


R 150032

JPRS-TAC-86-031

9 APRIL 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

19981103 107

97
A45

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.

9 April 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. Spokesmen Inconsistent in SDI Statements (Moscow TASS, 12 Mar 86)	1
TASS Cites U.S. Papers Detailing SDI Contracts (Moscow TASS, 18 Mar 86)	3
PRAVDA on 'Insanity' of U.S. ASAT Test Plan (G. Vasilyev; Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Mar 86)	4
USSR Examines NATO Nuclear Planning Group Meeting in FRG (Various sources, various dates)	5
Weinberger's Intentions Criticized, by Aleksandr Zholkver	5
Tone 'Set by Weinberger' by Eduard Mnatsakanov	6
Star Wars 'Main Subject'	6
U.S. 'Prodding Allies'	7
Weinberger 'Pressuring' Allies, by Vladislav Drobkov	7
U.S. Refuses Testing Halt	8
U.S. Applying 'Crude Pressure'	9
Group Communique Criticized	10
USSR: UK, FRG Reportedly Upset by U.S. Pressure on SDI (Various sources, 19, 20 Mar 86)	12
'Open Expressions of Dissatisfaction', by V. Drobkov	12
Kohl Yields To Pressure	13
UK 'Blindly Following' U.S., by Viktor Levin	13
USSR Criticizes FRG on Planned SDI Involvement (Moscow PRAVDA, 21 Mar 86; Hamburg DPA, 19 Mar 86)	15
Kohl-Weinberger Meeting, by Yuliy Yakhontov	15
USSR Envoy Comments on Bonn Talks	16

USSR: U.S. Tries To Involve Canada in SDI Through Norad (Moscow TASS, 19, 25 Mar 86)	17
'Hegemonistic Designs'	17
'Trojan Horse'	18
Briefs	
U.S. To Renounce ABM Treaty	20
U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
USSR Reports Arms Talks Meetings (Various sources, various dates)	21
INF 23 January	21
INF 30 January	21
INF 6 February	21
INF 13 February	21
INF 20 February	21
INF 27 February	22
Space Arms 21 January	22
Space Arms 4 February	22
Space Arms 11 February	22
Space Arms 18 February	22
Space Arms 25 February	22
Strategic Arms 22 January	23
Strategic Arms 29 January	23
Strategic Arms 5 February	23
Strategic Arms 12 February	23
Strategic Arms 19 February	23
Strategic Arms 26 February	23
Plenary Meeting 14 February	24
FRG Paper Applauds Reagan Response to Gorbachev Proposal (Thomas Kielinger; Bonn RHEINISCHER MERKUR/CHRIST UND WELT, 1 Mar 86)	25
Continued Superpower Status Seen as Top Priority for USSR (C. Graff Brockdorff; Bonn DIE WELT, 5 Mar 86)	28
PRC Journal Views New Gorbachev Arms Proposal (Li Qinzhen; Hong Kong LIAOWANG OVERSEAS EDITION, No 6-7, 10 Feb 86)	31
PRC Notes Conclusion of Geneva Fourth Round (Beijing XINHUA, 4 Mar 86)	35

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

XINHUA Analysis of West European Fear of Nuclear Accord (Beijing XINHUA, 5 Mar 86)	36
---	----

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Briefs	
Soviet, U.S. Discuss CW	38
Plans for CW Arsenals	38

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: U.S. Disarmament Envoy Repeats 'Trite' Arguments (Moscow TASS International Service, 11 Feb 86)	39
TASS Cites U.S. Disarmament Delegate's Address (Moscow TASS, 20 Mar 86)	40
PRAVDA Views East Bloc MBFR Draft, Western Stance (B. Dubrovin; Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Mar 86)	41
IZVESTIYA: 'Serious Questions' Remain After CDE Session (A. Sychev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 20 Mar 86)	43

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR's Kompletkov Affirms Acceptance of On-Site Verification (Moscow TASS, 14 Mar 86)	45
Soviet Reaction to U.S. Nuclear Test Blast in Nevada (Various sources, various dates)	46
PRAVDA Correspondent's Report	46
'Growing Avalanche of Mass Condemnation', by Tomas Kolesnichenko	48
'Reminiscent of Hiroshima', by A. Palladin	49
U.S. 'Wearing Blinders', by Vladimir Pasko	50
Viewed as Response to Ban Call, by Vladimir Pasko	50
'Designed to Poison' Relations, by Vitaliy Sobolev	51
Reaction in U.S. Cited	52
Blast Termed 'Very Serious' Action, by Nikolay Shishlin	53
'Political Shockwaves in Washington', by V. Gan	54
'Indignation and Protests in U.S.', by G. Vasilyev	55
Public Opinion Viewed, by Aleksandr Zholkver	55
Reaction in U.S. Cited, by Sergey Fedorov	56
TANJUG Sees Summit Postponement	57
Geneva Delegates Condemnation	58
Security Committee Statement	59
U.S. 'Indignation' Reported, by Vladimir Gerasichev	60

USSR's Petrovskiy Hails 'Delhi Six' Stand on Arms Tests (Moscow TASS, 14 Mar 86)	61
Delhi Six Response Read at Disarmament Conference (Moscow TASS, 18 Mar 86)	62
Moscow: Ending of Nuclear Tests Now Depends on U.S. (Moscow World Service, 14 Mar 86)	63
Moscow: Reagan, 'Case' for Rejecting Nuclear Test Ban 'Weak' (Moscow in English to North America, 14 Mar 86)	64
Moscow TV: U.S. Makes 'Hollow Excuses' To Continue Tests (Tomas Kolesnichenko; Moscow Television Service, 16 Mar 86) ..	65
Supreme Soviet Appeals to Congress on Nuclear Tests (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 20 Mar 86)	67
USSR: U.S. 'Stubbornly' Refuses To Match Test Ban (Aleksandr Zholkver; Moscow Domestic Service, 20 Mar 86) ..	69
Norwegian Paper on Latest USSR 'Signal' Promoting Zone (Editorial; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 21 Feb 86)	71
ERRATUM: Soviet Journal Lauds Declaration of South Pacific Zone (V. Amirov, Yu. Belokon; Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 12, Dec 85)	73
RELATED ISSUES	
Series of Soviet Pamphlets on Disarmament Published (T. Gushchina; Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI, No 5, Sep-Oct 85)	85
Zhao Ziyang Discusses PRC Position on Disarmament in Speech (Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 12, 24 Mar 86)	90

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. SPOKESMEN INCONSISTENT IN SDI STATEMENTS

LD121359 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 12 Mar 86

[Text] Washington, 12 Mar (TASS)--TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reports:

White House spokesman Larry Speakes said he did not know what the strategic defense system eventually would be, nuclear or not.

However, just the day before Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger had reiterated anew that research was being carried out under the "star wars" program into the use of nuclear energy in future partially space-based ABM systems. It is common knowledge that by stubbornly refusing to join the unilateral moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on nuclear explosions, the United States hopes to retain a free hand strenuously to go ahead with the development of a "star wars" system.

According to the American press, the point in case [as received] is the development of nuclear-pumped radiation weapons. Research in that area has been conducted for quite some time in the Livermore Laboratory under Edward Edward Teller, "the father of the hydrogen bomb" and one of the more strident champions of the "star wars" program.

What Washington thinks the "star wars" system will be like is not an idle question. Reagan personally has stated on more than one occasion that SDI is aimed exclusively at completely putting an end to nuclear weapons, which presumably makes SDI "morally justifiable." The purpose of the United States, the White House chief has announced, is to eliminate nuclear weapons.

In reality the United States is actually developing a qualitatively new type of nuclear weapons. Moreover, Washington obviously is not going to renounce those nuclear weapons which the USA possesses already today and which it will add to its arsenals under its program for the "nuclear modernization" of America. Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle said the other day that it is so far unrealistic to hope for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

What then are we to do with the commitment assumed by the United States as it signed a joint statement at the Soviet-American meeting at the foreign ministers' level in Geneva in January 1985? The document stressed that "ultimately the forthcoming negotiations (on nuclear and space weapons) just as efforts in general to limit and reduce arms, should lead to the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere."

This statement does not tally with what administration spokesmen, such as Weinberger and Perle, have been saying recently. Speakes did not come up with a sensible answer either.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1301

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS CITES U.S. PAPERS DETAILING SDI CONTRACTS

LD181847 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 18 Mar 86

[Text] San Francisco March 18 TASS -- The MERCURY NEWS newspaper reported that the Lockheed Corporation had secured a contract to the sum of 30 million dollars to develop guidance systems for offensive armaments in the framework of the star wars programme.

There are also plans for the production of laser units that could be used against targets in space and on the ground. According to the newspaper, the units will be tested during new flights under the "space shuttle" programme.

According to the information of the AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY journal, the Pentagon intends to conclude in the current year over 500 contracts for the development and creation of different components of space arms under the star wars programme. Another 150 orders are to be placed among medium and small corporations of the military-industrial complex in 1987. The Pentagon intends to spend on these contracts 17 billion dollars by 1989.

But this is just the visible tip of the "iceberg" of the appropriations for star wars preparation. TIME magazine notes, specifically, that the number of top secret programmes of the Pentagon is rapidly increasing. Not even congressmen are informed about the content and purpose of those programmes, when they vote on military appropriations. The volume of funds allocated for such programmes increased almost ten-fold in the past six years and will reach 8.6 billion dollars in the next fiscal year.

American observers note that alongside programmes of the so-called modernisation of nuclear potential the present U.S. Administration pays much attention to work to create a large-scale ABM system with space-basing elements. As the ASSOCIATED PRESS reported, this policy is sealed in a special directive of Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger of December 31, 1985, on the build up of the U.S. forces in 1988-1993. It is said in the directive that the Pentagon attaches the same priority importance to the star wars preparation as to the programmes of the build up of the United States strategic nuclear potential.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1301

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA ON 'INSANITY' OF U.S. ASAT TEST PLAN

PM191123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[G. Vasilyev article: "Aiming...At the Stars"]

[Text] New York 17 Mar -- To what subterfuge will the Pentagon not resort in its maniacal desire to turn space into a battlefield of the future! Last year the U.S. Congress passed a resolution banning the testing of American antisatellite weapons for as long as the Soviet Union observed its declared moratorium on such tests. It would seem that a ban is a ban. But this has not been the case here. Cunning people in C. Weinberger's department are seeking detours so as to continue tests already begun in the United States.

Since the Congress decision declares a ban on the launching of missiles aimed at targets in space, Pentagon "experimenters" have chosen themselves another "worthy target." As THE NEW YORK TIMES recently reported, the U.S. Air Force has decided to shoot at the stars. As the antisatellite missiles fired from F-15 fighters have a self-guiding device and stars have infrared radiation, these distant luminaries suit those in the Pentagon perfectly. It is planned to shoot at the stars twice in the coming months. It is proposed to spend more than \$330 million on the program to develop, create, and test anti-satellite weapons in 1988.

Among Americans concerned with the future of our planet there is no doubt that launching missiles aimed at the stars is the same as testing antisatellite weapons when missiles are fired at target in the atmosphere or in space.

"Errant caravans in an expanse of cast incandescent bodies," as a poet once said. From time immemorial the distant stars glimmering out of the depths of the universe have stirred people, inspired writers and visionaries, and engendered in man the desire to break loose into the expanse of space. For the Pentagon, however, a star is just another suitable target for a missile. There is something symbolic in this characterizing the insanity of militarists.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1301

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR EXAMINES NATO NUCLEAR PLANNING GROUP MEETING IN FRG

Weinberger's Intentions Criticized

LD192127 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Mar 86

[Commentary by station political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Talks were held today between Pentagon chief Weinberger and FRG Chancellor Kohl at one of NATO's military bases in West Germany. Here is our latest commentary by our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

The officially announced subject of today's talks is preparations for the regular meeting of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group, which starts tomorrow here in the FRG. Moreover, the West German press notes that attention at the meeting was focused on the question of involving the FRG in the U.S. plans for "star wars." I should like to remind you that negotiations between Washington and Bonn on the question have been going on for a long time. Several West German expert delegations have already crossed the ocean, and another one sets out next Monday, headed this time by Minister of Economic Affairs Bangemann. The FRG has often been visited by U.S. General Abrahamson, who runs the department that is developing space weapons. Nevertheless, despite Chancellor Kohl's readiness in principle, announced long ago, to conclude the relevant agreement with the United States, serious complications have arisen in preparing it, as West German newspapers themselves admit.

The whole point is that while striving to make use of the FRG's industrial and scientific potential for its own purposes, Washington has not the slightest intention of sharing with its West German ally either advanced technology or more of the profits on the production of space weapons. As the SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG put it, Kohl intended only to stretch out a finger, but the United States is unceremoniously preparing to chop off the whole hand.

Notice that Washington deals in the same way with its other allies as well. One of Gen Abrahamson's advisers was even thrown out of Britain recently because of his absolutely avid interest in the latest British technology. As far as one can judge from an article in THE OBSERVER, a British newspaper, the Japanese too are worried that the United States will make use of the latest Japanese technological research but will give nothing in return.

Such are the morals of the champions of "star wars;" our country adopts a totally different position in space affairs. This was emphasized again during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with scientists and specialists taking part in the Venus-Halleys Comet project. That flight is not only a brilliant achievement of Soviet science and technology but also a convincing example of fruitful international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space.

I would also add the launching of our new space station with the symbolic name "Mir." All this vividly asserts the peace-loving nature of our country's policies, as endorsed at the 27th CPSU Congress.

Tone 'Set by Weinberger'

LD191910 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 19 Mar 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] The situation that is forming on the European Continent is far from simple. This is also shown by the current trip by U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, to several Western Europe countries.

His talks in London with Younger, Great Britain's secretary of defense, have just ended. In fact they discussed the coordination of Washington and London in their efforts to block any progress in the field of arms control and step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons.

Today, Weinberger arrived in Bonn, where he immediately had a meeting with Chancellor Kohl of the FRG. Tomorrow in Wuerzburg, in West Germany, the spring session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group opens. The tone of the session will be set by Weinberger. Everyone thinks that the Pentagon chief will try to tie the West European NATO countries even closer to the "star wars" program.

Star Wars 'Main Subject'

LD201122 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Wuerzburg March 20 TASS -- The U.S. "star wars" program and a further drawing into its implementation of U.S. partners by the North Atlantic bloc is the main subject of the spring session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group on the level of defense ministers which opened today in Wuerzburg, West Germany. It is held in conditions of strict secrecy.

Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, and General James Abrahamson, director of the U.S. SDI program, came to attend the session in order to bring pressure to bear on the allies with the aim to further draw them into the implementation of their militaristic designs. Political observers believe that it is for this purpose that the Washington emissaries will try to discredit the Soviet program of the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons in the world and to explain their stubborn unwillingness to join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions declared unilaterally by the Soviet Union.

U.S. 'Prodding Allies'

LD202234 Moscow TASS in English 1801 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Wuerzburg March 20 TASS -- TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Sergey Sosnovskiy report: The NATO Nuclear Planning Group opened its spring session in Wuerzburg, West Germany, today. Chaired by NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington, it is being attended by the defense ministers of the bloc's member countries. Greece, Spain and Turkey sent their permanent representatives at the NATO headquarters to the meeting.

The venue of the session, which is being held amid strict secrecy, is sealed off from the outside world by heavy police details and Federal Border Guard Patrols. Commentators take the view that the principal aim of Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger and General James Abrahamson, director of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" organization who also arrived here, will be to draw the allies even deeper into Washington's militarist plans, in particular the ominous "star wars" program.

West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner said in an interview with the local paper MAIN POST that SDI-related issues will be among the main themes of discussions at the session.

Observers believe that Washington's envoys are also going to exert quite an effort to try to discredit the far-reaching blueprint for disarmament, including a plan to eliminate nuclear weapons step by step by the year 2000, which has been proposed by the Soviet Union and won broad international support. The United States will also be prodding the allies into continuing the nuclear arms buildup in Europe.

weinberger and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl held talks on the eve of the session and are reported by today's press to have agreed in principle about signing an agreement on West German firms' participation in the SDI.

The NATO policy of stepping up military preparations, a course the current meeting in Wuerzburg is called upon to fix even more firmly, is a source of mounting public anxiety and has drawn protests from West German peace forces. The Bavarian branch of the Association of Persons Victimized Under Nazism -- the Union of Anti-Fascists issued a statement urging the government to renounce any involvement in the SDI. "We demand that the Federal Republic of Germany should not sail subserviently in the wake of the U.S. strategy of a first nuclear strike and 'star wars'. A war threat must never again be flowing from German soil," the statement said.

Weinberger 'Pressuring' Allies

PM201035 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov article: "Pressure on the Allies"]

[Text] Pentagon chief C. Weinberger has departed the United States for Western Europe. The very office held by the visitor and his political positions leave no doubt that his trip is connected with a U.S. intention of overtly pressuring the NATO allies.

The visit is timed for the NATO Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) meeting in the FRG, planned for 20-21 March. Sessions of this group precede sessions of the North Atlantic bloc's military and political organs. They seem to be becoming the first lap in the NATO relay, on which the tone is set for the whole "race." So the concern shown by the Pentagon, which is striving to influence its West European allies to prevent the slightest deviation from their orientation toward Washington on fundamental issues of war and peace, is no accident.

But Washington sees a threat of deviation in the fact that the constructive Soviet peace initiatives, approved by the 27th CPSU Congress, have forced many in the West to stop and think whether it is not better for mankind to cast off its deadly-dangerous burden of nuclear arsenals on the threshold of the next century. NATO's missile worshippers are even more alarmed by the fact that the USSR has proposed a specific, totally realistic plan to realize mankind's dream of lasting peace.

Washington, as is well known, has avoided giving a constructive response to the Soviet proposals. The American Administration has preferred to submerge the essence of the matter in various conditions and "linkages" blocking the way to a solution of the problem. In addition to this, a massive propaganda campaign has been launched with the aim of persuading mankind that it will supposedly never be able to do without nuclear weapons. Consequently, it is said, the United States cannot (Weinberger himself speaks openly on this) give up its nuclear weapon tests and intends to continue nuclear explosions. This stance embarrasses many of the U.S. NATO allies. Weinberger's task, observers believe, is to "dispel their alarm," that is, simply twist their arms.

Now, on the eve of the spring sessions of leading NATO organs, Washington is striving at all costs to secure a negative reaction from the North Atlantic bloc to any proposals capable of leading to restraint in the arms race or to arms reduction. The possibility cannot be ruled out that this time too pressure of this kind, backed up by the transatlantic emissary's visit, will force the NPG to vote once again in favor of increasing NATO's nuclear arsenal. But it is also clear that the West's stubborn reluctance to heed the voice of reason once again reveals to the peoples the dangerous actions of those forces which are trying to perpetuate the nuclear threat hanging over mankind.

U.S. Refuses Testing Halt

LD201924 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, 20 Mar (TASS)--By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev: Washington is going to respond to the appeal of the leaders of six countries, which asked the Soviet Union and the United States to refrain from all nuclear tests till the next summit meeting, with a nuclear blast this April.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, who arrived in West Germany to attend another meeting of NATO's nuclear planning group, said to British television: "As long as we have to rely on nuclear weapons, they will have to be tested."

So, the U.S. Administration solemnly assures world public opinion that it is sincerely striving to render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete", but sees no better way to do that than by modernizing these weapons and augmenting their destructive power by means of nuclear testing.

A sophism? Undoubtedly. Nonsense? No, much worse. This is an unconcealed challenge to all mankind, disregard for the vital interests of the people for whom the Pentagon chief made his "explanations" and a mockery of their common sense.

It follows from the interview of Mr Weinberger, that the American delegation that arrived to attend the current meeting of NATO defense ministers in Wuerzburg is determined to stop short any possible talk about the United States joining the Soviet Union-announced moratorium on all nuclear blasts.

The American organizers of the meeting in Wuerzburg told newsmen that the session of the Nuclear Planning Group would discuss "disarmament issues." One can imagine what the Pentagon has in mind when it says "disarmament," considering the fact that the "prevention" of an arms race in space, Washington style, is a planned deployment of thousands of units of strike weapons, including nuclear system, in the near-earth space.

For many years now the leaders of West European countries who have to reckon with public opinion at home have been timidly trying to put in the communiqués issued at the end of the NATO gatherings their "special opinion" concerning the need of arms reduction by means of negotiations. Another such attempt will possibly be made at the Wuerzburg session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group. However, it has become a rule for Washington to brush off even the most modest wishes of its allies as regards the problems of war and peace.

There is every reason to believe that the current NATO defense ministers meeting will be no exclusion in this respect.

U.S. Applying 'Crude Pressure'

LD212051 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1031 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] Wuerzburg, 21 Mar (TASS) -- Washington's emissaries are resorting to putting crude pressure on their North Atlantic bloc partners at the spring NATO Nuclear Planning Group session in Wuerzburg (FRG). The United States is attempting to drag the Western Europe countries more firmly towards the implementation of the "star wars" program, regarded by the international public as the most dangerous adventure in the cause of peace.

It is characteristic that American General J. Abrahamson, director of the organization for the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative", who has no relation at all to the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, has been given the floor for the propaganda of Washington's plans for militarization of space. The general did not hide the fact that work on creation of the latest weapons systems for utilization in space is already being carried out in the United States. According to Gen Abrahamson, "considerable progress has been achieved primarily in the sphere of development of powerful lasers and new infrared systems". While advertising SDI, Abrahamson has not refrained from anti-Soviet insinuations either, having resorted to the standard claims about "military threat from the East".

The representatives of the United States and England have yet again confirmed that their governments will under no circumstances halt nuclear tests. R. Wagner, assistant to the secretary of defense on nuclear issues, and G. Younger, secretary of defense of Great Britain, have in unison stood up for continuation of underground nuclear explosions, having thus ignored the wide wave of protests both in the United States and in England against the militaristic policy of their governments.

W. Altenburg, Bundeswehr inspector general, has taken up a loyal position in relation to the adventurous course of Washington at the session. Counting on generous orders for the FRG military and industrial complex, he gave full support to the U.S. "star wars" plan.

A report saying the Spanish Government has decided to become a full member of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group has been spread here. Up to now, Spain had observer status.

London 21 Mar (TASS) -- In commenting on the session proceedings in Wuerzburg, FINANCIAL TIMES points out that the United States is calling upon any interested firms to participate in the SDI program, regardless of whether or not there is an accord covering this topic with the corresponding governments. "It is obvious" emphasizes the paper -- that the former anxieties of Western Europe concerning possible consequences of siting of the antimissiles space systems are being preserved.

Group Communique Criticized

LD211853 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] Wuerzburg March 21 TASS -- TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Sergey Sosnovskiy report: The NATO Nuclear Planning Group ended its spring session, which was held at the level of defense ministers, in Wuerzburg, West Germany, today after adopting a final communique which expressed full support for Washington's militarist policy of fuelling the nuclear arms race. Significantly, the communique passed over in complete silence the Soviet Union's major peace initiatives set forth in the January 15 statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. This was certainly a result of pressure which was exerted on Washington's NATO partners here by Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger and James Abrahamson, the man in charge of the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" project.

TI took advantage of the session to try to discredit the Soviet program for abolishing nuclear weapons stage by stage by the year 2000.

The U.S. defense secretary and his West German opposite number Manfred Woerner, the latter clearly taking his cue from the former, made utterly groundless charges of Soviet "violations" of both the SALT-2 Treaty and the ABM agreement. They floated those deliberate lies in a bid to justify the ominous U.S. "star wars" program and its West German-invented supplement, the notorious "European Defense Initiative". It followed from statements by the U.S. and West German defense secretaries at the final news conference that the United States does not at all intend to renounce the idea of militarizing space and is, on the contrary, going to extend the sphere of responsibility of its space arms to cover Western Europe. Woerner endeavored to present the dangerous plan as "meeting the interests of Western Europe".

The final communique, a product of the Pentagon's dictation, voiced support for the U.S. obstructionist stand at arms control talks and rehashed the same old allegations about "a Soviet military threat" and "a Western lag" in nuclear and conventional arms. It fully ignored the exceptionally important initiative of the USSR which has urged the United States to join its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts. Moreover, Weinberger said, when answering newsmen's questions, that his country would continue nuclear testing.

The attendees at the session also expressed content with the "progress" made in converting Western Europe into a launching site for new U.S. first-strike nuclear missile systems. They called for continuing to replace obsolete nuclear warheads with new ones, an operation they claimed was a "peace-making" effort. Commentators saw a sign of persisting disagreements inside the North Atlantic bloc in the fact that the representatives of Greece and Denmark at the session stuck to their own opinions on a number of issues discussed. The latter country, for example, reiterated its reservations about the NATO "dual-track" decision of 1979.

The results of the Wuerzburg meeting of the NATO countries' defense ministers indicate that the military-political bloc is reluctant to display a responsible approach to ensuring peace and security and so is missing the most favorable chances offered by the constructive Soviet blueprint for delivering mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1301

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: UK, FRG REPORTEDLY UPSET BY U.S. PRESSURE ON SDI

'Open Expressions of Dissatisfaction'

PM191532 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Drobkov "Rejoinder": "Stew With SDI Sauce"]

[Text] Strange events are happening in the upper echelons across the ocean! To start with, Washington's allies were collectively shocked by the Pentagon's demand in the form of an ultimatum that they join the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative." Later on, mesmerized by promises of profits in the billions and "sharing of advanced technology" they, admittedly not so collectively, still fell for the bait of orders for space weapons. Now some West Europeans are complaining increasingly loudly that the transatlantic "clients'" embrace is becoming painfully tight. Matters have reached a point of open expressions of dissatisfaction, even by the allies who were most obliging in the past.

For example, a Pentagon delegation for SDI affairs was urgently recalled almost before it had arrived in Britain. The reason for this was the sharp indignation against the uncerecermonious Yankees, who crudely attempted to dictate their own terms to British firms.

What was at issue was no more and no less than total U.S. control over any research work, and even over the actual British scientists involved with SDI. Addording to London's THE GUARDIAN, these plans by Washington "could lead to a new political scandal in connection with the extraterritorial application of domestic U.S. laws." Prior to their arrival in Britain, the Pentagon's emissaries encountered the very same hostile reception in a number of other allied countries.

No sooner had the passions aroused by this story cooled down when the alarm was sounded by FRG concerns. It appeared that the West German monopolies, which were just about to divide the spoils of SDI orders, are in jeopardy not only of being overtaken by pushy American competitors, but also of finding themselves in slave-like dependence on the Petnagon. The newspaper WESTDEUTSCHE ALLEGMEINE complains that the Americans intend to prohibit their future partners from utilizing even the results of research work "which is not directly connected with SDI."

According to the FRG press, U.S. ambitions can be explained by the haste with which the West German chancellor promised to sign the agreement on SDI with Washington "even before the Easter holidays." The SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG writes that the Americans are already exploiting this haste to the utmost for their own purposes. "Despite the fact that Kohl only intended to offer one finger, they intend to unceremoniously grab the whole hand," the newspaper concludes. There you have it, a completely accurate description of the Pentagon's appetites. How can one not recall the story about the rabbit which was inordinately flattered by an invitation to dine at the bear's. Arriving at the set hour, the poor guy discovered that he would indeed share the host's table, but in the form of rabbit stew...

Kohl Yields To Pressure

LD202102 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Bonn March 20 TASS -- West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, yielding to U.S. pressure, has actually consented to his country's participation in Washington's plans to prepare for "star wars." That is the way local political observers regard the results of the Wednesday talks between the head of the Bonn cabinet and U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger in Grafenwoehr (Rheinland-Pfalz).

The two sides have reportedly come to terms concerning the conclusion of agreements between the FRG and the USA on the participation of West German firms in SDI research work and on general technological exchanges. Helmut Kohl announced during a press conference that relevant agreements will be signed next week by West German Minister of Economics Martin Bangemann during his visit to Washington.

The head of the Bonn government took this step despite protests from the public and members of political parties, including those belonging to the ruling coalition. Helmut Schaefer, leading foreign policy expert in the Free Democratic Party group in the Bundestag, said that talks with the USA concerning West Germany's participation in the SDI may undermine the Bonn cabinet's prestige in the foreign policy field. He said that in his opinion the Federal Republic should not seek a military agreement with the USA. Olaf Feldmann, also a member of the Free Democratic Party group in the Bundestag, criticised Bonn's undue haste in the matter of the FRG's participation in the "star wars" programme.

UK 'Blindly Following' U.S.

LD201136 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] British Foreign Secretary Howe, speaking in London before foreign journalists, has called the Soviet peace proposals propaganda. Here is a Mayak commentary by Viktor Levin:

From the mouths of stiff-lipped British gentlemen, the word propaganda sounds like bad language. Everything that fails to gratify their tender ears and grates on their refined taste is described as propaganda. Having slapped this label on something,

they think there is nothing more to say on the matter. However, the matter concerns an issue of paramount importance; moreover, it must be stressed, of importance both for Britain and for mankind as a whole. The Soviet Union proposes complete elimination of all nuclear weapons in the next 15 years. Our proposals are specific and realistic. Besides, we are not only putting forward an idea which the international public has greeted with enthusiasm, but we are also taking a real step on the way to its implementation. This step is the unilateral introduction by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. We first established this moratorium from 6 August to the end of 1985, then extended it to 31 March. Then last week, in reply to the leaders of the six states, Comrade Gorbachev stated our willingness not to carry out nuclear tests after 31 March, too, until the first nuclear explosion in the United States. Each time, when announcing our decision, we have called on the United States to follow our example and at the same time begin working on a treaty on the complete halting of nuclear testing.

What is to say, we are providing an example of the first step being carried out on the way to the full elimination of nuclear weapons. However, however, disparagingly terms these real and highly important actions propaganda. It is known that in those cases where a diplomat is unable to say anything to the point, he tries to move conversation onto a different plane. The British foreign secretary is unable to speak about the Soviet peace initiatives objectively. The government of which he is part is blindly following Washington's course. I would like to recall the words of the foreign minister of another country, also belonging to NATO, which incidentally also very zealously follows Washington: It would be very sad if the Soviet proposals were called propaganda. Genscher, head of the FRG Foreign Ministry said that.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1301

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR CRITICIZES FRG ON PLANNED SDI INVOLVEMENT

Kohl-Weinberger Meeting

LD211429 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Yuliy Yakhontov "Commentator's Column": "Bonn-Washington Compact"]

[Text] Bonn -- The United States and the FRG have reached agreement on the terms for Bonn's involvement in the U.S. "star wars" plans, which are officially called the "Strategic Defense Initiative." As commentators here emphasize, this agreement was reached with striking speed at Federal Chancellor H. Kohl's meeting with U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, who came to the FRG.

According to the official version, this meeting was meant to eliminate the differences that supposedly exist over cooperation within the SDI framework. However, these "differences," which had been on the point of threatening to quite wreck an agreement between Bonn and Washington, suddenly were easily settled. Next week FRG Economics Minister M. Bangemann will set out for the U.S. capital, where two documents are to be signed -- on the terms for West German firms to participate in SDI and a general agreement on technological exchange.

The Kohl-Weinberger accord has elicited undisguised enthusiasm from FRG right-wing circles and representatives of the military-industrial complex. Both have repeatedly voiced dissatisfaction with the delay over signing an official agreement on involvement in SDI. It is very significant in this connection that both H. Kohl and C. Weinberger refused to inform journalists of the details of the talks. Such deliberate secrecy strengthened the FRG progressive public's long-standing suspicions that the version relating to "differences" was deliberately blown up by Bonn with a view to demonstrating its "independence" and "circumspection" in approaching a problem which is of concern to the majority of the country's population.

Representatives of the opposition parties and even some politicians in the ruling coalition's camp still believe that the FRG must not subscribe to SDI. It is also clear that "star wars" will not benefit the civilian sectors of industry here. In addition, as K. Voigt, a prominent Social Democratic Party of Germany figure, pointed out, the damage which could result from shifting the arms race into space will not be covered by any "industrial" gains. And former Federal Chancellor H. Schmidt declared that with the help of the "star wars" plans the United States wants to totally change its military-strategic doctrine and undermine the ABM Treaty with the USSR. He urged Western Europe governments to remind President Reagan that he is not their "political supreme commander in chief."

However, the fact remains that Bonn has once again demonstrated who really leads the Western Europe allies. It has also been confirmed once again that the FRG remains one of the most obedient champions of Washington's militarist course among the NATO partners. This policy only undermines the foundations of European security and runs counter to the fundamental interests of our continent's peoples.

USSR Envoy Comments on Bonn Talks

LD191320 Hamburg DPA in German 1215 GMT 19 Mar 86

[Text] Bonn, 19 Mar (DPA) -- The Soviet Embassy in Bonn on Wednesday joined the discussion on the planned SDI agreement between the Federal Republic and the United States with a statement that the SDI program threatened to destroy strategic stability. Concerning the Berlin Clause allegedly being pushed by the Federal Government, charge d'affaires Vladislav Teretskov said at a press conference that according to Western press reports the Americans themselves have reservations about the inclusion of West Berlin.

Teretskov assessed relevant reports as proof of the purely military nature of the U.S. space program. It is still too early to talk about likely effects of Bonn's participation in SDI on German-Soviet relations. This is also true about speculations on a visit by Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev to the Federal Republic. Teretskov denied that exploratory talks are already in progress with Bonn.

The Soviet diplomat once again called for comprehensive nuclear disarmament and asked the United States to give up the SDI program. He said security can not be built permanently on the fear of retribution. Teretskov underlined his country's willingness to conclude a test ban agreement and pointed out that the Soviet Union will not extend her unilateral moratorium indefinitely.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1301

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. TRIES TO INVOLVE CANADA IN SDI THROUGH NORAD

'Hegemonistic Designs'

LD191925 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 19 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS -- TASS News Analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The U.S.-Canadian agreement on NORAD, North American Air Defence Command, will be extended again for another five years in a ceremony in Washington today, following talks in the White House between President Reagan and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. It follows from reports of the U.S. press that the Washington Administration seeks to use the NORAD structure to involve Canada in direct participation in the "star wars" program, named for a camouflage "the Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI).

During a meeting with Mulroney in Quebec in March last year, President Reagan suggested that Canada should join in the plans for research and creation of an ABM system with space-based elements.

The majority of the Canadian public declared resolutely against Reagan's proposal. Taking into consideration the attitudes in the country, the Mulroney government declared in September last that the national policy and priority tasks of the country do not allow for Canada's participation at a governmental level in research under SDI program. True, a loophole has been left; private companies were not prohibited to participate in those programs.

Bypassing Ottawa's official stand, the U.S. Administration then started drawing its northern neighbour in the "star wars" plans through NORAD. The GLOBE AND MAIL newspaper writes that the U.S. Government tries to involve Canada in the so-called long range planning of the future space and anti-missile defence systems in the framework of the North American Air Defence Command.

NORAD itself has been included by the Pentagon among the most important components of the SDI and is viewed as one of the most essential links of the program of "star wars" preparation.

As to the agreement on NORAD, it contains a loophole by means of which the Pentagon intends to involve Ottawa in "star wars". The clause demanding that NORAD's tasks and aims be necessarily in keeping with the ABM Treaty was dropped from the agreement back in 1981. The Canadian side would like that clause to be restored, but they in

Washington have a different opinion to this effect. According to a UPI report, at the present talks in Washington Canada insisted again that the NORAD agreement that is being extended should contain an article precluding Canada's participation in an active system of ABM defence. The White House has rejected Ottawa's wish.

Practice shows that they in Washington have very little consideration for the views and stand of the United States' northern neighbour in such an important matter as national security and are guided exclusively by the United States hegemonistic designs.

'Trojan Horse'

LD251113 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 25 Mar 86

["NORAD -- Washington's 'Trojan Horse'" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- TASS commentator Aleksey Kvartsev writes:

The United States and Canada have renewed their agreement on the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) once again. But its renewal this time took place amid sharp political discussions initiated by the Canadian opposition to the Conservative Mulroney government.

The peace movement and many experts and politicians in Canada are openly worried about NORAD being gradually switched over from the task of providing deterrence to that of preparing for war. The U.S.-Canadian accords to modernize NORAD, which were reached a year ago, can only be seen in present-day conditions as closely related to the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

Even on Parliament Hill in Ottawa members of the opposition parties are warning that NORAD is a "Trojan Horse" of the "star wars" program.

A masterplan for the North American air defense, which was drawn up by the Pentagon way back in 1982, provided for modernizing NORAD and the revamping work has now been started by both sides. In the future, in case the U.S. goes ahead with its deployment of a new ABM system with space-based elements, NORAD and, consequently, Canada will be inevitably required to put in an even more vigorous effort.

Canadian observers point out the possibility of U.S. air defense fighters accommodated at Canadian air fields in the extreme north being fitted out with anti-satellite weapons. High-ranking spokesmen for Canada's National Defense Ministry are not making a secret of the fact that the United States will find it most desirable in the immediate future if systems meant to intercept ballistic missiles in the midcourse phase of their flight are sited in Canadian territory.

Is Ottawa's renunciation of official involvement with the SDI, which was voiced last fall, a guarantee that Canada will not find itself eventually drawn into preparations for "star wars" through NORAD?

The stubbornness shown by the Mulroney government in its objections to the restoration to the NORAD agreement of the provision that Canadian participation in it does not presume any commitment on Canada's part to contribute to the development of active ABM defenses (a provision withdrawn from the agreement when it was extended in 1981) has not as yet made broad public circles in Canada convinced of this.

There is a close intrinsic relationship between NORAD, with Canada taking an active part in its fundamental modernization, and U.S. preparations for war in outer space. They are mutually supplementing aspects of the U.S. single strategic plan devised by the Pentagon. The U.S. politico-military leadership apparently is very keen to share responsibility for the consequences of its implementation, which will be extremely dangerous for mankind, with Canada.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1301

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

U.S. TO RENOUNCE ABM TREATY--Washington, 26 Mar (TASS)--In speeding up work under the "star wars" programme, the United States is preparing for a unilateral renunciation of the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems. This is seen from pronouncements by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant security of defence, at hearings held by one of the Senate subcommittees for the affairs of the Armed Forces. The high-ranking representative of the Pentagon said that already at the stage of experimental design and research work being carried out within the framework of the Strategic Defence Initiative, the United State will possibly have to adopt a "broad" interpretation of the ABM Treaty. According to the American hawks, such interpretation allegedly allows to conduct the testing of components of the anti-ballistic missile defence system, which is prohibited under that most important agreement. Richard Perle stressed that in this opinion the United States will have to deploy a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements irrespective of the fact whether the Russians agree or refuse to hold talks on a revision of the ABM Treaty. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 26 Mar 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1301

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR REPORTS ARMS TALKS MEETINGS

INF 23 January

LD232101 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1239 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, 23 Jan (TASS)--A session of the group on medium-range weapons took place here today within the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons.

INF 30 January

LD301259 Moscow TASS in English 1252 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 30 TASS--The group on medium-range nuclear weapons held a meeting here today within the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

INF 6 February

LD061248 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 6 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 6 TASS--The group on medium-range nuclear arms at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons held a meeting here today.

INF 13 February

LD131218 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 13 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 13 TASS--The group on medium-range nuclear arms had a meeting today in the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons.

INF 20 February

LD201227 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 20 TASS--The group on medium-range nuclear arms met here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons.

INF 27 February

LD271250 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 27 TASS--The group on medium-range nuclear weapons held a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Space Arms 21 January

LD211254 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 21 TASS--The group on space arms has met for a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Space Arms 4 February

LD041238 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 4 TASS--The group on space arms had a meeting here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Space Arms 11 February

LD111502 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 11 TASS--The group on space arms at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons held a meeting here today.

Space Arms 18 February

LD181245 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 18 TASS--The group on space arms at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons had a meeting here today.

Space Arms 25 February

PM261111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 86 Second Edition p 12

[TASS report: "Routine Session"]

[Text] Geneva, 25 Feb--A session of the space arms group was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Strategic Arms 22 January

LD221239 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 22 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 22 TASS--The group on strategic armaments held its session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Arms 29 January

LD291546 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 29 TASS--A group on strategic arms held a meeting here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

Strategic Arms 5 February

LD051219 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 5 TASS--The group on strategic armaments has held a meeting here today within the framework of Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Arms 12 February

LD121737 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 12 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 12 TASS--A meeting of the strategic arms group has been held here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms.

Strategic Arms 19 February

LD191637 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 19 TASS--The group on strategic armaments held its session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Arms 26 February

LD261433 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 26 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 26 TASS--A session of the group for strategic armaments was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Plenary Meeting 14 February

LD141256 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 14 TASS--The delegations from the Soviet Union and the United States to talks on nuclear and space arms held a plenary meeting here today.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1298

9 April 1986

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG PAPER APPLAUDS REAGAN RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

Bonn RHEINISCHER MERKUR/CHRIST UND WELT in German 1 Mar 86 p 7

[Article by Thomas Kielinger: "Reagan's Response to Gorbachev's Latest Disarmament Proposals Can Be Supported in Many Ways: Courageous Step on Solid Ground"]

[Text] Western security experts rashly responded to Reagan's proposal on nuclear disarmament in negative terms similar to the initial reaction by the Soviets. This changed after studying the actual text. Is there now satisfaction because the Soviets reacted with hostility? This would be too little as a basis for approval of Reagan's response.

For the U.S. plan, on which this newspaper reported briefly in a previous issue, there can be only one measuring rod: Does the worldwide elimination of medium-range missiles promote security, and would the introduction of this plan result in a clear gain in easing East-West relations?

Any discussion of themes must start with the year 1979 and the memory of the questionable compromise entered into by politicians when in December of that year they agreed to the package deal of counterarmament and a negotiating offer, followed by the counterarmament-zero option package 2 years later. It was a classic misalliance between strategy and politics (this topic is treated succinctly by the just-published book by Hubertus Hoffmann, "Die Atompartner," Bernhard & Graefe Verlag, Koblenz). Defense experts argue in favor of the urgently necessary modernization of the Western nuclear arsenal so that the sliding chain of "escalation control," and thus the credibility of our "flexible response" doctrine of deterrence, remain assured on all levels of arms availability. This plea was made independent of the stationing of Soviet SS-20s. However, the politicians, intimidated by protests, then came along and got hung up on this question of the mobile SS-20s in order to justify the necessity of counterarmament to their own people--with the built-in political "escape route" that an elimination of this medium-range threat could also mean the sacrifice of one's own INF arsenal (the "zero option" proposal in Geneva in November 1981).

Strategy compellingly demands an imperative step towards strengthening security, while politics appears to undermine this logic with offers of disarmament.

The Soviet party chief reminded us of this contradiction in his general offer on 15 January 1986 when he put forth not only a medium-range zero option, but also a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. How is Western politics to get away from the zero option now that this outcome has been presented to the Western public as the summum bonum, a highly desirable goal of disarmament negotiations?

The misalliance between politics and strategy, a basic evil of open, democratic states, cannot be nullified in retrospect. We are keeping our word--which nevertheless does not mean that we have to disregard the requirements of our security. We merely have to readjust them.

The following points should be kept in mind in this:

1. Reagan's proposal for three-stage development towards a zero option for medium-range weapons (see details in the boxed information on this page) can only be judged in light of the new situation in the area of short-range nuclear weapons. In contrast to 1979 or 1981, the threat to Europe has long since ceased to revolve around these LRINF systems ("long-range intermediate nuclear forces"). Since the onset of counterarmament, the Soviets have introduced new types of short-range missiles in the western parts of their country, as well as in the GDR and the CSSR, which are no less of a threat to the European NATO territory than their big brother, the SS-20. They are called SRINF systems, "short-range intermediate nuclear forces," with ranges of 900 kilometers (SS-12/22) and 500 kilometers (SS-23). The SS-21, which is often added to this list and has a range of 80 to 120 km, does not belong in the SRINF category, but is placed under it as an SNF type, "short-range nuclear force.") Of these short-range intermediate missiles, the Soviets maintain 100 of the SS-12/22s and 550 of the SS-23s, thus a total of 650 warheads. On the Western side there are only the 72 Pershing I missiles stationed here. What will then become of this dangerous discrepancy after a worldwide LRINF zero option?

2. With respect to the effectiveness of NATO counterarmament, it must be acknowledged that the world has changed greatly since 1979. The Pershing 2 continues to provide deterrence for us, guaranteeing for its area of arms that which experts call the "available escalation option." It is a weapon that flies not only ballistically, but also with built-in terminal guidance, and thus with a mobile trajectory at the end stage. And it can reach Soviet territory. But the Soviets are making a great deal of progress in the area of anti-tactical ballistic defense (ATBM). Within 10 to 15 years--thus within the foreseeable future--the aptitude of offensive nuclear weapons will be decisively reduced by progress in the area of anti-ballistic defense. This should be kept in mind by critics of the zero option in particular.

3. If--and this is a big if--the Soviets were ready to agree to even the first stage of Reagan's plan and accept verifiable destruction of their medium-range potential, then we would be facing a dramatic change in the entire East-West climate. The image of the threat would have to be entirely reworked and reduced in the East and the West. The mere prospect of a genuine reduction in the Soviet nuclear arsenal, cautiously tested in the phases of

Reagan's plan, would have to make it worthwhile for the West to withdraw an important aspect of its counterthreat: the capability of striking the Soviet heartland (or "sanctuary", in the jargon of experts) using Pershing 2 missiles from Europe. Reagan's proposal provides for this very thing: reduction of the Soviet LRNF threat (and even a large amount of "goodwill" from the Kremlin in the first phase of reduction) in exchange for the willingness on the part of the West to little by little give them back the "sanctuary" of their mother country.

4. The central question remains: What about the SRINF weapons, the nuclear short-range systems (see point 2). Reagan's proposal addresses this problem in that he "requests" talks on these weapons. However, what if the Russians only want to talk about the long-range intermediate weapons and thus maintain a clear "escalation dominance"? Defense Minister Woerner was thinking of this very situation when he recently called for an acceleration of Western research on anti-missile defense in the tactical (European) area, in a well-regarded article for the American magazine STRATEGIC REVIEW.

5. It would be wrong to view the problems of intermediate weapons in isolation. The threat in the conventional domain in Europe must be reduced on a parallel basis. At the same time, NATO reserves the right to become more independent of the nuclear option through continual improvements in its own conventional forces, either in terms of arms technology or in the operative realm. Even after the withdrawal of the 236 LRINF missile warheads, the "flexible response" would still have 4,264 nuclear weapons at its disposal (ammunition, bombs, etc.)

It is a fact that Reagan's plan represents an intelligent, courageous response to Gorbachev's proposal of 15 January; even the German Social Democrats applauded. The plan offers Western accommodation with limited risks against Soviet cooperation, and attempts to achieve a change in the East-West pattern of threat by building general confidence. This can only be in everyone's interest.

12271

CSO: 5200/2656

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CONTINUED SUPERPOWER STATUS SEEN AS TOP PRIORITY FOR USSR

Bonn DIE WELT in German 5 March 86 p 5

[Article by C. Graff Brockdorff: "Moscow's Demand for "Equal Security" Not Lacking in Ideology: Analysis of Gorbachev's Proposal: Chances for an Arms Control Agreement Slim"]

[Text] Brussels--The USSR only appears to have entered a flexible phase in its disarmament policy. In reality, it is holding to its theory of "parity and equal security." According to the Soviet interpretation, this means that Moscow claims the right to assume a stronger military and strategic position than any other state in the world.

This is the conclusion reached by analysts in examining the latest statements by Soviet party chief Gorbachev. He demands, as a condition for an agreement on the reduction of medium-range weapons, that the nuclear weapons arsenals of Great Britain and France be frozen and that the modernization of them be abandoned. He wants to keep the 171 SS-20 missiles with 513 nuclear warheads that are stationed in Asia. The United States should lose its right to station medium-range weapons anywhere at all. Reaction to President Reagan's counterproposal was negative.

In the Soviet view, an agreement must serve the goal of "equal security." At first glance, there is willingness in the West to concede this to the USSR. In defining this concept, however, Moscow refers to the foundations of its societal order, which it has made the focal point of the assessment of its strategic situation. This gives the concept of "equal security" a different character.

National Nuclear Arms Drawn Into Calculations

Every non-Soviet state in the world that views the USSR as an enemy of its societal systems is included in the Soviet equation of nuclear potential. This results in ideological bloc thinking. It explains why Great Britain's and France's nuclear arms appear in the Soviet equation even though NATO does not decide on their deployment; only these states make that decision.

In other words, this is a question of national arms. The fact that their owners belong to an alliance is a coincidence. They are not weaponry of the

alliance. The supreme commander of NATO has to take into account British atomic weapons in planning his targets; it would be illogical to combat the same target with an American and a British nuclear weapon.

However, he does not know whether Great Britain will enter into a nuclear war with its national nuclear arms. This remains an open question, pending a British decision. How things will turn out cannot be predicted. The decision is made--as in the United States and France--by one single person. France does not participate militarily in the alliance.

A Contradiction Cannot Be Tolerated

Moscow does not regard the British and French nuclear weapons as NATO weapons. In the Soviets' eyes, they are part of the nuclear armament of ideological enemies. The Soviet argument for "parity and equal security" consequently means the demand for a guarantee of equal security for a societal system that views the "historically predetermined decline of capitalism" as being scientifically proven. Thus, the Soviet demand is logical: The class enemy cannot be allowed to steer the already fixed course of history in another direction by creating the potential for superiority. To tolerate contradictions like this would be revisionism.

The demand for "equal security" has a counterpart in the West with an opposite meaning. It is "equality and parity." No one has any desire to refuse the USSR "equality." It can arrange its societal system any way it pleases. It is entitled to "parity" as a legitimate principle. Because there is no international right to use atomic weapons and no veto right against them applied to others, the concept of parity can only relate to the national level. The principle of parity would be eliminated if the USSR had the right to be as strong as all of its alleged enemies put together.

The result of acceptance of the Soviet point of view would be that the United States would be relegated to the number two position among the superpowers. In other words, like his predecessor, Gorbachev is demanding, without saying so explicitly, that the USSR be accorded the status of a "super-superpower." The concept of parity is used by the Soviets only in propaganda. In negotiations, it is replaced by the formula of "equal security."

Without taking into consideration ideological foundations, it can be said that Moscow is maximizing security at the expense of the security of other states. It has never granted Western Europe the right to station American medium-range weapons because they are capable of reaching Soviet territory. In the Soviets' view they are of a strategic nature. Weaponry with a shorter range, such as the Bundeswehr's Pershing 1A, which fires a distance of 800 km, is not strategic. They "only" threaten non-Soviet states of the Warsaw Pact.

Nor is the SS-20 strategic. It does not reach the United States. Only Western Europe and Asia are threatened by it. According to the Soviet definition, the states there have no strategic status. They are "tactical targets," meaning that they are third-class--after the United States, which has been relegated to second place.

Hands of the U.S. Leadership Tied

Western experts are not very encouraged about the prospects for an agreement that takes into consideration the security interests of both sides. It is believed that the ideological foundation of Soviet security policy is an obstacle. References to agreements such as the 1972 ABM treaty on limiting missile defense and the 1979 SALT II agreement have no value. These agreements would have tied the hands of the U.S. leadership and served the Soviet buildup.

12271

CSO: 5200/2658

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC JOURNAL VIEWS NEW GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSAL

HK200739 Hong Kong LIAOWANG OVERSEAS EDITION in Chinese No 6-7, 10 Feb 86
pp 46-47

[Article by Li Qinzhen: "A Preliminary Analysis of the New Soviet Disarmament Proposal" -- capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] On the morning of 15 January, just as a White House press officer told reporters that "there will be no great changes in the Soviet position on the disarmament talks before its national party conference," in the Oval Office not far from the press briefing room, Secretary of State George Shultz hurriedly delivered to President Reagan a letter from Gorbachev that had just been received.

The letter contained a new Soviet disarmament proposal. Some 3 hours later, the Soviet news agency TASS made this new proposal public. Gorbachev's new proposal took the world at large by surprise. At the core of the "package plan" was that, "on the precondition that both sides refrain from developing, testing, and deploying offensive space weapons, the United States and the Soviet Union will completely destroy nuclear weapons in the next 15 years."

According to Gorbachev's argument, this plan will be carried out in three stages. The next 5-8 years will be the first stage. Both the Soviet Union and the United States will reduce by half the nuclear weapons that can reach the other side's territory, and the warhead ceiling is to be fixed at 6,000 for each side. Meanwhile, both the United States and the Soviet Union must suspend all nuclear tests and destroy all the medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in Europe. Moreover, the United States should pledge not to supply other countries with more nuclear weapons. Britain and France should also undertake commitments not to expand their nuclear forces. The 5-7 years starting not later than 1990 will be the second stage. Both the United States and the Soviet Union will continue to carry out the 50 percent reduction plans by destroying their medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. They are not allowed to study or develop nonnuclear weapons and mass destruction. The other nuclear states should also suspend their nuclear tests, freeze their strategic nuclear weapons, destroy their tactical nuclear weapons, and dismantle the nuclear weapons deployed in other countries. The major industrialized countries should join in the agreement on banning offensive space weapons. The 5 years prior to 1999 will be the third stage. All nuclear states in the world should eliminate all nuclear weapons by working out special procedures for destroying, and verifying the destruction of, these weapons.

As far as the contents are concerned, Gorbachev's proposal is a total disarmament plan mixing the old plans with the new, other people's ideas with his original creations, and a persistent stand with tactical changes. Its prominent features are as follows:

IT PUTS FORTH A CLEAR-CUT TIMETABLE. First, the plan puts forth a general timetable, that is, "By the end of 1999 nuclear weapons will have ceased to exist in the world." In the last 15 years of this century the work of freezing, dismantling, destroying, and verifying the destruction of all nuclear weapons, from strategic to tactical ones, will have been completed. Second, in the entire process of reducing and destroying nuclear weapons, it has defined three 5-year stages. In light of the progress, each stage can be lengthened or shortened by 2-3 years. In his new proposal Gorbachev has put forth a clear-cut timetable for disarmament lacking in the previous disarmament proposals of Soviet leaders.

IT INCLUDES ALL FIELDS OF DISARMAMENT. The previous disarmament proposals were usually presented in the form of a single item. Even the so-called disarmament package plan included only a few limited fields. Gorbachev's new proposal, however, includes all major and separate items, such as nuclear weapons of all types, space weapons, chemical weapons, conventional military forces, the new generation of weapons systems, and the problem of verification. A disarmament plan this comprehensive is the first in the history of disarmament.

IT INVOLVES DISARMAMENT BY MANY COUNTRIES. In his new proposal Gorbachev still regards the United States and the Soviet Union as the main targets of disarmament, with the principal aim of reducing U.S. superiority through disarmament and preserving Soviet superiority. Moreover, Gorbachev has also brought other nuclear states and the major industrialized states into the orbit of complete disarmament. On the question of nuclear disarmament, Britain, France, and China are to reduce their nuclear weapons at a later date (starting from the second stage) than the United States and the Soviet Union but, by freezing and reducing their nuclear weapons in the second and third stages, their nuclear weapons will ultimately be destroyed simultaneously with the United States and the Soviet Union.

On the question of reducing conventional weapons, the countries taking part in the "Central European disarmament talks" have been drawn into the disarmament process. On the question of space weapons, the major industrialized states, including Britain, France, the FRG, and Japan, have also been included. In essence, Gorbachev's new proposal tries to mix bilateral with multilateral disarmament and, by having more participants to the disarmament talks, to use multilateral disarmament to play down bilateral disarmament. This tactic represents a new development from the previous attempt to bring Britain and France into the orbit of U.S.-Soviet disputes over medium-range nuclear weapons.

IT TAKES OVER DISARMAMENT SLOGANS OF OTHER COUNTRIES. The contents of Gorbachev's new proposal largely look familiar but they are couched in slightly different terms. It continues to use or takes over disarmament proposals of some other countries and dishes them up in a new form to the advantage of the Soviet Union. First, taking advantage of the idea that "the United States and the Soviet Union should take the lead in reducing nuclear weapons," it proposes that both the United States and the Soviet Union should concentrate on reducing their strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons in the first stage and announces that the Soviet Union will extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests by 3 months. Second, taking over the slogan of "completely and thoroughly destroying nuclear weapons," it puts forth the objective of eliminating nuclear weapons on earth by the end of this century to enable human society to enter an era without nuclear weapons in the 21st century. Third, taking into account the demand for "separate British and French nuclear forces from the reduction of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe, it proposes that the United States and the Soviet Union should first reduce and destroy their medium-range nuclear weapons

deployed in Europe, and that British and French nuclear forces should be frozen in the second stage and destroyed in the third. Fourth, accepting the suggestion on the need to "carry out on-site inspection and verification of the reduction of nuclear weapons and chemical weapons," it proposes the use of technological means and the adoption of international procedures to supervise and verify the restriction and destruction of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, and other mass destruction weapons on the spot. Fifth, taking advantage of the sentiments of a majority of countries against a U.S.-Soviet arms race in space and their obstruction of the "star wars" program, it takes as a precondition for total disarmament a "ban on the development, testing, and deployment of offensive space weapons" and calls on both parties to reach an agreement on banning the development of space weapons in a vigorous attempt to turn this into a "multilateral agreement which all the major industrialized states have a duty to join."

Such an all-embracing disarmament plan put forth by Gorbachev at the beginning of the International Year of Peace is undoubtedly a new peace gesture. His strategic intentions are chiefly as follows:

TO TAKE THE INITIATIVE IN THE DISARMAMENT TALKS. Gorbachev made this new proposal the day before the fourth round of the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks started in Geneva. This put the United States off guard, making it impossible for the United States to consider, or to make, counterproposals before the talks. For this season, this round of disarmament talks will be brought into the orbit of specifically studying and discussing this new proposal, as the Soviet Union intended, thus giving it the initiative in talks.

TO WIN THE PROPAGANDA WAR AGAINST THE UNITED STATES. Gorbachev's "high-pitched" plan is a continuation of the propaganda war launched by the Soviet Union before the U.S.-Soviet summit last year. It is the second round in the political offensive the Soviet Union launched with the aim of winning more extensive support from world opinion and projecting the image that the Soviet Union is devoted to disarmament and peace, thus showing that the Soviet Union is superior to the United States in the propaganda war.

TO FURTHER ISOLATE AND ATTACK THE UNITED STATES. Taking over the previous disarmament proposals and slogans of Western countries, Gorbachev's new proposal caters to the demands of Western Europe with the aim of inducing the countries in the Western alliance to exert pressure on the United States, splitting the West's position on the disarmament issue, and weakening the U.S. position in the talks.

TO WEAKEN THE TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPACE WEAPONS BY THE UNITED STATES. In its new proposal Gorbachev takes as a precondition for total disarmament a "ban on the development of space weapons" with the aim of forcing the United States to choose between reduction of nuclear weapons and development of space weapons so that the United States, afraid to incur the charge of sabotaging the disarmament talks, may have to give up research into, and development of, space weapons.

Gorbachev's new disarmament proposal has put the United States in a very defensive position. In a statement issued 3 hours after the proposal was put forward, the Reagan administration held that "at first glance some aspects of this proposal are constructive." It expressed a "welcome" for the proposal and said it "will conduct a meticulous study on this together with the allies." However, it also said that "many of its contents are no different from the previous Soviet stands and still cause grave uneasiness" and even "contain traps on numerous issues." Therefore, on the one hand, the Reagan administration has stepped up its studies on the new proposal, and taking advantage of the Geneva disarmament talks, has insisted that the Soviet delegates supply

detailed contents in order to ascertain the situation in the Soviet proposal and to find a basis for making a counter proposal; on the other hand, it has upheld its original stand and refused to make any concessions on some crucial issues, such as space weapons, nuclear tests, and the SS-20 missiles deployed in Asia. On the space weapons issue, the day after the new Soviet proposal was put forward, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger categorically indicated: "The Reagan administration is determined to carry out its Strategic Defense Initiative." On the issue of banning nuclear weapons tests, White House spokesman Larry Speakes said: "Testing is of great importance to us. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct tests according to the original plan." On the medium-range missiles issue, Shultz said: "We have always considered this issue on a global basis and not only on a European scale. For this reason, it is necessary to take the Asian region into consideration." Moreover, in the face of the new propaganda war launched by Gorbachev, the Reagan administration is actively considering launching counterpropaganda. In addition to making an issue of the Soviet proposal itself, Weinberger also proposed to "reveal more facts about Soviet violations of treaties: in a vigorous attempt to reverse the defensive situation the United States has been in since the propaganda war started.

By and large, Gorbachev's new disarmament proposal is of some positive significance. It can play a certain role in easing East-West relations and promoting U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks. However, it should also be noted that the principled stand advocated in the proposal is far from that of the United States and even runs in the opposite direction on the space weapons issue. The proposal has also complicated matters by involving other nuclear states and the major industrialized states. For this reason, the positive role of Gorbachev's new proposal will be very limited. It will be possible to reach a tentative agreement on some issues that have a relatively sound basis and on which both parties hold a relatively similar stands. However, the possibility of reaching an agreement on some crucial issues is still not distinct in the near future. The key to whether or not human society will enter an "era without nuclear weapons" in the 21st century lies in whether or not the two nuclear superpowers can take the lead in earnestly practicing what they preach.

/6091

CSO: 5200/4030

JPRS-TAC-86-031
9 April 1986

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC NOTES CONCLUSION OF GENEVA FOURTH ROUND

OW041650 Beijing XINHUA in English 1643 GMT 4 Mar 86

[Text] Geneva, March 4 (XINHUA) -- The United States and the Soviet Union concluded the fourth round of the arms talks here today amid accusations by each side that the other is blocking progress.

The seven-week-long session ended with a plenary meeting at the U.S. arms control offices. U.S. and Soviet chief negotiators and their aides attended the 90 minute meeting. Afterward, Soviet Chief Negotiator Viktor Karpov said, "There was no positive response by the American side" toward Soviet proposals. Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation, told reporters before the session that the round had seen some progress, "but it's slow."

The talks began on March 12, 1985, and have been divided into negotiating groups on defense and space weapons, medium-range nuclear forces and long-range, or strategic, nuclear weapons. The talks will resume on May 8. No substantial progress has been made in the last three rounds of talks because of different stands on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative program and other arms issues.

/6091

CSO: 5200/4029

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

XINHUA ANALYSIS OF WEST EUROPEAN FEAR OF NUCLEAR ACCORD

OW051141 Beijing XINHUA in English 1037 GMT 5 Mar 86

["News-analysis: West European Countries Concerned About New U.S. Arms Control Proposal (by Chen Nanxin)" -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Beijing, March 5 (XINHUA) -- After years of urging the United States and the Soviet Union to reach a nuclear arms accord, the West Europeans now suddenly fear that such a pact might leave the continent exposed to conventional forces attack by the Warsaw Pact countries. The fear aroused when U.S. President Ronald Reagan on February 22 proposed the elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe and Asia in the next three years. His proposal was made in response to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal on January 15 which called for complete abolition of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

Reagan's proposal is nothing new but a repetition of his "zero option" program put forward at the U.S.-Soviet intermediate forces negotiations in 1981. According to the proposal, the Soviets would dismantle its medium range missiles targeted on Western Europe and the United States would forego its plans to deploy two comparable weapons, the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles. The U.S. Government has so far appeared somewhat confident about the signing of such a pact in the near future. U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director Kenneth Adelman said last month that the two countries are most likely to make some progress in the area of intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) talks. All this undoubtedly has made U.S. allies feel more nervous over the prospect of losing the protective shield provided by the installation of U.S. missiles.

To offset the Soviet superiority in medium-range nuclear missiles, the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) countries decided in 1979 to deploy 572 U.S. cruise and Pershing 2 missiles in five West European countries. Over the past two years, nearly 300 of these missiles have been deployed in Britain, Federal Germany, Italy and Belgium. The Netherlands, which is assigned to deploy 48 cruise missiles according to NATO's plan, has decided to deploy the U.S. missiles.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, a staunch supporter of the U.S. policy towards the Soviet Union -- a policy characterized as seeking peace from strength -- expressed her concern about the U.S. proposal while meeting Paul Nitze, special arms-control adviser to President Reagan. Nitze said nuclear weapons were a "necessary evil" that could prevent conventional wars in Europe when he visited Western Europe early last month.

Urging Reagan not to lose sight of the overall context of Western European security, Federal German Chancellor Helmut Kohl warned that if intermediate-range missiles were

removed from Europe, that would only enhance the importance of the Soviets' SS-22 and SS-23 short-range missiles. From bases in the Soviet Union these missiles can strike Federal Germany, and from forward positions in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) they can hit most of Western Europe. He insisted that any agreement to be concluded between the two superpowers should limit and, if possible, reduce the numbers of Soviet short-range missiles. Federal German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said last month that "the removal of nuclear weapons would bring us not more but less security -- unless at the same time political conditions were steadied and the conventional balance of power was stabilized."

France, which has consistently followed an independent nuclear policy, is critical about the possibility of signing a U.S.-Soviet agreement on freezing the number of British and French nuclear missiles or their plans to modernize them with more warheads.

Since the end of the Second World War, the defense strategies of the NATO countries have heavily relied on the U.S. nuclear deterrent which has been regarded as an effective force in checking the Soviet Union from launching an attack on Western Europe. The West European countries argue that at the time when Soviet Union still has a vast numerical superiority in troops at its disposal in Eastern Europe, how can the United States withdraw its medium-range missiles from the continent. If the two superpowers reached an agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe, the only result would be that Moscow could use its conventional arms superiority to intimidate Western Europe.

According to the figures published by the West, the Warsaw Pact countries have deployed about 1.16 million troops in central Europe, 160,000 more than the NATO troops stationed there. Western Europe, where the two big military blocs -- the NATO and the Warsaw Pact -- confront each other, has been the focus of contention between the two superpowers in their global strategies. What steps Western Europe will take in response to the U.S. proposal remains to be seen. But one thing is certain that none of the West European countries wants to see threats to their security if such a U.S.-Soviet pact is signed.

/6091

CSO: 5200/4028

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

SOVIET, U.S. DISCUSS CW--Berne, 7 Mar (TASS)--On March 5 and 5 the delegations of the USSR and the USA exchanged views here in keeping with the arrangement between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States for starting to discuss the question of preventing proliferation of chemical weapons. The USSR delegation was headed by Viktor Israelyan, member of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representative of the USSR at the conference on disarmament, and the USA delegation was headed by Mr Hose, U.S. deputy undersecretary of state. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 7 Mar 86 LD] /9738

PLANS FOR CW ARSENALS--Bonn, 12 Mar (TASS)--TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy reports: American militarists are planning to set up secretly from West German public another five chemical weapons arsenals. These dangerous designs of the Pentagon have been exposed by the organization of the Greens Party in Baden-Wuerttemberg. According to the information it has, two of such big arsenals are to be established in the area of Karlsruhe (Baden-Wuerttemberg) and Germersheim (Rhineland-Pfalz). The U.S. army is planning to deploy there beginning from 1987 binary chemical weapons, the most dangerous type of chemical weapons. The Greens grouping in the Council of Communities of Karlsruhe demanded that the authorities not allow a buildup of the American chemical death arsenals, inform the public about the dangerous designs of the U.S. military. The Greens described such moves as unlawful and recalled that way back in January last year the Council of Communities of Karlsruhe announced the city to be a zone free from nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2127 GMT 12 Mar 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1299

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: U.S. DISARMAMENT ENVOY REPEATS 'TRITE' ARGUMENTS

LD111903 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Excerpts] Geneva, 11 Feb (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

The conference on disarmament today adopted a report by the special committee on chemical weapons and charged it with continuing its work, intending that a draft of a corresponding convention be prepared as soon as possible. Stanislaw Turbanski (PPR) [Polish People's Republic], chairman of the committee in 1985, emphasized when presenting the report the importance of the proposals on this question contained in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, of 15 January, which will facilitate this work.

Against the overall background of speeches at the conferences, the statement today by Donald Lowitz, head of the U.S. delegation, was particularly disappointing. True, at first he also noted that the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and other events of recent months inspire new hopes. However, from his remarks on specific issues of the agenda it became clear that the U.S. delegation does not have anything in view which might speed up the talks.

So, in Lowitz's words, a ban on nuclear testing may be reached only in the framework of significant reductions of nuclear arsenals and meanwhile, the continuation of explosions, he says, is necessary to safeguard the security of the Western alliance. Having acknowledged that the SDI program causes anxiety among conference participants, the U.S. representative found nothing better than to repeat Washington's trite arguments in justification of the "star wars" project, accompanying this with attacks directed at the policy of the Soviet Union.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1300

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS CITES U.S. DISARMAMENT DELEGATE'S ADDRESS

LD201841 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Geneva, March 20 TASS--TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

One can hardly say if today's statement by the U.S. chief delegate to the disarmament conference smacked more of disrespect for his negotiating partners or of unwillingness to face real facts.

mbassador Donald Lowitz concentrated on the threat of the militarization of outer space, the threat which is posed, if we are to believe him, not by the American plans to develop space strike weapons but -- by the Soviet Union, which has allegedly been going ahead with military space programs for a long time. So the United States presumably has to fulfil its SDI program to catch up with the dangerous rival. As for the disarmament conference, according to the American delegation, it should first define the concept of the "militarization of space" and "its peaceful uses." In other words, the American delegate suggests that a futile exercise in semantics should substitute concrete debates and the drafting of practical measures to prevent, in accordance with the demands of the world community, another dangerous round of the arms race and to keep weapons from space for the good of the whole of mankind.

Chief Soviet delegate Viktor Israelyan, giving a brief reply to the address by Lowitz, stressed the absolute untensability of his attacks on the Soviet Union. At the same time this address, he said, is clearly showing anew that the United States merely does not want a ban on space strike weapons or talks on this matter while trying to introduce such weapons in space as soon as possible to achieve military superiority.

Czechoslovak delegate Milos Vejvoda denounced the U.S. negative stand on another problem, the termination of nuclear testing. A ban on all tests is needed already now, he said. A U.S. moratorium on nuclear explosions, like that imposed by the Soviet Union, would constitute a step in this direction. Mikhail Gorbachev's recent reply to an address of the leaders of six countries is fresh evidence of the constructive approach of the Soviet side and its readiness to break the vicious circle of the arms race, Vejvoda said.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1300

JPRS-TAC-86-031
9 April 1986

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRAVDA VIEWS EAST BLOC MBFR DRAFT, WESTERN STANCE

PM201430 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent B. Dubrovin dispatch: "To Take Advantage of the Real Chance"]

[Text] Vienna, March [dateline as published] -- The latest round of the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe is almost over. It began on 30 January 1986 under particular conditions. New Soviet proposals had been published shortly beforehand. It was declared at the highest level on behalf of the USSR that, in parallel with the withdrawal of mass destruction weapons from states' arsenals, it is necessary to embark on an agreed reduction of conventional arms and armed forces, and that accord at the Vienna talks could signal progress in this direction.

It was from these clear-cut and honest positions that on 20 February the socialist countries submitted at Vienna's Hofburg Palace a detailed draft "Agreement on the Initial Reduction of Ground Forces and Arms by the Soviet Union and the United States With Subsequent Nonincrease in the Level of Armed Forces and Arms by the Sides and Related Measures in Central Europe."

The new document goes a long way to develop, specify, and supplement the socialist countries' proposals of 14 February 1985. Taking into account all the acceptable elements of the Western stance, it offers compromise solutions on a number of important aspects where agreement between the sides is lacking.

Bearing in mind that the Western powers have hitherto been unprepared for major reductions of ground forces, the socialist countries propose that the USSR and the United States reduce their forces by 11,500 and 6,500 men respectively within 1 year, this reduction being applied to service units including their regulation complement of [shtatnyy] arms and combat equipment.

A pledge on the nonincrease of the level of armed forces and arms in Central Europe by all 11 parties to the agreement must come into force following the completion of the planned reductions of Soviet and U.S. forces.

Important new steps have also been taken by the socialist countries on the question of sensible verification [kontrol] of the fulfillment of the agreement. It is envisaged to exchange in good time lists of service units to be reduced with withdrawn, together with reciprocal notification of the start and completion of reductions. In addition, the USSR has also proposed that permanent checkpoints to monitor entry into the zone of reductions be established for the entire duration of the agreement. On-site inspection [proverka na mestakh] as a result of a justified request is not ruled out, either. The creation of an appropriate consultation machinery is also envisaged.

In the opinion of the socialist countries' representatives, this is the first time in many years that a real chance has emerged to overcome the deadlock in Vienna. The draft which has been submitted lays practical foundations for this.

As for the West's representatives, unfortunately matters have hitherto not progressed beyond words. Moreover, observers are put on their guard by the obstructionist tactics employed in the past by the North Atlanticists and particularly by their speculation on verification [kontrol] problems. There are many indications that they would like to replace the task of reducing the level of military confrontation in Central Europe with verification [kontrol] measures which are not commensurable either with the nature and content of a possible agreement or with the real needs for verification [proverka] of its fulfillment. One can legitimately ask: Is that not being done deliberately so as to complicate the reaching of agreement in Vienna?

The Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies are fully determined to achieve success at the Vienna talks. Provided the other side really desires the same thing, 1986 could be a watershed year for the Vienna talks.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1300

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

IZVESTIYA: 'SERIOUS QUESTIONS' REMAIN AFTER CDE SESSION

PM201445 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Sychev: "Who Is Delaying Work"]

[Text] Stockholm -- The latest session of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has ended in the Swedish capital.

What are the session's results? The 15 January 1986 statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the 27th CPSU Congress, which confirmed the Soviet state's unswerving desire to consolidate peace, had positive influence on its progress -- and this was noted in a number of speeches at the final plenary session.

At the session the USSR and the socialist countries again undertook vigorous actions to lead positive impetus to the conference's work and promote its successful completion. The socialist countries submitted in the working groups formulas for editing the final document, taking into account the positions and interests of their partners in the talks.

As is well known, the Soviet Union expressed the readiness to adopt the idea of a number of states on the mutual exchange of annual plans of military activity. The Polish delegation submitted detailed proposals for inviting observers.

Great activeness was displayed also by representatives of the neutral and nonaligned countries who sought to promote the search for and development of mutually acceptable decisions. Thanks to the efforts of the majority of those taking part in the conference definite dynamism was displayed in its work.

Nonetheless it must be noted that many serious questions remain unresolved. As is well known, the question of giving notification of naval activity in sea and ocean regions adjacent to Europe was a delaying factor.

To overcome this obstacle the Soviet Union put forward the proposal to examine right now questions of giving notification of the activity of ground forces and air forces and to carry out the naval forces to the next stage of the conference, stipulating this in a jointly drafted document.

But the NATO countries and above all the United States which throughout the conference opposed the navy being encompassed by confidence-building measures are also opposing the carrying over of this question. Where is the logic? What is this, an attempt to retain the deadlock? After all, it is perfectly obvious that without a gradual discussion of the problems work will eventually come to a halt not only in the field of notification but also in its connected aspects such as the exchange of annual plans in military activity and the invitation of observers.

Nonetheless, instead of a constructive reply the United States' bloc partners are trying to present the Soviet initiative as a refusal to give notification of naval activity. Failure to understand or unwillingness to understand? The USSR gave clear explanations: It is a case only of carrying over in accordance with the conference mandate, not of removing this complex problem from the conference table which, given the time, would make it possible to investigate it more carefully and find a solution according with the security interests of all. There can be no doubts that the activity of the ground forces, air forces, and navies throughout Europe and in adjacent sea and ocean regions and air space should be subject to notification.

The NATO countries' submission, after 2 years' silence, of their proposals for editing a document on the nonuse of force is as a whole undoubtedly a useful advance. But unfortunately their proposals still contain an attempt to emasculate the universality of the principle of the nonuse of force, to express it through the collection of military-technical confidence-building measures, and they discard the main provision -- the nonuse of military force, nuclear or conventional.

The NATO countries' attitude toward editing the document also puts us on our guard. They have in fact failed to alter their position on a single question. Their representatives inundated the working groups with depressing monotony with formulations taken from old proposals, many of which were rejected long ago or which are totally unacceptable. Is it not time to remove them and not to overload the talks with burdensome but futile debates?

Other examples can be cited of the NATO countries' blatantly unconstructive approach. "The coordination of the positions of 35 states with different political, economic, and social systems is, of course, no simple matter," special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy, the leader of the Soviet delegation, said. "We do not want to dramatize the situation. But the time has come to renounce futile attempts to achieve one-sided advantages, it is essential to embark on the settling of unresolved problems. That is the only guarantee of the conference's successful completion."

/9738

CSO: 5200/1300

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S KOMPLETKOV AFFIRMS ACCEPTANCE OF ON-SITE VERIFICATION

LD141813 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 14 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (TASS)--The Soviet Union is ready to use the assistance of the "Delhi Six" in implementing verification of refraining from nuclear explosions, said Viktor Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister. He spoke today at a press conference in the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry on the issue of the termination of nuclear tests.

Back in October last, the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden suggested creating mechanisms of verification of the territories of their countries to promote the establishment of effective methods of verification. The Soviet side immediately expressed its consent to use those opportunities; now, in connection with the new address of the "Delhi Six". We have confirmed the readiness to accept the proposal connected with the implementation of verification, including on-site inspections, the deputy minister said. We are ready to discuss without delay concrete forms of the assistance of the six countries in this important matter. But what is the main thing, is the United States' consent to keeping from staging explosions. If the U.S. side agrees to this, agreement on methods of verification will not be difficult to achieve.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET REACTION TO U.S. NUCLEAR TEST BLAST IN NEVADA

PRAVDA Correspondent's Report

PM241001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Unnamed "own correspondent" report: "A Brazen Challenge to the Peoples: The U.S. Administration Has Announced Its Intention to Carry Out a Nuclear Explosion at the Nevada Testing Ground"]

[Text] Washington, 22 Mar -- Openly mocking international public opinion and disregarding the demands of its own people, the U.S. Administration has announced its decision to conduct nuclear weapon tests on Saturday 22 March. An Energy Department spokesman announced that the explosion, codenamed Glencoe, will take place in the context of work to create a new warhead. It is noted that the yield of the explosion will be between 20 and 150 kilotons. With the aim of preventing panic among the population, the authorities have already told the residents of settlements located around the testing ground in Nevada about possible soil tremors.

That is the White House's answer to the Soviet Union's appeal to join its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which has been in force since last August and has just been extended, in the spirit of good will, for as long as the United States refrains from conducting explosions. That is the White House's answer to the appeal of the six states and to the demand of many members of Congress and the American public to follow the USSR's example and declare a moratorium as a practical step toward curbing the arms race and to demonstrate common sense and political will.

Obviously the administration has different ideas about statesmanlike wisdom and responsibility to the world. Moreover, as if seeking to dispel any doubts on this score, it has even, as THE WASHINGTON POST indicates, specially speeded up its nuclear test program. Shifting the schedule for conducting the explosion from mid-April to the end of March, the White House decided in this way to "neutralize" public pressure in favor of the moratorium, which would have intensified still further over the coming month.

The administration's arrogant challenge to the widespread sentiments in support of the moratorium immediately gave rise to an outburst of indignation. A group of legislators sent an urgent letter to the White House calling for the test to be canceled. A press conference was held on Capitol Hill at which congressmen sharply criticized the decision on the explosion. Pointing out that a moratorium is an effective means of

stopping the nuclear arms race, J. Wright, leader of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, stated: "Nothing can be more important than to take steps together with the Soviet Union to lower the level of the horror which makes people throughout the world tremble with fear." In his words, by holding the tests the administration will show that it does not want to share the mutual responsibility for the case of peace. Congressman T. Downey noted that "if this explosion takes place, it will destroy any hope of containing the proliferation of nuclear weapons." The refusal to join in the moratorium "will jeopardize U.S. security," Congressman J. Leach said. D. Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, calling for the tests to be canceled, stressed: "Common sense and common interests demand a total ban on nuclear explosions."

As soon as the news of the forthcoming explosion became known, Senators, A. Cranston (Democrat, California) and M. Hatfield (Republican, Oregon) submitted a legislative proposal to refuse the administration funds for all nuclear weapons tests, similar to that already submitted for examination by the House of Representatives on the initiative of 84 congressmen. "I deeply regret the administration's unreasonable and rash decision to continue tests. A mutual Soviet-U.S. cessation of explosions would give us a real chance of doing at least something to stop the arms race," Cranston stated. In Hatfield's opinion not only has the administration rejected the USSR's invitation to join in the moratorium, but with this act it has indicated that it clearly prefers the creation of armaments to talks about peace." [quotemarks as published]

Senators J. Kerry and P. Simon supported the initiative of Cranston and Hatfield. In his statement Kerry noted that the White House is basically "ignoring not only the Soviet moratorium and the Soviet proposals to extend it, but also the clearly expressed will of Congress to seek a comprehensive test ban." Rejecting as totally unfounded the "arguments" put forward by the administration to justify its obstructionist stance, Kerry noted that the United States has carried out more nuclear tests than the USSR. Claims that a test ban is not verifiable are not true. Geophysicists have demonstrated that all nuclear explosions can be registered on equipment already available. The truth, the senator stressed, is that the administration is not agreeing to end nuclear tests because of its desire to implement the "star wars" program.

The American Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the international organization Greenpeace have condemned the plans to carry out an explosion. Their statements assess this step by the White House as a deliberate attempt to undermine any chances of curbing the arms race.

The White House, however, has rejected all protests and appeals. Its spokesman launched into demagogic expatiations and made much of the "invitation to Soviet scientists personally to observe the explosion" in Nevada. There was no mention of postponing the test. It is certainly a shameful thing not to feel your own shame.

'Growing Avalanche of Mass Condemnation'

PM231745 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Tomas Kolesnichenko "Commentary": "Protest Alarm"]

[Text] The nuclear explosion at the Nevada tests site has caused an answering explosion of protest in the hearts of many Americans and of millions of people throughout the world. The reactions published by PRAVDA today are only a small part of the growing avalanche of mass condemnation and anger now rolling across the countries and continents of our world.

Understandably so. This was not just a 150-kiloton explosion. It has undermined the hopes of people of good will for a life without the threat of the Damoclean sword of nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind and the hopes for the limitations and ultimately the destruction of nuclear weapons.

The explosion in Nevada was not just another nuclear weapon test. It is primarily, a test of the will and the patience of people living on earth. It is an impudent, provocative challenge to them from the same position of strength that Washington has today raised to the status of a cult and made the foundation of U.S. foreign policy strategy.

A signal from Nevada has been recorded not just by the seismic stations. It has been clearly voted down by world public opinion. And there are no two opinions here: The United States is demonstratively rejecting the Soviet Union's proposal to join a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. This is despite the fact that the Soviet side has twice extended it and has supported the idea of using the international verification [kontrol] system -- in short, has removed all obstacles in the way of a reciprocal agreement on ending nuclear tests.

It cannot be said that no one in America can see how their own militarists have gone too far [zarvalis] in their plans. The House of Representatives adopted a special resolution calling for talks to be held with the Soviet Union on banning nuclear tests. Criticism of the Reagan administration's actions is growing among many public figures, senators, and experts. So why is official Washington rejecting all sensible arguments with high-and-mighty arrogance, and why is it ignoring public opinion both inside the country and throughout the world?

The official answer comes down to saying that "nuclear tests are necessary to be confident of maintaining the effectiveness of our deterrent arsenal and to be sure of the reliability and security of the U.S. arsenals." We can already catch here the "ring" of a present and future strategy of reliance on nuclear weapons and on expanding rather than reducing nuclear arsenals. But this is not the main point. Beneath the mask of "detering aggression" and of concern for the "security" of arsenals, the U.S. Administration is planning to launch [vyvod] strike weapons into space. It needs nuclear tests to provide for the "star wars" program. Thus the explosion in Nevada is one more link in the overall chain of plans for rolling forward the arms race on earth and extending it into outer space.

That is why an alarm bell of protest can be heard throughout the world. More and more people of different political convictions, religious faiths, and class adherence are today united in demanding that Washington's hand be stayed and that it not be permitted to wreck the Soviet nuclear moratorium, and it is necessary to be deaf not to heed that demand. Are nuclear tests to be or not to be? This question is now troubling all mankind.

But Washington will not succeed in sidestepping an answer. The bell tolls for it as well. It is no accident that Americans say that "He who God wishes to destroy [nakazat] He first makes angry."

'Reminiscent of Hiroshima'

PM241202 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Own correspondent A. Palladin report: "Yet Another Step Toward the Nuclear Abyss by Washington"]

[Text] Washington -- On Saturday at 1100 local time the United States carried out another nuclear explosion. Reagan spoke on national radio an hour later. The President again scared his countrymen with the "Soviet, Cuban, and Nicaraguan threat."

The nuclear explosion that shook the ground under Nevada seemed sinister. By carrying it out the Reagan administration was challenging all mankind, graphically demonstrating, in the words of Republican Senator M. Hatfield, that "it prefers creating new weapons systems to peace talks." That was how the White House responded to the calls of millions of inhabitants of our planet -- including Americans -- to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests and thereby stop the arms race.

The explosion of a nuclear device in Nevada at the will of its organizers was reminiscent of the Hiroshima tragedy. The local press reports that the device was assembled in the very same Los Alamos laboratory where in 1945 the atom bomb intended for Hiroshima was "constructed," but the new device that was tested was tens of times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb.

Attention is drawn to the flagrantly provocative nature of Saturday's explosion. "White House staffers," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, citing local officials, "deemed it necessary not to postpone the test in order to hang tough by demonstrating their refusal to adopt Moscow's proposed moratorium." At the same time, THE WASHINGTON POST adds, the administration was counting on undercutting the expanding movement worldwide for the complete ending of nuclear explosions.

A challenge has also been issued to local legislators. The same M. Hatfield who only the day before along with Senator A. Cranston tabled a bill on freezing appropriations for U.S. nuclear tests for the duration of the Soviet moratorium, feels personally hurt. Nor did the White House reckon with the opinion of 63 congressmen who urged the President to at least hold back on explosions in Nevada. In response a Reagan administration spokesman mockingly stated that the test that had been held does "not revoke" the proposal that the USSR send its representatives to the Nevada test site to jointly observe subsequent explosions.

U.S. 'Wearing Blinders'

LD221507 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Mar 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary]

[Text] As we have already reported, the U.S. Department of Energy has announced that another nuclear explosion will be carried out today in the Nevada testing range. Here is our commentator Vladimir Pasko:

It is quite obvious that this announcement is more than just a simple intimation to the public of an imminent event, in essence it is an answer by a government body to the appeals resounding around the globe for the United States to join in the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union's introduction of that moratorium on 6 August last year, its subsequent extension, and the statement that the Soviet Union would not carry out nuclear explosions after 31 March either until the United States' first nuclear blast, are specific and cogent confirmation of our country's sincere devotion to the idea of putting an end to the up-dating of nuclear weapons in order to move on to their reduction and, by the end of the century, to liberate the world from them entirely.

Even people in the habit of looking at the Soviet Union through the prism of bourgeois anticommunist propaganda see our initiative as a realistic way to liquidate the mass destruction weapons threatening the existence of all human civilization. At the governmental level alone, countries with a total population of over 1 billion people appealed to the United States to cease nuclear weapons testing. This demand was supported by the World Peace Council and by the international pacifist organization Greenpeace, and the issue of ending nuclear tests is at the center of attention of virtually all peoples including the American people. Reports are coming in from Washington of demonstrations demanding that the government join in the Soviet moratorium. A large group of legislators has made the same appeal. In a resolution adopted earlier, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress demanded that the government begin immediate talks with the Soviet Union on banning nuclear tests.

Those standing at the helm of the U.S. state policy, however, have no desire to hear anything. They are continuing to move along their previous dangerous course as if wearing blinders, justifying it with the aim of strengthening national security.

Thinking in obsolete terms, they simply cannot understand that in our age building security on the idea of military superiority--particularly nuclear superiority--is not only a vain cause but a dangerous one too; dangerous for everyone and dangerous for themselves.

Viewed as Response to Ban Call

LD231839 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 23 Mar 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary]

[Text] And so the U.S. leadership has given its response to our proposal to stop nuclear weapons tests as a first step toward their subsequent reduction and elimination by the end of the century. A response has been given to the appeal by hundreds of millions of people throughout the world, including Americans, to join

the USSR moratorium; an appeal which rang out in numerous messages to Washington from heads of state and government and parliaments of various countries and from international and national democratic organizations and movements. The White House has felt it unnecessary to heed their opinion, treating it with total scorn and throwing down a blatant and insolent challenge. World reaction to this was to be expected. But the question arises: How does Washington conceive the further development of events in the world? For by declining to stop improving its nuclear weapons the United States obliges others too to do the same and this can in no way lead to an improvement in the situation.

Spokesmen for the White House and the State Department maintain that in the existing conditions neither a moratorium nor a total and universal ban on nuclear tests will, they say, strengthen the cause of security, stability, or peace. But what on earth then, if one may ask, will strengthen them? Not U.S. military domination of the world, surely? For the fact is that the course currently being pursued by the United States is dictated by precisely that idea, which is permeated with the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative proposed by the White House -- the "star wars" program -- for which the present test was actually carried out. Yet it is completely obvious that military superiority, however alluring this idea might be for some, is not feasible. And this, incidentally, is being recognized by more and more people in the United States. Just yesterday the results of a poll among physicists was published: 83 percent of them said that the USSR is capable of developing [sozdat] an effective system to counter the "star wars" plans. And that's why, they say, the United States should not get involved in this venture.

Unfortunately, Washington officialdom is in no hurry to heed these warnings. But this is to no avail. Everyone knows that the nuclear age has brought substantial amendments to the concept of security. In the present day, security cannot be built to the detriment of others' security. It can be achieved only through the creation of universal security -- that is, security for all. In these conditions the idea of peaceful coexistence -- the idea defended by the USSR, the socialist countries, the developing states, and democratic organizations and movements in the West -- is more topical than ever. But Washington has up to now been reluctant to take this in, and is effectively sawing off the branch it is sitting on.

'Designed to Poison' Relations

LD221955 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 22 Mar 86

[Vitaliy Sobolev commentary]

[Text] You will remember that the United States intended to carry out nuclear tests in April.

Suddenly, a new blast has been scheduled to take place earlier, before the term of the extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has expired. The demonstrative nature of this action is obvious: Regrettably, it is on a par with a whole series of others, designed to poison Soviet-U.S. relations and consequently the whole international atmosphere. One recalls the recent decision of the U.S. Government to reduce the numbers of the permanent missions of the USSR, Ukrainian and Belorussian SSR's at the United Nations. Or the violations by U.S. warships of the frontier of Soviet territorial waters off the shores of the Crimea. The Pentagon boasts that those ships

are equipped with apparatus that can track anything that happens in the air, on water or under water, and that it is interested in the bases of the Soviet fleet at Sevastopol. In light of this, what is one to make of the White House and State Department assurances that the ships were merely availing themselves of the right of peaceful passage? How is it possible that the officials of the various American services got it wrong?

The deliberateness of all these -- to put it mildly -- unfriendly actions has been pointed out by the press in the United States itself. A great many Americans have been following the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva with enthusiasm and hope; but evidently there are others for whom the spirit of Geneva is unsympathetic, and one cannot but believe that their effect on the decisions of the Washington leadership is being felt more and more noticeably. That is evidently the explanation for the fact that the new nuclear blast is being carried out in such haste. Perhaps the White House has taken fright that the appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the U.S. Congress to stop nuclear tests may have an effect? We have already heard that many American legislators have expressed a high opinion of the Soviet initiative. First, the cessation of all nuclear explosions till the end of this year, then the extension of the moratorium till 31 March and finally, the decision not to resume tests after that date until the first U.S. nuclear explosion.

Both in Congress and in public circles in the United States, that initiative has been called a unique opportunity; and most of the states of the world are demanding that this opportunity should be realized. All mankind is making the same demand.

Reaction in U.S. Cited

LD231457 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 23 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 23 TASS -- The new nuclear test conducted by the United States, Washington's demonstrative refusal to join in the moratorium on nuclear explosions announced by the Soviet Union, have touched off a wave of indignation and criticism in the USA and outside it.

The nuclear blast, the CBS television company said, has set off a political quake in Washington. The television quotes Senator Mark Hatfield as saying that he did not know by what the American authorities are guided, but he was sure of one thing that the testing would not draw the world closer to peace, but, on the contrary, bring it closer to war.

Experts, the CBS stresses, point out that the conducted test closes the way to a real opportunity to make progress in curbing the arms race.

The ABC television company quoted 63 U.S. congressmen as urging President Reagan to cancel the test. James C. Wright, Democratic majority leader in the U.S. House of Representatives, said in an ABC interview that most of the congressmen hoped that they would be able to keep the door to peace open. For eight long months the Soviet Union adhered to the moratorium on nuclear explosions it introduced.

Berkley Bedell, member of the U.S. House of Representatives, described as a tremendous disappointment the fact that the President refuses point-blank to heed the calls ringing out all over the world for halting that terrible arms race. The congressman stressed that by its actions the Reagan administration was pushing the country and the whole world towards a nuclear catastrophe.

The newspaper WASHINGTON POST stresses that the USA has demonstrated its disregard for Moscow's proposals by conducting an underground nuclear test. The newspaper also quotes a spokesman for the U.S. State Department as saying that the American nuclear tests will continue. Under the existing conditions, the spokesman for the U.S. State Department demagogically claimed, neither a moratorium nor a complete and general ban on nuclear testing will strengthen security, stability or peace.

Retired Rear-Admiral Gene Larocque, director of the Washington-based Centre for Defence Information, called the Nevada test as a new step on the dangerous path of preparations for nuclear war. The Nevada blast, he pointed out, is evidence that the Reagan administration has not even the slightest intention to reach agreement on a ban on nuclear testing, to say nothing of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The fact that the nuclear test was conducted contrary to the demand of the House of Representatives and many members of the U.S. Senate for an immediate resumption of talks with the Soviet Union on complete and general testing of nuclear weapons is telltale proof that the Reagan administration is bent on speeding up work for the implementation of its nuclear programmes.

Michael Gruder, a spokesman for the American anti-war organisation Columbus Campaign for Arms Control, described the latest nuclear test in the USA as an irresponsible and provocative step. This is a policy of torpedoing the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which was unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union, he said. The Soviet proposals aimed at complete and general ban on nuclear testing, are opening up a real opportunity to strengthen peace and security, he stressed, whereas the U.S. Administration is bent on continuing the nuclear weapons race.

Blast Termed 'Very Serious' Action

LD231753 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1458 GMT 23 Mar 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Of course, one must mention a prominent event which took place a few days ago -- the Warsaw Pact member states Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers meeting. This was no routine event if only because it took place immediately after the 27th CPSU Congress. It was also not routine because it occurred at a responsible and serious time in the development of international events; at a time when the U.S. policy and actions have aroused many questions in international affairs.

I mean, first and foremost, U.S. actions such as the White House attitude to the well-known initiative by the six states linked with halting nuclear testing. The USSR replied affirmatively to the appeal by the six states and in point of fact accepted the theses of this appeal. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has stated quite clearly that the USSR, which in any case has already not been conducting any nuclear tests in the framework of its unilateral moratorium for over 7 months, will not carry out such tests until such time as the Americans carry out the next nuclear explosion. The United

States has replied with its habitual, categorical no, moreover, it intends to detonate a new nuclear warhead in March--if it has not done so already--and has planned to stage another nuclear weapons test in April. This, of course, if very serious, this is very serious.

'Political Shockwaves in Washington'

PM241419 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent V. Gan: "Shameful Page"]

[Text] Washington, 23 Mar -- Americans will long remember the day which has inscribed yet another shameful page in the "career record" of the present U.S. Administration's militarist activity. By a decision of official Washington's nuclear weapon test code-named "Glencove" has been carried out on a test range in Nevada. The yield of the detonated device was up to 150 kilotons -- several times more than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

When the explosion occurred a group of antiwar movement activists were in the immediate vicinity of the test range. Your correspondent liaised by telephone with Jessie Koks, the founder and national coordinator of the "American Peace Test" organization, who took part in this demonstration. Here is what she said.

"There were 90 of us. We gathered in the region where the explosion was to be carried out at about 0700. We sang antiwar songs. Shortly after 0800 the police arrested eight demonstrators. Soon we learned that early that morning, before we had assembled, six people who had come from Los Angeles -- three men and three women -- had penetrated the site of the forthcoming explosion. Informing the authorities of the fact, we demanded that the tests be deferred in order not to imperil people's lives. The explosion was not deferred..."

The first this year (and the eighth since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium), the explosion in Nevada is directly connected with the work to create a qualitatively new nuclear weapon. Administration spokesmen state that the aim of "Glencoe" was to test a warhead for the Midgetman mobile ICBM. But there are widespread suspicions in the U.S. Congress that the explosion was carried out within the framework of work on the "star wars" program providing for the creation of a nuclear-pumped X-ray laser.

Today's explosion in the Nevada desert has caused considerable political shockwaves in Washington itself. J. Wright, the leader of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, said: "There is evidence that they were in a hurry to carry out the explosion in order to wreck the expanding support for the moratorium for whose introduction the overwhelming majority in the Senate and the House of Representatives were calling."

In her talk with your correspondent, Jessie Koks said that the R. Reagan administration is not worried by the opinion of its own people. These words were reiterated by the participants in a mass protest demonstration against the nuclear explosion in Washington, Providence, and other U.S. cities.

'Indignation and Protests in U.S.'

PM241635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev report under the general heading "The Explosion in Nevada and Its Angry Echo: The World's Peace-Loving Forces Protest the Nuclear Explosion in Nevada, the Arms Race on Earth, and the Plans To Take It Into Space"]

[Text] New York, 24 Mar -- The explosion of a nuclear device by the Pentagon at a testing range in Nevada has caused indignation and protests in the United States. Rejecting the administration's fallacious argument that by means of improving nuclear weapons the United States "will strengthen international security," Senator Mark Hatfield (Republican, from Oregon) stated: "This (the explosion of a nuclear device -- G.V.) not only fails to bring us closer to peace, but, on the contrary, leads us along a path which brings us closer to war."

The Nevada explosion, which was carried out earlier than originally planned (the newspapers write that this was done in order to spare the administration the growing public pressure in favor of a Soviet-U.S. accord on this question), finally tore away the camouflage from those who try by various means to disguise their reluctance to do anything at all that would also draw down the rate of fulfillment of U.S. military programs. An article published in THE NEW YORK TIMES says: At first the American Administration explained its reluctance to join the moratorium on nuclear tests by references to the fact that the Soviet Union has supposedly carried out more explosions than the United States, so that the Americans had to catch up. This "argument" did not stand up to comparison with the facts. Even according to the U.S. figures which the newspaper publishes, in 1985, before the announcement of the moratorium, the Soviet Union carried out 8 tests, and the United States 15.

When the first fallacious argument collapsed, the White House and the Pentagon tried to demonstrate that they could not accept the ending of tests because of the problem of verification of such an agreement. The Soviet Union's officially expressed consent to certain forms of on-site verification robbed the American militarists of this camouflage too. Now the U.S. military-industrial complex has come straight out with it. It has been stated frankly in Washington that the continuation of nuclear tests is necessary in order to test the latest types of arms that are being developed in laboratories and design centers, first and foremost space arms under the "star wars" program.

Public Opinion Viewed

LD251106 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 24 Mar 86

[Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] It can be stated with certainty that the U.S. nuclear explosion has provoked an explosion of general indignation. What does such a reaction on the part of world public opinion show? Primarily that people in the world are aware of the danger of Washington's policy of force, which jeopardizes the future of all mankind. If Washington is so fond of talking about the global nature of its foreign policies, then it should be noted that they have found truly global condemnation.

In this regard, it seems to me necessary to point out the serious propaganda defeat suffered by Washington. It has exerted, and is exerting, considerable efforts to present nuclear weapons as a sort of guarantor of peace. It is no accident that the President calls U.S. missiles with nuclear warheads nothing other than peace-keepers.

The angry reaction to the nuclear explosion in Nevada shows graphically that people reject such a blasphemous insult to the interests of general security and to common sense itself.

I would add to this that the condemnation of the testing of nuclear weapons is quite evidently spreading to the U.S. plans to use these lethal weapons in space. If the world shuddered, in the full sense of the word, from the underground explosion in Nevada, then you can perfectly well imagine what the consequences of carrying such weapons into space could be.

In taking account of the reaction of world public opinion, I can foresee that Washington will again complain of Moscow's propaganda intrigues and of the success of its peace offensive. Well, as they say, don't blame the mirror if your face is crooked. In the mirror of world public opinion the fundamental differences in the policies of the two states are really graphically reflected -- of the Soviet Union, which in its unilateral moratorium has rejected nuclear explosions; and of the United States, which continues to play nuclear poker. And so, Washington pillories itself.

Finally, another consideration expressed in particular by the leader of the majority in the U.S. Congress: The Washington administration rushed the explosion in Nevada, fearing the wider and wider support in the world for the Soviet proposal for stopping nuclear tests. Yes, however paradoxical it may be, the U.S. ruling circles, even though they possess the most destructive weapons, are clearly nervous and afraid; they are afraid of the increasingly active antiwar movement in the world, and they are afraid of their own people too.

Reaction in U.S. Cited

LD231711 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1537 GMT 23 Mar 86

[By TASS political observer Sergey Fedorov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 23 Mar (TASS) -- The powerful 150-kiloton U.S. nuclear explosion in Nevada not only shook the buildings in Las Vegas, situated 130 km from the site of the tests, but has also provoked a real political earthquake in Washington. It is a long time since the White House has been under such fierce fire of criticism from the Capitol as after this explosion. The fact that the latest nuclear test was carried out despite the demand of the House of Representatives and many members of the Senate to immediately renew talks with the Soviet Union on a complete and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapons tests says eloquently that the U.S. Administration gives obvious preference to stepping up the arms race, rather than achieving peace. President Reagan's protestations about its striving "to make nuclear weapons outdated and powerless" is no more than a propagandist cover for the continuation of the arrogant plans to improve old and create new means of mass destruction, including those destined for space.

It is common knowledge that the nuclear tests are in their own way a "litmus paper," which makes it possible to precisely define the true attitude to all problems of arms limitation and reduction. In giving the order to press the button at the Nevada range, the opponents of disarmament have hurried not only to explode a nuclear device but also to undermine the idea of a nuclear peace and to foist on the world the opinion: Mankind is no longer supposed to live without fearing for its own future. The legitimate question also arises: Can the elaboration of ever newer types of nuclear weapons in the United States really correspond with an admission of the impermissibility of nuclear war and of attempts to achieve military superiority as contained in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of the summit-level meeting in Geneva?

The explosion in Nevada is in its way an "answer" Washington-style to the gesture of good will on the part of the USSR, which declared that it would not carry out nuclear tests, even after the 31 March expiration of its unilateral moratorium before the first nuclear explosion in the United States. More likely, some people in Washington, torpedoing the Soviet moratorium in this way, would be pleased if the Soviet Union is forced to renew its nuclear tests. Then certainly U.S. propaganda, turning everything upside down, would try to place the blame for breaking off talks on nuclear disarmament onto Moscow and ensure that Washington's hands are free to carry out its "star wars" program...

The Nevada explosion was also given the codename "Glencove," "Glenkov" -- with a clear allusion to the name of the residence of the USSR permanent representation at the United Nations, which has done much to establish understanding in the world community of the necessity of reaching agreement [dogovor] on the complete and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, and providing for a nonnuclear peace. The reaction of the public on all continents to the latest militarist demonstration by the nuclear maniacs is convincing; there are now even more supporters of nonnuclear politics. There are now even more people with common sense, ready to sign the statement of the American National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy: "Reagan simply lacks the political will to make a step toward ending the arms race."

TANJUG Sees Summit Postponement

LD232052 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1900 GMT 23 Mar 87

["Soviet Nuclear Test Ban Likely To Be Lifted" -- TANJUG heading]

[Text] Moscow, March 23 (TANJUG) -- The Soviet Union is likely to resume nuclear testing following yesterday's underground nuclear test in Nevada.

After the U.S. action, Moscow has indicated it will not "sit with folded arms." The self-imposed Soviet moratorium was originally to last until December 31, but was extended to March 31 this year, in expectation of Washington's decision to join it.

Meanwhile, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, responding to an appeal by leaders of the six countries which signed the Delhi Declaration, left open the possibility of the moratorium being extended past the end of March, but only until the first American nuclear test. That took place yesterday.

Sources in Moscow believe that the U.S. test in Nevada "has blown up" what has remained of the "Geneva spirit" following the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting last November, and that their new meeting, scheduled for this year in Washington, will probably be put off for better times.

Soviet party paper PRAVDA calls the U.S. test "an affront to all peoples of the world" and says that by it the U.S. "has neglected the demands of its own people."

Many foreign observers in Moscow believe that the Soviet test ban, announced on August 6 last, was the "most realistic and practical" Soviet peace initiative, since the two superpowers and about ten other countries have the equipment which can easily detect nuclear tests anywhere in the world.

Geneva Delegates Condemnation

LD260002 Moscow TASS in English 1539 GMT 25 Mar 86

[Text] Geneva March 25 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

The nuclear test held by the United States at the range in Nevada on March 22, has been condemned by many delegations taking part in the work of the Geneva conference on disarmament.

"By its actions the USA shows utter disregard of the interests and opinion of the rest of the world and of a considerable part of the public opinion in the USA," Viktor Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation, said at today's plenary meeting.

"The explosion is the response of the White House to the demands of the international public, numerous decision of the United Nations General Assembly and aspirations of millions of people of good will all over the world."

"The explosion is the response of the White House to a convincing call of the leaders of the six countries who, at a critical moment, urged the leaders of the USSR and the USA to keep from any nuclear tests in the period till the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. And finally, this is how Washington responded to the demand of the majority of ordinary Americans, representatives of different political and anti-war organizations of the USA, decisions of the U.S. Congress. This militaristic action by Washington", the Soviet representative stressed, "highlighted the falsity of the assertions about so-called democratic nature of the power existing in the USA, which proved capable of openly ignoring not only the wish of the American public but even the recommendations of the country's supreme legislative body."

The stand of the Soviet Union which for over eight months now has been observing a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and views their banning as a step of extreme importance in the context of the programme of nuclear disarmament advanced in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15 this year, is essentially a constructive answer to all proposals aimed at an early working out of an effective international agreement on the problem.

Representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Konstantin Tellalov said that the explosion at the range in Nevada was a political action running counter to the efforts to overcome the impasse at the Geneva talks on a comprehensive test ban, for which the delegations of socialist, non-aligned and neutral countries are striving.

"Sweden has always declared for the advance at the talks on this problems and for reaching arrangements", Sweden's representative Rolf Ekeus told the TASS correspondent. "My country strongly favours the idea of a moratorium of testing, regarding it as a very important step on this road. The staging of another U.S. nuclear explosion, as Sweden's Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson emphasised, is extremely disappointing".

The head of Argentina's delegation Mario Campora emphasised on his part that representatives of the six countries, the authors of the address to the leaders of the USSR and the USA, are now holding contacts to arrive at a joint assessment of the situation that has developed.

Security Committee Statement

LD252214 Moscow TASS in English 2107 GMT 25 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- The Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation has issued the following statement:

Despite the hopes of European peoples and entire humanity, in defiance of the Geneva spirit, the U.S. Administration still took a reckless step. The testing of nuclear arms at the range in Nevada is a new disgraceful action of U.S. militarists.

The Soviet public cannot overlook this act of defiance. The decision to set off the explosion was made at a time when the USSR has been observing for almost eight months a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and proclaimed its readiness to keep from nuclear blasts even after March 31 of this year, till the first U.S. nuclear weapon test.

The explosion of March 22 in the USA was staged just a few days after the Soviet Union's address to America calling on it that everything should be done to end nuclear tests in accordance with the will of the peoples, their striving to ensure durable peace on earth.

The new U.S. test in the USA is also an ostentatious refusal of the proposal of the leaders of six states, including two European states, to keep from any nuclear tests in the period till the next summit meeting. The U.S. militarists thus flouted the will of peoples of seven countries which are inhabited by over a billion of people, the will of all who treasure peace.

One cannot fail to see that the implementation of the dangerous plans to spiral the arms race on earth and to spread it to outer space is sped up in Washington under the pretext of the concern over the U.S. security.

Together with all peace forces, with the anti-nuclear movement mounting in the world, the Soviet public demands resolutely that the U.S. Government stop pushing humanity to the abyss of nuclear holocaust.

We urge all realistic people, no matter where they live, in Europe or in America, to stop Washington's hand, to press for comprehensive test ban on the basis of an effective international agreement.

U.S. 'Indignation' Reported

LD251134 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 24 Mar 86

[Report by station correspondent in the United States, Vladimir Gerasichev]

[Text] The conducting of a new nuclear explosion by the United States has given rise to a wave of indignation in the country about this militarist action of the administration. Supporters of the movement to end the arms race came to the steps of the Capitol protesting against the continuation of nuclear tests. "The Russians Have Stopped Nuclear Weapons Tests, Why Don't We Do the Same?" -- I am reading what is written on a banner carried by one of those taking part in the demonstration.

On the eve of the explosion 63 congressmen sent a letter to President Reagan demanding that he give up the planned tests. However, despite the opinion of the public and the congressmen, despite the voice of reason and the demand of the time, despite the hopes and expectations of millions of its citizens and peoples of other countries, the White House issued the order for the nuclear device to be detonated in the state of Nevada.

The power of the underground nuclear explosion was 10 times greater than the power of the bomb dropped by the Americans on Hiroshima.

THE NEW YORK TIMES draws its readers' attention to the fact that the Soviet Union has observed a moratorium on nuclear explosions since August of last year. What we are doing does not bring us any nearer to peace, stated Mark Hatfield, a Republican senator from the State of Oregon. Congressman Thomas Downey expressed himself along the lines that the explosion carried out by the United States gives the Soviet Union complete grounds for giving up observance of the moratorium. Democrat Congressman Thomas Downey is one of 84 co-authors of a new bill presented to the House of Representatives. The bill aims at inducing President Reagan's administration to hold talks on the conclusion of a treaty on the complete banning of such tests by means of temporarily halting the financing of underground nuclear explosions.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S PETROVSKIY HAILS 'DELHI SIX' STAND ON ARMS TESTS

LD141500 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 14 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (TASS)--The address of the leaders of the countries of the "Delhi Six" advanced considerations on creating a system of international security that have a lot in common with what was said to this effect in the political report to the 27th CPSU Congress, said Vladimir Petrovsky, head of the Department of International Organizations of the USSR Foreign Ministry. He spoke today in the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry at a press conference on the question of ending nuclear tests.

The Soviet system of international security is based on the concept of a world without nuclear arms. It is unthinkable; without-ending all nuclear weapon tests, Vladimir Petrovskiy emphasized. In its essence and in the ways to achieve it, that is the insurance of security not by military and technical means, but by political ones, the Soviet proposal actually coincides with the proposals of the "Delhi Six".

We proceed from the view that the shaping of the system of international security is not a privilege of a single state or group of states. It is the concern of all peoples of the world in this sense the activity of the authors of the "Delhi Six" means a weighty contribution to the creation of a system of international security. The Soviet side is prepared to continue and develop a useful dialogue with the leaders of the "Delhi Six" and with all for whom peace and security mean the supreme value.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

DELHI SIX RESPONSE READ AT DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

LD181839 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 18 Mar 86

[Text] Geneva March 18 TASS -- The response of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the joint message of the leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece was read out by Viktor Israelyan, head of the Soviet delegation at the plenary meeting of the disarmament conference today. At the request of the Soviet delegation, the response will be issued as an official document of the conference.

The statement of the Soviet leader to the effect that the USSR will not conduct nuclear explosion even after March 31, until the U.S. conducts the first nuclear explosion, has aroused much interest among the participants in the conference, who are examining the problem of putting an end to nuclear testing as one of the top priority items on the agenda. As Jose Carlos Maritegui, Peru's representative, said, it is inadmissible to put off any longer the resolution of such an urgent issue under the pretext that the verification questions have allegedly not been sufficiently elaborated.

Mikhail Gorbachev's response to the message from the leaders of the six states is permeated with a sense of high responsibility as regards the issues of peace and disarmament, stressed Luvsandorjiin Bayart (the Mongolian People's Republic). The Soviet Union, he said, is again demonstrating its sincere will and striving to do its utmost to put an end to nuclear testing. As in the previous cases, the Soviet Union has positively responded to the appeal by the group of non-aligned and neutral countries to the USSR and the USA to refrain, as one of confidence building measures, from conducting any nuclear explosions, newsmen were told by A.S. Gonsalves, head of the Indian delegation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: ENDING OF NUCLEAR TESTS NOW DEPENDS ON U.S.

LD141627 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 14 Mar 86

[Text] In his reply to a message by the leaders of six countries, Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, has spelled out in a clear-cut form the Soviet stand on the issue of ending nuclear testing. Here is our comment:

It is obvious that the halting of nuclear tests would be an important step on the way to freeing mankind from the burden of the nuclear arms race, with all its harmful consequences. Proceeding from this assumption the Soviet Union declared last year a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions that was to last until 1 January this year. This country called on the United States to join it. The United States responded to this gesture of goodwill by a series of nuclear tests carried out at the testing ground in Nevada. Despite this the Soviet Union decided to give the United States more time to weigh the Soviet proposals and therefore extended its moratorium until 31 March this year.

Refraining from any nuclear tests for over 7 months already the Soviet Union has had to forego some of its needs, both in the military and economic fields. Nevertheless, it demonstrates once again its goodwill. In his reply to the leaders of the six countries, Mikhail Gorbachev makes it clear that the Soviet Union will not carry out nuclear tests after 31 March, until the first nuclear explosions in the United States.

In order to fully solve the problem of nuclear tests a treaty is needed that would ban nuclear weapons tests in keeping with norms of international law. The Soviet Union proposes that the sides should immediately begin work on such a treaty without linking this work to any other issue. It also proposes that from the very start of the talks the sides should get down simultaneously to solving questions of verification over the observance of this agreement on stopping nuclear tests. Such control can be ensured both by national technical means and also with the help of international procedures including on the spot inspection if necessary.

So, the Soviet Union's stand is simple and clear. And there are no reasonable arguments to be advanced against it by those who favor continuation of nuclear testing. It now depends on the United States whether nuclear tests are stopped or not.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: REAGAN, 'CASE' FOR REJECTING NUCLEAR TEST BAN 'WEAK'

LD141134 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 14 Mar 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] President Reagan has rejected congressional and international calls for a ban on nuclear testing. In a letter to Congress on Wednesday he said that such a ban is not in the interest of the United States.

Halting and then outlawing nuclear tests is a vital step toward ending the arms race. By rejecting the idea and saying that a nuclear test ban is not in America's national interests, the United States President made at least two things absolutely clear: Number 1--it is in the interests of the United States to continue the arms race, spread it to outer space and thus make it uncontrollable, and it is hogwash when United States officials claim that they seek deep and verified arms control agreements. Number 2--national interests have got nothing to do with the position of the Reagan Administration on a comprehensive test ban. The American people cannot be interested in a nuclear arms race, and in outer space at that. The arms race is in the interest of military oriented corporations and those political and academic circles whose careers, and very existence, rest on anti-Sovietism, on tension, and animosity.

In his letter to Congress President Reagan has expressed his concern about what he said was the pattern of Soviet noncompliance with its commitments, including those dealing with nuclear tests. Well, when cynicism replaces arguments and becomes the only justification for the frustration of all efforts to put an end to the nuclear madness, it is a demonstration of how weak the administration's case is.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, in his reply to the leaders of the six countries, Mikhail Gorbachev said that this country would refrain from carrying out its own nuclear tests after 31 March, but till the first such test in the United States.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW TV: U.S. MAKES 'HOLLOW EXCUSES' TO CONTINUE TESTS

LD161827 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Mar 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Text] Hello, comrades, the pulse of international life is quickening. A steadfast struggle for the implementation of the new Soviet foreign policy initiatives, the struggle for a nuclear-free world is developing. And the ways of solving key problems are emerging more and more clearly. It is about them in particular that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev speaks clearly in answer to the joint message of the leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden, and Greece. It is important to stress that the leaders of the six countries are proceeding from the principle which is actually at the basis of Soviet foreign policy initiatives, namely, not allowing the arms race into space and halting it on earth.

It is characteristic also that the message expresses ideas which are in keeping with the concept of developing a comprehensive system of international security, put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress. Its basis is the complete and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons, and in this our points of view coincide. We are united in the view that an important step in this direction is the halting of nuclear tests, and we are making this step. The Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his reply, will not carry out any nuclear explosions, even after 31 March, the expiration date of our moratorium, until the first nuclear explosion in the United States.

What does this mean? One can say clearly: We are proposing a moratorium without a time limit, effectively the halting of nuclear tests. And if the United States does not carry out nuclear explosions then we will not carry them out either. This will be an example to other nuclear powers.

However, to judge by the first reaction, Washington rejects the Soviet proposals by the leaders of the six countries, and rejects the very idea which millions of people on our planet support. In Washington they declare that the United States cannot accept a halt to nuclear tests: They are

lagging behind and are obliged to catch up with the Soviet Union! This of course is not in keeping with the truth. These are hollow excuses. Their underlying reason--and in Washington this is not even hidden--is that U.S. military and political strategy is still based not on the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons, but, on the contrary on their modernization; not on the reduction of nuclear arsenals but on their accumulation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SUPREME SOVIET APPEALS TO CONGRESS ON NUCLEAR TESTS

PM191630 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Appeal to the U.S. Congress" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Esteemed members of the U.S. Congress!

On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its Presidium considers it its duty to appeal to you on a question of exceptional importance -- the immediate ending of nuclear weapon tests.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has received an appeal from the leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden, and Greece. They recall that at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva determination was expressed to achieve the speediest results at the talks on nuclear and space arms. The message also expresses the healthy proposal that the USSR and the United States refrain from any nuclear tests until the next summit meeting.

We know that President R. Reagan also received a similar appeal.

In his reply M.S. Gorbachev noted that the Soviet Union will not carry out nuclear tests even after 31 March -- until the first nuclear explosion in the United States.

The Soviet Union has thereby acceded to the view of the six countries. This means that seven states are now making an insistent appeal to the leadership of the United States to end nuclear weapon tests. Over 1 billion people live in these states on various continents. They are joined by all to whom peace is dear.

For more than 7 months now the Soviet Union has unilaterally not been conducting nuclear tests. During this time the United States has carried out seven officially announced nuclear explosions and is preparing an eighth for April. Thus, the entire world can see the fundamental difference in the two states' position.

Addressing the USSR and the United States, the leaders of the six countries stated: "You bear the main responsibility for safeguarding our survival." For its part the USSR is fully aware of this responsibility. It is prepared for talks on banning nuclear weapon tests on any basis -- bilateral, trilateral, or multilateral. It is now up to the United States.

The arguments of the opponents of a mutual moratorium on and complete cessation of nuclear tests, it is our conviction, do not withstand criticism.

They say, for example, that tests are necessary to verify [kontrol] the "reliability" of U.S. nuclear weapons. But in reality the tests are carried out for the purpose of modernizing these weapons, upgrading their combat and destructive properties, and creating [sozdaniye] new types, including for use in space. Thus, a stake is being made on seeking to ensure that the potential of mass destruction weapons continues to grow, although those which already exist could blow up mankind and cover the planet with the dust of the grave. They also state: Let us limit ourselves to elaborating [razrabotka] methods of verification [kontrol]. But what they propose verifying is not compliance with accords on ending tests, but the nuclear explosions which they want to continue.

We are convinced that nuclear tests must be ended in the interests of all mankind. Moreover, the Soviet Union is prepared to go further. It has put forward a detailed stage-by-stage program for totally liberating mankind from nuclear weapons even before the end of this century. All states, all parliaments, and all governments in the world have been notified of this program. It is also known to the U.S. Congress.

Of course, the Soviet Union, which is just as interested as the United States in the rigorous observance of accords, attaches great importance to verification [kontrol]. Scientists and specialists proved long ago that verification [kontrol] of the observance of agreements on ending nuclear tests and subsequent nuclear disarmament treaties can be ensured by national means and also with the help of international procedures -- and via on-site inspections, if necessary, to which the Soviet Union has given its consent.

The question of ending nuclear tests is today at the center of attention of the world's peoples. Politicians, public figures, parliamentarians, and eminent scientists in all countries, including famous U.S. scientists, point out the urgent need to put an end to nuclear weapon tests.

WE APPEAL TO CONGRESS TO DO EVERYTHING WITHIN ITS POWER TO ENSURE THAT THE U.S. STANCE IS CONSONANT WITH CARRYING OUT THE TASK OF ENDING NUCLEAR TESTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WILL OF THE PEOPLES AND THEIR PASSIONATE DESIRE TO ENSURE LASTING PEACE ON EARTH. [Uppercase passage published in boldface]

It is incumbent on our two countries, which possess the largest stockpiles of nuclear weapons, to be the first to end tests of these weapons. Our two countries can and must vindicate the hopes for peace nurtured by all peoples.

The USSR is against nuclear explosions.

The USSR is against nuclear weapons altogether.

But now the first step must be a decision on the nonresumption of nuclear explosions by either the Soviet Union or the United States.

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. 'STUBBORNLY' REFUSES TO MATCH TEST BAN

LD201846 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] Already the initial reaction to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium appeal to the U.S. Congress proves that the question of putting a halt to nuclear tests has now become the focus of universal attention. Nor is this surprising; after all, if the USSR and the United States, which possess the largest nuclear arms stockpiles, were to renounce nuclear explosions, this would represent a most important step toward removing the threat of a nuclear conflagration in which the whole of mankind may perish. Why is it, then, that Washington stubbornly refused to follow our country's example? Our country has unilaterally refrained from carrying out nuclear tests for more than 7 months now, even though in the same period the United States has already carried out seven officially announced nuclear explosions. Up until recently, Washington made it appear as though everything was being held up by the problem of verification. However, scientists, including U.S. scientists, have proven that monitoring the halting of nuclear tests can be fully provided for through national means with the addition, where necessary, of on-site inspection.

The USSR for a long time now has been trying to persuade the United States to reach an accord concerning inspections of this kind and also to make use of the additional proposals of the six Delhi declaration signatory states. However, naturally enough, the point at issue here should revolve around monitoring the halting of nuclear explosions and not their continuation. And, in order to get nuclear arms tests banned, the USSR is ready for talks on any basis -- bilateral, trilateral, or multilateral. Thus, it is clearly not a matter of verification or the nature of the talks, it is a matter of the position taken by United States. And this position is determined by the interests of the U.S. military-industrial complex and of the so-called global strategy of the current U.S. Administration.

Setting forth this strategy in a recent message to Congress, President Reagan stated that U.S. participation in world affairs can no longer be confined to the defense of its national territory and that the United States pursues a global foreign policy. Military might is unequivocally proclaimed as the instrument of this policy.

Moreover, the White House and the Pentagon alike emphasize that nuclear arms were and remain one of the most important components of this military might. As for nuclear arms tests, these are certainly not carried out in order to verify their reliability, but for the purpose of intensifying their destructive properties, of modernizing them and creating new types, including their use in space. And U.S. military concerns receive enormous profits from all this.

However, one cannot fail to note something else: in the United States, including Congress, there is a growing number of sensible politicians who recognize the necessity of curbing the dangerous and ruinous nuclear arms race. And now, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium calls on Congress to do everything in its power so that the position of the United States, too, may correspond to the resolution of a most important task of our time: to put a halt to nuclear tests in the interests of ensuring stable world peace.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1302

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWEGIAN PAPER ON LATEST USSR 'SIGNAL' PROMOTING ZONE

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 21 Feb 86 p 2

[Editorial: "Soviet Union and the North"]

[Text] At regular intervals, the Soviet Union sends out signals indicating its views on the Nordic question. One popular topic is the question of a nuclear-free Nordic zone. Recently this question popped up again in the Finnish newspaper KALEVA. The paper presented an article under the by-line Yurii Komissarov, who is assumed to be a high-ranking official at the Foreign Ministry in Moscow. Consequently, it may be seen as a semiofficial presentation of the Soviet superpower's position. But the well-known opinions that are presented here are not designed to spark new interest in this disarmament project.

The author of this article evaluates the positions of the various Nordic countries with regard to a nuclear-free zone. The governments of Finland and Sweden are called "realistic." Interestingly enough, although not surprisingly, Norway is said to have a negative effect on progress toward the nuclear-free goal. The Willoch government is criticized for making the "Atlantic and NATO arguments" its own. Fortunately, this is precisely what the Willoch government has done.

Norway belongs to the Western defense alliance and has the world's largest military base, the Kola Peninsula, as its closest neighbor in the north. This is a reality that, of necessity, must shape our policy toward a nuclear-free Nordic zone. The Soviet writer criticizes the so-called Colding Report, which makes Norwegian participation in such a disarmament effort dependent on a reduction in nuclear and conventional weapons on the Kola Peninsula. The Soviet Union will not agree to such an arrangement, it is said.

The above-mentioned article assures us that the forces located on Soviet territory in the north have no regional objectives. They are intended to reestablish the strategic global balance that was alleged disrupted during the 1960's, at the expense of the Soviet Union, because of the buildup by the United States and NATO. That is an assertion that no responsible Norwegian government can believe. Consequently, most Norwegians see the establishment of a nuclear-free Nordic zone in a broader perspective.

This proposal has been brought up and discussed at regular intervals since it was first proposed by the Soviet Union 25 years ago, although nothing has happened that could justify a change in the Norwegian position. For us, it is the premises and conditions of a nuclear-free zone that are decisive. It cannot be established as an isolated or separate measure. It can occur only as a result of a comprehensive and adequate disarmament agreement between the two superpowers that is in accordance with the NATO nuclear strategy. A "nuclear-free" Nordic zone in which the Kola base retains its present nuclear arsenals would give us a false feeling of security.

9336

CSO: 5200/2637

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET JOURNAL LAUDS DECLARATION OF SOUTH PACIFIC ZONE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85
pp 99-106

[Article by V. Amirov and Yu. Belokon: "Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific"]

[Text] A new phenomenon in the international-political life of the Pacific--the strengthening movement for the creation in the South Pacific of a zone free of nuclear weapons--has been calling increasingly great attention to itself recently.

The decision concerning the formation of such a zone was adopted on 6 August 1985 at the 16th session of the South Pacific Forum in Avarua, the administrative center of the Cook Islands (Rarotonga Island).* The event, which occurred in a remote part of the planet, on a tiny island lost amid vast ocean expanses, has had extensive repercussions throughout the world. And this is not fortuitous inasmuch as it concerns the most burning topic of the present day--the problem of an end to the arms race and elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

There is now an increasingly perceived need that energetic work to curb the arms race be performed in all directions. An important place here is occupied, as before, by measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in reply to an appeal of the Japanese Council of Organizations of Victims of the Atomic Bombings, "our country treats with understanding the endeavor of many states to create nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world. We support the creation of such zones in, for example, North Europe, the Balkans, in Southeast Asia and in Africa. The efforts of states of the South Pacific to create a nuclear-free zone in this region merit approval."**

* As is known, currently the world's sole nuclear-free zone, which is enshrined in international-law form in accordance with the "Tlatelolco Treaty" (which was signed in 1967 and which came into force in 1969), is Latin America. In addition, a de facto nuclear-free zone is Antarctica, where a corresponding international treaty (signed in 1959, came into force in 1961) prohibits any military activity at all and stipulates specially, furthermore, that all nuclear explosions and the disposal of radioactive material in this region are banned. The treaty's provisions apply to the area south of Latitude 60 degrees South, including shelf glaciers.

**PRAVDA, 6 August 1985.

The participants in the session of the Socialist International Bureau in mid-October 1985 in Vienna supported the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific region.

The territory encompassed by the nuclear-free zone being created in the Pacific is impressive primarily for its dimensions. According to the description provided in Appendix I to the "Avarua Treaty" and the sketch map appended thereto, the zone is described by a line starting at the point of intersection of the equator and the northern maritime frontier between Indonesia and Papua New Guinea. It then runs eastward basically along the equator, with the exception of certain sectors, where it runs somewhat to the north of it (as far as Latitude 5 degrees 30 minutes North). The eastern boundary is the 115th meridian of Longitude West, while the southern boundary is the 60th parallel. In the West the line of the zone runs initially along the 115th meridian of Longitude East and then along the outer frontier of the territorial waters of Australia and the maritime and land frontier between Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, thus closing the perimeter of the zone. The latter includes also the islands in the Indian Ocean belonging to Australia.

The following facts also provide an idea of the scale of the nuclear-free zone. Although the total population of the countries which are incorporated in the South Pacific Forum is small (less than 24 million), the aggregate dimensions of the territory they occupy constitute approximately 8.5 million square kilometers. The area of their 200-mile economic zones is truly vast (for example, for Australia it constitutes 6.4 million square kilometers, for Papua New Guinea 3.1 million square kilometers).

I

To understand the essence of what occurred on 6 August in Avarua a retrospective glance at the development of events in this region in recent decades is appropriate. First, concerning the body which made the decision. The South Pacific Forum is a regional organization which has been in existence since 1971. The leading part in its creation was played by Australia, which has the biggest political and economic influence in the region. Originally the forum was made up of 6 states and 1 self-governing territory. In line with the development of the decolonization process, which has been stepped up particularly here since the mid-1970's, the number of its participants has reached 13. They include, besides Australia, one other developed capitalist country--New Zealand--9 independent developing states--Vanuatu, Western Samoa, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Fiji and also Niue and the Cook Islands, which have the status of self-governing territories in "free association" with New Zealand.

Since the time of the emergence of the South Pacific Forum its participants have proclaimed as their main goal the establishment of mutual economic cooperation. However, with time--particularly in recent years--increasingly great significance has come to be attached to interaction in questions of foreign policy also. The set of problems connected with nuclear weapons, the nuclear threat, the conducting of nuclear explosions here and their consequences is moving to the forefront here.

There have been and continue to be particular reasons for a kind of "nuclear allergy" on the part of the peoples of the region. The point being that practically throughout the postwar period it has served and continues to serve as the most important and, it may be said, sole nuclear firing range of its kind of the Western powers. Thus the United States carried out nuclear explosions from 1946 through 1963 on a number of atolls of the Marshall Islands, which are situated north of Nauru and Kiribati. Australia's Victoria Desert was the site of British atomic weapon tests in the 1950's and 1960's. Instances of the secret burial in the former testing area of Maralinga of the British atomic industry's radioactive waste were revealed recently. The United States and Great Britain were "relieved," as it were, by France. After Algeria had won independence, it transferred its nuclear testing center from the Sahara to Eastern Oceania. More than 100 nuclear explosions, including 45 in the atmosphere (up to 1975), have been conducted here, in Polynesia, which since 1958 has had the status of "overseas territory," on the Mururoa (the main testing site) and Fangatau atolls from 1966 through 1985. Approximately eight tests are now conducted annually. As a whole, according to foreign press reports, the Western powers have exploded over 250 atomic and hydrogen bombs in the Pacific, which has done tremendous damage to the population and environment of the areas adjacent to the test sites.

But for the countries and peoples of the South Pacific there are other aspects of the nuclear problem also. They are connected primarily with the Pentagon's assertive activity in the region, the scale of which is growing constantly. The ocean waters are being plied by American ships with nuclear weapons on board. In a number of states of the forum the U.S. armed forces have the opportunity to use airfields, ports and other installations, not to mention the presence of large American military bases on Australian territory. Important military and naval facilities of the Pentagon are located in neighboring Micronesia, where nuclear and chemical weapons are stored and there are firing ranges for testing ICBM's. Reports have appeared concerning the existence in a number of Western states of plans to dispose of and bury radioactive waste (spent nuclear power station fuel, in particular) in certain parts of the Pacific (in the Marianas, for example).

Thus there are more than enough factors engendering antinuclear sentiments and movements in this region. At the same time circumstances of another kind have to be taken into consideration also. It is primarily a question of considerable--and in some cases huge--differences in the economic and political position of the Pacific Forum members and, correspondingly, their far from equal role in the affairs of the region. All this gives rise to differences in their positions in respect of the nuclear problem as a whole and individual aspects thereof. Furthermore, the very essence of the problem has undergone considerable change. Whereas initially its seriousness was determined mainly by the conducting of nuclear weapons tests, in time the significance of other aspects began to grow also. Thus a new factor appeared stimulating antinuclear sentiments and exerting an increasingly big influence on the policy of the governments--the broad public movement in support of the deliverance of the region from nuclear weapons. And, finally, compared with the period of 10-15 years ago, when the decisive part in questions of the determination of nuclear policy here was played by Australia (and also New Zealand), now the voices of the region's young developing states are ringing out increasingly loudly.

The way to the decision on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific proved difficult and for this reason quite long. The idea itself was advanced for the first time officially in 1973. A number of factors contributed to this. Among these were primarily the assumption of office in Australia and New Zealand of the Labor parties, in which (particularly among the ordinary members) antinuclear sentiments had begun to spread markedly. And, of course, the trend toward the relaxation of international tensions, which acquired considerable impetus at the start of the 1970's, could not have failed to have been reflected in the political situation in the region.

The first to present the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone was New Zealand (its position on this issue is at the present time also more consistent than many other countries of the forum). Two years later, in 1975, this initiative was supported, although not without hesitation, by Australia, which voted at the UN General Assembly 30th Session in support of the corresponding proposal, which had been submitted by New Zealand in conjunction with Papua New Guinea and Fiji. The point was that the existence of large reserves of uranium and developed scientific-technical and industrial potential was prompting a certain section of Australia's ruling circles to think about the possibility of the creation in the future of its own nuclear weapons.* There were--and continue to be--serious internal political disagreements on the question of uranium production in the country. They are also occurring in the Labor Party itself, whose left wing supports a total ban on the mining and export of uranium. But the main factor, perhaps, countering the trend in favor of support for the idea of a nuclear-free zone were Australian-American military-political relations--both bilateral and along ANZUS bloc lines.

At the same time, however, Canberra began also to take into consideration increasingly the essential benefits which it would derive from support for the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone. It was assumed there that this would underpin Australia's claims to the role of a kind of "regional leader" (from the angle of interimperialist rivalry with France, which owns here, besides Polynesia, other "overseas territories" also, included) and markedly increase its political influence. Hopes for a broadening of the possibilities of foreign policy maneuvering beyond the confines of Oceania also (in relations with the developing states included) were also bound up with this. In short, Canberra's policy in the nuclear field was determined from the angle of the search for ways and means of enhancing the country's role and place in world politics.

Conservative parties returned to office in Australia and New Zealand in 1975, which pushed aside the problems of a nuclear-free zone. Thus the New Zealand Government once again permitted calls at the country's ports of American ships with nuclear weapons on board, while the Australian Government lifted in 1976 the ban on calls of nuclear-powered warships which had been in effect since 1972. The subsequent years of conservative rule were characterized as a whole by a

* While having signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 1969, Australia ratified it only in 1973.

strengthening of the two countries' military-political relations with the United States within the ANZUS framework, while the proposals connected with a limitation of nuclear activity in the region were reflected merely in documents of the opposition parties.

The idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone acquired new impetus with the assumption of office in Australia in March 1983 of the Labor government headed by R. Hawke. In 1982 the party conference had determined its platform on this problem. It condemned nuclear explosions and the disposal of nuclear waste in the ocean and demanded an end to "all kinds of nuclear activity" in the South Pacific. The prevention of calls at Australian ports of warships carrying nuclear weapons was envisaged.*

The question of the creation of a nuclear-free zone became an important element of the policy of the R. Hawke government. The right-of-center leadership of the Labor Party connected with support for this idea hopes for a strengthening of its domestic policy positions, hoping that this, in particular, would help neutralize the demands of the party's left wing, which occupies a more radical position on various aspects of the nuclear problem, and "curb" the growing antiwar movements in the country. In the foreign policy plane Canberra, having taken the initiative in the creation of a nuclear-free zone, endeavored to direct into a certain channel the antiwar activeness of the young states of Oceania threatening the positions of imperialism in this region and to strengthen its authority in the South Pacific Forum. Simultaneously the R. Hawke government hoped to expand the field of diplomatic maneuvering (primarily in relations with France and the United States) and thereby impart to its foreign policy greater dynamism within the framework of the entire Asia-Pacific region.

The possibilities of negotiations of the countries of the South Pacific subregion concerning the creation within its confines of a nuclear-free zone increased with the assumption of office in New Zealand in July 1984 of the Labor Party. The ban imposed by the D. Lange government on calls at the country's ports of ships with nuclear weapons on board and nuclear-powered ships served as the catalyst for a further growth of antinuclear sentiments in the states of the South Pacific Forum. Its 15th session, which was held in August 1984 in Funafuti (Tuvalu), determined the general provisions of the status of the future nuclear-free zone and adopted the decision to prepare a draft of the corresponding treaty for the next session, for which a working group headed by the Australian representative was set up.

The draft treaty was drawn up in an atmosphere of the intensified struggle of various political and social forces in the subregion around the problem of nuclear disarmament. Of course, outside pressure, primarily on the part of Washington, which is stubbornly insisting that the D. Lange government cancel its decision, was reflected also. The profound crack which has appeared in ANZUS has seriously troubled the Australian Government. Despite the readiness which is displayed constantly to support the general foreign policy line of the United

* In February 1984 the Labor Government, following consultations with the United States and Great Britain, abandoned further compliance with this provision of the election platform.

States, on this question it evidently did not consider it advisable to put too strong pressure on New Zealand. In addition, the antiwar, antinuclear movement had strengthened in the country itself. The pronounced success at the December 1984 parliamentary elections of the Nuclear Disarmament Party, which had been formed only 18 months prior to then, testified, in particular, to its stimulation. The fall (according to the Australian calendar) antiwar marches acquired in 1985 a mass character. Thus, according to press estimates, approximately 400,000 persons took to the streets on 31 March in all the main and the majority of the peripheral cities of the country. Over 8.5 million of the country's inhabitants are living in cities and districts which their municipalities have declared nuclear-free zones.

As we can see, the interweaving of a whole number of factors--of both a foreign and domestic policy nature--determined the basic motives which conditioned the interest of both Australia and New Zealand (despite the differences, considerable at times, moreover, in their positions) in the speediest adoption of a decision on the creation of a nuclear-free zone. But this interest also prompted them to make efforts to reduce to a common denominator the very different opinions of and approaches to this issue of the developing countries of Oceania. Ultimately, the document prepared by the working group and approved in Avarua recorded the basic principles preliminarily determined by the states of the forum in 1984 at its session in Funafuti.

III

The preamble to the Treaty on the Creation in the South Pacific of a Zone Free of Nuclear Weapons proclaims the allegiance of its signatory states to the cause of peace throughout the world; it expresses their serious concern at the continuing arms race, which is leading to the "risk of nuclear war with its devastating consequences for all mankind," as, equally, the belief that "all countries are obliged to make every effort for the achievement of the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons" and the removal of the threat which they represent for mankind and life on Earth; expresses the confidence that "regional arms control measures could contribute to global efforts for a turning back of the nuclear arms race and promote the national security of each country of this region" and general security for all; and confirms once again "the importance of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons for preventing the spread of such weapons and promoting international security".

The communique adopted on the results of the Avarua session observes that "the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific...reflects the profound concern of all members of the forum at the continuing nuclear arms race and the risk of nuclear war". The resumption of the Soviet-American Geneva negotiations is welcomed in this context and the hope expressed that these negotiations "achieve their stated goal--both a reduction in nuclear arms as far as their final liquidation and the prevention of an arms race in space".

The basic provisions of the treaty are recorded in articles 3 through 7.

Thus article 3 proclaims a renunciation of nuclear explosive devices. The subscriber-countries undertake here: "a) not to produce or acquire and not to

possess or have control over any nuclear explosive device by any means anywhere-- within or beyond the confines of the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific; b) not to endeavor to obtain or obtain any assistance in the production or acquisition of any nuclear explosive device; c) not to engage in any actions to assist or encourage the production or acquisition of any nuclear explosive device by any state".

Article 4 concerns the peaceful aspects of nuclear activity. In particular, the subscriber-countries undertake to supply fissionable material for the use for peaceful purposes to any nonnuclear state only in accordance with the safeguards provided for by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and to any nuclear power only in accordance with safeguards agreements with the IAEA.

Article 5 contains an undertaking to prevent the deployment on one's territory of nuclear explosive devices. However, "each subscriber, by way of the exercise of its sovereign rights, is free to decide whether to permit visits of foreign ships and aircraft to its ports and airfields and the crossing of its airspace by aircraft and the navigation of foreign ships in its territorial waters..."

Article 65 undertakes "to prevent the testing of any nuclear explosive device on its territory" and "not to engage in any actions to assist or encourage tests of any nuclear explosive device by any state".

Finally, article 7 contains an undertaking "not to dispose of radioactive waste and other radioactive substances in the sea anywhere within the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific" and not to help or encourage anyone to such actions; "to prevent the disposal of radioactive waste and other radioactive substances by anyone in one's territorial waters"; and to support the conclusion as quickly as possible of a convention concerning protection of the natural resources and environment in the South Pacific region and a protocol thereto on the prevention of the pollution of this area by way of the disposal in the sea of radioactive substances.

The creation of a system of control of compliance with the provisions of the treaty, an exchange of information, consultations within the framework of a consultative committee established for these purposes and so forth are provided for. The treaty is to be ratified by each subscriber-country. It is of an indefinite nature and will take effect from the time its instruments of ratification are deposited. The depositary is the director of the South Pacific Office of Economic Cooperation, which is the main executive authority of the South Pacific Forum.

The treaty was signed in Avarua by the heads of government of eight states and territories (Australia, Western Samoa, Kiribati, Niue, New Zealand, the Cook Islands, Tuvalu and Fiji). Concerning the other participants in the forum, the communique on the results of the session noted understanding of the fact that they could not sign the treaty until the appropriate constitutional procedures were observed.

Of course, the laws of each country have their singularities. But it is obviously not only a question of this. There are also purely political reasons

engendered by the nature of the document adopted at the Avarua session and the varying attitude thereto on the part of states of the region.

The greatest attention is attracted in this connection by article 5 of the treaty, whose content was spoken of above. After all, it may also be interpreted in the sense that it affords foreign states, nuclear included, an opportunity to use ports, airfields and similar installations on the territory of countries of the region. And primarily the United States and also Great Britain could avail themselves, as, incidentally, they are already availing themselves, of this opportunity. As far as France is concerned, its military activity is concentrated on its "overseas territories".

Those who insisted on the incorporation in the treaty of article 5 are attempting to justify their position by the need for respect for and compliance with international law in the part thereof concerning freedom of navigation and aeronautics. Such an intention can only be welcomed, which cannot be said of the difference in interpretation of this freedom. Thus the desire of the USSR--within the framework of the development of mutually profitable economic relations--to conclude fishing agreements with certain island states of Oceania is immediately presented by imperialist circles as an example of "Soviet expansionism" and some kind of "threat" to the countries of the region.

At the same time, however, the regular visits by American missile-carrying submarines of the Cockburn Sound (west coast of Australia) base are considered as "going without saying". B-52 strategic bombers have an opportunity when making flights over the Indian Ocean to land at the Australian air base in Darwin (in the north of the continent), at which the United States permanently keeps service personnel. Major American communications, tracking and guidance stations (North West Cape, Pine Gap and [Narrangara]), which play an important part in supporting the functioning of the nuclear-space component of the United States' military machine, are located on Australian territory. All this compels special attention to the provisions of articles 3 and 5 of the treaty, which speak of renunciation of the possession and prevention of the deployment on one's territory of nuclear explosive devices, but do not say one word about their delivery systems (among which, for example, are those same B-52 bombers, missiles installed on submarines and so forth).

IV

Granted all the complexities connected with the formulation of the "Avarua Treaty," complexities engendered to a considerable extent by disagreements between participants in the South Pacific Forum, and granted the existence of the barriers which still have to be overcome in the way of implementation of the provisions recorded in the treaty, the decision adopted on Rarotonga Island contains a considerable positive charge.

In the subregional plane the "treaty setting" of antinuclear sentiments at interstate level could serve as a stimulus to their further spread among the broad public and active introduction in the foreign policy of the governments of the forum's countries as an important element thereof. States which both

signed the "Avarua Treaty"* and which have not signed it, but which support certain of its provisions have acquired an instrument of collective influence on the policy of the leading imperialist powers in this part of the world. The document in question will contribute to growth of international-political self-awareness in the young ocean states.

It should be mentioned particularly that the "Avarua Treaty" goes beyond the subregional framework--it is of significance for the Asia-Pacific region as a whole. Thus a number of its provisions is consonant with the antinuclear demands of the peoples of Micronesia,** whose relations with countries of the South Pacific Forum have enjoyed certain development in recent years (it has observer status in this organization). An active antinuclear position is occupied by a part of Micronesia--the Republic of Belau.

At the UN General Assembly special session held on 16 October 1985 devoted to the decolonization process a collective statement made by a group of East European socialist countries observed, in particular: "The policy of the dismemberment of Micronesia, the conversion of which into a U.S. military base is contrary to the aspiration of the Pacific states to the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, is causing serious concern."

The initiative of the South Pacific countries has also revived interest in the problem of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. And here also the main obstacle to the realization of this idea is the policy of imperialism, American primarily, and its close military-political relations with a number of ASEAN countries. In particular, on the territory of the Philippines there are, inter alia, two bases of strategic significance which are the Pentagon's biggest military facilities outside of the United States--the Subic Bay naval base and the Clark Field air base. Washington is endeavoring by might and main to preserve and strengthen its military presence in Southeast Asia. It is attempting for this purpose, in particular, to impede the establishment of constructive dialogue between the Indochina countries and the ASEAN states. Given the absence of such a dialogue, it is easier for the United States to counteract the conversion of Southeast Asia into a zone of lasting peace, stability, good-neighborliness and cooperation. Serious concern was caused in Washington by the fact that in the wake of the adoption in 1984 at the 15th session of the South Pacific Forum of a decision in principle on the creation of a nuclear-free zone ASEAN returned once again to discussion of the question of the establishment of such a zone in its subregion. Although it is as yet too

* Papua New Guinea subscribed to it on 16 September 1985--the 10th anniversary of the proclamation of its independence.

**Since 1947 it has been a UN trust territory administered by the United States. The latter, in violation of the UN Charter, had split Micronesia by the start of the 1980's into four formations: the Community of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Republic of Belau (Palau archipelago) and the Federated States of Micronesia (the Central and East Carolines and a number of other islands).

early to speak of any pronounced practical actions in this field, the "Avarua Treaty" could undoubtedly perform a certain stimulating role here. Indonesian Foreign Minister M. Kusumatmaadja declared, in particular, that the antinuclear treaty concluded by the participants in the forum serves "as an expression of the Pacific countries' firm position on this question."

The movement for the creation of a nuclear-free zone is having a positive impact on the South Pacific states' position on problems of peace and disarmament as a whole, and not only at the regional level. Thus Australian Foreign Minister W. Hayden, welcoming the moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons announced by the Soviet Union, called for a mutually agreed renunciation of testing and emphasized that there was no alternative to a treaty prohibiting nuclear tests which was all-embracing and subject to verification.

The Australian Government has declined to support President R. Reagan's "strategic defense initiative". We believe, W. Hayden declared, addressing the UN General Assembly 40th Session, that the maximum attention should be paid to the mobilization of efforts to ensure that space be used solely for peaceful purposes. Support for actions aimed at an end to the nuclear arms race was also reflected in the speeches delivered from the UN rostrum by the representatives of New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu, Western Samoa and other participants in the South Pacific forum.

The movement for the creation of nuclear-free zones, which has encompassed various parts of the world, is contributing to the development of the political cooperation of the states which support this idea. The political contacts between New Zealand and Sweden may be cited as an example. Back at the end of the 1970's the latter, as is known, banned calls in its territorial waters of warships with nuclear weapons on board and actively advocates nuclear disarmament and supports, in particular, the creation of a nuclear-free zone in North Europe.

V

Naturally, the position of the nuclear powers (upon realization of such partial measures as the creation of nuclear-free zones) is extraordinarily important primarily from the viewpoint of a positive solution of the problems of nuclear disarmament. Taking this circumstance into consideration and taking account of all aspects thereof connected with the implementation of the provisions of the "Avarua Treaty," the countries of the South Pacific Forum appended thereto three protocols addressed to the nuclear powers.

Protocol I pertains to the United States, Great Britain and France inasmuch as they control, in accordance with this legal status or the other, certain territories within the confines of the zone defined by the "Avarua Treaty". Thus for France this means New Caledonia and French Polynesia and also the Wallis and Futuna islands. The United States owns Eastern Samoa, while Great Britain owns Pitcairn Island. According to the protocol, the said nuclear powers may assume in respect of the enumerated territories the basic commitments assumed in accordance with the treaty (articles 3, 5 and 6) by the South Pacific Forum members.

The two other protocols are opened for signing by all the nuclear powers. Protocol II provides for the commitments: first, not to contribute to any actions which represent a violation of the provisions of the treaty and its protocols by the countries which have signed them; second, not to use nuclear explosive devices and not to threaten their use against subscribers to the treaty and the South Pacific territories controlled by the powers which sign Protocol I. Protocol III deals with the commitment not to test any nuclear explosive devices within the confines of the nuclear-free zone.

Consultations with the nuclear powers which consider these protocols acceptable to themselves are envisaged for final touches to the wording contained in the protocols. It is planned examining the results of the consultations, if such take place, at the session of the South Pacific Forum in 1986.

For realization of the provisions of the "Avarua Treaty" paramount significance in the light of the facts expounded above is attached to the reaction thereto on the part of Washington and Paris. And it cannot be called promising.

The point being that the treaty on the nuclear-free zone, as, equally, the New Zealand Government's ban on calls at its ports of ships carrying nuclear weapons, not only affects the Pentagon's military activity in the subregion but is also perceived politically as an extremely undesirable precedent from the viewpoint of the United States. Washington fears a chain reaction of the spread of anti-nuclear sentiments and, what is most important, the adoption under the influence thereof of practical steps which could impede realization of the United States' military-political strategy within the framework of the entire Asia-Pacific region.

It is here that the reason for the power pressure to which New Zealand is being subjected on the part of the United States lies. In Canberra in July 1985 in connection with the Australian-American negotiations being conducted there, which had replaced the annual meeting of the participants in the ANZUS bloc (Washington had insisted on its cancellation on account of Wellington's antinuclear measures), Secretary of State G. Shultz publicly expressed "serious reservations" in respect of the plans for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. According to press reports, the United States is putting pressure on some participants in the forum to ensure that they not sign the "Avarua Treaty".

At the same time, however, Washington cannot fail to consider, albeit partially, the interests of its most important ally in the region--Australia. Yet Canberra has already made it understood that it expects U.S. assistance in prompting France to cease nuclear tests. The Australian Government has also proposed reducing the number of calls by American warships at ports of the country's west coast.

In turn, France has unequivocally declared its intention to continue nuclear explosions on Mururoa Atoll, which (together with the well-known circumstances connected with the blowing up of the "Rainbow Warrior" in the port of the New Zealand city of Auckland) has contributed to an exacerbation of relations between Paris on the one hand and Canberra and Wellington on the other. Last year even W. Hayden warned of the possibility of "stricter actions" on the part of

Australia in addition to the halt to supplies to France of uranium ore as a sign of protest against its nuclear tests.

There is no doubt that implementation of the "Avarua Treaty" will require prolonged and significant efforts--and not only on the part of the South Pacific states.

As far as the Soviet Union's position is concerned, it believes that countries which do not possess nuclear weapons and do not have such on their territory have the right to dependable international-law guarantees of their security and to the fact that nuclear weapons will not be used against them.

In September 1985, during the UN General Assembly 40th Session, talks were held in New York between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and Australian Foreign Minister W. Hayden and G. Palmer, deputy prime minister of New Zealand. The Soviet side confirmed the USSR's positive attitude toward the decision of the South Pacific countries to create a nuclear-free zone in this region and noted the positive reaction which this decision had evoked in the world.

The idea put forward by the Soviet Union of a comprehensive approach to ensuring security in Asia and the Pacific elicited extensive comment. The implementation of measures of a regional nature could make a considerable contribution to the strengthening of international security and a curbing of the arms race.

The statement of the meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee on 22-23 October in Sofia emphasized the particular significance of the consolidation of peace and cooperation in Asia and the Pacific and a strengthening of trust and security here. It noted, in particular, that the efforts of the South Pacific states to create a nuclear-free zone serve the interests of ensuring general security.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

9274

CSO: 5200/1243

RELATED ISSUES

SERIES OF SOVIET PAMPHLETS ON DISARMAMENT PUBLISHED

Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNIYE NAUKI in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 85 pp 167-171

[Article by T. Gushchina, candidate of economic sciences and responsible secretary for the "International Peace and Disarmament" series of publications: "The Publication Series 'International Peace and Disarmament'"]

[Text] An important place in the work of the Scientific Council for the Study of the Problems of Peace and Disarmament, established in the USSR in 1979, is occupied with the preparation of books and pamphlets for printing. Along with the basic monographs and its yearbook, the council issues a series of publications titled "International Peace and Disarmament." The task of the series is to inform the public of the results of investigations carried out in the USSR on matters pertaining to warding off the nuclear threat and the struggle to strengthen the general peace and security of peoples from the point of view of Soviet scientists.

The editorial staff for the series is headed by academician P. Fedoseyev, chairman of the Scientific Council and Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The pamphlets are issued with the assistance of the Soviet Peace Fund. They are published by the main editor's office for editions for foreign countries of the "Nauka" Publishing House. In the less than 5 full years beginning in 1980, more than 30 titles of these books have been issued in Russian as well as English, Spanish, German and French. Along with prominent Soviet scientists and specialists in the area of the social and natural sciences, their authors include public figures and publicists.

The series issue of small-size publications makes it possible to inform the readers of the most current and central aspects of a complex set of problems of peace and disarmament promptly and systematically. It should be emphasized that the series is addressed not only to specialists in the area of "peace research" but also to a significantly larger audience. The editorial staff and the authors of the pamphlets are striving to combine the high scientific level of their content with a popular presentation and the generalization of facts and figures with convincing arguments.

The different aspects--political, strategic, economic and technological--of the problems linked with peace and disarmament are closely intertwined. Nonetheless, one can separate out several main and fundamental questions that

have become the central themes of the series "International Peace and Disarmament."

These include, above all, pointing out the catastrophic consequences of nuclear war for humanity, if it does break out. "Gubitelnyye posledstviya yadernoy voyny" [The Ruinous Consequences of Nuclear War] is the title of a book issued in 1985 under the editorship of M. Barabanov, doctor of economic sciences. (Footnote) (Here and in the following, the year indicated is the year of the issue of the Russian language editions in the series.) In this work, investigators from the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences come to the conclusion that a nuclear conflict would have catastrophic consequences for contemporary civilization.

It is not possible to resolve the global problems of humanity under the conditions of the continuing arms race and the pursuance of policy "from a position of strength." The scientific foundation of this conclusion is the subject of a number of publications in the series, in particular "Razoruzheniye i okruzhayushchaya sreda" [Disarmament and the Environment] (1981, under the editorship of academician Ye. Fedorov and R. Novikov) as well as "Globalnyye problemy i mir mezhdunarodami" [Global Problems and Peace Between Nations] (1983, doctor of economic sciences M. Maksimova).

To be successful in the struggle against the nuclear threat, it is not enough merely to state that it exists. It is necessary to present its sources clearly. The pages of the series publications show this source--contemporary imperialism and the military-industrial complex that it has created. In particular, in the work "Voyenno-promyshlennyy kompleks SSHA--ugroza miru" [The Military-Industrial Complex of the United States--A Threat to Peace] (1983; 1985), doctor of economic sciences Ye. Bugrov, using abundant factual material, characterizes the interaction of the American military industry and the upper echelons of federal military authority, who have become a dangerous factor in the accelerated militarization of the United States.

In the pamphlet, "Protiv neytronnoy smerti" [Against Neutron Death] (1985), L. Ilin, member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, and T. Dmitrichev, doctor of historical sciences, write about the history of the creation of the neutron bomb in the United States and about the danger that it poses to humanity. The authors devote a lot of space to the struggle of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for the prohibition of neutron weapons.

The plans for the so-called "star wars" actively developed by Washington represent a serious danger to the cause of peace. In the work "Kosmos i mir" [Space and Peace] (1985), T. Zhukov, doctor of juridical sciences and a Soviet specialist in the area of space law, justifies the point of view under which the militarization of space and the deployment of weapons there are inadmissible, no matter what arguments are used to cover these actions. "Space defense", stresses the author, is nothing other than a precondition for inflicting a first "disarming" strike.

The policy of international terrorism, the "secret war" of imperialism against progressive and national-liberation forces, has become a serious destabilizing

factor in the contemporary international situation. In the work "Eta drugaya voyna" [This Other War] (1984), in stressing the danger of this policy for the cause of peace, candidate of historical sciences and publicist V. Matveyev characterizes the state terrorism elevated to the rank of official policy by the administration of the United States as a type of crime of an international nature.

An important place in the series' editions belongs to an analysis of the factors and ways of preserving peace and strengthening international security. Security under today's conditions, as is emphasized in "Sovetskaya kontseptsiya razoruzheniya" [The Soviet Concept of Disarmament] (1983), the work of doctor of historical sciences V. Petrovskiy, can be achieved only through disarmament. The importance and complexity of this task have increased immeasurably with the accumulation of enormous stocks of weapons of mass destruction in the world. At the same time, the Soviet Union, a consistent supporter of the idea of universal and complete disarmament, welcomes partial measures for disarmament. The author develops this theme in his new publication, "Sovetskaya kontseptsiya bezopasnosti" [The Soviet Concept of Security] (1985). Attempts to ensure one's own security at the expense of others or to achieve military superiority are unrealistic and fraught with the intensification of the global nuclear threat.

Soviet scientists realize that, under the conditions of the endless accumulation of extremely deadly weapons and the increasing instability in the world, a nuclear conflict can arise as a result of the accidental or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons. In studying this type of danger, in the work "O vozmoshnosti "sluchaynoy" yadernoy voyny" [On the Possibility of an "Accidental" Nuclear War] (1985), corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences V. Yemelyanov points out the necessity of the most rapid and significant reduction of nuclear armaments. From his point of view, the first step on this path could be the implementation of an immediate freeze on the nuclear arsenals of the USSR and United States.

How is it possible to limit armaments and reduce military production when the military industry is an important component of the economy of many capitalist countries? The pamphlet of doctor of economic sciences R. Farmazyan, "Gonka vooruzheniy i konversiya voyennoy ekonomiki" [The Arms Race and the Conversion of the Military Economy] (1985), is dedicated to this problem. For the first time in scientific literature, the author made extensive use of and generalized Soviet experience in transferring military enterprises to the track of peaceful production after the end of World War II.

The peace-loving foreign policy of the USSR and the other countries of socialism is a basic factor in the preservation and consolidation of peace under present-day conditions. The work of academician O. Bogomolov and candidate of historical sciences A. Vakhrameyev, "Sotsialisticheskoye sodruzhestvo v borbe za mir i razoruzheniye" [The Socialist Community in the Struggle for Peace and Disarmament] (1983), tells of the consistent struggle of the socialist community for the improvement of contemporary international relations, for stopping the arms race, and for a relaxation of military tensions and disarmament. In our time, the peace-loving public is playing an ever more noticeable role in the struggle to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

The book of O. Kharkhardin, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee in Defense of Peace, "Sovetskaya obshchestvennost v mirovom protivoyennom dvizhenii" [The Soviet Public in the World Antiwar Movement] (1985), is dedicated to the contribution of Soviet public organizations to the struggle for peace.

The active and growing role of scientists in the antiwar and antinuclear movement is shown in "Nauka i otvetstvennost uchenykh" [Science and the Responsibility of Scientists] (1981), the work of academician M. Markov, chairman of the Soviet Pugwash Committee.

At the present time, a ramified international mechanism has come into being for the examination disarmament questions. What is the role of this mechanism in the overall process of arms limitation and disarmament, and how does the work of international organizations influence the positions of states? These questions are examined in "Mezhdunarodnyy mekhanizm peregovorov po razoruzheniyu" [The International Mechanism of Disarmament Talks] (1984), the work of A. Kalyadin, doctor of historical sciences, and Yu. Nazarkin, candidate of historical sciences. In the work "Venskiye peregovory" [The Vienna Talks] (1985), in analyzing the 11-year history of negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, G. Kamenskiy notes that precisely the socialist states have carried on and are carrying on negotiations in fact and in a constructive spirit and have done and are doing everything possible to achieve just and mutually acceptable agreements.

Measures to build confidence between states are attaining tremendous importance in view of the exacerbation of the international situation. This problem is the subject of the works of doctor of historical sciences O. Bykov, "Mery doveriya" [Confidence Measures] (1983) and "Za atmosferu doveriya" [For an Atmosphere of Confidence] (1985). The author comes to the conclusion that an improvement of the international atmosphere is quite attainable if at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe success is achieved in reaching a decision of a far-reaching nature, above all on the banning of the first use of nuclear weapons. Such a decision would practically preclude nuclear war, the most terrible thing that can threaten humanity. The book of An. Alekseyev, "Stokgolmskaya konferentsiya" [The Stockholm Conference] (1985), goes into detail on the work of this representative forum. The author analyzes the positions of the sides and characterizes the proposals put forth by them.

The deployment of American missiles in Europe, where the fire of world war has already flared up twice, is one of the most dangerous and destabilizing factors in contemporary international relations. The works of doctor of historical sciences D. Proektor, "Osnovy mira v Yevropa" [Bases of Peace in Europe] (1983), and candidate of historical sciences L. Voronkov, "Severnoy Yevrope--bezyadernyy status" [Nuclear-Free Status for Northern Europe] (1984) are dedicated to a comprehensive analysis of the possibilities and prospects of a policy of security on the continent.

Various regional aspects of the struggle for peace and international security are also examined in the works, "Indiyskiy okean: sfera napryazhennosti ili zona mira?" [The Indian Ocean: Area of Tension or Zone of Peace?] (1983) by doctor of historical sciences I. Pedko and candidate of military sciences N.

Shaskolskiy; "Latinskaya Amerika: problemy vooruzheniy i razoruzheniya" [Latin America: Problems of Armaments and Disarmament] (1983) by a group of authors from the Latin America Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and "Afrike--zonu mira" [Africa--A Zone of Peace] (1983 under the editorship of An. Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences).

A set of questions having to do with the role of the mass information media in today's world is raised in "Novyy mezhdunarodnyy informatsionnyy poryadok i problema podderzhaniya mira" [The New International Information System and the Problem of Support for Peace] (1983), the work of doctor of juridical sciences Yu. Kolosov and B. Tsepov.

In an exchange of books, the publications of the series are being sent by the Scientific Council for the Study of the Problems of Peace and Disarmament to many international and national research and educational centers, including the International Peace Institute in Vienna, the International Institute of the United Nations for the Study of Disarmament Problems in Geneva, the Institute for the Study of Problems of Peace in Tampere (Finland), the International Institute for the Study of Problems of Peace in Stockholm, the UN University in Tokyo, the UN Department for Disarmament in New York, the Center for Defense Information in Washington, and others.

The pamphlets are disseminated on a commercial basis in more than 30 countries. The increase in the number of copies of editions in the series and the interest of foreign book dealers (in particular reprints in India and Cuba) in it are evidence of the popularity of the series.

Taking into account the experience gained in the last 5 years, the editorial staff is setting the tasks of the further expansion of the subjects of the series, the making of the content of its issues more current, and the provision for their prompt publication in different languages. At the present time, special attention is being paid to the preparation of works dedicated to the International Year of Peace. Among them are "OON i problemy obespecheniya mira v sovremennykh usloviyakh" [The United Nations and Problems in Ensuring Peace Under Contemporary Conditions] and "Khimicheskoye oruzhiye--pod polnyy zapret" [Chemical Weapons--A Complete Ban]. The work "Atom--tolko mirnyy" [The Atom--Only for Peace] (responsible editor is A. Petrosyants, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences) came out recently. In the series in 1986, it is also planned to issue such publications as "Zhenshchiny mira v borbe za mir" [The Women of the World in the Struggle for Peace], "Okruzhayushchaya sreda i mir na planete" [The Environment and Peace on the Planet], "Profsoyuzy i mir" [The Trade Unions and Peace], and others.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Obshchestvennyye nauki", 1985

9746

CSO: 5200/1291

RELATED ISSUES

ZHAO ZIYANG DISCUSSES PRC POSITION ON DISARMAMENT IN SPEECH

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW Vol 29 No 12, 24 Mar 86 pp 14-15

[Text of Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang speech to the United Nations' International Year of Peace Rally, held in Beijing on 21 March 1986]

[Text]

Today's rally is held by the Chinese people in response to the United Nations' call for marking the International Year of Peace. It reflects the profound desire for peace on the part of the Chinese people of all nationalities and their determination to strengthen unity with the people of other countries in maintaining peace. I wish this programme initiated by the United Nations complete success throughout the world.

During the first half of this century, mankind went through two world wars with untold sufferings. In spite of the absence of a new world war in the past four decades since the end of World War II, the turbulent international situation indicates that the danger of war is yet to be removed. It is therefore a matter of common concern to the people of all countries whether peace will reign for the rest of this century and whether there will be continued peace in the next.

China needs peace; the Chinese people love peace. In peace lies the fundamental interests of the Chinese people. As a developing socialist country, China can achieve prosperity only through peaceful development. It requires sustained efforts of several

generations for a country like ours to achieve socialist modernization and to approach or catch up with the developed countries economically. We need peace not only in this century, but also in the next. As China is a big country in the East with a population accounting for nearly one quarter of the world's total, its position on the question of world peace and its efforts towards this end have a major worldwide impact now as well as in the future. Aware of this important mission entrusted by history, China is ready to make its due efforts and contributions for the sake of world peace and stability.

The Chinese Government pursues an independent foreign policy of peace. The basic objective of our foreign policy is to oppose hegemonism and maintain world peace. Firmly standing by the third world, we will steadily strengthen and increase our solidarity and co-operation with other third world countries. We are actively seeking to establish and develop normal relations and friendly co-operation with various countries in the world on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. We will never enter into alliance or establish strategic relations with any superpower.

We are opposed to interference and aggression against any country and the use or threat of force in international relations. We are in favour of the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and on a fair and reasonable basis. No matter how the world situation may evolve, we will steadfastly implement these foreign policies, which have been proved correct through practice.

At present, the ever-intensifying arms race between the superpowers has caused concern among the people of various countries. Although numerous disarmament proposals have been put forward, they have not brought people any sense of security, because disarmament can only be achieved through deeds, not words.

China opposes arms race and will never take part in such race. The level of our military expenditure and armament is far lower than that of other big powers, and yet we have taken repeated measures on our own to reduce our military forces and cut our defence expenditure. China's limited nuclear force is for the sole purpose of defence. From the very first day China possessed nuclear weapons, we explicitly undertook not to be the first to use them

under any circumstances. China has not conducted nuclear tests in the atmosphere for many years and will no longer conduct atmospheric nuclear tests in the future.

Disarmament is now a question of universal concern. I would like to take this opportunity to outline the Chinese government's basic position and views on this question.

1. Nuclear arms race constitutes a grave threat to world peace and security. The ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament should be the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

2. The United States and the Soviet Union which possess the largest nuclear arsenals should take the lead in halting the test, production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons and drastically reduce all types of nuclear weapons they have deployed anywhere inside and outside their countries and destroy them on the spot. This will make it possible to create favourable conditions for the convocation of a broadly representative international conference on nuclear disarmament with the participation of all the nuclear weapon states to discuss measures for further nuclear disarmament and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

3. In order to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war, all nuclear weapon states should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in any circumstances and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states or nuclear weapon-free zones. On this basis, an international convention should be concluded

with the participation of all nuclear weapon states, ensuring the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

4. There should be a simultaneous and balanced reduction and on-the-spot destruction of the medium-range nuclear missiles deployed in Europe and Asia by the Soviet Union and the United States.

5. Along with nuclear arms reduction there should be a drastic reduction of conventional arms. The conventional arms of all countries should be used only for self-defence, and not to threaten the security of other countries.

6. The outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. No country should develop, test or deploy space weapons in any form. An international agreement on the complete prohibition of space weapons should be concluded through negotiations as soon as possible.

7. An international convention on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons should be concluded at an early date. Pending this, all countries capable of manufacturing chemical weapons should pledge never to use chemical weapons and to stop the test, production, transfer and deployment of such weapons.

8. To effect the implementation of arms reduction, it is essential for disarmament agreements to provide for the necessary and effective measures of verification.

9. As the question of disarmament concerns the security of all countries, it should not be monopolized by a few big powers. The disarmament agreement between them must not jeopardize

the interests of other countries. All countries, big or small, militarily strong or weak, should enjoy equal rights to participate in the discussions and settlement of problems related to disarmament.

The above position and views of the Chinese government on the question of disarmament has taken into account the desire of all the peoples in the world and the viewpoints of all the interested parties. We support all proposals truly conducive to disarmament and are ready to continue our efforts to promote genuine progress on disarmament together with other countries.

Of course, the question of disarmament is not the only issue affecting world peace and security. World peace and national security are closely inter-related. In this sense, encroaching upon a nation's independence and sovereignty means jeopardizing world peace. The Chinese government wishes to reiterate that in order to relax tension and eliminate regional conflicts, it is imperative to observe strictly the principle of equality among all countries, big or small, in international relations and to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs or encroaching upon the sovereignty of other countries in any form. Only thus will it be possible to contribute to the maintenance of world peace.

The maintenance of world peace is the dedicated goal and sacred duty of the people of all countries. Human destiny must be held in the hands of mankind itself. The factors making for peace are growing faster than those making for war. So long as the people of the world keep up their unremitting efforts, they will certainly win peace.

/9274

CSO: 5200/4030

END