-based missile complexes that are difficult to detect by existing observation resources, and a terrifying arsenal of binary, chemical, bacteriological, laser and other weapons--the United States wants to turn the wheels of history backward.

The idea of a "crusade" against the USSR, against communism is becoming the dominant foreign policy course of the USA. The Washington administration is openly making "annihilation of socialism as a sociopolitical system" its objective. Hostility toward communism and fear before it permeate all of the state policy of the United States. Is this an accident? Not at all.

Imperialism is deeply alarmed by the fact that the world is not at all developing in accordance with the scenario which it would wish to impose upon it. The world revolutionary process is continuing to develop. The sphere of domination by imperialism is growing narrower. Progressive forces are enjoying new victories all the time. This is why the present American administration is openly laying its hopes on counteracting the world revolutionary process at any price, on undermining socialism and on weakening its influence in world affairs.

The USA has unleashed an unprecedented global offensive with the goal of preserving capitalist governments and exporting counterrevolution wherever it possibly could. Thus the main goal of its foreign policy is a struggle against socialism, against the international workers', communist and national liberation movement. Growth of aggressive war potentials and psychological warfare are the resources of this struggle. Carrying the struggle of ideas over into international relations, the USA and its allies are creating obstacles to development of international ties between countries with different social structures, and hindering constructive solution of urgent international problems, be they concerned with bridling the arms race, with the economic sphere, with scientific-technical exchanges and so on.

The USA sets cessation of the revolutionary process in the world as a precondition of peaceful coexistence with socialism. But this process is objective

in nature. It is not "the hand of Moscow" but capitalist exploitation and imperialist oppression that brings into motion the millions of people in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We are in favor of peaceful coexistence of states with different systems, but this would be impossible without considering the legal interests of socialist countries. And considering these interests, we cannot in any way agree with the claims of "world leadership," hegemony and the right to retaliate against the struggle of liberation of peoples under the excuse of suppressing terrorism--in a word, with the claims forwarded today by the American administration.

Washington's military expenditures have attained astronomical proportions, surpassing the \$300 billion mark long ago. But the problem lies not only with the quantity of new missile systems or submarines that are produced with these assets. The problem also lies with qualitatively new categories, with appearance of forms and systems of weapons that can fundamentally alter ideas about the possibility itself of effective limitation and reduction of nuclear arms. First of all there are the concrete plans for sharply increasing the proportion of nuclear high-precision homing warheads in the U.S. Armed Forces; such warheads can be interpreted by the other side as first-strike weapons with full grounds. We should add to this the tendency to develop capabilities for surprise strikes on targets: The USA intends to concentrate the bulk of the "anti-forces" potential of its strategic forces in resources for quick delivery of nuclear weapons to a target. This is precisely the plan being followed by Washington as it qualitatively reorganizes its strategic forces.

Speaking in early February 1985 to the Senate Armed Forces Committee, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger described the program for modernizing the USA's strategic forces in the following way. Bomber aviation will be strengthened: Cruise missiles are being installed on B-52s, and they have already been deployed on 90 craft. Production of a new modification of this bomber will begin in 1986. In this same year 48 B-1 bombers are to be built. An effort to design a so-called "invisible bomber" is under way. The fleet of Trident submarines carrying ballistic missiles is being enlarged. The potential of MX intercontinental missiles, which are distinguished by high precision, is growing.

Add to this new military-technical factors undermining strategic stability such as reduction of missile flying time, launching on "unpredictable" trajectories, reduction of the possibilities for radar detection of new weapon systems, and much else. Pershing-2 ballistic missiles being deployed in West Europe are a special threat in this aspect, since they have a shorter flying time, their warheads are more precise, and they are intended for a "decapitating" strike against Soviet objectives. It would be sufficient to point out that many millions of Soviet citizens reside and a large proportion of USSR industrial enterprises are located within the average range of the new American missiles. Note that weapons with similar range deployed on Soviet territory would not reach the United States. Deploying its strategic missiles, the United States thus hopes to kill two birds with one stone: to make a significant contribution to achieving superiority at the global level, and simultaneously to achieve superiority at the regional European level.

The nuclear forces of two other states of the Atlantic alliance--England and France--are also developing in the direction of significant increases in the quantities of ammunition, precision and killing power. According to some data, by the late 1990s the nuclear forces of these two countries will be in a position to deliver over 2,000 warheads to targets as a result of the approved modernization programs.

The conditions for development of the present strategic balance are such that the advent, and even the testing of a new "defensive" weapon, not to mention its deployment by one of the sides, can elicit a "perturbation" in the balance which is no less (and probably which is greater) than that which may be elicited by creation of any new offensive weapon. Reagan's plans for creating a major antimissile system with space resources as its central element, and the plans for creating antisatellite systems are a direct threat to peace.

They cannot but understand in Washington that implementation of a major space-based antimissile defense system would invariably lead to an uncontrollable arms race in all directions, that it would make limitation and, all the more so, reduction of strategic offensive arms impossible, and that it would sharply intensify the danger of nuclear war. Despite this, the present U.S. administration is displaying stubborn reluctance to abandon these programs, and it is trying to make them irreversible. It would like to impose the diplomacy of force, the politics of militarism and the arms race on future generations as well.

The futility of such a policy is recognized by many even in the USA. In February 1985 THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote that the President and his assistants justify the "star wars" program by four different arguments that contradict each other. They say that it is the sole morally justified defense in the nuclear age; that it only represents scientific research in behalf of our grandchildren; that soon it would be useful, and even irreplaceable, be it imperfect; that, finally, it is a tested stimulus for arms control.

The newspaper emphasized that in the best case, "star wars" is a plan for protecting ground-based missiles, and not people. It may be possible that this plan will place America in a position from which it could pose a threat of surprise attack and reap the harvest of "nuclear blackmail."

Another American newspaper, THE WASHINGTON POST, reported that the Congressional Office of Technological Estimates prepared a draft report from which it follows that the new major space-based antimissile defense system conceived by Washington is a step in the USA's preparations for nuclear war against the Soviet Union.

It is emphasized in the document that preparations for introducing "star wars" is an inherent component of acquisition of the potential for making the first nuclear strike against the Soviet Union in the United States. Explaining the essence of the report, The Washington Post points out: "The document makes it understood that Reagan's goal is to take the risk out of a first strike against the Soviet Union."

Reagan's so-called "strategic defense initiative" also elicits serious doubts among allies of the United States. In the words of THE LONDON TIMES, this

initiative "threatens to become the cause of the most serious disagreements between countries of the North Atlantic alliance the moment it is implemented."

No soberminded individual can seriously accept the "argument" the USA forwards in its justification of preparations for "star wars."

It is asserted in Washington that the new system will be defensive in nature. What hypocrisy! The "universal" antimissile defense system not only does not mean exclusion of ballistic missiles from the USA's strategic arsenal, but on the contrary it presupposes their increase and improvement, chiefly as first-strike resources. In other words Reagan's "star wars" conception foresees mandatory presence of two basic components--an "irresistible sword" and an "antimissile shield." This is the goal pursued by the USA in creating the new first-strike strategic resources mentioned above (MX and Midgetman intercontinental ballistic missiles, Trident-2 submarine ballistic missiles, B-1 and Stealth strategic bombers, Pershings and long-range cruise missiles deployed at the threshold of the socialist countries). The administration is promoting its program for deploying MX missiles with special persistence. In the meantime, in the words of former leaders of the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-American strategic arms limitation talks Smith and Warnke, and former Defense Secretary Clifford, these will be "first-strike weapons that could provoke nuclear war, and not prevent it."

Assertions that the "star wars" preparations are "nothing more than scientific research" ring hypocritical. In the words of England's DAILY TELEGRAPH, the USA's allies "anxiously recognize that there is a barely discernible boundary between research and production." And this anxiety is fully justified. The Pentagon's new plans are not at all limited to a research stage, as American representatives try to persuade us. As officials of the Washington administration themselves admit, some forms of "weapons of the future" are already undergoing testing. The USA took a number of steps to practically implement the new programs and plans. An effort is being made to create a laser weapon and electromagnetic cannons. Tests on the first antimissile weapons are planned for as early as 1987.

Guiding and tracking resources to be used in the destruction of missiles by laser weapons are to be tested in the course of experiments with the space shuttle. Antisatellite resources are being created as well. The USA has already tested a system consisting of an F-15 fighter that launches homing missiles.

As we can see, the global situation has become seriously more complicated at the fault of the ruling circles of the USA. At the same time, communists are certain that world war may be averted. However, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, Comrade M. S. Gorbachev noted at the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum that "the struggle to preserve peace and insure universal security is not an easy matter, and it constantly requires new effort. The international situation continues to be alarming and dangerous at the fault of imperialism. Mankind now faces a choice: either further escalation of tension and confrontation, or a constructive search for mutually acceptable agreements that could put a halt to the process of material preparations for nuclear conflict."

The position of our country on the fundamental problems of modern times is distinguished by maximum clarity and accuracy. First. We have no intention of obtaining any kind of one-sided advantages over the United States. Second. We want cessation and not continuation of the arms race. And third. We want a real and major reduction of accumulated arms, and not creation of more and more new weapon systems. Agreement is completely necessary and fully possible. The Soviet Union is exerting enormous effort toward these goals. Just in the United Nations alone our country submitted more than 100 proposals for restraining the arms race, for disarmament, for detente and for improvement of relations between states. The USSR has proposed an entire code of rules governing mutual relationships between nuclear powers. As we see it, these rules are approximately as follows: viewing prevention of nuclear war as the main goal of one's foreign policy; refraining from propagandizing nuclear war in either of its variants, global or limited; accepting the obligation not to use nuclear weapons first; not using nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries under any circumstances; encouraging creation of nuclear-free zones; preventing the spread of nuclear weapons in any form; achieving a reduction of nuclear arms one step at a time on the basis of the principle of equal security, down to their complete elimination in all variants.

Measures to bridle the nuclear arms race are the most important factor in our programs. Since the moment nuclear weapons were created, the Soviet Union has consistently proposed declaring them illegal and annihilating nuclear weapon reserves. Back in 1946 the Soviet Union submitted, to the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission, a draft international convention on adoption of obligations by states not to use atomic weapons, to prohibit their production and storage, and to eliminate their reserves within 3 months. By this means the USSR intended to limit the nuclear arms race, using what could now be called a "partial freeze"--the freezing of production of this form of weapons as the first step to complete annihilation of their reserves. The USSR's draft was not adopted.

In November 1977 the Soviet Union proposed a radical step to all states--agreeing on simultaneous cessation of the production of nuclear weapons. In May of the following year the Soviet Union submitted a major initiative to the United Nations to halt the nuclear arms race and begin nuclear disarmament: It proposed reaching agreement to halt production of nuclear weapons in all of their forms and to gradually reduce their reserves, down to their complete elimination. The Soviet Union has persistently fought for prohibition of nuclear weapon testing in all of these years.

Fighting to halt nuclear tests, the USSR submitted proposals accounting for the degree of agreement that had been attained on this issue in recent years, and for the desires of its contractors. And we proposed declaring a moratorium on all nuclear explosions until agreement is reached. The USSR is in favor of immediate resumption of trilateral talks between the USSR, the USA and England on complete prohibition of nuclear weapon testing.

Of course, complete elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world would be the best solution. But the Soviet Union also welcomes partial measures leading toward this goal--for example creation of nuclear-free zones in different regions of the world. It would not be difficult to imagine how much the

situation would improve if, for example, nuclear-free zones were to be created in Europe, and particularly in northern Europe and in the Balkans, and if battlefield nuclear weapons were to be removed from the corresponding zones in central Europe. Creation of such zones would be an important contribution to reinforcing security, and a major step forward in liberating Europe from tactical and medium-range nuclear weapons.

The USSR is opposed in principle to the use of nuclear weapons in general. It solemnly pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Today it is impossible to limit, and all the more so reduce, nuclear weapons without first adopting, as was noted above, effective measures that would prevent militarization of space. Militarization of space would not only signify actual termination of efforts to limit and reduce nuclear weapons, but it would also become a catalyst of an uncontrollable arms race in all directions. No strike weapons of any sort--conventional, nuclear, laser, beam and so on--should be launched into space or deployed in space. The Soviet Union has proposed a radical solution to the problem to the USA--prohibiting and eliminating the entire class of space strike weapons, including space-based antisatellite and antimissile resources, and all ground-, air- and sea-based resources intended to destroy objectives in space. Our position has enjoyed the wide support of the United Nations, the decisions of which clearly state the need for abandoning the use of force in the cosmic activities of different states.

It is becoming obvious in this case that all attempts to limit strategic offensive arms would be unpromising if space strike resources are created. The militarization of space is transforming into a factor of uncontrolled arms race in all directions, and it is leading to a new, even more dangerous spiral in the arms race, and to drastic weakening of strategic stability.

It would be pertinent to recall that American leaders understood this well not that long ago. It was precisely recognition of the objective mutual relationship between offensive and defensive strategic systems, and of the role of major antimissile defense systems, which provoked the arms race, that led them in 1969 to the negotiating table, and permitted the USSR and the USA to sign the appropriate agreements in May 1972. The Soviet-American treaty to limit antimissile defense systems was the foundation for further negotiations on limitation and reduction of nuclear arms.

What happened in the thinking of Washington circles that now reject the obvious mutual relationships which they had recognized earlier, and the objective needs they implied? A turn in the direction of unrealistic and dangerous plans for attaining military superiority over the USSR occurred. Imperial ambition blinded them, and they no longer see the interconnections between strategic defensive and offensive arms, ones which are objective no matter what their technical level, and they do not wish to understand that the more perfect large antimissile defense systems would be, the more they would influence the ratio of the strategic potentials of the sides, making this ratio extremely unstable and destabilizing the entire strategic situation.

This is not the first year that the Soviet Union has been trying to reach an agreement aimed at preventing the spread of the arms race into space. The

USSR is continually raising this question before the leaders of the USA. We do so because we clearly understand the terrible consequences that militarization of space would bring about. The Soviet Union, which opened the road into space, is in fact the initiator and participant of all presently existing international agreements directed at using space exclusively for peaceful purposes. In order to radically complete this task, the USSR proposed signing a treaty prohibiting placement of any kind of weapons in space. Our country proposed such an initiative to the United Nations in August 1981. In summer 1983 we proposed a new major initiative: We suggested reaching agreement on complete prohibition of testing and deployment of all space-based weapons.

The Soviet Union proposed resolving the issue of antisatellite weapons in the most radical fashion--agreeing to eliminate the antisatellite systems presently in existence and prohibiting creation of new ones. As a supplement to these proposals the Soviet leadership adopted another exceptionally important decision: The USSR pledged not to be the first to launch any kinds of anti-satellite weapons into space--that is, it introduced a unilateral moratorium on such launchings for as long as other states, including the United States, would refrain from introducing any kind of antisatellite weapons into space.

The Soviet Union feels that in order for the security of all states to be actually strengthened, and in order to find a way out of the present dangerous situation, we would first of all need the political will of state officials, the political will to reject first use of nuclear weapons, to reject the conception of military superiority. Our stand is based in this case on a consideration of the fundamental changes that have occurred in the world, including in the interpretation given to the definition of national security. It would be an anachronism today to draw distinction between national security and international security. Security cannot be insured at the expense of the other side, in a way detrimental to it.

The wide circles of the international public rated as an important and constructive gesture of goodwill the new Soviet peace initiatives communicated by Comrade M. S. Gorbachev in an interview with the editor of PRAVDA, and confirmed in a discussion with the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. The Soviet Union proposed that a moratorium be introduced on the creation, testing and deployment of offensive space weapons, including on scientific research, and freezing all strategic offensive arms for the time of the Geneva talks between the USSR and the USA. As the CPSU Central Committee general secretary emphasized, we thought of the moratorium as only a first step, one which could help to strengthen mutual trust, and promote assumption of the path of radical reductions in nuclear weapons. Our suggestion is that on establishing the moratorium, the USSR and the USA would agree to submit to the negotiations, within a particular time period of, say, 1 or 2 months, their specific proposals on all issues under discussion, including the levels to which they would be prepared to reduce strategic offensive arms, and of course in conjunction with a prohibition on offensive space weapons. The Soviet Union is in favor of returning Soviet-American relations to a normal channel, to the path of detente and mutually advantageous cooperation. Concurrently we feel certain that deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe and correspondingly the escalation of Soviet retaliatory measures must be ceased.

Demonstrating its good will in this matter, the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on deployment of its medium-range missiles and cessation of other retaliatory measures in Europe. This moratorium is to be effective until November 1985.

The new peace initiatives of the USSR evoked a great positive response from the whole world. Prominent politicians and public officials of different countries note that the Soviet Union is fully resolved to defend the peace, and that it is demonstrating its political will to improve Soviet-American relations and achieve substantial positive results in the Geneva talks.

Life dictates the need for an agreement aimed at all-out reinforcement of an atmosphere of constructive politics, trust and a readiness to cooperate--that is, of that which characterizes the process of normalizing relations and improving the political atmosphere in general. That such agreement is possible is demonstrated by the experience of the anti-Hitler coalition in World War II and by the process of detente in the 1970s. We recently celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Yalta Conference. The anniversary of the Potsdam Conference and the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki Conference are coming near. These unforgettable dates symbolize the spirit of cooperation among states with different social systems in behalf of common goals: prevention of aggression, establishment of a firm peace on the continent, and mutually advantageous cooperation among the peoples inhabiting it. This spirit is embodied in the Concluding Act of the All-European Conference, which documented the concrete principles of peaceful coexistence between states of different systems. There could be no other foundation for peace. Determining the future of Europe, the leaders of the anti-Hitler coalition had the foresight to base their actions precisely on these ideas.

The power of the USSR and of the entire socialist fraternity, and the will of the peoples of the whole world are a decisive factor in averting a new war. Warsaw Pact states jointly proposed a constructive all-encompassing program of measures called upon to return the overall development of events into the channel of detente and cooperation, to strengthen peace and security, and to achieve military relaxation and disarmament.

The Warsaw Pact, the 30th anniversary of which was recently celebrated triumphantly by the fraternal peoples, serves as a powerful, indestructible shield of peace. New evidence of the unity of its members could be seen in their unanimous decision to keep the form of the defensive union of socialist states unchanged for 20 years and to prolong its existence another decade beyond that.

Our friends and partners in the struggle for a firm peace, for better, just relations between peoples include many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the antiwar movement throughout the world. The role of the non-alignment movement, which has embraced over 100 countries and which has as its objective promotion of international peace and security, cessation of the arms race, especially in nuclear weapons, and attainment of universal and complete disarmament under effective international control, is growing. The nonalignment movement is a force together with which socialist states

are cooperating in the struggle for peace and against the aggressive, neo-colonial and racist policy of imperialism.

An initiative on a general, integrated approach to the problem in security in Asia and possible unification of efforts of Asian states in this direction, recently proposed by the Soviet Union, has enjoyed a wide response. This approach can include both bilateral negotiations and multilateral consultations, going as far as conducting some kind of all-Asian forum in the future.

In January of this year the heads of states and governments of six countries--Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden--met in New Delhi. Representing almost a billion inhabitants of our planet, the participants of this conference voted decisively in favor of eliminating the threat of nuclear war, limiting the arms race and preventing militarization of space. The joint declaration of the conference contains an appeal to halt the arms race, chiefly in space and nuclear weapons. This appeal is a continuation of an initiative by six countries which signed a joint declaration in May of last year on the need for halting the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles.

As we know, the Soviet government offered clear support to the spirit and premises of this document. We also equally understand the appeal of the participants of the New Delhi conference for immediate cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons, and their demand for the fastest possible conclusion of the appropriate treaty. Our goals are also consistent with the demand of the declaration's authors to follow cessation of the arms race by a reduction in nuclear forces going as far as complete elimination of nuclear arsenals.

Millions of people alarmed by the danger of nuclear catastrophe and fully resolved to avert it are now going into motion. The mass antiwar movement has become an influential factor of international scale. It is especially strong in Europe. Impressive antimissile demonstrations in countries of western Europe demonstrate that people holding different political views maintain a common position in questions of liberating Europe from nuclear weapons, freezing nuclear arsenals, preventing militarization of space and creating nuclear-free zones. The peace movement is becoming a sociopolitical force that the leaders of the NATO countries must reckon with today.

The situation remains complex, and even dangerous, but we believe that there are fully real possibilities for bridling the forces of militarism, and resurrecting and deepening detente. There is a growing conviction in the consciousness of people that a world without wars and weapons is practically attainable today. The conviction that such a world could be built right now, that in behalf of it we must act aggressively, and fight right now, today!

In a letter to the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, the Soviet Union appealed to all peoples, parliaments and governments to heed the voice of reason, to stop the slide into the abyss of nuclear catastrophe through aggressive joint actions, to block the road of new war, and to achieve complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union, the letter states, is prepared to consider any initiative, any proposal which favors peace.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Politicheskoye samoobrazovaniye", 1985

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRENCH LE MONDE ASSESSMENT OF GORBACHEV VISIT

PM081534 Paris LE MONDE in French 6-7 Oct 85 pp 1, 4

[Article by Jacques Amalric: "A Dialogue Without Major Concessions"]

[Excerpts] "No concession was made on our principles, but the adversary is tough." These are essentially the initial conclusions gleaned from Mr Mitterrand's entourage now that Mr Gorbachev is returning to Moscow. There are two such principles which had to be safeguarded: The first consisted of reaffirming the French position of nonparticipation in Mr Reagan's SDI without dealing a blow to the alliance's solidarity. The second related to the French deterrent force, on which there can be no bargaining.

On these two subjects Mr Mitterrand did not make any fundamental concessions to Mr Gorbachev. While reaffirming his hostility to SDI ("We were not going to say the opposite of what we think and what we have always said simply because the Soviet general secretary was in Paris," the Elysee pointed out), Mr Mitterrand avoided making too many criticisms and providing Moscow with arguments. Although he phrased it carefully, the president of the Republic firmly declined Mr Gorbachev's proposal to open bilateral negotiations on the French deterrent force. On the other hand, the president of the Republic will not shy away from "exchanges of views."

Mr Gorbachev apparently did not depart from his stance during the talks and was not exactly prolific in the details he gave; in particular, he did not specify whether his hostility to SDI applies to the whole program and rules out fundamental research (as he had suggested in his interview with TIME) or whether he might even accept tests being carried out. This silence is not surprising because it is a fundamental point and will probably determine the Geneva meeting. The general secretary is therefore keeping this essential card to himself with a view to the major confrontation to come. Is the Elysee making any forecast about the outcome of the Geneva meeting? It was one of the president's aides who said, with reservations: "The Soviets have an interest in negotiating but not in reaching a settlement. Moreover, there is a chance that they might move considerably closer to our stance on SDI."

CSO: 5200/2519

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CANADA

GOVERNMENT REJECTS DIRECT PARTICIPATION IN SDI

Parliamentary Committee Report

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 23 Aug 85 p A3

[Article by Greg Weston]

[Text]

The failure of a special parliamentary committee to decide whether Canada should participate in controversial U.S. Star Wars research has prompted Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to warn that he will "make the decision for them."

Mulroney told a news conference in Vancouver Thursday the matter "has to be resolved, one way or the other."

"It won't take long."

Asked whether the government would have a position on it by Sept. 9, the day Parliament resumes, the prime minister replied: "I would think so, at least, yes."

Mulroney gave no hint what his decision might be — whether Canada would accept or reject President Ronald Reagan's invitation to participate in his \$26-billion Strategic Defence Initiative.

The parliamentary committee's final report being released later today but obtained by *The Citizen* Thursday recommends the government make no decision on participating in SDI until it has obtained more information about it.

NDP MP Steven Langdon said the committee's decision — proposed and backed entirely by Tories — makes a mockery of the past two months of public hearings and deliberations, and simply hands Mulroney a "blank cheque" to do whatever he wants.

Other opposition critics have branded the recommendation a "cop-out" designed to heal a major rift in Mulroney's party over the Star Wars question.

Tory MP Pat Crofton even voted with the Liberals and New Democrats to have the committee issue a flat rejection of Canada getting involved in Star Wars research. The move was defeated by only one vote.

The committee report states:

- Economic factors should be considered secondary to the strategic and arms control implications of SDI. In any case, the committee "has not received evidence that (Canadian) government participation (in SDI) would result in significant job creation."

- The committee members have "serious concerns about the implications of any eventual production, testing and deployment of such (Star Wars) systems on the stability of U.S.-Soviet relations."

Nonetheless, it is "prudent" for the Americans to continue Star Wars research until stopped by some kind of treaty which also limits similar work the Soviets might be doing.

The New Democrats and Liberals on the committee are scheduled to issue minority reports on Star Wars later today. Copies of both documents were obtained by *The Citizen* Thursday.

The NDP report condemns the Tories who banded together to push through the recommendation that the government make no decision without further information on SDI.

"The committee was inundated at all of its hearings with detailed information on the strategic, arms control, technological, economic and moral aspects of Star Wars. What more did the Conservative majority (on the committee) need?" the New Democrats ask.

"The committee has abdicated its re-

sponsibility to Canadians by deciding not to answer this issue specifically," the Liberal statement says.

The lack of a more specific recommendation in the committee's report, the Liberals say, is also "a betrayal of all the witnesses who testified under the assumption their participation would be reflected in specific advice... to the government."

The Liberals say in their statement they would have given consideration to a "qualified rejection" of Canadian participation in SDI.

Report Excerpts

Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR in English 24 Aug 85 p B6

[Text]

With respect to active participation by the Canadian government in the research phase of the SDI, the majority of the Committee developed their recommendations in the context of the government's traditional approaches to the promotion of security for Canadians. These are commitment to defence; commitment to arms control; and commitment to the economic strength of Canada.

Commitment to Defence

Canada is committed to the common defence of the West through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to the common defence of North America through the North American Aerospace Defence Command. Canada's security is intimately bound up with that of the United States and Western Europe, and its alliances are an essential element of its foreign policy.

These commitments are detailed in the First Report of the Senate Subcommittee on National Defence entitled Manpower in Canada's Armed Forces (January 1982). In referring to Canada's military role, the Report states:

(These roles) consist of the protection of Canada, joining in the defence of North America, participation in NATO and contributing to the U.N. and similar peace-keeping missions.

The first of these commitments involves surveillance and control of Canadian territory, air space and waters; aid

to the civil power; assistance to the civil authority such as participating in fisheries surveillance and ice reconnaissance; providing search and rescue services; and contributing to national development.

The second requires close co-operation with the United States to counter direct military threats to this continent. Participation in NATO involves the stationing of land and air forces in Europe and the maintenance of sea, land and air forces in Canada which are committed to NATO.

Defence commitments provide a broad framework for the pursuit of national policies but they need to be translated into a series of military tasks if the armed forces are to carry them out. For example, surveillance of the Canadian Arctic includes periodic patrols by long range aircraft.

In referring to Canada's naval role, the Report states:

(Canadian naval forces) are responsible for carrying out surveillance to identify and track air, surface and subsurface naval threats, joining in the protection of sea lines of communication to Europe; contributing to surveillance of the Canadian North; assistance in fisheries protection and participating with the United States in maintaining a North American underwater surveillance system.

NATO is the Western Alliance's primary instrument for strengthening its

defence and deterrent posture, and also for co-ordinating policies and initiatives with respect to arms control. It should be clearly understood that membership in NATO imposes no contractual obligation to accept the U.S. invitation to join in SDI research. In fact, three NATO members have already declined the invitation. NATO does, however, provide a key avenue for consultations with the United States on the SDI. Whether or not Canada participates in SDI research, it has an important stake in the future direction of the SDI.

The United States and the Soviet Union have been researching ballistic missile defence technologies since the early 1960s. Limitations in the technology and concerns about stability led to the signing of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 1972, which limited production and deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems. Since that time, the operational arrangements for defence against ballistic missile attack have been focused primarily on the deployment of effective early warning systems to prevent a successful first strike. Early warning was viewed as integral to the maintenance of an effective deterrent to nuclear attack.

Commitment to Arms Control

Another of the firm foundations of Canada's foreign policy has been its commitment to working for arms control objectives, both within the United Nations system and outside it.

A number of technological and economic concerns surrounding Canada's participation in the research phase of the SDI were raised before the Committee.

These included testimony that participation by the government in the research phase of the SDI would result in significant direct and indirect job creation in Canada. In contrast, the Committee also received testimony that research and development is a capital-intensive process and that the individuals directly involved are highly trained scientists and technicians with good existing employment opportunities. In fact, there were indications that Canada is already in short supply in some categories of scientists and technicians. In terms of indirect job creation, concerns were expressed that a significant portion of the expenditure on capital equipment would be used to purchase equipment outside Canada, leading to less indirect job creation than might otherwise be expected.

Developments in space and space-related technologies seem likely to remain on the leading edge of all technological development and to provide a continued source of commercial spin-offs. For these reasons, a strongly focused space industry is a central feature in the planning of most industrialized countries.

The SDI research program can be viewed as an economic initiative designed to revitalize the technological base of U.S. industry. Significant advances in new technology, and refinements of existing technologies, are expected to result from the SDI research program. It has been strongly argued that Canada must be involved in the SDI research program or risk falling behind the rest of the world in technology, especially in view of the large Japanese and European research efforts that have recently been initiated.

A counter-argument is that the economic revitalization objectives of the SDI research program and the demands of national security in the United States will act to block the flow of key technological developments to other participating countries. If this proved to be the case, then Canadian research resources would likely be assigned to support roles in the program, and the Canadian portion of SDI research would be diffuse and yield little of value in terms of commercial spinoffs.

Canada's fledgling space industry has grown at a considerable rate in recent years. The future health of the industry is, however, by no means guaranteed, partly because of the stiff international competition. The government will shortly decide upon a long-term plan for Canadian activities in space, the Strategic Space Plan.

Three possible components of this plan are currently under consideration:

- ☐ Development of an Integrated Servicing and Test Facility to complement the U.S. Space Station by performing space-based assembly, testing, servicing and maintenance functions;

- ☐ Development of a remote sensing satellite for resource monitoring and navigation (RADARSAT);

- ☐ Development of a commercial Mobile Communications Satellite System.

These activities are primarily civilian in nature, although later generations of RADARSAT may enhance Canada's surveillance capability with respect to its

territory and sovereignty and to protection of the U.S. land-based deterrent.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The majority of the Committee is of the opinion that the government of Canada should remain fully committed to NATO and NORAD and should strive to fulfil our Alliance responsibilities.

The majority of the Committee recommends that the government continue to support pragmatic defence-oriented research and development programs where those programs contribute to our ability to fulfil our military roles and responsibilities. Further, that the government continue to enter into joint defence research programs.

The majority of the Committee was struck by the fact that an overwhelming portion of the testimony it received, both in favor of and in opposition to the SDI, was drawn from secondary sources, such as journals, magazines and newspapers of U.S. origin. They concluded that a significant Canadian effort is required to inquire into the strategic and technological issues involved in ballistic missile defence and they recommend that the government continue to do primary research on the subject of ballistic missile defence and attempt to expose the public to primary sources of information on this issue.

Technological and Economic Considerations

The Committee recommends that technological and economic factors be considered subordinate to strategic and

arms control concerns in the formation of the government's decision.

The Committee has not received evidence that government participation would result in significant job creation in Canada in the research phase of the SDI.

The importance of establishing a Canadian military space program was expressed in the recent report of the Special Committee of the Senate on National Defence, which stated, "space-based systems are likely to provide the main elements of North American Air Defence, because they are becoming technically feasible and cost effective."

The military applications of space technology continue to grow in complexity and importance. Space represents the 'high ground' for the gathering of intelligence and for military communications. Informed defence planning can take place only if current technologies and their potential applications are understood, and if appropriate military intelligence is available. Space technologies are of particular interest to the Canadian military because of the difficulties inherent in monitoring and defending our large territory in a cost-effective manner. Space-based systems are seen to be possible solutions to these difficulties.

The majority of the Committee has concluded that Canadian interests will be best served through a coherent plan for the Canadian aerospace industry. The majority of the Committee believes that a Canadian space program should straddle military and civilian purposes and, indeed, that the distinction between military and civilian applications is becoming increasingly blurred.

Southam News Poll

Windsor THE SATURDAY WINDSOR STAR in English 31 Aug 85 p D3

[Article by Less Whittington]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Canadians are evenly divided over the wisdom of participating in the controversial U.S. Star Wars defence plan — and some would oppose the idea even if it created more jobs in Canada.

In the Southam News poll, 40.5 per cent said they were in favor of Canada accepting the Reagan administration's invitation to participate in research for the program, while 42.3 per cent said the offer should be rejected. About 16 per cent said they had no opinion.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has said he will announce Sept. 7 whether Canada should take a role in research for the \$26-billion, space-based anti-missile scheme, formally known as the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative.

JOINING THE program would create new jobs in Canada said 43 per cent of respondents, while 30 per cent said no additional employment would result from Canadian participation. About 28 per cent expressed no opinion on the jobs question.

The poll, conducted for Southam

News by the Carleton University School of Journalism, was taken between Aug. 19-27, the period when a special Parliamentary committee studying Star Wars released its report.

The committee's conclusion, which received extensive publicity, was characterized as an "interim no" by its chairman, Conservative MP Tom Hockin. The 17 MPs and senators said they did not have enough information to make a more precise recommendation.

BUT THE REPORT said participation in Star Wars is unlikely to create many new jobs in Canada, contradicting the position of advocates of a Canadian role.

The Southam poll, which surveyed 1,727 people, indicates a hardening of opposition toward Star Wars in recent weeks.

A survey published by the Toronto Globe and Mail Aug. 10 showed 57 per cent support Canadian participation, with 35 per cent opposed. In that poll, eight per cent were indifferent or had no opinion.

Visiting Soviet Official's Warning

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 7 Sep 85 p 5

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Canada will be as morally responsible as the United States for an escalation of the arms race if the Mulroney Government permits Canadian participation in Star Wars research, a senior Soviet official said yesterday.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney plans to discuss the U.S. invitation to participate in the research with the full Conservative

parliamentary caucus today. He has promised to give Washington a reply by Monday, when Parliament resumes.

There have been indications the Government will not participate directly in the Strategic Defence Initiative, the formal name for Star Wars, but will allow Canadian high-tech firms to bid on research contracts.

However, refusing to get involved directly would not absolve

Ottawa of moral responsibility if Canadian scientists participate, Lev Tolkunov, a member of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, said in an interview.

Mr. Tolkunov, who is also the Speaker of one of the two chambers of the Soviet parliament, is in Ottawa at a week-long conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, an organization consisting of legislators from more than 100 countries.

The only Canadian official he has been able to lobby on the SDI issue so far has been Commons Speaker John Bosley. "We had an exchange of views," Mr. Tolkunov said, noting that the Canadian view is different on many issues.

He said U.S. President Ronald Reagan's planned space-based defence system to shoot down incoming Soviet ballistic missiles

would increase the possibility of nuclear war.

Mr. Tolkunov, 66, a former editor-in-chief of Izvestia, the Soviet Government's daily newspaper, said Star Wars is destabilizing and would, in any event, not be effective.

"I can tell you frankly we can create systems to penetrate SDI," Mr. Tolkunov said through an interpreter.

The United States sees this as a basic contradiction in the Soviet argument: How can SDI can be both destabilizing and ineffective?

Mr. Tolkunov rejected the U.S. position that the \$26-billion (U.S.) Washington plans to spend on SDI in the next five years is simply for research. "We do not think Americans would waste billions of dollars only on research" unless there were an intention to

deploy such a system, he said.

U.S. claims, repeated this week by Mr. Mulroney, that the Soviet Union has spent large sums on SDI-style research of its own are untrue, he said, offering as evidence a 1983 statement by Mr. Reagan that he would share the fruits of SDI research with the Soviets.

Mr. Tolkunov said that suggests Mr. Reagan knew the Soviets did not possess SDI technology.

He also said the Soviets do not expect much of substance to come out of the Geneva summit meeting in November between Mr. Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, because the U.S. Administration does not want to discuss Star Wars and because there have been many unfriendly statements coming out of Washington recently.

Government Decision

Toronto THE SUNDAY STAR in English 8 Sep 85 pp A1, A8

[Article by Bob Hepburn]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has formally rejected the U.S. offer to have the Canadian government participate directly in the Star Wars research project.

But the federal government has agreed to indirectly support the controversial U.S. program by providing normal tax breaks, loans and grants to private companies that receive Star Wars research contracts.

And Mulroney has left the door open to future Canadian participation in Star Wars when the United States tries to deploy the system in space.

"After careful and detailed consideration, the government of Canada has concluded that Canada's own policies and priorities do not warrant a government-to-government effort in support of SDI research," the Prime Minister said yesterday.

The announcement ends months of controversial, often bitter, national debate on the issue, especially during cross-Canada hearings of a Senate-Commons committee which said Aug. 23 it did not have enough information to make a forthright recommendation. That prompted Mulroney — then holding a cabinet meeting in Vancouver — to say that if the committee couldn't make a decision, he would.

Yesterday, Mulroney made his announcement following an all-day meeting of his Progressive Conservative caucus of MPs and senators, and a day after a meeting of his cabinet at Meech Lake.

Space-based system

The Strategic Defence Initiative, the formal name for the Star Wars project, is aimed at developing space-based satellites that could use lasers to destroy Soviet missiles that are heading toward North America.

Mulroney conveyed his decision to U.S. President Ronald Reagan at 3.20 p.m. yesterday in a 15-minute phone conversation.

"I don't think there will be any disappointment in the White House," Mulroney told reporters.

Shortly afterwards, the U.S. state department said in Washington it respected the decision, and a Reagan spokesman added that the President, thanked Mulroney "for the opportunity to work with Canadian private corporations that can and will participate in SDI research."

Ottawa's formal decision was sent by Defence Minister Erik Nielsen in a letter to U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger.

Opposition MPs and peace group leaders immediately cheered the decision to reject the U.S. invitation, calling it a major victory in the arms control movement.

"I'm happy that the opposition has forced the government to back off (the Star Wars offer)," said Jean Chretien, Liberal external affairs critic. "It's another great victory for the Canadian people."

New Democratic Party leader Ed Broadbent called the decision "constructive and positive," praising it as a victory for individual Canadians who made known their opposition to the project.

While Mulroney agreed to let private companies seek Star Wars contracts — especially if they are partly financed by Canadian taxpayers — peace activists suggest few firms will get any work from the \$26 billion project without the formal government participation.

Canada now joins a growing list of countries to reject Reagan's invitation, issued March 26 to members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and several other nations.

Besides the growing opposition in Canada to Star Wars, Mulroney rejected the offer because he felt Canada would not control the project or have much say in how it was operated.

He said he was concerned about "getting involved in a situation where the parameters are beyond our control and where the government of Canada does not control the shots."

"Our national commitment is to the welfare of Canada and the conduct of a foreign policy will always be in the interests of Canada."

Mulroney tried to soften the blow to the White House by saying Ottawa still supports the concept of SDI research, adding such work "is prudent in light of significant advances in Soviet research and deployment of the world's only ballistic missile defence system."

"Only a naive 6-year-old would fail to understand (that) the Americans are involved in this research because the Soviets have been doing it for a long period of time, they have expended billions of dollars and committed thousands of personnel to it," he told reporters.

And he reiterated that Canada still believes Star Wars research is consistent with American treaty obligations.

Woo U.S.

It was in March that the U.S. issued a formal Star Wars invitation to its allies at a meeting of NATO foreign ministers in Luxembourg. It asked for a response within 60 days, a deadline we did not eventually comply with.

In April, a senior public servant was assigned to travel to Washington to take a "hard look" at the invitation, particularly the strategic, scientific and economic implications. Arthur Kroeger presented a report to Mulroney this summer although it has not been made public. Then came the high-profile Parliamentary committee hearings.

The issue turned out to be one of Mulroney's toughest political decisions in his year as Prime Minister. Since assuming power, he has worked hard to win U.S. investment in Canada by going out of his way to appease Reagan on many issues.

Within the next 10 days, Mulroney will ask Reagan to open talks aimed at freer trade between the two countries.

Senior Mulroney aides insisted yesterday they are not worried about the possibility Reagan will be upset over the Star Wars decision and take out his disappointment on the free-trade talks.

While Ottawa has rejected the invitation to participate formally,

private companies will be free to bid on Star Wars contracts.

Many Canadian firms already are heavily involved in work for the U.S. military, such as Litton Industries, whose Metro Toronto plant assembles guidance systems for cruise missiles.

Federal funding of Star Wars research by Canadian companies "will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis," a Mulroney aide said.

The money would come from funds, such as loans or grants, that are available to any company involved in space technology. No new funds would be set aside strictly for Star Wars work.

In addition, Ottawa may eventually decide to participate in the actual deployment of Star Wars.

Official Letter to Weinberger

Toronto THE SUNDAY STAR in English 8 Sep 85 p A8

[Text]

This is the letter sent yesterday by Defence Minister Erik Nielsen to U.S. Secretary of State Caspar Weinberger.

Dear Mr. Weinberger:

On March 26 you wrote to me extending to the Government of Canada and to other friendly governments an invitation to participate directly in research under the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI).

My colleagues and I have given this issue careful and detailed consideration. A Parliamentary Committee had conducted extensive public consultations across the country. Upon reflection, the Government of Canada has concluded that Canada's own policies and priorities do not warrant a government-to-government effort in support of SDI research.

In conveying this decision to you, there are a number of additional points I would like to make. We believe that the extensive existing co-operation in defence research between our two countries is mutually beneficial and should be encouraged to grow. The Government is committed to further development of this co-operation and will continue to welcome further

research arrangements with the United States, consistent always with Canada's national interest and its research and development priorities. Although Canada does not intend to participate on a government-to-government basis in the SDI research program, private companies and institutions interested in participating in the program will continue to be free to do so.

As Canada has previously stated, our Government believes that SDI research by the United States is both consistent with the ABM Treaty and prudent in light of significant advances in Soviet research and deployment of the world's only existing ballistic missile defence system.

I look forward to continuing to work closely with you as we together address the vital security issues facing us.

Sincerely,
Erik Nielsen

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 10 Sep 85 p 9

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

OTTAWA — The Government refused to say directly yesterday whether private Canadian companies will be eligible for federal financial assistance to conduct Star Wars research.

Various officials, however, indicated that existing defence research assistance programs could be available to Canadian high-tech industries engaged in Star Wars work for the United States.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney declined to answer in the House of Commons when asked by New Democratic Party foreign affairs critic Pauline Jewett to clarify the policy announced four days ago.

On Saturday, Mr. Mulroney said that Ottawa would not participate in a government-to-government arrangement with Washington in the Strategic Defence Initiative research program, known popularly as Star Wars. He left open the possibility, however, that Canadian companies might be able to participate in the \$26-billion (U.S.) research program on their own.

In the Commons yesterday, Ms Jewett asked Mr. Mulroney whether there would be indirect federal involvement in the form of grants or loans to private companies.

Mr. Mulroney stayed in his seat and indicated that Defence Minister Erik Nielsen should respond. Mr. Nielsen said that Saturday's announcement "reflects what we believe to be in the national interest of this country."

"With respect to ongoing research activities, as we have been doing over many years, we intend to co-operate with the United States as we have in the past and we hope that research activity will increase.

"All of these projects are subject to a decision-making process which is in place and which will be utilized when any new project comes up for consideration."

Ms Jewett again tried to get a clear answer. Mr. Nielsen said: "The honorable member may take it that we intend to continue our research efforts in co-operation with the United States and we hope that that activity will grow."

"Talk about velcro lips," Ms Jewett said later of Mr. Nielsen's response.

Associate Defence Minister Harvie Andre, who took on the junior post in the Defence portfolio in last month's Cabinet shuffle, was not much clearer in his response to questions by reporters who caught up with him on the move.

He was asked whether Canadian companies

could get a contract from the SDI office in the United States and get assistance from the Canadian Government. "Not necessarily," he said. "The programs we have had in place continue. That's all."

A reporter who followed Mr. Mulroney's press secretary, William Fox, across the wide Parliament Hill lawn to his office a block away also asked several times whether it was Government policy to refuse assistance to companies that want help to secure SDI contracts. Mr. Fox repeated several times that each case would be reviewed individually.

Ms Jewett said in a later interview that Mr. Nielsen's answers in the Commons suggested to her that the Government "is not really saying no to Star Wars."

"There will have to be constant monitoring to see if they are going to use the back door to help firms get SDI research."

She noted that Mr. Mulroney had said Saturday that it was not in the interest of Canada to participate directly in SDI. "If that is not in the interest of Canada, then surely it is not in the interest of Canada to give Government assistance to private firms."

Thomas Niles, the new U.S. Ambassador to Canada, told reporters on his arrival at the Ottawa airport that how much SDI work that Canadian companies get depends on them.

Responding to questions, Mr. Niles said the U.S. Government is willing to co-operate with Canadian companies. He also said that the Mulroney Government's decision Saturday would not adversely affect Canadian-U.S. relations.

Meanwhile, university scientists in the United States who say that Star Wars is "science fiction" and a "colossal waste of money" are asking colleagues to join them in refusing millions of dollars in research grants.

Hundreds of engineers, chemists and physicists on more than two dozen campuses have pledged not to accept money for work on the SDI.

"Our major emphasis is not to make a political statement but to point out that the bulk of the scientists who would be working on it think it is technically unfeasible and at the level of science fiction," said John Kogut, a physics professor at the University of Illinois in Urbana, one of two campuses where petitions have been circulating since June.

Nielsen on NRC Involvement

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 18 Sep 85 p A2

[Text]

OTTAWA (CP) — Defence Minister Erik Nielsen has refused to rule out the possibility that the federal National Research Council could be involved in research for the so-called U.S. Star Wars defence program.

Nielsen, saying it was a hypothetical question, yesterday dismissed an Opposition call for assurances that the government will not allow any of its agencies, such as the council, to take part in research into a space-based ballistic missile defence system.

And the research council itself said it has received no directive telling it to change its way of operating as a result of Canada's rejection of the American invitation to participate in Star Wars.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said earlier this month that Canada was rejecting any "government-to-government" participation in what is formally known as the Strategic Defence Initiative because it is not in the national interest.

No definition

But he said private companies, institutions and universities would be permitted to apply for Star Wars research contracts and would be eligible for government funding on a case-by-case basis.

However, Mulroney and his cabinet ministers have yet to define the phrase "government-to-government participation," so there is still some confusion as to exactly what Canada has rejected.

Asked by reporters yesterday to define government-to-government participation, Nielsen said: "Put your own definition on government and you can answer your own question."

"The last time I looked, the NRC was not, nor is the Northern Canada Power Commission nor is the dairy commission, a part of the government in the sense that government-to-government was used," he said.

Sought assurances

The council describes itself in its last annual report as "Canada's largest government general purpose research and development organization."

Nielsen would not directly answer questions from Liberal external affairs critic Jean Chretien, who was seeking assurances that government agencies would not be involved in Star Wars.

"The position of the government is that it is not the intention to participate in the SDI research on a government-to-government basis with the United States and that private enterprise is, as it always has been in this country, free to make their own decisions as the opportunities might arise," Nielsen said.

A spokesman for the council said it has received no directive telling it to change the way it operates as a result of Star Wars.

This means that if a company applies for funding for a project that meets the normal criteria of being of economic and social benefit to Canada, the council would not reject the application simply because some elements of the project are related to Star Wars.

"We could go ahead as we normally would," said the spokesman, who asked not to be identified. He said the council, however, does not plan to solicit Star Wars projects.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRC'S DENG XIAOPING SPEAKS ON SDI

OW050910 Beijing XINHUA in English 0856 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Excerpt] Beijing, October 5 (XINHUA) -- Deng Xiaoping, chairman of the Chinese Communist Party Central Advisory Commission, said here today that China is against any superpower engaging in the development of space weapons. He said the "star wars" plan symbolizes the escalation in nature of the nuclear arms race between the two superpowers.

Speaking at a meeting today with Franz-Josef Strauss, minister-president of the Federal German State of Bavaria and chairman of that country's Christian Social Union, Deng Xiaoping said he has a conviction that China, the Federal Republic of Germany and Europe as a whole are a force for peace and a force checking world war.

The 81-year-old Chairman Deng Xiaoping said China has always stood for a united and strong Europe. "Whenever China and Europe make progress in their economic development they add strength to the world's forces for peace," he said.

CSO: 5200/4002

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

FRENCH FIRMS INTERESTED IN EUREKA--At a conference on 10 September, characterized by the Ministry of Research as "very constructive," Mrs Cresson and Mr Curien, respectively the ministers of industry and research, together, met with some 40 French industrialists--notably, Siemens France, Thomson, Crouzet and Cap Sogeti--interested in the European cooperation program Eureka. The purpose of this meeting was mainly to exchange views and information of mutual interest prior to the forthcoming Eureka meeting in Hannover (FRG). The latter meeting, which is to be held in November, is expected to mark the actual operational launching of the program, with the presentation of an initial set of industrial projects. The two ministers emphasized the "essential role" of the industrialists themselves in the definition and conduct of the Eureka projects. For Mr Yves Sillard, the Eureka national coordinator (he is shortly to receive an official letter defining his mission), the 10 September meeting provided him an opportunity for an initial contact with the firms interested in Eureka--firms whose sole interlocutor he will be for the drawing up of their dossiers. [Text]
[Paris ELECTRONIQUE ACTUALITES in French 20 Sep 85 p 3] 9399

CSO: 3698/3

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GDR LAUDS SOVIET ARMS PROPOSALS

Support Intent of Geneva Talks

LD060218 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1705 GMT 5 Oct 85

["Commentary of the Day" by Rolf Schiek]

[Text] Good evening. The matter is concrete, clear, and unmistakable, and it offers everyone, all of humanity, a truly unique chance for survival and for continuing life. The whole world echoes this -- it echoes the USSR's proposal to the U.S. Government to agree to completely ban space strike weapons, applicable to both sides, and to make a genuine and radical 50 percent reduction of nuclear weapons, those nuclear weapons that can reach the territory of the other. This is what the Soviet Union is proposing, and this is what Mikhail Gorbachev said in Paris.

With this proposal, the Soviet Union is striking precisely at the heart of what both sides agreed to as the goals of the Geneva negotiations at the beginning of this year; specifically, not only to cease the arms race, for this would only be half the solution, but to drastically reduce the level of armaments and, simultaneously, to prevent an arms race in space. The new, radical disarmament proposals, therefore, are intended to give the Geneva process a constructive character. A 50 percent reduction in the nuclear weapon potential would certainly drastically reduce the threat hovering over humanity, and, as Mikhail Gorbachev said, it scarcely needs to be stressed how this would consolidate strategic stability and mutual trust. The Soviet Union, whose well-known policy aims at a complete removal and destruction of all nuclear weapons stocks, and which has already made concrete proposals to this end, is, with its present offer of a mutual 50 percent reduction and a ban on space strike weapons, which is to be agreed upon, again simultaneously meeting many proposals, ideas and suggestions from international organizations and personalities, parties and associations, on what is currently necessary and feasible in the disarmament sector.

With its new steps, the Soviet Union is fulfilling the interests, hopes, and longings of millions of people throughout the world. Today, international press organs particularly emphasize the constructiveness and flexibility of the USSR's approach to the solution of these complicated problems. This also applies, by the way, to medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. In order to facilitate an agreement on the earliest possible reduction of those weapons, the USSR considers it possible to conclude an appropriate agreement separately, without any direct connection with the problems of space and strategic arms. For those who remember, this was a desire that was often expressed in the West, especially in Western Europe. The Soviet Union has also met this desire; it has also shown itself prepared for compromises here.

How are things now with its own medium-range missiles? There has repeatedly been talk in certain Western media of the fact that Moscow is infringing upon its own moratorium by continuing to deploy missiles quietly and secretly. The truth is that the number of SS-20 missiles, which the Soviet Union has deployed in the operational system in the European zone currently amounts to 243 units. This corresponds exactly to the position in June 1984, when the supplementary deployment of missiles in response to the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe began. Mikhail Gorbachev said this plainly in Paris, and he added that the extra SS-20 missiles deployed in this process have now been withdrawn from the operational system.

The stationary bases for the deployment of these missiles will also be dismantled within the next 2 months, and this can be verified. Anyone who wants to, the CPSU general secretary said at yesterday's news conference in Paris, can photograph it. All suggestions that the withdrawn missiles would possibly be deployed in Asia are without foundation. And, when the Soviet Union takes such a step, then this should be taken seriously. Besides, the USSR has already completely withdrawn the old and extremely powerful SS-5 missiles from its arms stocks and is now continuing to remove its SS-4 missiles.

This means that the number of medium-range booster missiles in the European zone of the USSR is, altogether, considerably lower today than 10, or even 15, years ago. This most certainly, is all a great piece of self-restraint which stems from the far-reaching interests of European security, and a security, in turn, which according to the USSR's conviction, cannot be guaranteed with military means or military strength. A quote from Mikhail Gorbachev: "There cannot be any victors in a nuclear war." Certainly all responsible politicians agree with that. It is time to draw the practical conclusions from this. Good evening and good-bye.

Prime Minister Stoph's Statement

LD051016 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1243 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Excerpts] Berlin 4 Oct (ADN) -- "Nothing is more urgent for us than to work on the basis of the unity and cohesion of the socialist community of states for the amalgamation of all forces of reason and realism in order to free mankind from the danger of nuclear destruction." This was stated by Prime Minister Willi Stoph, GDR State Council deputy chairman and SED Central Committee Politburo member on 4 October at an awards ceremony in Berlin.

The GDR particularly welcomed the far-reaching proposals contained in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Paris aimed at preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth. The GDR, resolutely and wholly in the spirit of this coordinated foreign policy, supports a return to detente. This was proven by the proposals Erich Honecker submitted to the FRG federal chancellor to start negotiations on the creation of a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe, and his recent political talks with various FRG politicians. "It is more than ever up to the responsible powers in the FRG to demonstrate, through actions, that they are serious about the statement that war must never again be allowed to emanate from German soil, but rather only peace."

As a firm component of the amicable allied family of peoples in socialism, the GDR makes its contribution in the center of Europe to the strengthening of socialism and preservation of peace, Willi Stoph said. It is because of the tireless efforts of the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries allied in the Warsaw Pact that peace has prevailed in Europe for over four decades. "But, that peace is threatened more than ever by the policy of confrontation and arms escalation pursued by the most aggressive circles of imperialism."

The politicians said that the country's working people recognize that every action for strengthening the economy's performance is simultaneously an important contribution to the international attraction of socialism and its peace policy. On the eve of National Day, the party and state leadership's gratitude goes out to all citizens who do their utmost for socialism with their hearts and minds.

Politburo Member Sindermann's Statement

LD040727 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1333 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Text] Berlin, 3 Oct (ADN) -- The GDR emphatically supports the Soviet Union's peace initiatives on a halt to the arms race, the prevention of the militarization of space, the transition to disarmament, and a return to detente. This was stated by Horst Sindermann, deputy chairman of the GDR State Council and SED Central Committee Politburo member on 3 October at a gathering for the presentation of awards on the occasion of the GDR's national day. "There would be poor prospects for the life of mankind and the existence of our planet if there was no mighty socialist community of states with the Soviet Union at its head. There would be poor prospects for human culture if the ideals of socialism did not brighten life."

Horst Sindermann went on to say that only the socialist community of states can pave the way for lasting peace for mankind and strengthen the peace-loving forces throughout the world.

31 October 1985

In the meantime, the British and French nuclear potentials continue to be upgraded. The rearmament of Britain's submarine fleet with Trident systems, will increase the number of nuclear warheads carried by the subs from 400 to 900. And France has already built its sixth nuclear capable (?submarine). The French potential has likewise reached about 900 warheads. In other words, the Anglo-French potential is capable of destroying 1,800 targets in the USSR. Needless to say, for someone in Moscow, Smolensk, Kiev, or Minsk it is of little consequence whether a NATO, British, or French missile destroys his home.

When he proposed a direct exchange of views with the aim of reaching a mutual understanding on the subject with France and Britain, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out that this was important, above all, for the further process of negotiations on intermediate-range missiles, so as to invigorate the [word indistinct] process and give it a realistic direction, and the Soviet side, he added, was prepared to advance in this direction as far as its partners were.

Now, let me draw your attention to the question Mikhail Gorbachev was asked at his Paris news conference by a correspondent of the BBC. The BBC correspondent asked why the Soviet leader expected some change in London's official stance on the British nuclear forces. Well, this is a reasonable question. Throughout the talks on intermediate-range arms up to now, London has objected to having the British nuclear forces included in the overall nuclear balance in Europe. But, the whole package of the new Soviet initiatives outlined by Mikhail Gorbachev in Paris, was aimed at creating more favorable conditions (?for) a constructive solution to the problems of arms limitation.

In his reply to the BBC correspondent, the Soviet leader said up to now Britain's position on intermediate-range missiles was shaped in one set of conditions. Now I am inviting Mrs Thatcher to adopt a new approach in connection with the radical proposals made by the Soviet Union. This radically alters the situation and since there is a new situation, Mikhail Gorbachev added, there have to be new approaches. These words remain addressed to London.

FRG Politician

LD051843 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Bonn October 5 TASS--Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals on direct negotiations with France and Britain is a great advantage, providing the way to come to terms, at long last, on French and British nuclear weapons, said deputy chairman of the parliamentary faction of the Social Democratic Party of Germany Horst Ehmke. In an interview to the newspaper GENERAL-ANZEIGER he noted that though these arsenals are small, they are rapidly on the rise. Nobody can pretend that these arsenals are non-existent. Therefore, I believe it is correct to have direct negotiations, said Horst Ehmke.

CSO: 5200/1047

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SITUATION IN NETHERLANDS AS DEPLOYMENT DECISION APPROACHES

PRAVDA Commentary

PM031314 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "Our Commentary": "Widespread Opposition"]

[Text] Brussels--Thousands of people took part in an antimissile demonstration held on Saturday in the Netherlands town of 't Harde. "Stop the missiles!," "End the arms race!," "Prevent Euroshimas!"--those were the slogans of this demonstration, which has become one of the central events of the fall Peace Week that ended in the Netherlands 29 September.

It was announced at the 't Harde rally that 2 million inhabitants of the country have already signed an appeal addressed to the government and parliament to reject the cruise missiles being imposed by Washington. The campaign to collect signatures to this appeal has now been launched throughout the country. The Netherlands has not yet given its assent to the commencement of the deployment of the 48 U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles envisaged for it by the 1979 NATO "missile decision."

The 2 million signatures already collected in the first few weeks of a campaign that will continue until the end of October attest to Netherlanders' widespread opposition to Washington's missile plans and their reluctance to turn their country into a launchpad for U.S. first-strike weapons. The antiwar campaign has been joined not only by antiwar movement activists and representatives of left-wing and democratic forces, but by parliamentary deputies, municipal leaders, religious, and scientific and cultural figures.

At the same time the Atlanticists' pressure on this small state is being stepped up. The most belligerent circles on both sides of the Atlantic would like to force the Netherlands to adopt the missiles and thereby take yet another step along the road of whipping up international tension. A slanderous campaign about the alleged "buildup in USSR missile forces" has been launched and attempts are being made to disparage the peace-loving Soviet initiatives, and first and foremost the unilateral moratorium announced in April on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and the implementation of other retaliatory measures. Amsterdam and The Hague are being subjected to increased propaganda and other pressure. And now the country's foreign minister, H. van den Broek, speaking at the UN General Assembly session, states that the

Netherlands cabinet "in all probability will deploy cruise missiles".... "It seems that our participation in their siting is now inevitable," he said. It is promised that the final decision will be taken 1 November.

In this situation the results of the Peace Week that has just ended again attest to the resolve of ordinary Netherlands to divert the threat from their country and not permit cruise missiles there. They are also talking about the flagrant contradiction between the U.S. intentions to continue siting its missiles in Europe with the interests and aspirations of the peoples of the West European states. The slogans of the Peace Week are dear to and understood by the overwhelming majority of Netherlands and the population of the other European countries.

NATO Pressure

LD071000 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 7 Oct 85

[Commentary by International Affairs Journalist Eduard Kovalev]

[Text] It is reported from the North Atlantic bloc headquarters that the next NATO Nuclear Planning Group session will be held in Brussels at the end of October. In the opinion of competent observers, a new attempt will be made there to put pressure on the Netherlands to force it to agree to the deployment of 48 American cruise missiles. At the microphone is Eduard Kovalev, international affairs journalist.

Will the deployment of American first-strike nuclear weapons in Western Europe be continued? This is the question being asked today by many realistically-minded politicians and public figures in the countries of Western Europe. Particular attention is being drawn to the situation in the Netherlands. The American administration is still putting extra pressure on the Netherlands, whose government has still not made a final decision on the 48 American cruise missiles. It was reported the other day that the United States has even suggested to the Netherlands Government that they conclude an agreement on this question without waiting for a decision from parliament which is due after 1 November following the corresponding debate and vote.

The Dutch public, peace supporters, and participants in the antimissile movement and, finally, many political parties in the country are actively opposing this fatal step which is being imposed on the country. Let us recall that, as Netherlands Government leaders have reaffirmed, the fate of the decision on the missiles depends on the position of the Soviet Union. If the USSR reduces the number of its medium-range missiles in Europe then the need to deploy the American cruise missiles in the Netherlands will be removed.

These last few days the European public has welcomed the new development of events. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev set out in Paris the Soviet position and reported that the USSR is reducing its medium-range missiles. By embarking on such a self-limitation, he said, we are guided by the broad interests of European security.

In these new conditions the people of Europe have been right to expect a responsive step, an end by the United States to the further deployment of medium-range missiles on the European continent, the more so since such a course of events would meet the hopes and aspirations of Europeans for lasting peace and security. However, as yet, there has been no sensible constructive response to the Soviet initiatives. The policy of pressure by the United States and NATO on the Netherlands continues. The political forces of that country and the Dutch public will make the appropriate conclusions from what has happened.

Antimissile Campaign Intensifies

LD091933 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 9 Oct 85

[Text] The Hague, October 9 TASS--By TASS correspondent Oleg Pivovarov:

The scene is being set in the Netherlands before a decisive battle whose outcome will decide whether American cruise missiles will be deployed on Dutch soil.

The government is to adopt a decision on this issue on November 1, and the pressure the United States and the NATO leadership have been continuously exerting on the Netherlands, is making itself felt to an ever greater degree with each day. The Dutch are being told nearly every day, and rather unceremoniously, that the "special position" of the Netherlands which is in no hurry to comply with the NATO December 1979 missile decision sets a "bad example." Proponents of pro-American policy inside the country have rallied around this "thesis."

The anti-war movement in the Netherlands, one of the most powerful in Western Europe, has put forward the task of convincing broad sections of the population that the missile deployment is not only unnecessary, but is also contrary to the country's interests by making it dependent on the United States.

A nation-wide campaign of collecting signatures under an appeal to the government and parliament urging them to renounce the deployment is entering its final phase. The postcards, signed by the Dutch people, distributed by thousands of activists of the coordination committee No To Cruise Missiles, will be presented to government and parliament members on the square in front of the parliament building on October 26. The number of signatures has surpassed two million, and more and more people are joining the campaign.

Local observers notice a direct link in this respect with remarks made in Paris by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and his announcement of new Soviet proposals on the reduction of nuclear armaments.

The signature-collecting campaign turned into a factor of immense moral importance. According to the recent public opinion poll, two-thirds of the Netherlands' population believe that the government should take into account the view opposed to the presence of American missiles on Dutch soil. Forty-two per cent of those polled believe it is necessary to start new actions if the government adopts a decision in favour of the missiles. Among the actions considered are demonstrations, strikes and blockades of roads leading to military bases.

CSO: 5200/1047

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH PARTIES' VIEWS ON CRUISE 'LETTER' OUTLINED

PM100700 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 2 Oct 85 p 1

[Unnamed "own correspondent" report: "Cruise Missile Agreement Wins Christian Democratic Appeal and People's Party for Freedom and Democracy Support"]

[Text] The Hague--The Christian Democratic Appeal and the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy are satisfied with the main outlines of the agreement in which the Netherlands wants to regulate the use of cruise missiles. Above all, they consider it important that the letter about the agreement with the United States on which the cabinet reached agreement yesterday makes it clear that the Netherlands will be closely involved in the decisionmaking process relating to the use of the missiles. According to the Labor Party in the letter the cabinet is simply trying to camouflage the fact that in the final analysis the U.S. President decides on the use of cruise missiles from Dutch territory.

After a conflict between Foreign Minister Van den Broek and Defense Minister De Ruiter, the cabinet rapidly reached agreement on the text of the letter yesterday morning. It appears that, contrary to Van den Broek's wishes, express reference is made to the NATO procedures through which the Netherlands is able to make its influence felt at different stages in the decisionmaking process relating to the use of the cruise missiles.

Additional influence for the Netherlands, whereby "The Hague" would have a weightier voice when it comes to firing the cruise missiles from Woensdrecht, has not been made a condition for deployment. Prime Minister Lubbers admitted yesterday that there would be no divergence from normal NATO procedures. But the simple fact that the letter stresses optimum influence for the Netherlands already adds additional weight to this, the prime minister said.

In the agreement with the United States (not a treaty) it is stated, the cabinet says, that the cruise missiles can only be used for the defense of NATO territory and that the strict regulations agreed within NATO by the allies apply here. According to Lubbers, in a period of increasing tension the Netherlands, just like any other NATO partner, has the opportunity to declare itself against NATO military action in the decisionmaking process for a "general alarm."

In this situation Netherlands troops could be withdrawn from NATO's command. According to the prime minister the "operational phase" for the cruise missiles in Woendsdrecht could not be reached under such circumstances, and launch from Netherlands territory would be impossible. However, if the Netherlands agrees with this general alarm the use of the cruise missiles at a later stage can no longer be prevented. According to Lubbers "the rubicon" would then "already have been crossed."

The cabinet takes the view that linking the agreement to NATO procedures meets the conditions laid down by the Council of State on this point. This interpretation is of importance in connection with the question of whether the agreement with the United States conflicts with the constitution, and thus whether a two-thirds majority in the Second Chamber is required for its approval.

In its reaction to the letter the Labor Party said that there is still "tension" with constitutional stipulations, because the sovereignty of the Netherlands is affected. Democrats '66 are now wondering whether in the cabinet's view it can be concluded from the letter that no conflict with the constitution exists.

In the final phase of talks on the letter between the ministers most involved, at the request of Van den Broek a further passage was scrapped expressly stating that the NATO treaty does not contain an automatic obligation to military involvement. Lubbers and De Ruiter agreed to this. Last Friday after the cabinet meeting and yesterday in his press conference on the letter the prime minister amply compensated for this "defeat" by concentrating above all on the sovereign rights of the Netherlands within NATO.

CSO: 5200/2520

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH POLL ON REVERSIBILITY OF INF DECISION

The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN in English 3 Oct 85 p 2

[Text] The Hague, October 3--Some 48 per cent of Dutch voters believe the government to be formed after the elections next May should be allowed to alter a decision to deploy cruise missiles, an opinion poll showed last night.

The poll, conducted by the Interview agency for the Socialist VARA broadcasting association, showed that 41 per cent believed the decision should stand. The remaining 11 per cent were not certain.

The Dutch government is due to decide on November 1 to deploy Nato cruise missiles on Dutch soil before the end of 1988. Top cabinet ministers have said the decision is inevitable because the Soviet Union has not met Dutch terms for non-deployment.

These are that the Soviet arsenal of SS-20 missiles total 378 or less on November 1. At present Nato estimates the total at 441.

The question of whether the next government should be able to reverse or amend this decision is topical because the oppositive Labour party has pledged to try and do so if it is returned to power after the next election.

Until this week, arguments have hinged on whether a Labour-led cabinet would have authority to amend a treaty signed with the United States on deployment.

On Tuesday Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers announced the cabinet plans to regulate deployment through an exchange of notes rather than a treaty.

Among Labour voters, 69 per cent were in favour of changing the decision. For Christian Democrats the figure was 38 per cent and the Liberal voters 19 per cent.

CSO: 5200/2518

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

POLL ON PARTY PREFERENCE, CONFIDENCE IN LEADERS

The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN in English 3 Oct 85 p 2

[Text] The Poll also showed that more Liberal voters have confidence in Christian Democrat Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers than in their own party leader Ed Nijpels.

Asked which of the three major party leaders they had confidence in, 68 per cent of the Liberal voters mentioned Lubbers and only 62 per cent Nijpels.

Of all voters questioned, Lubbers had the highest confidence score of 46 per cent. Some 36 per cent had confidence in Labour leader Joop den Uyl, 27 per cent in Nijpels and 25 per cent in D'66 upcoming leader Senator Hans van Mierlo.

If an election were held now, the poll results would give a distribution of seats in the 150-seat Second Chamber of parliament as follows (September 1982 election results in brackets); Labour 59 seats (47), Christian Democrats 44 (45), Liberals 26 (36), Democrats '66 6 (6), other left 8 (9), other right 7 (7).

CSO: 5200/2518

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

IZVESTIYA REPORTS CONCLUSION OF 36TH ROUND OF TALKS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jul 85 p 4

[Article by N. Novikov under the rubric "On the Vienna Talks": "Make the Most of a Workable Possibility"]

[Text] Vienna. (IZVESTIYA correspondent). The closing plenary session of the 36th round of the Mutual Balanced Force Reductions [MBRF] in Central Europe negotiations took place in the Hofburg Palace in Vienna on 11 July. It should be borne in mind that 19 states are participating in the negotiations, 7 from the Warsaw Pact and 12 from NATO.

Ambassador V.V. Mikhailov, head of the Soviet delegation, spoke at the session. He stressed that the results of the concluding round of the Vienna negotiations could not be described as satisfactory or promising so long as a workable possibility for advancement, as contained in the Socialist countries' 14 April 1985 proposed draft document, entitled "Basic Conditions of Agreement on Commencing Reductions of Soviet and American Land Forces and Armaments in Central Europe, and on a Subsequent Zero-Increase in the Level of Armed Forces and Armaments of the Parties in This Region," was neglected.

The draft of the basic conditions of this agreement contains everything required for a mutually acceptable understanding. However, the NATO countries have still not given an answer on the merits of this proposal.

During the entire round of negotiations, the Soviet representative said, the Western participants confined themselves solely to a general repetition of their old biased and unrealistic positions, which in many ways contradict the substance and meaning of the Vienna negotiations, do not take the socialist countries' reasoning into consideration, and offer no way out of the deadlock. It is becoming more and more evident that the U.S. and its NATO allies do not want to undertake a tangible mutual reduction in the level of military opposition.

This also predetermines the NATO countries' attitude toward the Vienna negotiations and their lack of serious interest in success there. Serious

discussion can occur only on an agreement which satisfies both parties' needs, does not threaten either's security, and does not place anyone at a disadvantage.

It was again pointed out that the members of the Warsaw Pact invariably seek a substantial and effective agreement which would not delude anyone, but would in fact lead to a mutual reduction in the concentration of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, and which would normalize the situation in Europe. The best that could be done at the negotiations, as they currently stand, is to agree on those aspects which will support a mutually acceptable decision right now.

The next round of negotiations will begin on 26 September of this year.

13110

CSO: 5200/1330

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FURTHER CRITICISM OF U.S. BINARY WEAPONS PLANS

Congressmen Cited

LD202133 Moscow TASS in English 1539 GMT 20 Sep 85

[Text] Washington 20 September TASS--The decision to modernize the U.S. chemical arms arsenals with binary munitions, filled with a deadly nerve gas, will subvert the military, technical, political and psychological constraints on the spread of chemical weapons in the world, Dane Fasseil, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, said.

He noted in a statement the text of which is carried by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS that the United States should seek instead the conclusion of a comprehensive and verifiable agreement on the complete prohibition of the production of chemical weapons.

Congressman John Porter also criticized the administration's decision to begin the serial production of binary munitions. He called upon the House members to vote against appropriations for binary munitions during forthcoming debates on the Pentagon's budget for fiscal 1986.

European Deployment Dangers

LD051115 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, 5 October TASS--The probability of chemical weapons being used has risen considerably, Soviet Academician Nikolay Zhavoronkov said in a TASS interview.

He said the appearance of binary weapons in the United States and plans to deploy them in Europe have marked the start of a new phase in the arms race.

The Soviet scientist gave several reasons why binary weapons have aroused special worry and apprehension around the world. Their production technology enables the aggressor to cover up his plans since the starting components can be made in the civilian chemical industry. One does not even need to conceal the stocks of these components and can partially use them, for instance for pest control or as a starting material in the chemical industry.

Since chemical weapons are relatively simple and cheap to manufacture, states harboring aggressive intentions could be tempted to produce them. Academician Zhavoronkov recalled in this connection that the Chilean junta has already started producing the Sarin nerve gas.

He said the United States has piled up enough chemical weapons to be able to kill all living on earth. Despite this overkill capability, the United States has embarked on a program for building up its arsenal of chemical weapons even further.

The Soviet scientist said he believes the movement for establishing zones free from chemical weapons is especially important nowadays. "If the United States deploys binary weapons in West Germany and other countries, Europe will become a binary gas chamber," he said. "But is it possible to prevent accidental gas leaks or explosions?"

CSO: 5200/1043

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

WARSAW PACT SEEN CAPABLE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS ATTACK

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 21 Aug 85 pp 1-2

[Article by Karl Feldmeyer]

/Text/Bonn, 20 Aug --The Soviet Army and the armies of the other members of the

Warsaw Pact are also armed and trained with chemical weapons to lead a widespread attack against the ground ~~forces~~ and air forces of NATO. The Soviet leadership would only consider a preemptive use of chemical weapons during an armed conflict if a significant part of the NATO armies could be eliminated in this way or if it would lead to the sudden collapse of the defenders. The prerequisites for conducting coordinated and simultaneous strikes against the most important land and air bases of NATO with chemical weapons as well, were created by the Warsaw Pact. Appropriate authorities of the Western Allies came to this evaluation through the analysis of their knowledge of the chemical armament of the Soviet Union and her allies. From an analysis of Soviet military doctrine, leadership and deployment instructions, as well as practical education and training of Soviet armed forces, one may recognize the will, according to the opinion of experts, to carry out a large-scale attack as well as an independent military single action of limited scope when the political and military leadership considers it useful and necessary and gives the order.

According to the experts, especially the equipment and conduct during training of the Soviet army indicate that it is (thoroughly prepared for deployment on terrain contaminated with chemical weapons.) Thus, since 1973 all military vehicles of the Warsaw Pact countries are equipped as standard equipment with an over-pressure installation and ventilation which protect the occupants from nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological contamination. The soldiers are trained in warfare with chemical weapons under warlike conditions. NATO is acquainted with at least 15 troop training grounds on which the action of chemical weapons is practiced. On two of these sites, live chemical ammunition is actually used. According to the observations by the West, the offensive action of chemical weapons during large-scale maneuvers against enemy airfields, headquarters, storage facilities and troop preparation sites was observed. According to observations by the West, the Soviet Union possesses over thirteen

manufacturing facilities for chemical weapons of which three are in production. They are supposed to be in Dzerzhinsk, Chibany, and Volgograd. Other facilities, according to Western sources, are in Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Rumania, and probably also in Hungary and Bulgaria. They are all supposed to be under Soviet control. The number of central depots for chemical weapons maintained within the Soviet Union is supposed to amount to about 10, of which three are located in the southeast and eastern part of the Soviet Union and the others in the western parts. In addition, it is assumed that in the advance front of the Soviet Union several depots exist holding nuclear and chemical weapons: there are about ten (depots) in East Germany, seven in Czechoslovakia and five in Hungary.

For the employment of these weapons, the Soviet forces have at their disposal a great number of mortars, howitzers, and airplanes, as well as the short-distance rockets "SCUD" and "FROG" and their successors, among them the SS-21 so that, if ordered, the air bases, anti-aircraft installations and depots located behind the front of NATO can be reached. One assumes in the West that the units specially armed for chemical warfare are under the command of the Ministry of Defense under the leadership of a Colonel General. The peacetime strength of these troops is estimated as more than 45,000 men.

Altogether, the Soviet armament of chemical weapons and munitions is considered to be far superior to that of the West, not only numerically but also qualitatively concerning the weapons. The supplies are estimated to amount to 300,000 to 600,000 tons while in NATO only the Americans possess limited supplies from the old production, because, as is known, the production of chemical weapons was unilaterally suspended in 1969. One considers it probable that the Soviet Union has available toxic substances, the composition and possible mode-of-action is unknown in the West. Confirmation of this suspicion has been obtained in Afghanistan where the Soviet Union introduced a weapon unknown to the West, which caused unconsciousness even with the greatest dilution. According to the opinion of Western experts, there are about 15,000 scientists engaged in the area of basic chemical research for the past 30 years, which is important for the development of chemical weapons. It is estimated that the advantage thus created puts them (Soviets) at least 10 years ahead of the West. This is especially cogent, one believes, with binary weapons and those weapons possessing different persistence. Altogether, the Soviets have a wide spectrum of chemical weapons, among them nerve gases like Tabun, Sarin, and Soman; anti-dermal materials like S-lewisite, N-lewisite, phosgenoxim, and arsenicals; antipulmonary materials like phosgene and chloropicrin, as well as psycho-chemical weapons and blood poisons like cyanogen chloride and hydrogen cyanide.

The threat of the Soviet chemical armament is also discussed in NATO internally but only in the military sphere. One attempts to avoid a discussion of this topic along political lines. This is especially true for the meetings of the defense ministers. Attempts by the American government to obtain a positive position from its allies as to their own intention to start up production again of chemical weapons as a minimal counter threat against the Soviet Union have failed because the European NATO partners, who themselves renounce chemical weapons, shy away even from taking a position.

In the FRG, the topic has received greater attention when after the return of the CDU/CSU coalition chairman Mr Dregger from Washington, he let it be known that Mr Weinberger, Secretary of Defense, had notified him that the U.S. government intended to withdraw the chemical weapons stored in Germany without replacing them, as soon as the binary weapons would be produced and stored in the United States. Weinberger let it be known that he has not made a definite promise along these lines. The SPD-Representative Horn, after talks in Washington, indicated that the Americans are no longer prepared to respond automatically with an atomic weapon in case of an attack by Soviet chemical weapons. The Americans would prefer much more to include chemical weapons as the fourth element in the previous triad consisting of conventional, tactical nuclear and strategic atomic weapons, because they wanted to raise the nuclear threshold and reduce the risk of their deployment in Europe.

So far, the German government has tried until now to avoid any discussion of the related problem. Its spokesman Ost has restricted himself to a statement that the German government would welcome as "optimal solution" the unilateral withdrawal of the chemical weapons by the Americans. Like the other NATO partners, the German government supports the demand of a total prohibition of production and storage of all chemical weapons. So far, a corresponding agreement has failed because the Soviet Union has refused to agree to necessary site control for clarification of the question of adherence to the treaty. The SPD and Socialist Unity Party (SED) of the GDR have worked together on a draft treaty and proposed to the governments that the goal was to create a zone in Central Europe, free of chemical weapons, that the principals would be the FRG and the GDR, and that it would contain regulations for the control of the adherence to the treaty. Continued open discussions about chemical weapons are expected by Bonn despite the unsatisfactory situation and the reluctance of the West German government to explain its own position about the suggestions made so far.

CSO: 5200/3083

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

U.S. BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS USE--Managua 30 September TASS--The Ministry of the Interior of Nicaragua and the country's medical experts are investigating the causes of an epidemic of dandy fever which afflicted a substantial part of the population of the republic and the rare disease, called Xantonoma, that affected cotton plantations in Nicaragua. This was disclosed by Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega. Speaking in the "Face the Nation" radio and television program, he said that both epidemics might be a result of the use of biological weapons by the United States in its undeclared war on the Nicaraguan people. Jaime Wheelock, minister of agricultural development of Nicaragua, said that he could not rule out the possibility that Xantonoma had been brought to the plantations for hostile purposes by means of contaminated imported chemicals that were used in cotton-growing. The minister stressed that owing to timely actions taken by Nicaraguan cotton-growers the damage caused by the epidemic to that crop was minimized. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 30 Sep 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1043

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON PLAN TO STORE NUCLEAR ARMS IN PUERTO RICO

LD182229 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 18 Sep 85

[Text] A UPI correspondent reports that the United States is intensively preparing to use Puerto Rico as one of the new centers for the storage of nuclear warheads. At the Roosevelt Roads Naval Base there, special depot facilities are being built for this purpose. Military personnel are stationed at the base who are trained to carry out tasks connected with nuclear weapons. I'll hand over to international affairs journalist Aleksandr Baryshev:

The actions of the Pentagon in Puerto Rico again demonstrate the absolute disrespect of the present U.S. administration for very important international documents, for they are grossly violating a treaty on the banning of nuclear weapons in Latin America.

Let us recall that this treaty--it was signed in Mexico, in the town of Tlatelolco back in 1967--consolidated the status of a non-nuclear zone in Latin America. One of its articles directly prohibits the deployment of nuclear armaments in Latin America. The document is supplemented by two protocols: the first places responsibility for the observance of the provisions of the Tlatelolco Treaty on the countries possessing territories in the zone, which concerned the United States in part; the second specifically obliged nuclear powers to observe the status of a nuclear-free zone. Let us note that this Protocol was signed by the United States.

Nevertheless, invoking reservations made by U.S. representatives, Washington even then failed to renounce the transportation of nuclear weapons through Latin American countries. And now in Puerto Rico, an island which has been effectively turned into an American colony, an unsinkable Pentagon aircraft-carrier, the American military has evidently decided to act without paying attention to any restrictions contained in international legal documents.

The use of the territory of Puerto Rico in the United States' dangerous military-strategic plans and United States' intention to turn the island into a depot housing the latest armaments--nuclear and other--show convincingly again that the draft resolution reaffirming the rights of the Puerto Rican people to self-determination and independence must be supported. It was proposed by the Cuban delegation at the August session of the UN Decolonization Committee.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the militarization of Puerto Rico is a threat today not only to Central America and the Caribbean Basin, but to the whole of Latin America. The United States intends to supplement the military bastion on the island with the military base on the Malvinas [Falklands] islands in the Atlantic which is being established jointly with Britain and a military space complex in the Pacific on Chile's Easter Island. And that means that the entire South American continent is being surrounded by a military-strategic triangle.

CSO: 5200/1043

31 October 1985

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: PROTESTS IN AUSTRALIA OVER U.S. SHIP CALLS

PM30929 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 1 Oct 85 p 3

[B. Kirvoshey commentary: "Dangerous Visitors"]

[Text] The Australian public is indignant and concerned at the impudent behavior of the U.S. servicemen who have been crowding into Australian ports recently. As the West Australian newspaper attests, almost 2,000 U.S. seamen from the assault helicopter carrier Okinawa, who are in the Australian city of Fremantle, have been behaving as if they owned the place, while the local population is expected simply to serve them.

The huge gray outlines of U.S. ships are now filling the waters not only of Fremantle but also of Geraldton and other ports on Australia's western seaboard and nimble tugs are guiding more and more "combat units" bearing the Stars and Stripes to their moorings.

According to Australian press reports the visit by the U.S. aircraft carrier group to the country's ports was accompanied by mighty protest demonstrations. Australian peace supporters stated that the inhabitants of the fifth continent do not approve the policy of their government, which follows Washington's lead. Josephine Valentine, a member of parliament, has stated that right now one U.S. Navy ship drops anchor off Australia's shores every 10 days and a large proportion of those ships have nuclear weapons on board. In its strategic plans Washington regards Australia as a huge pacific naval base.

The example set by neighboring New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange stated recently that the ban on U.S. nuclear-armed ships entering the country's ports will soon receive the status of a law even if such a move by his cabinet leads to a review of the ANZUS treaty on the military bloc consisting of Australia, the United States, and New Zealand.

The inhabitants of countries in the Pacific do not want to be Washington's nuclear hostages.

CSO: 5200/1043

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MORE ON NEW ZEALAND BAN ON NUCLEAR SHIP CALLS

Irritates' U.S.

LD281817 Moscow TASS in English 1623 GMT 28 Sep 85

[Text] Washington 28 September TASS--New Zealand's anti-nuclear policy and its government's intention legislatively to seal the ban on port calls of foreign nuclear-powered or nuclear-armed ships irritates the United States. This is evidenced by a press conference given here by a spokesman of the U.S. Department of State who resorted to threats to New Zealand in an obvious attempt to secure its renunciation of the chosen political course. The Washington administration's spokesman pointed out that if Wellington does not give up its course and if it adopts an appropriate anti-nuclear law, the USA will have to reconsider New Zealand's status as a U.S. ally for ANZUS. In so doing he admitted that New Zealand's ban on port calls of nuclear-armed ships has been to the detriment of cooperation with the United States and injurious to ANZUS effectiveness.

Quoting these pronouncements by the U.S. State Department spokesman, the UPI News Agency describes them as the U.S. toughest statement of late addressed to New Zealand. It is viewed here as Washington's reaction to the statement made by the head of the New Zealand Government David Lange in a speech in Christchurch yesterday in which he reaffirmed New Zealand's determination to ban nuclear weapons from its territory. If the anti-nuclear policy continued to be an irritant in the wider relationship between New Zealand and the United States because it could not be fitted into the ANZUS treaty, the treaty would have to go, David Lange said. He emphasized that deployment of nuclear weapons in New Zealand territory may cost the country too dearly. He said Wellington wanted good relations with the United States. But, he added, "we will not admit nuclear weapons as the price of a good relationship." As is seen from the U.S. State Department spokesman's statement, they in Washington, have different views on that score.

New Zealand Reaffirms Policy

LD021841 Moscow TASS in English 1108 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Text] Tokyo 2 October TASS--M. Wilson, chairman of New Zealand's ruling Labour Party, has confirmed the New Zealand Government's firm decision to bar,

in disregard of the U.S. pressure, U.S. warships armed with nuclear weapons from New Zealand ports. She attends the international anti-nuclear womens' conference, in session here. M. Wilson said that meeting the peaceful demands of the broad segments of the New Zealand public, the government makes, jointly with neighbouring states, vigorous efforts to set up a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific and works for the termination of nuclear weapons tests which put peace and security in peril.

CSO: 5200/1043

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW ON U.S. BATTLESHIP IOWA'S SCANDINAVIAN CRUISE

'Deliberate Provocation'

PM271345 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Kostikov report: "'Iowa' off the Swedish Coast"]

[Text] Stockholm, 26 September--The country's democratic public sees a crude political provocation in the fact that the nuclear-armed U.S. battleship "Iowa," due to take part in the U.S.-NATO war games in the Baltic in mid-October, has sailed through the Oresund Strait and Swedish territorial waters.

Such a demonstration of militarism, the newspaper NORRSKENSFLAMMAN notes in this connection, is nothing but a deliberate provocation against Sweden's policy of neutrality and nonparticipation in military alliance and blocs, against the demand by Nordic countries' peoples that Northern Europe be proclaimed a nuclear-free zone and that specific measures be taken to ease international tension. Never before has such a large warship sailed into the Baltic. The 58,000 ton "Iowa" carries 32 nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missiles. Thus the "cruising death" has made its first appearance off the coast of neutral Sweden and this, according to the newspaper, is only a prelude to full deployment of cruise missiles by the Pentagon on naval ships and aircraft off the Norwegian coast. [sentence as published]

Back in the late seventies Sweden imposed a ban on warships with nuclear weapons on board entering its territorial waters. In addition to this, any foreign warship intending to sail through Swedish territorial waters must ask permission from the country's appropriate authorities 3-4 weeks in advance. Furthermore, according to a Swedish Foreign Ministry spokesman, any such request must indicate not only the time and location of the ship's intended voyage but also all its basic specifications, including the presence and type of weapons. But no such request was filed regarding the battleship "Iowa." It was only at the last moment that the Americans tried to obtain permission for the "Iowa" to sail into the port of Stockholm, and it was categorically refused.

The battleship is on its way to Copenhagen.

Nuclear Capability Stressed

LD081619 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT 8 Oct 85

["Provocation in the Baltic"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 8 October TASS--TASS commentator Valeriy Vavilov writes:

"Baltops-85" is the code name of the big three-day NATO naval exercises that have started in the Baltic Sea. So it is now the Baltic that has become an arena for muscle-flexing exercises by Washington and its European allies--Denmark and West Germany: more than 30 combat ships of these states, aircraft and headquarters of NATO member countries are rehearsing joint actions in the period of "the initial stage of the third world war" which the NATO strategists perceive definitely as a nuclear-missile one. It is not by chance that the armada includes the American battleship "Iowa" with 32 "Tomahawk" cruise missiles and the cruiser "Ticonderoga", that also has a nuclear capability. The ships will have firing practice during the exercises.

The Pentagon's war games are of a clearly provocative nature. Their aim is also obvious--not only to practice "military interaction of individual detachments of allies navies" but also to intensify further the anti-Soviet hysteria and to try to divert the attention of broad peace initiatives directed at easing tension, disarmament, strengthening trust and developing international cooperation.

Neither can the NATO exercises do any good for the efforts of the representatives of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada at the Stockholm conference who are now discussing confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe and at which a contour is already beginning to appear of future accords that include a certain set of confidence-building measures in the military field--these safety fuses in the event of an erroneous interpretation of the actions of the other side in conditions of a deteriorating military confrontation.

The holding of exercises in direct proximity of the territory of the GDR, Poland and the Soviet Union and, more than that, with the participation of nuclear-capable ships is clearly designed to escalate tension and not to ease it.

One cannot but help noticing the "strange", to say the least, position taken by Norway and Denmark. Contrary to the traditional "atomic policy" that forbids the appearance of nuclear arms in these countries at times of peace the American nuclear-capable ships not only sailed through their territorial waters but also berthed in the Danish ports of Copenhagen and Orhus and in the capital of Norway--Oslo.

It is noteworthy that the Norwegian authorities simply turned a blind eye to the calls of these ships at Norwegian ports and called them a "routine matter". As to the Danish Defence Minister Engel, he decided to count on Washington's "gentlemanliness." According to him Washington "is well aware

of the Danish policy of keeping nuclear weapons out at times of peace and for this reason this Danish position will be respected by it."

Such statement cannot satisfy the Scandinavian public. The appearance of the NATO nuclear armada in the Baltic has further alarmed the peace champions, those who want the north of Europe to become a zone of peace. They state ever more loudly: The American ships with nuclear arms on board must go away. In the interests of peace and security the military and political provocations should be stopped and never repeated. They approve of the position of the Soviet Union which supports the idea of turning the north of Europe into a nuclear-free zone and has voiced readiness to take part in the appropriate guarantees.

CSO: 5200/1043

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

FINNISH COLUMNIST: FORM NORDIC ZONE WITHOUT POWERS' GUARANTEE

Helsinki UUSI SUOMI in Finnish 11 Sep 85 p 2

[Commentary by Martti Haikio: "Guarantees and Distancing"]

[Text] Finnish foreign policy has two ambitious goals. We wish to realize a Nordic nuclear-free zone. At the same time we wish to decrease the part the superpowers would play in Nordic affairs or "distance" the superpowers from the North.

Both goals basically aim at the same result: the increase of Finland's own security. Finland has the opinion that the presence of one superpower is in itself sufficient to attract the opposing side to the area. The superpowers have a tendency to respond to power with power, to the spreading of the other's sphere of influence by increasing its own efficiency. No other role remains for the small nations than acting as an arena of conflict.

Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen repeated Finland's established stand at the Geneva nuclear ban treaty inspection conference. According to it, Finland wants superpower guarantees for a Nordic nuclear-free-zone.

Assistant Secretary Klaus Tornudd of the Foreign Ministry has, in his book "Sanat ja Teot" (Words and Deeds), enumerated what kinds of guarantee this might include.

--They (the superpowers) will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any target within the zone.

--They will not place, store or transport nuclear weapons in the zone.

--They will not transport nuclear weapons through the zone, except possibly according to special rules on ships through the Baltic sea straits.

--They will not give any of the states within the zone aid in acquiring or manufacturing nuclear weapons.

Professor Allan Rosas and HELSINGIN SANOMAT, however, have noted that demanding guarantees in advance from the superpowers could make the achievement of the entire zone more unrealistic. The new Oceanic zone, where no superpower guarantees exist, but where the zone was created by

the common announcement of the countries in question, was mentioned as an example.

In addition it could be said that the superpower guarantee make the superpowers partners in the agreement, which undoubtedly also gives them rights to interfere with the regulation of the area involved. It is unlikely that the superpowers would agree to any unilateral guarantee that would restrict only their own activities.

The joint announcement of all the Nordic countries ratifying and respecting the present Nordic lack of nuclear weapons could be the first step. This would be supplemented by legislation on the national level such as Finland has in the works in the form of nuclear energy legislation.

If the superpowers, in addition, would give their unilateral guarantees to respect the area's nuclear-free position, then we are as close to accomplishing a nuclear-free-zone as we could realistically expect.

12989

CSO: 5200/2503