

076077

JPRS-TAC-87-005

12 JANUARY 1987

Worldwide Report  
**ARMS CONTROL**

19981209 100

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Reproduced From  
Best Available Copy

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

22  
119  
A06

#### 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.

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: 'Star Wars' Increases Risk of Nuclear Catastrophe (Vladimir Bogachev; Moscow TASS, 5 Dec 86).....	1
USSR: U.S. View of SDI Threat, Space Militarization Hit (Anatoly Chapis Interview; Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE, No 10, 1986).....	3
Moscow Assesses French Leaders' Remarks on SDI (Vsevolod Mikhaylov; Moscow to France and Belgium, 4 Dec 86).....	6
Moscow Radio Criticizes British Involvement in SDI (Moscow to Great Britain and Ireland, 9 Dec 86),.....	8
Briefs TASS on U.S. Beam Weapon	9

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR's Tolkunov on Post-Reykjavik Security Prospects (Lev Tolkunov; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 48, 30 Nov 86)....	10
--	----

SALT/SALT ISSUES

Moscow News Conference on U.S. Abrogation of SALT II, USSR Restraint (Moscow Television Service, 8 Dec 86; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 10 Dec 86).....	16
Moscow TV Coverage, by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, et al. IZVESTIYA Report	16 19

USSR: Further Commentaries on U.S. SALT II Violation (Various sources, various dates).....	23
Shishlin: U.S. 'Renunciation', by Nikolay Shishlin	23
'Pointed' Violation Condemned, by Vladimir Chernyshev	24
Lomeyko Criticism	25
XINHUA on U.S. Allies' Misgivings	26
French Complacency Over Break, by Boris Tumanov	26
132d B-52 Planned	27
XINHUA Reportage: U.S. Rejects Calls for Compliance With SALT II (Beijing XINHUA, 16 Dec 86).....	28
XINHUA Notes U.S. Accusation of SALT Violations (Beijing XINHUA, 10 Dec 86).....	29
 INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
TASS Criticizes Rogers Euromissile Stance (Vladimir Bogachev; Moscow TASS, 11 Dec 86).....	30
Soviet-Japanese Roundtable Discusses Asian Security (Yu. Vdovin; Moscow PRAVDA, 3, 4 Dec 86).....	32
3 December Report	32
Report on Communique	33
Moscow: NATO Nuclear Group Viewing INF, Conventional Arms (Sergey Sayenko; Moscow to Great Britain and Ireland, 21 Oct 86).....	35
PRAVDA: U.S. Missiles 'Destabilizing' Korean Peninsula (Boris Barakhta; Moscow PRAVDA, 3 Dec 86).....	36
Thatcher Sees Labor Nuclear Policy Helping Soviets (Chris Moncrieff; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 3 Dec 86)...	37
 EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
USSR Commentary on Vienna CSCE Preparation, Prospects (Various sources, various dates).....	38
CSSR News Conference	38
Roundtable Previews Meeting, by Georgiy Zubkov, et al.	38
Public Forum in Vienna, by N. Novikov	40
USSR Officials Cited, by Heinz Nussbaumer	41
USSR Delegation Press Conference	42
Tolkunov on Reykjavik Influence, by Raimund Loew	42
European Politicians on Agenda	43
Mikhaylov on Meeting Prospects, by V. Mikhaylov	44
Shevardnadze Meets With Austrian Officials	47

USSR To Do 'Utmost', by Igor Kudrin	48
TASS Previews Upcoming Conference	49
Poland Urges Progress, by Andrzej Rayzacher	50
Shevardnadze-Shultz Meeting Previewed, by Boris Andrianov, Igor Charikov	50
USSR: Report on Phase One of CSCE Proceedings (Various sources, 4-7 Nov 86).....	53
Opening of CSCE Meeting	53
Soviet Delegates' Press Conference, by Raimund Loew	53
USSR Ambassador Interviewed, Yu. B. Kashlev Interview	54
Genscher Meets Shevardnadze	55
Raimond Meets Shevardnadze	55
Zimmerman Criticized, by Igor Kudrin	56
USSR's Grinevskiy, Lomeyko Interviewed, by Vanya Encheva	57
Second Day at CSCE Meeting	58
Shevardnadze on Meeting With Schultz	60
Shevardnadze: 'Bitter Aftertaste'	60
Moscow Radio Commentary	61
Soviet Delegation Press Conference	62
Kovalev at Soviet Press Conference	62
IZVESTIYA Previews CSCE Work, by V. Matveyev, N. Novikov	63
Shevardnadze Speech to CSCE, by Eduard Shevardnadze	64
Shevardnadze Statement on CSCE Talks	70
Vienna on Shevardnadze Statement, by Helmut Opletal	71
Foreign Delegates Cited	72
Phase One Closes	73
USSR: Assessments of Vienna CSCE Phase One (Various sources, various dates).....	75
Ambassador Kashlev on Process, by Anatoliy Tyupayev	75
Moscow Radio on New Stage	75
IZVESTIYA on Follow-up Proceedings, by V. Matveyev, N. Novikov	76
Moscow Radio Commentary, by Viktor Levin	78
IZVESTIYA Contrasts Ministers' Speeches, by V. Matyveyev, N. Novikov	79
CSCE Results Reviewed, by Tomas Kolesnichenko	80
Experts Hold Press Conference	81
Further Details on Press Conference, by Raimund Loew	82
Soviet Initiatives, U.S. Isolation, by V. Matveyev, N. Novikov	83
PRAVDA Assessment of Follow-up Forum, by B. Dubrovin, V. Mikhaylov	83
Tatarnikov Criticizes U.S. Stance	87
Report Contrasts East, West, by Igor Revyakin	88

USSR's General Tatarnikov Addresses Vienna CSCE Follow-Up (Moscow TASS, 12 Nov 86; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 14 Nov 86).....	89
TASS Report, by Anatoliy Tyupayev	89
Army Paper Report	90
USSR: Vienna CSCE Follow-Up Prospects in Post-Reykjavik Context (Dimitriy Luzhkov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 21 Nov 86).	92
Briefs	
Polish UN Resolution on CDE	96
NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
Briefs	
Soviets on Kola Withdrawals	97
RELATED ISSUES	
USSR Revolution Anniversary Speakers View Reykjavik, Testing (Moscow Television Service, 6, 7 Nov 86; Khabarovsk Domestic Service, 7 Nov 86).....	98
Ligachev Speaks at Meeting, by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev	98
Lushev Addresses Parade, by P. G. Lushev	101
General Yazov Speaks at Khabarovsk, by Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov	101
Moscow: Military Observer on Verification Issue (Moscow to Great Britain and Ireland, 17 Oct 86).....	103
TASS Hits Kohl's Bundestag Statement on SDI, INF, Testing (Aleksy Shestakov; Moscow TASS, 6 Nov 86).....	105
Danish Prime Minister Visits USSR 21-24 October (Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 22, 23 Oct 86; Moscow PRAVDA 22, 23 Oct 86).....	107
Talks With Gromyko, Gorbachev, by Michael Kuttner	107
Ryzhkov Dinner Speech, by N. I. Ryzhkov	107
Schlueter News Conference	109
Soviets Noncommittal to Nuclear-Free Zone, by Michael Kuttner	109
Canada: Liberals Reject Cruise Tests, Nuclear Arms (Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN, 1, 2 Dec 86; Ottawa THE TORONTO STAR, 1 Dec 86).....	110
Convention Policy Resolutions, by Jane Taber	110
TORONTO STAR Editorial	111
OTTAWA CITIZEN Editorial	112
PRC People's Daily Discusses UN Disarmament Resolutions (Chao Yang; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 6 Dec 86).....	113

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: 'STAR WARS' INCREASES RISK OF NUCLEAR CATASTROPHE

LD051337 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Tass headline: "'Insurance Policy' or Guarantee of Nuclear Catastrophe?"]

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Since U.S. President Ronald Reagan unveiled his "Star Wars" program more than three years ago, the slick wrapup has worn off from his promises to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" with a space missile defense.

Even official spokesmen for the American Administration have stopped recalling those words by the President in their public statements.

Washington's renunciation of the SALT-2 treaty, the unrelenting U.S. nuclear arms buildup and the continued nuclear testing in Nevada have demonstrated a glaring discrepancy between the present American Administration's P.R. declarations on the objectives of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" with its practical actions to propel the arms race on earth and to take it to outer space.

Level-headed people have long realized that "Star Wars" is, as a minimum, a twin for the U.S. program for building up offensive nuclear arms.

It is not a coincidence that the advocates for the nuclear arms race in the United States are also determined apologists for SDI.

The U.S. Administration has now apparently decided to smarten up the shopworn advertising tags on its "Star Wars" program and so the new Washington way of selling plans to deploy American strike weaponry in space is calling it nothing other than an "insurance policy to protect peace".

However, this "insurance policy" which will cost the U.S. tax-payer at least three billion dollars, according to expert estimates, will, at best, be a leaky umbrella.

Even the most sophisticated multitiered space-based ABM system cannot provide an impenetrable shield to protect an aggressor's territory from a retaliatory missile downpour.

Military experts have computed that even if just five percent of the incoming nuclear warheads reach their targets, this will mean what the Pentagon likes to call "unacceptable damage" also to the country that has been the first to use nuclear weapons.

Washington intends to create its space monster of a missile defense in such a way as to be able to swing it into action as a surprise, with the other side being unable to detect any preparations for the aggression.

This involves using a great multitude of computers to allow transition from a "manual" to a completely automated battle management system.

Computers may thus replace people altogether in decision-making on nuclear warfare.

Even land-based computers, however, are not 100-percent foolproof in their conclusions and decisions.

Computer malfunctions, which are known to have caused sad results even in peacetime, may spell global disaster in a crisis.

This will be the case, for example, when "Star Wars" battle management machines actuate their assigned weaponry in response to signals which have nothing to do with a nuclear-missile attack and are resultant, say, from small environmental disturbances, or when they just go wrong and order fire for no particular reason at all.

The fulfillment of the American "Star Wars" plans will dramatically increase the risk of outbreak of nuclear war also as a result of technical trouble in other computers, early-warning and communications systems, or unprovoked self-action by part of the U.S. ABM defense.

The SDI advocates are attempting to convince the Americans that work on this program is bound to produce a "miracle" which will eliminate all the extremely dangerous technical faults in U.S. strike weapons and the systems managing them at one fell swoop. These hopes have no grounds whatsoever.

The "Star Wars insurance policy" now being busily pressed on the American people can only lead to a complete bankruptcy of the brokers from the U.S. military-industrial complex.

The implementing of the space militarization program will visit unprecedented catastrophe upon all mankind.

/9365

CSO: 5200/1170



## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. VIEW OF SDI THREAT, SPACE MILITARIZATION HIT

Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE in English No 10, 1986 pp 12-14

[Interview with Anatoly Chapis, researcher from the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, by Tatyana Snopkova: "Danger From Space"; date and place not given]

[Text]

**CORR.** American politicians and the military assure that nothing fatal will happen to peace in case space defence systems are developed. They say that, in time, nuclear offensive forces will lose their values due to the SDI, and that the latter represents almost a foundation of future world cooperation.

**A. CHAPIS.** Perhaps someone thinks that Reagan's "star idea" is tempting. Humankind for four decades has been living under the fear of instantaneous nuclear death and this fear is provoking people's natural striving for a liquidation of nuclear weapons. And this is the thing that Reagan is promising. The SDI is also attractive for ignorant people because the White House is promising to dismantle nuclear reserves with the aid of non-nuclear means, by the so-called "exotic" weapons (laser, accelerating, high-frequency, radio-wave, etc.), the combat use of which, allegedly, would not lead to world destruction. They assert that the Pentagon will destroy only nuclear warheads while people, material values and the environment will remain intact. And another thing — space shield supporters are trying to present their scheme as an all human goal. They say, let all of us roll up our sleeves and set to build a new peace, based not on mutual "deterrent" but on a mutually secured self-defence.

Perspectives—wonderful... But what kind of fantasy will enter into our life following the SDI? Will our future coexistence be peaceful or half-peaceful, or

peaceful against our will? Will not the prefix "co" in this word be changed into a black and endless "no"?

Let's think about such an enigmatic fact: for two years the American administration cannot give an intelligible answer to a number of questions which have objectively appeared in connection with the SDI. But the "star idea" cannot be taken on trust — the stakes are too high and the cost of a mistake is too great.

So, question number one. What is the reason that while the United States has begun the working out of a wide-scale programme of the antimissile system, which must "devalue" nuclear missile weapons, it does not only curtail its nuclear programme, but, on the contrary, is performing a speedy increase of the nuclear missile potential of the whole strategic triad? The USA plans to produce another 17 thousand warheads in addition to available ones in the near future. Therefore instead of making it easy to solve the task of liquidating nuclear weapons stockpiles, the USA, on the contrary, consciously complicates it thus casting doubt on its "humane" aim.

Question number two. In what way is the United States going to persuade the Soviet Union from taking retaliatory measures? For the first time in the military, building practice, the United States received, due to the development of military space technology, the capability for creating high-accuracy weapons for delivering strikes against Soviet targets. Such high-accuracy, or, in other words, counter-

force characteristics, have the means stationed near Soviet territory. Their pre-flight time has been reduced by about three times!

Naturally enough, if the SDI becomes reality, a temptation may appear in the USA to deliver a nuclear strike against the USSR and its allies having covered itself under a space shield. A "star shield" in this case will be needed to frustrate a retaliatory strike by the Soviet Union and finish off its missiles which survived the US first nuclear strike. It is evident that the SDI is planned for these purposes. Otherwise how can one explain the change in its supporters' consciousness lately? At first the American people were promised a 100-per cent defence. Later, when authoritative scientists, including American, convincingly proved that such a defence was impossible, the Pentagon "agreed" on a 60-80 per cent defence. The problem is not only in the fact that the absolute defence is impossible from a technological point of view, but Washington thinks that even an antimissile system of limited capability can be used as an effective nuclear-missile "sword".

**CORR.** In a word, unless we work out just norms of mutual relations on earth, space defence will only instigate further mistrust. But, if... mankind managed to reach an agreement on a stage-by-stage liquidation of nuclear arsenals and a reduction of conventional weapons to a reasonable minimum? Maybe then the SDI would not seem so desirable?

**A. Chapis.** Would it be needed then at all? The only correct decision is to destroy the accumulated arsenals. And this is the aim of the all-embracing programme of stage-by-stage liquidation of nuclear weapons proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev this January 15.

Already now, military use of space threatens to pour oil into the existing hotbeds of tension. Let's remember the fact that military information from American satellites was used by the Israeli Army during the Arab-Israeli wars, and the English Army — at the time of the Falkland conflict.

The Strategic Defense Initiative is calculated to be finished in about 30-50 years.

Is it possible to predict the character of the confrontation of these two systems in the transitional period? The transfer of the arms race into space will sharply liven up the works on the latest military-technological directions. Though Washington speaks about the "purely defensive" character of the SDI, but in the near future we can witness the emergence of a new type of weapon — space strike means which will be able to destroy targets on Earth, in the air, on sea and in space. And they include not only the antisatellite system, now being tested in the USA. Satellites equipped with missiles and other means of destruction can also be used as a strike force. The creation of this space fist will make it possible for the USA to widen the system of basing its strategic forces. In addition to the already deployed nuclear-missile systems along the USSR territory perimeter, it will be possible to build a new threat to Soviet strategic targets — to deploy weapons systems which will literally hang over people's heads! Until recently, the distance between the highly-accurate destructive means (i.e., between intercontinental ballistic missiles) and ground targets was about 10 to 14 thousand kilometres. Now, weapons systems can rotate on low near-earth orbits at a distance of only 500, 300 or 100 km. There's no need to speak how greatly will the threat of surprised destruction of ground targets be increased: in this case the pre-flight time to them will be reduced to a minimum, and if the so-called weapons employing a controlled transfer of energy are deployed — this time, in general, will be reduced to nothing! And this means that the USA will have obtained a powerful means of pressure not only on the Soviet Union. "Star" weapons would flash practically over any point of the globe at definite time intervals. If now, for example, interference into a regional conflict demands the transfer of considerable forces and means to a required area, the deployment of weapons in space removes this difficulty. A space fist can be used at any moment and practically against any country.

**CORR.** Preparations within the framework of the SDI involve the destruction of former agreements. But their system has

already surrounded the planet with a net — let it be thin — but it impedes the transfer of the arms race in space...

A. CHAPIS. Yes, this system includes a whole number of agreements. The first one — the treaty of 1963 banning nuclear explosions in space. Four years later, a new agreement was concluded — a treaty which banned the launching of objects with nuclear or any other weapons of mass destruction into Earth's orbits. Then — the beginning of the 70s — the highest warm point in Soviet-American relations. Article IV of the Soviet-American ABM treaty says: "Each Party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based." The spirit of this treaty is completely incompatible with any attempt of space militarization that even research works in this sphere, which are now in the laboratory stage, are in inevitable contradiction to it. Many Western politicians agree with this.

Besides, according to 1972 and 1974 agreements each side received the right to use an ABM land-based system which is based only on kinetic energy, and only in limited areas and stationary-based. That means that the treaty prohibits building new ABM systems based on other physical principles (for example, with the employment of lasers):

If SALT-2, still not ratified, comes into force, a more firm barrier would be erected against space weapons. The treaty prohibits the designing, testing and launching into orbit nuclear and other types of weapons, including partially-orbital missiles.

At last, the threat of deployment of weapons in space gave birth to a danger — a possible transfer of the Earth's natural satellite into a military satellite. The treaty of 1967 declared that the Moon as well as all other celestial bodies, should be used only for peaceful purposes. They are prohibited for building military bases, instal-

lations and fortifications, and for testing all types of weapons, and carrying on military manoeuvres.

I believe, everyone will agree that having worked out this system, mankind has defended the principle of a non-militarization of space and made a colossal step forward to fix it in international law. Of course, there are still many unsolved tasks yet; only the deployment of mass destruction weapons and the building of an ABM space system are prohibited in space, while non-nuclear weapons, if they do not belong to ABM systems, are, unfortunately, left outside the ban. But the spirit of the concluded agreements must induce governments and people to work out such concrete and clear legal norms which would save space from all kinds of weapons. The concluded agreements would be crossed out and eroded if weapons are deployed in space. If attempts are already being made to revise the ABM treaty and justify "non-aggressive" military use of the Moon, what will happen later when the Pentagon's star dreams become a reality?

The Strategic Defense Initiative is threatening the life of every person. Indifference is criminal here. Today there must be no talks about whose point of view — the USSR or the USA, the West or the East — will be victorious. Collective reason, which demands a real all-humanity's referendum on this problem, must win.

Beginning the development of near-earth space, peoples must remember that the star path of the future opens only two mutually-exclusive ways: either common and harmonious work on the principles of justice and equality, or transferring our conflicts in space, which will aggravate the international situation to the limit. We must enter the space age with the respect of those humanistic principles, which have been worked out by humankind in spite of all sufferings and difficulties.

/9365

CSO: 5200/1170

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### MOSCOW ASSESSES FRENCH LEADERS' REMARKS ON SDI

LD052256 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1800 GMT 4 Dec 86

[Political observer Vsevolod Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] French Defense Minister Andre Giraud says that he sees no reason that should prevent the launching of space satellites which represent an interest for the SDI program in the context of the Ariane program; I have no doubt about this subject, he added. We believe that Andre Giraud has no doubt either about the U.S. SDI program, our political observer Vsevolod Mikhaylov writes.

His pro-Atlantic tendencies and his desire to promote all aspects of the military links between France and the Pentagon are well-known. In particular the defense minister takes a position in favor of the acquisition of U.S. AWACS aircraft in order that the French Air Force is equipped with U.S. eyes and ears. It is not therefore surprising to see this new gesture of solidarity with the Pentagon, which is encountering grave difficulties in building SDI elements following the Challenger catastrophe last January. Moreover it was not [word indistinct].

According to statements by the president of the Republic, France, being aware of the risks run by the Star Wars program, has no intention of participating in it. The French prime minister has also recently adopted a more careful position toward SDI. The national military budget for 1987-91, approved recently by the government, does not make any overtures or advances to the United States as regards SDI either. There are certainly politicians in France who would wish to associate Paris with this dangerous adventure. It is with their support that French arms industry companies received the green light to participate in the execution of orders linked with SDI. Groups like Aerospatiale and Matra intend to take advantage of them. But in announcing that Paris is ready to join the Ariane program, including its financing, in which France plays a dominant role in research in the context of the U.S. SDI program, Andre Giraud was not talking as a businessman or as a private person, but as the defense minister [sentence as heard]. Does his statement indicate a change in Paris' attitude vis-a-vis France's nonparticipation in SDI; or is it an attempt to compromise its attitude? Anyway, this new aspect of military cooperation that the French defense minister wishes to open with the United States is for Paris an association with the Military adventure of the U.S. Administration which is dangerous for all mankind.

What is surprising is not only the diligent service with which Mr Giraud has decided to go to the rescue of the Pentagon, which is in difficulty with the achievement of its principle military enterprise, but in particular the moment he chose to make this business offer. The Union for French Democracy, we remember, was the principle obstacle to the preparation of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik on the creation of a world without nuclear weapons and on the Liberation of Europe from this type of weapon. All the talk about SDI as a space shield is inconsistent for the strong reason that if nuclear weapons, against which this shield is supposed to defend disappeared, what is the usefulness of the latter?

The French military program stresses that France intends to reduce the U.S. and Soviet nuclear potential to the lowest level on the basis of the equal security principle. but disarmament [words indistinct] of the government according to official statements and the preparations for Star Wars are incompatible things. Also, the support that the French defense minister would be ready to offer to SDI cannot be considered as other than new attempts to block, as far as possible, the disarmament process.

As one cannot run with the hare and ride with the hounds, one cannot allow the Pentagon to use French missiles in order to achieve the inaugural SDI program, and at the same time present oneself as committed to disarmament, our commentator Vsevolod Mikhaylov writes in conclusion.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1163

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### MOSCOW RADIO CRITICIZES BRITISH INVOLVEMENT IN SDI

LD092307 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 9 Dec 86

[Text] The U.S. defense secretary, Caspar Weinberger, in the course of talks with his British counterpart George Younger has announced that the United States is awarding Britain a contract worth more than 10 million dollars for research under the Star Wars program. The following comment has been written by Sergey Sayenko. In terms of dollars, the new contracts bring British participation in the controversial Reagan's plans to develop space weapons up to 34 million. British supporters of SDI are claiming their country will now be able to create more jobs, reduce unemployment and make technological headway. It is good intentions, of course, but must a country even with super intentions necessarily take part in action on the Star Wars program? I don't think so. I believe the Tory government supports the Americans' Star Wars plans because it does not want to offend the ally. It is significant that in an interview with the JANE'S DEFENCE WEEKLY the other day, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher supported SDI once again. This time she alleged the Star Wars program held out the promise of a secure future. What kind of security is it if Western scientists, many of them in the United States and Britain, keep explaining that SDI has nothing to do with defense, but is geared to a first nuclear strike? In 1983, President Reagan claimed the West needed an SDI to shield itself against Soviet ballistic missiles. But in Reykjavik the Soviet Union suggested getting rid of all strategic nuclear forces, including ballistic missiles within 10 years. The United States Administration has yet to explain in a logical way why a space shield has to be developed at all. It's a pity that in Reykjavik the United States opted for SDI, thus deliberately torpedoing an agreement with the Soviet Union that would scrap nuclear missiles on earth. I believe, writes Sergey Sayenko, that primarily the United States hopes to build what it terms a space shield and to perfect a space sword into the bargain. According to American experts themselves, SDI plus MX and other new generation nuclear missiles will increase the U.S. strike potential sixfold. The destabilizing factor of SDI consists in the fact that the program is inflating the nuclear war threat. I'm convinced that by taking part in the American Star Wars program, Britain is not taking a step either to peace to disarmament.

/9365

CSO: 5200/1170

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### BRIEFS

TASS ON U.S. BEAM WEAPON--New York, 10 Dec (TASS)--The U.S. Air Force is engaged jointly with the U.S. Army in creating beam weapons, one of the key elements of space strike weapons, the AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY journal said. According to the journal, it is planned to carry out a joint space experiment with the use of beam weapons already in the early 90s. Simultaneously, the AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY said, the Pentagon has practically completed work on one of the most important documents of the "Star Wars" program to determine the activities of the U.S. military department until the beginning of next century. The main objective set by the military department in that document, the journal says, is to create a technology ensuring that space objects to be placed in orbit under the "Star Wars" program be survivable. In its desire to implement the plans to militarize outer space the U.S. is torpedoing the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile defense systems, resorting to "new interpretation" of that treaty in order to get a free hand for the implementation of its programs. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2314 GMT 10 Dec 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1163

## U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

### USSR'S TOLKUNOV ON POST-REYKJAVIK SECURITY PROSPECTS

PM081003 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 48, 30 Nov 86 p 7

[Article by Professor Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation: "Not Policy of Strength, But Strength of Policy. Europe After Stockholm and Reykjavik"]

[Excerpts] Time introduced radical corrections into established notions about the role of force in world affairs. This force proved to be an unsuitable means for solving disputes and ensuring security. It became obvious that the nuclear threat made the states equal in the one respect that no one has the right to stay aloof in a large-scale war. Security cannot be ensured single-handed, it must be built by common effort. However powerful weapons may be, they are an unreliable foundation for state-to-state relations. After all, the use of even a fraction of the existing arsenals spells destruction to humankind and death to the inimitable environment which nature has produced over the millions of years of life on our planet, obviously the only one in the universe.

Thus, the content of security is acquiring new parameters. More and more it is seen as a task of building, by common effort, the political, material, organizational, and other structures for the maintenance of peace, which would rule out the very possibility of an outbreak of war.

The new reality calls for a sober appropriate attitude to the objective process of socio-political development in the world.

The USSR will never of its own free will tie its future to a military solution of world problems. Marxism denies the prodding of revolutions, which are developing as class antagonisms mature and are becoming more acute. We are convinced that the imposition of revolutions from outside is meaningless and inadmissible. Lenin said that revolutions "are not made to order, not by agreement."

On the other hand, we shall never resign ourselves to the export of counterrevolutions, to the policy of "neoglobalism" pursued by Washington, to the provocations and subversive activities against young states or to the attempts to halt the march of history by force of arms.



We do not try to forcibly convert anyone to our doctrine. But we have championed and will go on championing those ideas that we greatly value. We have chosen our own way of life and have a right to demand that someone else's notions about the fundamental values of existence should not be imposed on us from outside. Therefore, whether or not they like it in the West, they will have to master the science and art of behaving in a restrained and meaningful way on the world scene, and live in a civilized manner, i.e., according to tactful peaceful communication and cooperation.

### A Steep Turn

The experience of Europe indicates that this communication and cooperation are possible. The all-European process, the beginning of which was marked by the Helsinki forum, could become a peculiar model for the implementation of a universal security system. This process is a multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon. It extends to every sphere of international relations on the continent and is making headway--with varying degrees of success, it is true--in many areas.

Following Belgrade and Madrid, there have been conferences of experts on human rights (Ottawa), on contacts between people (Bern) and cultural cooperation (Budapest). The first stage of the Stockholm Conference was successfully completed. The Vienna meeting is now under way.

The peoples of the continent are pinning great hopes on Vienna. Its task is to sum up the results of previous development in Europe, where much has been done in the recent period, and take a new step forward. The direction is already clear: to further the democratization of state-to-state relations and the democracy of social life in every country, because one is inseparable from the other.

Objective conditions exist for the vindication of a new mode of thinking in Europe and the rest of the world: the realization of the catastrophic nature of power politics in the nuclear age, the possibility of peaceful coexistence between opposite systems, and the positive experience of detente and cooperation in Europe. It is beyond doubt that our continent can close the pages of war in its history and open pages of peaceful coexistence.

It is these new realities that the 27th CPSU Congress proceeded from in advancing a comprehensive programme for the consolidation of peace.

The Congress marked a steep turn in the process of creative, critical conceptualization of the phenomena of international life, including in Europe, pointing to the need for new initiatives, a search for new approaches, for persistent, persevering work in the name of peace and security on earth. The Congress put forward a multitude of ideas in the fields of theoretical analysis of the world and the European situation, the main features of the USSR's foreign policy and the practical tasks it is undertaking.

## A Unique Chance

Our words are never at odds with our deeds. This has been confirmed once again by the Soviet Union's position at Reykjavik.

Indeed, Reykjavik will enter the annals of international relations thanks to the USSR's fundamentally new, unprecedented approach to the consideration of the problems of our time--innovatory, radical, bold and sweeping. By adopting this position the Soviet side has set an example of a realistic and attainable solution to the most intricate problems of international security.

Our proposals are well known: 50 percent reduction of strategic armaments, elimination of all medium-range missiles in Europe, strengthening of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and prohibition of nuclear testing. This is a package of interconnected and carefully balanced proposals. If it had been accepted by the American side, a start would have been made to really eliminating nuclear arms.

The above-mentioned large-scale Soviet proposals have a global character. But they are fully consistent with the vital interests of the peoples in our--European--region as well. They were a logical continuation of the USSR's persistent line in European affairs. The Soviet programme for nuclear disarmament envisages at the first stage the elimination of all Soviet and American medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles in the European zone--elimination and not their transfer to somewhere else. The Soviet Union's position on this question was further developed at Reykjavik. Voicing its readiness for serious concessions in the given direction, the USSR proceeded from the need to clear the way for detente in Europe, free the peoples of the continent from the fear of nuclear holocaust, and then advance further--towards the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Seeing them as useful steps on the way towards lessening the military threat in Europe, the Soviet Union supports the idea of nuclear-free zones in different regions of the continent, notably in Northern Europe and the Balkans, as well as the proposal on setting up a corridor free from nuclear weapons along the line dividing the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries. In calling for completely freeing the European continent of chemical weapons, we also support the proposal on the establishment of chemical weapons-free zones in Central Europe and the Balkans.

All recent Soviet proposals envisage far-reaching and diversified procedures, including those on an international scale, in the field of verification, the question of which was so often used in the West as an argument against disarmament. The problem of control was resolutely and categorically posed at Reykjavik as well: in the event of embarking on the path of nuclear disarmament control must be real, comprehensive and convincing.

"All realistically-minded people in the world should act now," said Mikhail Gorbachev. "All of us, living in the socialist world, in the capitalist world and in the developing world, now have a unique chance: to really start, at

last, work on ending the arms race, banning nuclear weapons, destroying them and diverting the nuclear threat from mankind."

This concerns our continent to a special extent. If Western Europe carefully studies our proposals, it will see that they are consonant with its interests.

#### Non-Existent Wedge

However, the position of some West European leaders on disarmament questions is embarrassing. When, finally, the real possibility arose to clear the continent of missiles, they began talking about the need to keep American nuclear weapons in Europe, and to defend their sham privileges to a nuclear status. Somehow there is no talk that London and Paris should at least hint at their readiness to join in time the process of nuclear arms elimination.

With amazing shortsightedness some West European capitals have supported Washington's Star Wars project.

It is strange, writes the London GUARDIAN, that the European allies have so willingly supported Washington's efforts to reshape the perception of Reykjavik. Why do they not challenge President Reagan's refusal to hold back on SDI? European governments have been skeptical about SDI. They question the feasibility of space weapons but worry that the emphasis on such defences will destabilize the strategic balance. They also worry that it would leave Western Europe dangerously exposed.

Although it is surprising, it is a fact that the Nuclear Planning Group of NATO, meeting in October in Gleneagles (Scotland) at the level of the North Atlantic bloc's defence ministers, unreservedly supported the U.S. obstructionist stand in Iceland and "strongly supported" the SDI programme. However, even American analysts admit that the space-based weapons, which Reagan describes as defensive, can be turned into destructive, offensive means of delivering nuclear strikes at communication satellites, radars and even cities.

The fact that space defence components can actually be used for direct attack makes the Russians really worried, said Harold Brown, former U.S. secretary of defense. More and more people are coming to understand that the militarization of space is a step towards war. It is no accident that an opinion poll among members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences has shown that eight in nine American scientists are opposed to SDI.

Let us take a sober look at things. The politico-military blocs in Europe are a reality, as are Western Europe's close ties with the United States, especially in questions of ideology and strategy. The contentions that the Soviet Union's intention is to drive a wedge into the ranks of the Western alliance and to split it are naive. We are guided by the facts, not abstract wishes. And proceeding from them, we believe that the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic alliance should strive not to cement a bloc-orientated mentality and a bloc-orientated policy, but to look for common denominators in

the interests of preserving peace in Europe. The advocates of the North Atlantic alliance say that this bloc was set up not so much for military as for political purposes. Why is this not confirmed by deeds that this is so, that this alliance is prepared to look for mutually acceptable solutions?

Why shouldn't it; for example, accept the Warsaw Treaty's proposal on pooling efforts in the interests of easing tensions and strengthening peace?

For the time being the Western alliance is reluctant to accept the socialist states' proposal on dissolving both military blocs. Well, this is also a reality which we must reckon with. That's why we are proposing relaxation measures which can be implemented while NATO and the Warsaw Treaty still exist: reaching agreement on the non-use of force against each other, especially on the non-first use of nuclear weapons, on the establishment of nuclear-free zones and ridding the continent of chemical weapons, on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in the zone from the Atlantic to the Urals, on the joint consideration of the proposal tabled by the socialist countries concerning the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of the relations of peace, and others.

#### What is Within Europe's Power

Western Europe should make its positions clear also on questions determining the balance of strength between the blocs. We propose that American and Soviet medium-range missiles be completely eliminated in Europe. Where is the understanding and support of this initiative from West European capitals? Furthermore is there nothing Europeans can do to help bring an end to nuclear explosions? Some of them keep discreet silence and block their ears not to hear the "thunder" of underground nuclear tests in Nevada. Isn't the world paying too high a price for this "Atlantic solidarity"? Lastly, cannot Western Europe do something to give a start to the reduction and elimination of strategic nuclear weapons--on land, in the air and at sea?

Western Europe, naturally, could make a formidable contribution to the improvement of the international climate. It could use its clout and influence to adjust Washington's course towards greater circumspection, sober-mindedness and readiness for compromise. This is within Europe's power. It has sufficiently great economic and political potential to speak more confidently and definitely on its own behalf, and to work for progress at all talks now in progress.

Therefore it must be regretted that the governments of some NATO countries yield to overseas pressure and thereby assume a share of responsibility for the escalation of the arms race. Isn't it clear how ruinous this political mentality is for the future of Europe? Is it not possible to see where this policy is leading in our nuclear age? Who doesn't understand that on the European continent the use of even conventional weapons, to say nothing about chemical ones, will bring about no less severe consequences than nuclear war?

The new mentality means above all a realistic approach to the present and future of the European continent and the world. This of course, calls for change on the part of all politicians and statesmen. But not them alone--from all Europeans who realize the impending danger. A change in the framework of their socio-economic system and their ideology.

Not the policy of strength, but the strength of policy--this is what, in a nutshell, the new political mentality amounts to. Its ruling is to act now so as not to miss the historic chance of finding a way out of the impasse.

This idea permeates the Appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet "To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World."

Unique construction was started at Reykjavik. A historic chance arose for the Old World. The shoots of the new mentality are striking roots on the continent. The responsibility is constantly growing for the preservation and consolidation of our "European home." Hopefully at this very responsible moment both the politicians and the public of Europe will be up to the mark. The unique chance of finally making Europe a region of permanent peace must not be missed.

/9599

CSO: 5200/1088

SALT/START ISSUES

MOSCOW NEWS CONFERENCE ON U.S. ABROGATION OF SALT II, USSR RESTRAINT

Moscow TV Coverage

LD082236 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 8 Dec 86

[Report on news conference by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy foreign minister; Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and B.D. Pyadyshev, first deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Department, in Moscow on 8 December; video shows Bessmertnykh, Chervov and Pyadyshev on a platform with reporters and cameramen in audience -- Bessmertnykh, Chervov, and Pyadyshev voices recorded; announcer reads reporters' questions over video of them standing to ask questions]

[Text] [Announcer] A news conference on the USSR's position with regard to the operating conditions of the agreements concerning Strategic Arms Limitation was held in Moscow today. Comrade Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, who spoke at the press conference, stated:

[Bessmertnykh] Events, the consequence of which could have the most serious impact on the further development of the international situation, have been happening lately in the field connected with the strategic stability in the world.

The United States has not only announced its rejection of the 1972 interim agreement and SALT II, but has also exceeded in practice one of the main limitations stipulated in that treaty by putting into combat service the 132st bomber equipped to carry cruise missiles. The United States thereby took an unprecedented provocative step designed to wreck the treaty structure of limiting the arms race.

Washington has come out in the role of a violator of the process of a basic reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons.

The logic of the present administration's attitude toward the fundamental problems of security has led it to the violation of SALT II, a logic which is built on the obsolete stereotype of old thinking that it is somehow possible to ensure one's own security at the expense of the security of others.

The unique logic of U.S. diplomacy where the public is told one thing and in effect something else is done is also evident here.

Let's take a look: At Reykjavik the U.S. President gave his consent to the liquidation of all strategic offensive weapons within the framework of an agreed period. Now, however the United States is opening up the floodgates of an unlimited race of precisely these armaments.

At Geneva the U.S. delegation says that it is guided by instructions to move ahead, but in essence it has not made a single step toward accords and has put a brake on the talks.

On 5 December the Soviet Government said that the USSR is refraining for the time being from withdrawing from the limitations of the SALT I agreement and the SALT II. The Soviet Union's decision is based on the immense importance for all mankind of the whole question and from the same noble, humane motives which stand behind the Soviet program for the liquidation of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, behind our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, and behind the USSR's large-scale proposals for compromise at Reykjavik.

The Soviet side is giving the U.S. leadership the opportunity to weigh once again in a responsible manner all the possible consequences of its actions, and to heed the unanimous opinion of the world community and the sober voices in political and public circles, including in the United States itself.

[Unidentified voice] Thank you, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich. And now, your questions, please.

[Announcer] A question from CSSR television: Western propaganda explains the Soviet Union's restraint by the fact that it apparently has a certain superiority in strategic weapons. Is this so? Col Gen Chervov, chief of directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, replies.

[Chervov] Such theses that the Soviet Union allegedly has a superiority in strategic weapons are, indeed, now evident in the West. Such claims however, in truth do not add up. They are pure invention. Since the end of the sixties and the start of the seventies, and up to the present day, a strategic parity has existed between the Soviet Union and the United States. There is no superiority; there is a parity. At Reykjavik the Soviet side handed to President Reagan a summary table of data on the quantities of the strategic weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States where not only the overall total was indicated, but it was also broken down into types of weapons, quantities of carriers of each type, and also the quantity of nuclear warheads on the strategic weapons.

It can be seen from that table that up to date the Soviet Union does indeed have rather more strategic carriers, since SALT II was not ratified, was not implemented, and no reduction in strategic carriers was made. If the treaty was implemented, the strategic carriers would be reduced to an equal level. This same table shows that the United States has considerably more nuclear warheads [yadernyy zaryad] in its triad which can be carried by the U.S. strategic weapons at one time. Altogether, counting in both carriers and nuclear warheads, there is a strategic parity between the USSR and United States.

The U.S. side made no objection to such an evaluation.

[Announcer] (Kraszewski), correspondent of the Polish TRYBUNA LUDU, asks, what is the meaning of the words, the USSR is for the time being refraining from going beyond the limitations of the SALT I agreement and the SALT II?

[Bessmertnykh] A legitimate question. How long does this: For the time being, mean? I think that in the case in question a great deal will depend upon the conduct of the United States itself; first and foremost, how the United States will now behave specifically in fact, in the military strategic sphere. Well, for instance, there can be a number of alternative moves here. One can forecast these. For instance, the United States could take compensatory actions, which would enable it to remain within the existing framework of agreements and treaties, in spite of the fact that the 131st bomber has been equipped for cruise missiles and is being made operational in this form. Or there is the option of the United States doing nothing at all, and continuing stubbornly and persistently its policy of violation of this and other provisions of the treaty and agreement. Then, of course, the Soviet Union would be compelled to undertake the necessary measures.

[Announcer] What is the West's reaction to the Soviet Government's announcement?

[Bessmertnykh] The governments in a number of countries have reacted in passing, so to speak, to what is happening. These are chiefly the governments of a number of NATO countries. I think that the reasons for such behavior by these governments is wholly explicable, since in other cases, too, -- regardless of whether their national interests were affected by some actions or other by the United States -- they took the line of supporting all the steps taken by Washington, by way of a falsely understood alliance-solidarity. I should like to say a lively discussion is under way in both public and political circles, not only in governments, about what is to come next. This has affected U.S. public and political circles, too. That is, the chief conclusion for today is that a serious discussion is under way. First and foremost, a great deal of support can be felt for the reasonable, considered, carefully balanced progress of Soviet diplomacy under the circumstances which are being established today.

One could even say that a sort of nationwide, or international referendum is taking place on U.S. policy in the sphere of strategic weapons; and a sort of vote of no confidence in Washington's policy in the strategic weapons sphere is already now being presented, and we can feel this.

[Announcer] An ABC correspondent: in order to reach agreement with the Reagan administration, could not the Soviet Government and Mr Gorbachev agree to a smaller package of agreements than the one proposed at Reykjavik?

[Bessmertnykh] I think that despite the possibility of achieving interim accords, and we have spoken about these, the Soviet Union and the United States have already historically found themselves at a higher stage than was the case, for instance, several months ago. Even some time ago, we took as our premise the possibility of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles, and cuts of less than 50 percent in strategic offensive weapons were being proposed. We have already seen all this, but it was before Reykjavik; and why should we go back past the limits of what has been achieved? I am fundamentally unable to agree with the opinion repeated here by the esteemed correspondent, that the Soviet Union, or Gorbachev, as he put it, is more interested in agreements than the United States or the U.S. leadership. This is an exceptionally incorrect conclusion, if it really does exist in anyone's mind. It is incorrect because it could lead to misconstruing of the tactics and strategy of conduct of affairs by the Soviet Union, including conduct in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction.



[Announcer] Why has the Soviet Union made such a fuss over just one bomber?

[Bessmertnykh] I think that in fact there is nothing particularly tragic in the fact that yet another bomber has been fitted with cruise missiles. That is, the strategic picture itself has not radically changed because of this. This is not the point, the fact that it is the 131st bomber, as if 130 was good, while 131 is too many. That is not the point. The point is that by equipping a 131st bomber with cruise missiles and adding it to combat capabilities in this way, the United States has overstepped the limit of 1,320 units established by SALT II for ballistic missiles with multiple warheads and heavy bombers carrying cruise missiles. This action is dangerous as a tendency, as the opening of the floodgates, which may be followed by violation of other ceilings as well, and of other restrictions, both quantitative and qualitative.

[Announcer] Comrade Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Department, rounds off the news conference.

[Pyadyshev] On 12 May 1979, when drafting of SALT II was still continuing, Jimmy Carter, President of the United States, made the following statement: If the United States were to sign SALT II and then refuse to ratify it, it would find itself in the role of warmonger, by having refused to take part in joint efforts to restrict the proliferation of the most destructive weapons mankind has ever known. On this, we conclude our news conference.

#### IZVESTIYA Report

PM101331 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "For Strategic Stability; at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists on the USSR's stance regarding the system of agreements concerning strategic arms limitation was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center 8 December.

A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, issued a statement at the press conference.

In the last few days, he said, events whose consequences could have a most serious effect on the further development of the international situation have occurred in the sphere of strategic stability in the world. The United States has not only announced its repudiation of the 1972 Interim Agreement and the SALT II treaty but has also actually exceeded one of the basic limits enshrined in that treaty by bringing into service the 131st bomber equipped for cruise missiles. The United States has thus taken an unprecedented provocative step aimed at the disintegration of the treaty structure for curbing the arms race. Washington has played the role of violator of the process of the radical reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons.

The present administration was brought to the flouting of the SALT II treaty by the logic of its attitude toward fundamental security problems. A logic built on the obsolete stereotype of the old-fashioned thinking that it is supposedly possible to ensure one's own security at the expense of others' security.

This is also an example of the peculiar logic of U.S. diplomacy whereby one thing is said in public and a different thing is done in practice.

In Reykjavik the U.S. President gave his assent to the liquidation of all strategic offensive weapons within an agreed period. But now the United States is opening the floodgates for an unrestrained race in precisely these weapons.

In Geneva the U.S. delegation says that it is guided by instructions "to move forward" while in fact it is not taking a single step toward accords and is hindering the talks.

In Washington much is being said about the importance of "an atmosphere of trust." In practice, however, there is a move toward intensifying unpredictability in the development of the strategic situation and suspicion in relations between the states. Claiming that the SDI would render nuclear weapons unnecessary, the United States has set off on the quantitative and qualitative buildup of its nuclear potential.

To sum up, it can be said that the present U.S. Administration, without a single arms control agreement to its credit, is nullifying operative accords in this sphere, setting new records in military expenditure, initiating an arms race in space, and moving toward undermining the ABM Treaty as well.

One gets the quite definite impression that people in Washington are in a hurry to impose on future administrations a binding commitment to the arms race.

In these circumstances the Soviet Government would have been fully justified in, so to speak, automatically abandoning its corresponding pledge under the treaty and the agreement which are being broken by the Americans. But the Soviet leadership, having thoroughly weighed the political, military, moral, and ethical aspects of the emerging situation, has drawn the conclusion that it is necessary to make additional efforts to divert from mankind the threat of the slippery path to strategic chaos. In this regard, the Soviet Government declared 5 December that the USSR would, for the time being, refrain from exceeding the limitations under the SALT I Agreement and the SALT II treaty. In taking this serious decision the Soviet Union proceeds from the enormous importance of the entire issue for the whole of humanity, from the very same noble and humane motivations which stand behind the Soviet program for the liquidation of nuclear arms by the year 2000, behind our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, and behind the USSR's large-scale, compromise proposals in Reykjavik.

The Soviet side offers the U.S. leadership an opportunity once again to responsibly weigh all the possible consequences of its actions and to heed the world community's unanimous opinion and the sober voices in political and public circles, including those in the United States itself. The Soviet Government's decision is also a call to the U.S. Administration to display genuine restraint, to stop before it takes any steps which would finally derail the agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. There is still a way out of the prevailing situation; it is still possible to take the measures which would prevent the uncontrollable growth of strategic offensive weapons.

As regards the Soviet Union's future course, we will continue to persistently pursue a peace-loving and dynamic foreign policy, but, as M.S. Gorbachev declared the other day, no one will succeed in exploiting our vested interest in peace to force us to compromise our security.

A.A. Bessmertnykh and Colonel General N.F. Chervov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, replied to journalists' questions.

Question: Will the USSR's unilateral observance of the SALT II treaty not affect its security?

Answer: While remaining within the limits set by the SALT II treaty, the Soviet Union will carefully evaluate the development of events and will monitor the actions of the United States. We know whom we are dealing with. All the actions being undertaken by the USSR, including unilateral ones, are thoroughly considered and weighed so as not to jeopardize its security. The USSR will not allow military superiority over itself.

Reagan's decision to repudiate SALT II is an attempt to act from a position of strength. But the USSR is a mighty, proud, and great country which will never compromise its security and independence and will never allow anyone to dictate to it.

The United States will not succeed in attaining military superiority either through "Star Wars" or through the nuclear arms race. We have all the potential -- economic, intellectual, and military-technical -- to meet any U.S. challenge whenever necessary. The Soviet Union does not claim greater security, but neither will it accept lesser security -- this 27th CPSU Congress decision and the will of the Soviet people are being sacredly fulfilled. This is how it will be in the future.

Question: What is the meaning of the words "refrains for the time being" in the Soviet Government statement? For how long will the Soviet Union display restraint?

Answer: Now that the U.S. Administration has taken a practical step to break out of one of the most important limitations imposed by the SALT II treaty, the Soviet side has complete legal justification to deem itself free from any pledges under the treaty. And if Moscow was guided only by emotions, this may have been the action to take.

But the Soviet leadership carefully and thoroughly examined this question from the position of sound reasoning and the logic of our policy, and it drew the conclusion that the USSR will, for the time being, observe the limitations. For how long? Much in his case will depend on the U.S. behavior, primarily from the military-strategic viewpoint: Will it take the compensating measures which would allow it to remain within the treaty's existing framework, or will it pursue the line of breaching this and other provisions of the SALT II treaty?

The Soviet Union will monitor the U.S. actions very carefully, whether parity is subjected to excessive overloads through U.S. military programs.

Question: The Soviet Government statement says that the United States is making a major mistake by nullifying the SALT II treaty. How are these words to be understood?

Answer: Evidently, the U.S. Administration has not considered too well the consequences for U.S. national interests and security stemming from its decision to withdraw from the SALT II treaty. The liquidation of the structure for curbing the race in strategic offensive arms would lead to serious unpredictability and uncertainty in the sides' implementation of strategic programs.

The SALT II treaty and SALT I Agreement contain many provisions which make possible to reliably control [kontrolirovat] the development of the strategic situation. The threat of a kind of chaos and instability is now emerging. This will be bad for international security and for the talks on nuclear and space weapons, for it is difficult to build accords on that shaky ground of uncertainty which would be one result of the course which the United States is now proposing to the world.

We propose to the United States a genuine restraint which means the rigorous fulfillment of treaties and agreements and unconditional observance of levels which are the subject of pledges. It is only on the basis of such an approach that we will be able to ensure strategic stability and a reliable base for productive talks.

Answers were also given to other questions.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1161

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: FURTHER COMMENTARIES ON U.S. SALT II VIOLATION

Shishlin: U.S. 'Renunciation'

LDO42359 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 4 Dec 86

[Commentary by political observer Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Public and political figures abroad have been criticizing the U.S. Administration's renunciation of its compliance with the Soviet-U.S. SALT II Treaty. Here is a Mayak commentary by political observer Nikolay Shishlin:

[Shishlin] The U.S. actions are directed at moving away from the Reykjavik accords. This is nothing new. In point of fact one's attention was drawn immediately after Reykjavik to the fact that there are political and business circles in the United States that have no liking either for an improvement in the Soviet-U.S. relations or for a general leveling-out in international affairs as such. However, one cannot at the present fail to mention the fact that by bringing into service its 131st B-52 bomber equipped with cruise missiles the United States has de facto departed from the SALT II Treaty, although that treaty was not ratified by the United States in the first place.

The question now arises as to what is the significance of this. After all, from the military viewpoint this will not upset the military-strategic parity. But it can be said that there are economic motives here as well. The U.S. military-industrial complex is interested in escalating the arms race and by no means in its curtailment. This is true, but again the overall cost of a present-day strategic bomber, though it is expressed in fairly large amounts, will in the final analysis not fill the pockets of these greedy U.S. military monopolies.

I believe that the political reasons are the most important thing here. The United States took fright at the possibility of a breakthrough to major accords that appeared at Reykjavik. It is this fear that is dictating all these U.S. actions, which are directed at moving away from the Reykjavik accords and making the world forget that major decisions were just a stone's throw away at Reykjavik. But I rather believe that this policy of fear -- a policy that is characterized by a certain amount of confusion, although in certain cases and in the case of exacerbating the international situation the United States does act deliberately -- this policy simply cannot have a future.

Indeed, however paradoxical it may sound, it is precisely this fear of the U.S. Administration to reach compromise decisions which shows that the Soviet State has chosen the correct course, and that it is to this course that the future belongs.

## 'Pointed' Violation Condemned

LD032249 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 3 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS — Follows commentary by Vladimir Chernyshev, a TASS military news analyst:

Washington's pointed violation of the SALT-2 Treaty is condemned worldwide, including in the USA itself and in the countries allied to it. That move is described with good reason as one undermining the process of limitation and reduction of arms, as a serious blow to the Soviet-American Geneva talks, as an offensive by the current U.S. President against the fundamentals of the limitation of strategic weapons, the fundamentals into which each of Ronald Reagan's four predecessors in the White House laid his own brick. One can hardly assess as a hyperbole the statement by the U.S. ABC Television Company that albeit the talks are continuing both powers have entered the world without SALT, with no contractual limitations on offensive nuclear weapons.

Meanwhile, Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, was apparently right in saying that the administration's decision was clearly aimed at winning support from ultra-rightist circles. Proof of that has been, for example, the letter of Senator Robert Dole to the President applauding the destruction of SALT-2. This is not astonishing, since that spokesman for the rightists recently said in setting forth his views in the journal policy review that detente was a "dangerous myth", and the USA would have a real chance to achieve its aims only if it was able to put an end "once and forever to detente."

A buildup of U.S. power, in the first place of military power, is, in the opinion of that "philosopher" of anti-detente, one of the indispensable preliminary conditions for successful relations with the Soviet Union.

That is precisely why he called for ensuring a considerable superiority over the USSR both as regards nuclear and conventional weapons, for "forcing" the Soviet Union to "strike a deal" on the American terms.

Such figures stubbornly refuse to draw lessons from history, to wake up to the realities of the nuclear space age and realize where the obsession with the cult of force may lead their own country and the whole world. The U.S. Administration's offensive against the existing agreements containing the weapons race can be described only as triumph of anti-Soviet ideology over common sense. One cannot help asking in that connection whether the current administration has set out to make every effort over the remaining time of its stay in office to put an end to the existing treaties and agreements and totally wreck the existing regime of arms control.

## Lomeyko Criticism

AU011106 Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG in German 29 Nov 86 p 1

["M.S." report: "This is Kohl's Baby"]

[Text] At a press conference in Vienna, Soviet special envoy Vladimir Lomeyko called yesterday, Friday, a "black day" because yesterday the United States violated the Soviet-American SALT II treaty by putting into service its 131st B-52 bomber. Other topics of the press conference were the relationship between the USSR and the FRG, Afghanistan, and the U.S. arms deals with Iran.

Lomeyko had come to Vienna to brief Chancellor Franz Vraniaszky and Foreign Minister Peter Jankowitsch on the state of the Geneva disarmament talks. Due to the fact that just yesterday the United States exceeded the contractually fixed upper limit of strategic nuclear weapons systems, his mission acquired unwanted topicality.

Lomeyko harshly criticized U.S. President Reagan, who had caused this violation "not inadvertently but with the desire for further armament." Previously, Reagan had criticized his predecessor Carter, who had signed SALT II, because Reagan did not consider the treaty to be comprehensive enough, Lomeyko said. Now he had done "what he had criticized Carter for doing." For the Soviet Union the principle of "pacta sunt servanda" (treaties have to be kept) is sacred. Lomeyko: "We do not understand one President signing a treaty and his successor not considering it valid for himself." For the Soviet Union the treaty had been valid as long as it had not been violated, but "that has now happened."

Lomeyko rejected as "slander" American accusations that the USSR itself has been violating the treaty for a long time. He referred to American-Soviet expert committees, which had always been able to refute such accusations.

Lomeyko also spoke about the Vienna Force Reduction Talks, which have been going on for 13 years without success. He suggested discussing conventional disarmament during a new stage of the Stockholm negotiations in order to come to a solution.

Asked about the relationship between the FRG and the USSR, Lomeyko said that Kohl's statements had not been just a single gaffe but "a policy line of those ruling in Bonn." (As is known, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl had compared Kremlin leader Gorbachev with Nazi Propaganda Minister Goebbels and the Soviet Union with Nazi Germany.) Lomeyko recalled the "terrible history that lies between our two peoples" and the 20 million Soviet victims in World War II.

The Soviet Union has not heard any apology from Kohl, only explanations, said Lomeyko. Moscow does not "demand" an apology; that must come without demand. For: "This is not our baby."

Another topic at the press conference was the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. Lomeyko said that he can imagine a total withdrawal of Soviet troops only if Pakistan gives a guarantee that "armed gangs will no longer be sent into the country" from its territory. The rebels are paid by the United States and equipped with American weapons, stressed the Kremlin's special envoy.

Asked whether Reagan is still credible for the Soviets after the revelations concerning the arms deals with Iran, Lomeyko answered rather evasively. He said it is much more important whether Reagan is still credible for the Americans themselves after he has violated his own promises and the laws of his own country.

## XINHUA on U.S. Allies' Misgivings

PM081517 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 86 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "XINHUA Commentary"]

[Text] Beijing, 4 Dec — XINUUA has carried a commentary which reads in part: Almost all U.S. allies in Western Europe have perceived as an unwise act the decision by U.S. President R. Reagan to commission the 131st B-52 bomber equipped with nuclear-armed cruise missiles. In doing this, the Chinese news agency asserts, the United States has exceeded the limit set by the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty.

The commentary notes that the West European countries' negative reaction to the U.S. decision is explained by the fact that this decision raises doubts about the sincerity of the West's desire for disarmament, although since the beginning of the year the Soviet Union has made a whole series of proposals on this issue. Moreover, now, following the recent summit meeting in Reykjavik, the U.S. Administration — whether it wishes this or not — is acting as the initiator of the violation of SALT II. And finally, with this decision the United States has inflicted still greater damage on relations with its allies. In the last 2 years the United States has repeatedly come forward with its "Star Wars" program, a fact which has generated misgivings among the West European countries. And now the United States has gone even further by completely disregarding their allies' misgivings, which can only strengthen their already serious misgivings.

### French Complacency Over Break

LD051038 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1800 GMT 3 Dec 86

["Notes of a Publicist," presented by Boris Tumanov]

[Text] Good evening dear listeners. The SALT II agreement has been put into question thanks to the good care of the Reagan administration. It has just put into service in its strategic nuclear forces the 138th [as heard] B-52 bomber equipped with cruise missiles. This means that Washington is deliberately destroying the barrier that has thus far stood in the way of the arms race in the area of strategic nuclear weapons. President Francois Mitterrand has noticed — not without a certain melancholy — that the SALT II agreement was very useful and very reasonable. The conclusion therefore, must be that in violating this agreement, Washington has just committed something useless and unreasonable. But French officials contended themselves with just making funeral orations without trying to name the reasons and especially the consequences of a possible disappearance of SALT II.

This is surprising for two reasons: First, if it is admitted that France and the other European allies of the United States have tried during these last months — as they themselves affirm — to deter Washington from compromising SALT II, the fact that the U.S. Administration has not deigned to take into account their request should at least produce from the European NATO members a bit more worried reaction than those circumstantial funeral orations. This is because the Washington attitude proves once again that President Reagan and his circle interpret Atlantic solidarity as some sort of oath of blind obedience by European vassals to the transatlantic king. Second, official Paris — which does not cease to refer to the supposed Soviet threat and to count imaginable and real Soviet nuclear missiles — understands without doubt that the U.S. decision can directly lead to a new increase of the Soviet and U.S. nuclear potential. Now, if it is admitted that France is really threatened by the Soviet military potential, one is surprised by the passivity with which French officials react to such perspective.



To give you a more precise idea of what I say, I will ask you to imagine for a while what would be France's reaction if it was the USSR and not Washington that abandoned the SALT II agreement. That said, I have no intention of inciting French officials to violent diatribes or to verbal condemnations toward Washington. It is not this that could free us at the end of the day from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. But, the realization of the fact that the political responsibility of the Western European politicians should not put itself in the role of the retinue of his majesty the transatlantic king. Otherwise, it will be condemned to repeat quite often: The king has gone crazy. Long live the king!

132d B-52 Planned

LD120021 Moscow TASS in English 0012 GMT 12 Dec 86

[Text] Washington, 12 Dec (TASS)--Having broken out of the SALT II Treaty, the Reagan Administration got down to a massive build-up of strategic armaments.

A Pentagon spokesman stated that one more, the 132d, B-52 bomber reequipped as a cruise missile carrier will be made operational with the U.S. Air Force early in January. Besides, another "Trident" submarine will be commissioned on Saturday.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1161

SALT/START ISSUES

XINHUA REPORTAGE: U.S. REJECTS CALLS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SALT II

OWL60800 Beijing XINHUA in English 0728 GMT 16 Dec 86

[Text] Washington, December 15 (XINHUA) -- The Reagan administration today rejected calls from Congress members for continued compliance with the SALT-2 treaty, saying such efforts would jeopardize the current arms control talks with the Soviet Union.

Fifty-seven senators, including 10 Republicans, today sent a letter to President Reagan urging him to reverse his decision to finally scrap the unratified treaty.

The letter, signed by Sam Nunn, incoming chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said President Ronald Reagan's decision to violate the limit of 1,320 strategic weapons by deploying another cruise-missile-carrying B-52 bomber is "an open invitation" to the Soviets to exceed restrictions on their nuclear arsenals, particularly their large land-based missiles.

House Democrats last week approved a resolution criticizing Reagan's action and pledged to try to get the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives to reverse the decision when Congress convenes next month.

In a press release today, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said that such efforts by Congress members "send a signal to the Soviet Union that it can violate its arms control commitments with impunity".

Congress would be "undercutting current U.S. attempts to negotiate real reductions in offensive nuclear arms with the Soviet Union", the statement added.

It said that Reagan's decision to finally break the treaty was based on the fact that "the Soviets failed to correct their non-compliance or to respond constructively to our diplomatic approaches and to our continued unilateral self-restraint."

The statement called the U.S. action as an "incentive" which it said is essential for the Soviet Union "both to address the issue of non-compliance constructively and to exercise restraint in their unwarranted arms buildup."

Meanwhile, the statement reiterated that the United States "will continue to exercise the utmost restraint" and "will not deploy more strategic nuclear delivery vehicles or more strategic ballistic missiles warheads than does the Soviet Union."

/9738

CSO: 5200/4040

SALT/START ISSUES

XINHUA NOTES U.S. ACCUSATION OF SALT VIOLATIONS

OW100218 Beijing XINHUA in English 0145 GMT 10 Dec 86

[Text] Washington, December 9 (XINHUA) -- The United States today accused that the Soviets "have violated, and continue to violate, some of the central provisions of SALT II" in recent years.

A press release of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said the recent Soviet announcement to continue its adherence to SALT II is "disingenuous," and represents a "propaganda effort."

The Soviet violations include the deployment of SS-25, a second "new type" of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) which is prohibited by SALT II, the release said.

The treaty allows each side to deploy one more new type of ICBM after it was signed and for the Soviet side, it was SS-24.

The U.S. alleged that the Soviets have also exceeded the treaty's cap of 2,504 strategic nuclear delivery vehicles despite "their public statement that they would not be the first to exceed SALT-II limits."

With the absence of SALT II, the document said, the United States hopes that "the Soviets would not necessarily expand their forces significantly beyond the increases already projected with SALT II. Soviet forces are already very large and would appear to be more than enough to meet reasonable military requirements."

The United States formally and finally broke SALT II late last month by deploying its 131st cruise-missile-carrying B-52 bomber without dismantling older-type strategic weapons.

The Soviet Union denounced the U.S. action as a "big mistake" but declared that it will continue to abide by the treaty in the hope that "there is still an opportunity for stopping the dangerous course of events that is provoked by the irresponsible actions" of the Reagan administration.

/6091  
CSO: 5200/4038

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### TASS CRITICIZES ROGERS EUROMISSILE STANCE

LD111918 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 11 Dec 86

[TASS headline: "General Rogers Does Not Agree With President Ronald Reagan"]

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

General Bernard Rogers, NATO's supreme allied commander Europe, criticized President Reagan for giving his consent to the elimination of medium-range missiles deployed in Europe at the Reykjavik summit.

Addressing members of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, the general said that the elimination of U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles in Europe would hurl the alliance back to the situation which had existed in 1979 and in some areas would even worsen the situation.

Does General Rogers' statement mean that he is no longer committed to the NATO's 1979 dual decision, that he got disappointed with the "zero option" on medium-range missiles and that now there exists a divergence of views between him and the U.S. President. Hardly so. More probably the U.S. Administration decided to continue the revision of the understandings reached in Iceland and to "add substance" to such a policy by throwing the authority of the supreme allied commander Europe behind it.

As to the substance of General Rogers' statement, one can clearly see that it misrepresents some facts and does not mention some others.

In 1979 the NATO leadership explained the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe by the need of "compensating for" the Soviet medium-range missiles. Now Rogers pretends that in Reykjavik the sides agreed to eliminate only the U.S. missiles.

It should be remembered, however, that during the summit meeting in Iceland the Soviet Union proposed and the American side agreed to scrap all Soviet and American medium-range missiles. So, there are no grounds to speak of NATO "being hurled back" to the situation that existed before 1979. If only for the reason that in case the decisions taken in Reykjavik were realized NATO would have a monopoly to medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, retaining the French ground-based systems in that class and the submarine-launched missiles of Britain and France.

Insisting actually on getting a free hand to deploy an American large-scale space-based ABM defense system and launching an effort to undermine the understanding on the elimination of all medium-range missiles in Europe, the U.S. Administration is demonstrating yet another time its commitment to the concept of a "limited nuclear war" and its plans for the militarization of outer space.

A "limited nuclear war" for Europe and an anti-missile shield for the aggressor. Such is the deadly essence of the Pentagon's military strategy and of the diplomatic maneuvers of the White House.

/9365

CSO: 5200/1168

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### SOVIET-JAPANESE ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSES ASIAN SECURITY

3 December Report

PMO31549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Vdovin dispatch: "Constructive Debate: Fifth Soviet and Japanese Public 'Roundtable' Conference Continues Its Work"]

[Text] Tokyo, 2 Dec -- Breaking up into commissions, the participants in the Fifth Soviet and Japanese Public "Roundtable" Conference being held here today began discussing questions on the international situation and the preservation of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region, problems of disarmament, the development of bilateral relations, the deepening of the political dialogue between the USSR and Japan, the creation of confidence-building measures, the state of and prospects for trade and economic ties, and so forth.

Representing various public circles in the two countries, the participants are not always united in their approach to these problems and ways to solve them. However, the majority of them believe that chief attention must be devoted to those areas where there is a closeness or coincidence of viewpoints. Concentrating the chief effort on what unites us will help to raise Soviet-Japanese relations to a new level, the speakers pointed out today, and will create favorable possibilities for their all-round development -- which will help to strengthen security and peace in Asia and the Pacific.

A number of speeches voiced alarm in connection with the U.S. plans to shift the nuclear arms race into space. In particular, K. Fushimi, the well-known physicist and member of parliament, spoke about this. SDI, in which Japan has decided to participate, he said, has become a new factor of tension in the world. Those who are helping to create such a situation, Fushimi pointed out, certainly cannot be categorized as sober-minded people. He therefore fully agreed with the Soviet Union, which has advanced major nuclear disarmament initiatives.

The USSR's proposals are remarkable in that they open up prospects for realizing modern society's ideal -- the elimination of nuclear weapons. Mankind can choose no course other than that charted in Reykjavik. The Japanese physicist urged his government to make its contribution to disarmament and the ensuring of security and peace in the Pacific region.

In their speeches many participants pointed with satisfaction to the positive changes that have occurred over the past year in relations between the two countries, the deepening of the political dialogue, and the broadening of exchange in many different areas. Guided by our own national interests and the interests of peace in Asia, we

must continue to extend points of contact and create fertile ground for the further development of friendship and good-neighborly relations between the two countries, prominent public figure T. Yokoyama said.

The members of the commission discussing the prospects for trade and economic relations spoke of great possibilities in developing very multifaceted ties. Obstacles and problems still exist in this sphere, H. Kanamori, spokesman for the Japanese economic center, said. Our task consists in finding concrete solutions to them and to reinforce favorable trends with practical steps, so that Japanese-Soviet economic cooperation develops on a wider front.

The debate will be continued tomorrow, but, summing up the initial results, it can already be said today that the participants are unanimous in their desire to develop and deepen multifaceted relations between the two countries. And one more conclusion can be drawn on the basis of this frank and constructive debate. The chief condition for developing relations of friendship, good-neighborliness, and cooperation, so the "roundtable" conference participants believe, is the preservation of peace, the curbing of the arms race, and the prevention of nuclear war.

#### Report on Communique

PM100943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Vdovin report: "In a Spirit of Mutual Understanding: Roundtable Conference of Soviet and Japanese Public Has Finished Work"]

[Text] Tokyo, 3 Dec -- The participants in the fifth roundtable conference of the USSR and Japanese public, which has ended in Tokyo, have called for further efforts to bring about a rapprochement between the two countries' views, to deepen mutual understanding, and to develop truly good-neighborly relations between them. The further development of friendly relations between the two neighboring countries, they stated, is of great significance for strengthening peace in the Asian and Pacific regions.

The 3-day conference's main theme was "The Role of the USSR and Japanese Public in Ensuring Peace and Security in the Asia-Pacific Region." More than 400 representatives of the two countries -- USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and Japanese dietmen, politicians, businessmen, activists of various social organizations, scientists, and journalists -- took part in the meeting. The roundtable has been held since 1979 on behalf of Japan by a number of social organizations advocating the development of relations with the USSR in the most diverse spheres and on behalf of the Soviet side by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the "USSR-Japan" Society.

During the discussions, held in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding, the participants discussed problems of the international political situation in the Asia-Pacific region and Japanese-Soviet relations in the political, economic, and cultural spheres as well as the activity of social organizations in the struggle for peace, to prevent nuclear war, and to strengthen friendship and good-neighborliness between the USSR and Japanese peoples. In a joint communique approved today, the conference participants rated highly the possibility of achieving an accord in principle on questions of nuclear disarmament which emerged during the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik. They indicated the need to mobilize international public opinion to end the nuclear arms race and to use space solely for peaceful purposes.

The conference welcomed the various proposals aimed at reducing tension and ensuring security and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region and urged that every opportunity be used to achieve the further development of dialogue among the region's countries.

The participants in the meeting, the communique says, expressed readiness to help overcome the difficulties hindering fruitful economic and technical cooperation between the two countries and considered an exchange of opinions on new forms of such cooperation useful.

Expressing satisfaction at the positive changes in Soviet-Japanese relations, the conference advocated the expansion of bilateral political contacts and the development of long-term mutually beneficial cooperation in the spheres of the economy, science, and technology, the search for new forms of trade and economic ties, and a broadening of exchange in the spheres of culture, education, and sport.

It has been decided to hold the next roundtable conference of the Soviet and Japanese public in Moscow in 1988.

/9365

CSO: 5200/1168



## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW: NATO NUCLEAR GROUP VIEWING INF, CONVENTIONAL ARMS

LD231135 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 21 Oct 86

[Text] The Nuclear Planning Group of NATO is holding a top secret meeting in Gleneagles, near Edinburgh. The following commentary has been written by Sergey Sayenko:

Reports from Gleneagles say that when it came to the medium-range missiles some NATO defense ministers had much to say about the need to have these missiles in Europe. Their main argument is the claim that the Warsaw Treaty countries hold a notable edge over NATO in conventional arms in Europe, and that the West will become virtually defenseless if this continent is rid of nuclear armaments.

Nothing can be further from the truth. Western experts themselves have admitted more than once that in Europe there are approximately as many armaments, including conventional ones, at the disposal of NATO, as there are at the Warsaw Treaty countries' disposal. United States Secretary of State George Shultz, too, had had to admit it. He said that NATO has enough conventional armament to oppose the Soviet Union. And for those who don't know, the large-scale program for disarmament that the Soviet Union submitted to the West last January suggests ridding this earth of nuclear weapons along with reducing conventional arms in Europe.

At the congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in Berlin last April, Mikhail Gorbachev said the Soviet proposals (?may be) conducive to reducing conventional arms on the European Continent in a drastic way, from the Atlantic to the Urals. It's a pity the West doesn't want to listen to proposals of this kind. For instance at the Vienna talks (?on) arms reduction in central Europe, the West doesn't want to discuss even a 1 percent reduction in arms, but insists on reducing personnel by 1 percent.

Since the West doesn't want to notably reduce arms in central Europe, the Vienna talks have been continuing for 13 years. Yes, 13, and doesn't this figure stand out against the backdrop of NATO defense ministers meeting at Gleneagles?

/9738

CSO: 5200/1154

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA: U.S. MISSILES 'DESTABILIZING' KOREAN PENINSULA

PM040847 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 86 First Edition p 5

[Boris Barakhta "Commentator's Column": "Complicating the Situation"]

[Text] As already reported, Pentagon strategists intend to deploy operational-tactical Lance missiles in South Korea.

It is known that the south of the Korean peninsula was long ago turned into a source of constant tension in the region. The American military has deployed on that bridgehead hundreds of nuclear warheads and numerous delivery vehicles for them -- from artillery pieces to the latest aircraft. The Pentagon hotheads are planning to add to that mighty potential by deploying a new class of arms in South Korea -- mobile operational-tactical missiles capable of carrying both conventional and nuclear, chemical, or neutron charges.

Although Lance missiles have a limited range, their transfer to South Korea could prove to be one more dangerous step on the way to a buildup of increasingly destructive kinds of nuclear missile arms there. The United States is essentially introducing new destabilizing factors into the military and political situation in the Far East and challenging the peoples of the region, who are seeking to limit the arms race.

In this connection, Washington's timing of this action is obviously not accidental. The missile decision was announced at the very moment that valid optimism concerning the prospects for the radical reduction and elimination of nuclear arms has emerged among the world's peoples, including those inhabiting Asia and the Pacific basin, as a result of the Soviet Union's large-scale initiatives. Let us recall that our country has advanced constructive proposals aimed at including the Asia-Pacific region in the overall process of creating an all-embracing system of international security. Other socialist states in Asia have also advanced new peace-loving initiatives.

Washington's present decision cannot fail to arouse just condemnation and protest. The new missiles in the south of the Korean peninsula are one more factor seriously complicating the situation in the region.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1154

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### THATCHER SEES LABOR NUCLEAR POLICY HELPING SOVIETS

LD031544 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1458 GMT 3 Dec 86

[By chief political correspondent Chris Moncrieff]

[Text] The prime minister warned in an interview published today that the Soviet Union would reap the benefits from unilateral action by a Labour government to remove nuclear weapons from Britain.

She said in *Jane's Defence Weekly* that Britain's ability to deter aggression and prevent intimidation would therefore be seriously affected.

"NATO is a purely defensive alliance and there is no question of its being provocative. None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to an attack."

Mrs Thatcher said the Soviet Union should never be allowed the option of escalating an attack to a level at which it might calculate there was no credible NATO response.

"That is why Labour Party policies of unilateral nuclear disarmament and removal of American nuclear bases in the UK would be so dangerous.

"They would seriously affect our ability to deter aggression and prevent intimidation. They would increase the risks of conflict, not reduce them. And they would be wholly ineffective in convincing Soviet leaders of the risks inherent in any aggression.

"Unilateral action by the United Kingdom to remove nuclear weapons would signal a weakening of the alliance and would raise serious doubts in the eyes of our allies about our will to defend ourselves. The Soviet Union would reap the benefit."

Mrs Thatcher stressed that Britain's independent strategic nuclear deterrent would remain vital to Britain's security and that of NATO for the foreseeable future.

"That is why we took the decision to purchase Trident. Any other solution would either be more expensive, not available in the time scale required, or both."

President Reagan's Star Wars programme was criticised as a hindrance to arms negotiations by a top Soviet official in London today.

Mr Andrey Aleksandrov-Agentov, a Soviet ambassador at large, told a press conference that outer-space weapons were "one of the key problems of the present epoch in the development of international relations.

"How this problem could be solved will determine the peaceful or the extremely dangerous future for the whole of mankind." The Star Wars strategic defence initiative was "dangerous because it opens the door for starting an unlimited and unpredictable atmosphere in a sphere where it has not yet existed — in outer space."

The idea that SDI would protect the whole of the United States was "utopia." But it could provide a partial shield for military objects and could lead to a temptation to deliver a first nuclear strike.

Perhaps the most dangerous part of the process was the possibility of building up armaments on a completely new principle, whether on laser or something else. Politically and psychologically, once the process began there could be no question of reducing existing nuclear arsenals.

/9274

CSO: 5240/028

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### USSR COMMENTARY ON VIENNA CSCE PREPARATION, PROSPECTS

#### CSSR News Conference

LD242315 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] Prague October 24 TASS -- The process of European detente initiated by the signing of the Helsinki Final Act should be continued, Bohuslav Kucera, chairman of the Czechoslovakian Committee for European Security and Cooperation, said at a press conference in Prague today. The press conference was devoted to the forthcoming Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The efforts of the participants in the Vienna meeting should be aimed at making the process of European detente a reality. In spite of the unwillingness of certain Western politicians to drop their hopes to achieve military superiority, progress in that field can be ensured. Czechoslovakia unconditionally supports the proposals aimed at abolishing chemical weapons and establishing nuclear-free zones. Special importance is attached in this context to the recent initiative of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the Social Unity Party of Germany on the establishment of a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe, the initiative which is an example of a constructive approach to a major problem of our time, Kucera stressed.

#### Roundtable Previews Meeting

LD251243 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1610 GMT 24 Oct 86

["On the Eve of the Vienna Meeting" roundtable presented by political observer Georgiy Zubkov with Lev Nikolayevich Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Georges Bartoli, French political observer; Karol Szyndzielorz, Polish television commentator and writer for ZYCIE WARSZAWY, and (Rene Aiberson), Netherlands television news editor and commentator]

[Excerpts] [Tolkunov] On 4 November the next meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Helsinki process opens in Vienna. The Reykjavik experience will definitely be felt in the Austrian capital. Europe has not been a detached observer of that meeting, which has been of direct interest to all European people.

[Zubkov] How have the European public and the leaderships of the European countries reacted to the outcome of the meeting in Reykjavik?

[Tolkunov] I must say that on the whole the results of the Reykjavik meeting have been received in West Europe with considerable alarm. They have shown that the Washington administration is capable of sacrificing the direct interests of its allies, and that is worrying the West Europeans. In the words of the London TIMES, everyone now feels a natural disappointment that the hopes for the main, specific treaties have not been realized. But at the same time, the desire is coming to fruition in West Europe to struggle more actively for the achievement of compromises and agreements. [passage omitted]

The heart of the process is military detente. Here the West has piled up not a few obstacles. All the more important, therefore, are the results of the recently-ended Stockholm conference. They contain, as you know, a range of measures of military detente to reduce the risk of war in Europe. [passage omitted in which Bartoli, Szyndzielorz and Aiberson speak on the Helsinki accords and the Stockholm conference]

[Zubkov] What will be the difficulties in Vienna, and how can they be overcome?

[Tolkunov] I believe it's the actions of the United States that will constitute the main difficulty. That has been shown by the conference in Berne, where all the European countries agreed on important questions of humanitarian exchange and human rights. But the United States imposed a veto on the decisions of all the European states. The position of the U.S. Administration in Reykjavik also indicates that it is in general, against developing the process of detente. It is out to gain a definite military superiority; and in this it wants to rely on the help of its allies in West Europe. So, naturally there will be pressure on the West European allies, and this could make the whole meeting in Vienna more difficult.

But, on the other hand, the West European allies of the United States realize that the process of detente is necessary if we are to extricate ourselves from all the impasses that have been created, above all, by the arms race. We've got to break the vicious circle of the arms race. Here certain tendencies are maturing, they are very strong, and they are due, above all, to pressure from the public of the West European countries. We are seeing that the public forces of the West European countries, in West Germany, Britain, France, Italy or Spain, are raising their voice: The voice that calls for Europe that is a continent of peace, a continent of detente: A true laboratory of detente. Europe has all it needs to become that: huge material resources, the experience of history, the remarkable culture of the peoples of Europe. We have the potential for further rapprochement and mutual enrichment. Thus, of course, the continent of Europe, if it really does become a continent of detente, will give a powerful impetus to the improvement of relations in the world as a whole.

[Zubkov] As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said at his press conference in Reykjavik, the time has come for action.

[Tolkunov] Time for action. Time won't wait. That's the main thing. This is especially important for the continent of Europe, which, as I said, today has the biggest accumulation of weapons of all sorts, especially at the very heart of Europe, in its center. [passage omitted]

## Public Forum in Vienna

PM031505 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent N. Novikov dispatch: "We Need Peace! International Public Forum Concludes Its Work in Vienna"]

[Text] Vienna--An international public forum organized by the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation has concluded its work here.

...a large banner in English hung above the presidium table: "Security and Cooperation for Europe Today and Tomorrow." It was on this topic that the forum participants conducted a broad debate. It was opened by U.S. Rear Admiral E. Carroll, deputy director of the Center for Defense Information. As a former military man, he rejects the ancient Roman saying: "If you want peace, prepare for war." In his opinion, the Reykjavik meeting was not crowned with success because the U.S. President "tried to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union" with the help of SDI. E. Carroll admitted that there are forces in U.S. official circles (U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger and others) which are doing everything to increase East-West confrontation, particularly in Europe.

L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, and head of the Soviet delegation, who spoke after the U.S. admiral, emphasized the importance for the cause of peace of the major peace-loving initiatives advanced by the Soviet leader at the Reykjavik meeting. The meeting in the Icelandic capital was an important event in international life in the struggle against the arms race and for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

By referring to some "missile threat" in West Europe, the head of the Soviet delegation went on to say, certain figures in NATO countries, particularly the FRG, are trying to foist onto Europeans the idea of the need not only to participate in the American SDI program but also to develop their own "European Defense Initiative" (EDI) in addition. It is logical to ask: If it is a question of ensuring the continent's peaceful, nuclear-free future, why erect a palisade of arms in the form of SDI for Europe, an independent EDI, or a combination of both? Because the Soviet Union proposes ridding Europe totally of nuclear weapons and sharply reducing armed forces and conventional arms.

Touching on the upcoming meeting in Vienna, L.N. Tolkunov emphasized: It is extremely important to prevent that meeting being turned by opponents of detente into an arena of confrontation. The public in the Soviet Union is firmly convinced that the Vienna forum must be one more milestone on the way to reliable security. So, Vienna is taking the baton over from Stockholm. Soviet people call on all peace-loving and realistically-minded forces in the countries which signed the historic Final Act in Helsinki to take care of the develop what was achieved in the Swedish capital in order to proceed to the chief, basic thing--to real disarmament measures on the European continent.

These same thoughts imbued the speeches by B. Kucera, deputy chairman of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly; M. Louekoski, deputy chairman of the Finnish Parliament; Professor A. Jacob, president of the Canadian Alliance for Peace, and others.

The work of the international public forum concluded with the adoption of a final document.

#### USSR Officials Cited

AU031351 Vienna KURIER in German 1 Nov 86 p 3

[Heinz Nussbaumer dispatch from Moscow: "What the Kremlin Plans for the CSCE"]

[Excerpts] If one talks now with the Soviet department heads on the forthcoming Vienna CSCE conference, a new note can be heard--the old information (Moscow's interest in disarmament and disinterest in human rights issues) no longer appears to be true. "Of course, disarmament will also demand due attention in Vienna," said, for instance, Ambassador Bondarenko, the head of the Third European Department, to KURIER, "but we are against a playing up of one or a playing down of another 'basket' of topics. All of them are individually important. They should not be put into opposition to each other, either." And he announced a "constructive as well as offensive attitude" concerning "human rights" in Vienna.

But no, say Moscow's top diplomats, again contrary to all expectations, nothing has already been fixed for the CSCE by the Soviet side: "We consider the conference as a creative process, where everyone of us first attentively listens to the others--and then makes his decision."

And disarmament, Moscow's pet subject? "Military confidence-building is not enough," say the Soviets; "the reduction of arms and forces can no longer be delayed." A lot of elan has evaporated during the 13 years of force reduction talks in the Vienna Hofburg conference center that have not yielded any agreement. The future of this East-West struggle, too, has to be discussed at the CSCE. A new forum? A new circle of participants? A new venue?

Moscow unmistakably wishes to signal to the West Europeans, despite the meeting between Shultz and Shevardnadze in Vienna: The superpowers do not decide alone about Europe's fate.

This course also fit the rather thick praise for the host and mediator, Austria: "You are pivotal figures--very active, very experienced, and very flexible...."

The fact that Austria's neutrality was once modeled after the "Swiss pattern" is considered outdated in Moscow. "For quite some time this has not been a suitable pattern any more--you have your own interests, your particulars." And: "It would be an attack on your own profile to consider all neutrals alike."

## USSR Delegation Press Conference

PM311138 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Excerpt] A press conference was given at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 29 October for Soviet and foreign journalists by the Soviet delegation to the Vienna meeting of states which took part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The meeting, which opens in Vienna on 4 November at the level of foreign ministers, will be a major event not only on the European continent, but elsewhere, Ambassador Yu B. Kashlev, head of the USSR delegation, noted. It will take place in a fundamentally new situation in the world, the situation created by the major Soviet initiatives in the sphere of ending the arms race and promoting disarmament -- the program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's January statement. This situation was also created by the far-reaching proposals of the Warsaw Pact states on reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe and by the package of major, concrete measures put forward at the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik to take the struggle for nuclear disarmament to new heights.

The Soviet Union, it was stressed at the press conference, is in favor of holding the Vienna meeting in a positive key, dynamically and constructively, and achieving substantial accords on all sections of the Helsinki Final Act. Our country is prepared to discuss any questions whatever at the Vienna meeting, there are no forbidden topics for us.

On questions concerning security in Europe, the USSR attaches great significance to resolving the military and political problems which are so important for improving the political climate on the continent. In Vienna, the Soviet Union will advocate agreeing on the mandate for the next stage of the Stockholm conference, with a view to continuing the examination of questions of confidence-building measures, but mainly embarking on practical talks concerning the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. It is expedient to continue working on the political and legal aspects of the mutual relations among the CSCE states, with a view to jointly securing an increase in the effectiveness of all 10 principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

### Tolkunov on Reykjavik Influence

AU291954 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1700 GMT 29 Oct 86

[Raimund Loew report on a press conference given by Leuv Tolkunov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Council of the Union and chairman of the International CSCE Committee, at the conclusion of a 2-day conference, on 29 October in Vienna-- recorded]

[Excerpt] "After Reykjavik: Cautious Cooperation or Confrontation?" was the topic of the press conference given by the International CSCE Committee consisting of official East European representatives and Western armament opponents. They made a clear appeal to the official CSCE follow-up conference which is to begin next Tuesday [14 November]: Disarmament measures and issues of confidence-building and security policy should be the focus of the conference.



The Soviet representative and chairman of the Council of the Union in the Supreme Soviet, Lev Tolkunov, stresses to the great expectations Moscow places in the Vienna meeting: Since a compromise was reached this summer at the Stockholm conference on confidence-building and disarmament, there have been favorable prospects for disarmament in Europe, he said. Stockholm showed that compromises are indeed possible even in sensitive military areas. This is the point from which the Vienna meeting has to start, Tolkunov stated.

Cooperation, Tolkunov asserted, would be intensified in particular in the area of economy, science, and environmental protection. If detente in Europe is endangered, such cooperation projects could contribute to reducing the crises in East-West relations.

Tolkunov does not want to call the Reykjavik summit a failure. After all, the most important vital questions of mankind were discussed there. If Reagan had not insisted on SDI there would have been a breakthrough, Tolkunov said.

The meeting in Vienna is influenced by Reykjavik, the Soviet representative stated. There it was attempted to take the world's most difficult and steepest mountain by storm. This was not possible. Now there is the question how this could be achieved in spite of all difficulties. In Vienna it will be possible to discuss which compromises are necessary -- last but not least during the meeting between Shultz and Shevardnadze, Tolkunov said.

Via nuclear-free corridors and nuclear-free zones in Europe, the conferees stated, the elimination of American and Soviet nuclear missiles and, finally, of conventional armaments must be reached. It is also hoped that the conference will pave the way for a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

#### European Politicians on Agenda

LD031512 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1400 GMT 3 Nov 86

[Text] European Center, Liberal and Agrarian Parties recommend the extension of confidence- and security-building measures to sea areas, too. The participants in the 2-day so-called mini-CSCE, which has ended in Espoo, thus gave their support in principle to President Mauno Koivisto's recent statement on sea areas. In its statement, the meeting appealed to the United States and the Soviet Union to strive to reach an agreement as soon as possible on nuclear and space weapons, on the basis of what was achieved in Reykjavik. The party representatives believe that the improvement in superpower relations and the success of the Stockholm disarmament conference, create a good basis for the success of the third CSCE meeting due to begin in Vienna tomorrow.

On their own initiative, the center parties express the hope that the Vienna meeting will call for the convening of an expert meeting on environmental questions.

## Mikhaylov on Meeting Prospects

PM031525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 86 First Edition p.6

[Article by V. Mikhaylov: "From Stockholm to Vienna"]

[Excerpts] A meeting of the states that participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe opens in Vienna 4 November. The foreign ministers of 35 states are assembling there. This is an expression of today's chief trend: The time has come for all states to make a decisive effort and take specific actions to halt material preparations for nuclear war and shape an all-embracing system of international security, primarily through disarmament.

In the qualitatively new situation created by the Soviet initiatives in the disarmament sphere, this meeting is intended to be an important milestone in movement toward reliable security and to aid the implementation of real measures to improve the climate in our continent and the world over.

Now it is the job of the Vienna meeting not only to discuss the results of Stockholm and the experts' conferences, but to elaborate the paths of further progress in strengthening security and peaceful cooperation in Europe.

The all-European process is not taking place in a vacuum. The period from the start of the Stockholm conference in January 1984 to the upcoming Vienna meeting has been packed with a multitude of events, often multifaceted and frequently containing conflicting features.

It was precisely these years that witnessed the start of the siting of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles on the European Continent. The United States perpetrated its intervention against Grenada and its attack on Libya. The "Star Wars" program conceived in Washington began to acquire sinister shape, and the predictability of U.S. policy began to decline dangerously.

But it was in this same period that the Soviet Union put forward a detailed program to deliver mankind from nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons. Reinforcing this program with specific actions, the USSR announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The Warsaw Pact states put forward an initiative aimed at a decisive reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Last November there was a Soviet-American summit in Geneva at which the two powers' leaders jointly stated that there can be no victors in a nuclear war and that it must never be unleashed.

And finally -- Reykjavik.

The results of the Reykjavik meeting and its lessons will be a factor in Vienna as well. They illuminated the real prospects of nuclear disarmament. Had the U.S. Administration gone along with the Soviet proposal on strengthening the ABM Treaty the number of strategic weapons in the world would have been cut by one-half over the next 5 years and all -- U.S. and Soviet -- medium-range missiles would have vanished from European soil. So as far as Europe is concerned the issue of whether or not there is going to be an arms race in near-earth space is not a side issue. After Reykjavik the efforts to justify certain countries' joining in the U.S. SDI by claiming that they would only be participating in a research program [issledovatel'skaya programma] have lost all plausibility. [paragraph continues]

It is not a matter of theoretical research [teoreticheskiye izyskaniya] but of practical preparations [prakticheskaya podgotovka] for placing strike weapons in near-earth orbits and creating [sozdaniye] new and even more devastating means of destruction. This affects all continents -- not the least of which is Europe.

Great disarmament opportunities were revealed in Reykjavik, primarily as a result of the abandonment of trivia and petty mathematics, as a result of the bold switch to large-scale decisions. That was the Soviet approach in Reykjavik to the burning problems of the day, as a result of which the process of elaborating practical decisions on halting the arms race received a powerful boost. The utilization of this experience could be beneficial at the upcoming meeting in the Austrian capital.

The Stockholm conference has passed on to the Vienna meeting a substantial package of political and military technical measures on reducing the risk of war in Europe and strengthening security and mutual trust on our continent. Compared with the provisions of the Final Act, they have been considerably expanded and supplemented with new measures.

The principle of not using or threatening force was concretized and consolidated in the Stockholm final document. It is essential to introduce this fundamental provision of modern international law into European practice. The nature of today's weapons means that no state can hope to defend itself by military means alone. Europe, with its high population density and excessive concentration of armaments, would be more vulnerable than any other continent in the event of an armed, especially nuclear, conflict.

The package of military-technical confidence- and security-building measures which comes into effect 1 January 1987 has been supplemented with important provisions such as the pledge to exchange annual plans for notifiable military activity. For the first time, aside from national means of monitoring [kontrol] this activity, a system of inspections is being introduced. (The full text of the conference decisions was published in the Soviet press.)

The Stockholm document is the first major agreement in the military-political sphere since the signing of the Soviet-American SALT II Treaty. After a lengthy period of stagnation in matters of limiting the danger of military confrontation it is an undoubted victory for common sense, a gain for all the 35 states participating in the all-European conference. By its very nature the all-European process accords with European political tasks in the context of the new approach to international affairs and the new thinking on questions of peace and the development of the chief principles of peaceful interstate relations which the Soviet Union has always upheld.

It is now up to the Vienna meeting. After the first stage in Stockholm, it has first of all to pave the way to a transition to the second stage -- to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. A solid foundation already exists for this difficult task, a task of importance to the destiny of detente.

First of all there is the proposal by the Warsaw Pact states to the NATO states, consisting of a detailed program of major cuts in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. The program envisages, in particular, that the strength of the opposing military-political alliances' forces will be reduced over a period of 1-2 years by 100,000-150,000 men on each side, and tactical strike aircraft will be cut also. [paragraph continues]

Immediately after this the Warsaw Pact states will be prepared to embark on further considerable cuts as a result of which, given reciprocal willingness on the part of the NATO countries, in the early nineties ground forces and tactical strike aircraft would have been cut by approximately 25 percent compared with the present level, that is, over 500,000 men on each side. Given an objective approach to these proposals, they could serve as a good basis for future work at the second stage of the Stockholm conference. Also handed down from the first stage is the question of extending confidence-building measures to independent [samostoyatelnyye] naval and air force operations, limiting the size of exercises, and, finally, extending confidence-building measures to the territory of all the participating states, without exception.

The climate of international contacts in Europe depends to a considerable extent on the intensity and depth of cooperation in the economic, scientific, technical, and environmental spheres. But the level of cooperation in these areas still falls short of the Helsinki Final Act guidelines. What is needed here is an innovative approach, in particular, in the search for new forms of collaboration and the international division of labor. The Soviet Union, which has entered the phase of the dynamic restructuring of the national economy, is ready for such a quest. The more efficient utilization of complementary facilities in East and West and the removal of artificial restrictions and barriers from ties between them would increase the potential of the entire continent and, consequently, strengthen its positions in the world. The Vienna meeting can and must speak out on this important matter.

In Vienna the closest attention should be given to developing a mutually enriching exchange of spiritual values, providing the European peoples with more extensive information about one another's lives, and inculcating in the younger generation a sense of mutual respect -- in short, in the humanitarian sphere.

The Soviet Union attaches the greatest significance to questions of safeguarding human rights and basic freedoms. Among the values of the socialist way of life the human individual is supreme. The creation of the most favorable conditions for people's spiritual and physical development is socialist society's chief aim. It was born for that and it lives by that. The USSR is an ardent advocate of all-European cooperation in that sphere too. This cooperation is hampered by the hypocrisy and speculation of those who want to use humanitarian problems to kindle enmity and hatred, in order to be able to continue forcing on the arms race without hindrance. The Bern conference of experts on human rights demonstrated who is actually opposed to all-European cooperation in defending and asserting human rights. The adoption of a final document at the Bern conference, envisaging a considerable development of collaboration, was blocked by the United States, which had no qualms about opposing all the other participants.

Whatever sphere of international relations in the European continent you choose, the USSR is always open to broad, innovative solutions. Our country wants the Vienna meeting to be held in a positive vein and it wants to see it achieve substantial accords. These should promote the further development of the provisions of all sections of the Helsinki Final Act and the important accords reached at the Stockholm conference.

Europe, with its inherent creative spirit, has every opportunity to transform itself into the model of an all-embracing system of security and cooperation. The Vienna meeting could be an important stage on the path of accomplishing this noble mission which is of relevance to the whole of mankind.

#### Shevardnadze Meets With Austrian Officials

LDO32100 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1920 GMT 3 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna, 3 Nov (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, had a meeting today with Kurt Waldheim, federal president of Austria. The sides confirmed their interest in further developing the fruitful bilateral cooperation in various fields based on the Austrian State Accord of 1955 and the Austrian status of permanent neutrality. During the exchange of opinions on topical international problems, attention was paid to the meeting of representatives from the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, due to open on 4 November in Vienna. The success of the meeting could become a significant step in making the world's political climate healthier and bringing about favorable conditions for establishing new relations between states which correspond to the requirements of our time.

Also today, there was a meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and Franz Vranitzky, federal chancellor of Austria. During the conversation, which was held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, the sides gave a positive evaluation to the current state of bilateral cooperation and expressed mutual readiness to assist in further developing good-neighborly relations between the USSR and Austria in political, economic, cultural, and other fields.

Discussing topical problems of world politics, E. Shevardnadze drew the Austrian chancellor's attention to the complex of new and large-scale initiatives put forward in Reykjavik by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, implementation of which could start the liquidation of nuclear arms and fundamental breakthrough for the better in the international situation. The mutual interest of the USSR and Austria in containing the all-European process was confirmed. The importance of a constructive meeting in Vienna for the purposes of strengthening security and cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole was noted.

Today, Eduard Shevardnadze met with Peter Jankowitsch, Austrian minister for foreign affairs. An exchange of opinions on certain aspects of bilateral relations and a number of topical international issues took place. It was stressed that the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik was one of the most important events in international life. The ministers expressed their conviction of the need to step up efforts by all states, regardless of size, for implementing concrete measures to maintain and consolidate European and universal peace, and to reduce arms -- primarily nuclear arms. Adherence by both countries to the development of the all-European process in all fields and the intention to assist in conducting the Vienna meeting of representatives from the CSCE member countries in a constructive and businesslike spirit, was confirmed.

Eduard Shevardnadze today met with Hans Blix, director general of the IAEA. E. Shevardnadze drew H. Blix's attention to the essence of the far-reaching Soviet initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev during the recent Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik aimed at the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union's principled support for the work of the IAEA, which is playing an important role in the cause of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, of the continued development of cooperation between states in the field of peaceful utilization and strengthening of nuclear energy safety procedures, was stated.

H. Blix spoke highly of the enterprising proposals and the role of the Soviet Union in deepening international joint action in the development of nuclear power engineering.

The sides noted with satisfaction that, as a result of collective efforts and shared experience, within the framework of the IAEA important international conventions on notification and on assistance in case of nuclear accidents were speedily drafted and adopted. These conventions strengthen the atmosphere of trust in international relations and are an example of the new political thinking oriented toward the peaceful use of mankind's opportunities.

#### USSR To Do 'Utmost'

OW031837 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 3 Nov 86

[From the "World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Excerpts] There is an important event on Europe's political calendar. A meeting of representatives of the general European conference member states will open in Vienna tomorrow. The previous meeting began its work in Madrid six years ago.

The road between Madrid and Vienna was lengthy. On the way the Soviet Union and the socialist countries presented a large number of peace initiatives that meet the recommendations included in the final document of the Madrid meeting. We are of course interested in how much these initiatives, the results of the Stockholm conference, and the Soviet-U.S. dialogue in Reykjavik will influence the course of the work in Vienna.

Europeans believe that the Vienna forum will make its contribution to the creation of a comprehensive system of international security.

At any rate, the Soviet Union will do its utmost to make the meeting in the Austrian capital end with significant positive results. In a way, the United States seems to be seriously disposed toward the talks. At any rate, at a campaign stop in South Dakota, President Reagan announced: We would like to confirm the agreements reached in Iceland and continue to work on the basis of them.

At the same time one's ears prick up at reports in the Western press about certain NATO circles; first of all the United States, intending almost to do battle with the Soviet Union over Reykjavik in Vienna. A large-scale anti-Soviet, anticommunist campaign was started in advance.

#### TASS Previews Upcoming Conference

LD031254 Moscow TASS in English 1212 GMT 3 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna, 3 Nov (TASS)--TASS special correspondents report:

Representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) will meet anew at the negotiating table in the Austrian capital tomorrow.

Two such meetings, one in Belgrade in 1977-1978 and the other in Madrid in 1981-1983, took place in the eleven years since the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. The delegates from 33 European countries, the U.S. and Canada, noted in the final documents of those meetings the importance of the continuation of the European process and compliance with the stipulations of the Helsinki accords to the establishment of a collective security system and mutually beneficial cooperation on the basis of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-economic systems.

However, artificial barriers were raised on the road to these goals. Instead of carrying on a constructive dialogue, some leading Western countries began to whip up confrontation and hostility, escalate the arms race in the European continent and elsewhere and simultaneously block the practical solution of the problems of detente in the political, economic and other fields. In the past few years the world has begun to slide towards nuclear catastrophe far faster because of the plans of the Western militarist forces to produce and deploy weapons of mass annihilation of new types and to develop space strike weapons.

Yet no attacks on detente could kill the Helsinki process and the hopes for the improvement of the international situation that had been fuelled by it. Those hopes were alive first and foremost in the European countries, big and small alike, which have special interest in broader cooperation under conditions of peace and security due to a number of reasons.

The far-reaching Soviet proposals, the implementation of which could quickly achieve a drastic turn for the better in international affairs, ensure progress in every area of disarmament, remove the threat of nuclear war and begin the advance towards a nuclear-free world, have evoked positive responses in Europe and all over the world.

These are signs of new thinking in the European process as well. Interesting proposals have been put forward on individual aspects of that process at meetings of experts. It was only a U.S. veto that blocked accord at a meeting of experts from the 35 CSCE countries on human contacts in Berne last spring. The Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe was a major success.

The results of that conference showed that even under conditions of today's tensions, it is possible to work out mutually acceptable solutions to complex problems if there is readiness for cooperation and compromise.

The Vienna meeting will open at the level of foreign ministers on the Soviet Union's initiative. The socialist countries have come to the meeting with the desire to seek substantial results. The foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty countries stressed at their recent meeting in Bucharest the resolve of their countries to contribute in every way to the development of the European process in every field. The countries of the socialist community consider this possible on the condition that all the CSCE countries display political will, a businesslike approach and readiness to look for mutually acceptable accords so as to revive detente, strengthen security and promote cooperation in Europe and all over the world.

#### Poland Urges Progress

LD031810 Warsaw PAP in English 1650 GMT 3 Nov 86

[By PAP special correspondent Andrzej Rayzacher]

[Text] Vienna, 3 Nov--An opinion prevails here that one must not waste the dynamics lent to the dialogue on military security by the Stockholm conference and that while making the use of the "Reykjavik factor", one should proceed towards concrete disarmament actions on the territory from the Atlantic to the Ural.

Poland and other socialist countries, neutral and non-aligned states and some NATO members want the Vienna meeting, after assessing the results of the Stockholm conference, to agree on the mandate for its second phase so that it could deal both with concrete steps limiting the military activity of states as well as moves concerning disarmament. The document from the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states embodies concrete and far-reaching offers on the issue.

The European proves stronger, more important and more durable on our continent from this what differentiates states of various socio-political systems. In the face of deadly perils of the nuclear era and the danger of expanding the arms race into outer space there is a particular necessity for joint, thoughtful and responsible actions on the side of European population in defense of the supreme weal--peace. This idea will guide the work of the Polish delegation in Vienna.

#### Shevardnadze-Shultz Meeting Previewed

LD050058 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 4 Nov 86

[From the "International Diary" Program presented by Boris Andrianov; Igor Charikov commentary]



[Text] [Andrianov] In the Austrian capital, Vienna, the meeting of member states of the CSCE began today. Those taking part in the meeting are to discuss not a few complex international issues concerning not only the situation on the continent of the globe. The matter in hand is to continue the search for possible ways to return to detente and activate cooperation.

Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, has arrived in Vienna to take part in the meeting. As a TASS correspondent previously reported from Austria, he has already had a conversation with British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary Geoffrey Howe. Comrade Shevardnadze will also have meetings with other leaders of foreign political departments, including U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, who is preparing, in the words of the agency's correspondent, to give the Russians a serious fight over questions concerning human rights. I shall ask my colleague, Igor Charikov, to comment on this last report:

[Charikov] Secretary of State Shultz's participation in the Vienna meeting and his forthcoming conversation with Comrade Shevardnadze are already being widely publicized by the U.S. mass media. They are being publicized in a brash, over-the-top fashion, and I would even say with a certain shade of poorly concealed hostility. For example, here is what he made public through the lips of one of his highly-placed officials -- I shall quote his statement almost in full: The basic stress will be placed on the mutual link between the questions of ensuring security and human rights, as well as our conviction that international obligations have to be respected. Just this one statement is worthy of detailed commentary, but I shall cite another one: Last Friday [1 November], speaking in Los Angeles, Secretary of State Shultz personally criticized the Soviet Union, accusing it of violating human rights, and stated in this connection:

The Soviet State, he said, remains profoundly repressive, despite its attempts to show the whole world its more contemporary and more humanitarian face.

Well, let us start by trying to get everything straight. And so, Mr Shultz intends to link the questions of disarmament and human rights. This method -- linkage, a term that appeared in the political lexicon at the end of the seventies -- is by no means new. It was used during the time of President Carter when the chief ideologue of his administration, Brzezinski, was testing the socialist system for, as they say, soundness in the question of human rights. We will remember how the crusade failed. Either the present administration has failed to learn this sad lesson, or it intends testing our soundness yet again. Either way, it appears that the U.S. leaders have nothing to tell the world regarding its initiatives in the sphere of arms reduction and disarmament, and they are resorting to a stereotype in diplomacy and putting an already worn-out record on the gramophone. The Russians, they say, violate human rights and so there is no point in talking to them about serious matters like disarmament. Shultz is attempting to stand everything on its head, present black as white and vice versa.

The political creed of the U.S. Administration suffered badly in the eyes of the international public and the United States public, too, following the statements by its highest representatives on the question of the meeting in Reykjavik. This was, as far as I can remember, one of the greatest mistakes of U.S. diplomacy and an abortive attempt to deceive its own people. I would like to refer to a statement by one of Reagan's predecessors, a distant predecessor, President Lincoln, who said: You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. And as they like to cite their great figures in the White House with such alacrity, they are probably familiar with the words I have quoted.

On what then are the architects of U.S. policy counting now? What can they say at the forum in Vienna? With what can they back up their arguments on the fate and peace and their aspiration to preserve and strengthen it? As far as one can see at the moment, nothing, apart from the latest groundless accusations against the Soviet Union, which is allegedly violating human rights.

The time has come to choose priorities and concentrate attention on the key questions that consist not in whether this person is, if you please, living badly in the Soviet Union, but in what has to be done for all people -- not just those in the Soviet Union and the United States, but all other peoples -- to live more peacefully and safely and in complete happiness and confidence. There are the issues of war and peace, a transition to a new way of thinking and a new nuclear age, questions that at the present the United States is attempting to move away from at a tangent.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1158

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### USSR: REPORT ON PHASE ONE OF CSCE PROCEEDINGS

#### Opening of CSCE Meeting

LD041307 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 4 Nov 86

[Excerpts] Vienna, 4 Nov (TASS)--The third meeting of participatory countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe opened today in Vienna's Hofburg Palace.

The participants will discuss the fulfillment of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the concluding document of the previous meeting in Madrid, and continue the search for possibilities of returning to detente and stepping up cooperation between the continents' countries.

#### Soviet Delegates' Press Conference

AU041641 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1100 GMT 4 Nov 86

[Raimund Loew report on a press conference held by the USSR delegation to the CSCE in Vienna on 4 Novemeber -- recorded]

[Text] A Soviet press briefing was held 1 and 1/2 hours before the official start of the conference. Present at the podium in addition to Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Soviet delegation to the Vienna conference, are Andrey Kokoshin, expert on the United States and Oleg Grinevskiy, Soviet spokesman at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures that was concluded this summer. This composition of personages is indicative of the program, because the Soviet Union wants to continue the process of detente with Washington through Vienna and take a decisive step toward disarmament in Europe.

Oleg Grinevskiy, gives fundamentally optimistic picture of the East-West situation: The Reykjavik summit has opened new horizons and created new possibilities. The Stockholm conference, a product of the CSCE process, has demonstrated that a process including all of Europe would be the best framework for cooperation between East and West. The Soviet representative recalls that in Stockholm the Warsaw Pact states have agreed to military on-site inspections. We are clearly interested in also implementing such agreements, Grinevskiy says, and he outlines the Soviet goal for Vienna. The way is clear, he continues: From Stockholm part one we want to get to Stockholm part two, via Vienna. The Vienna conference is to give the Stockholm sideline conference a mandate for a second phase in which not only security and confidence-building will be

discussed, as up to now, but also the reduction of weapons arsenals and military expenditures. The Soviets stress that they mean Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, that they also include the Soviet part, the European part of the Soviet Union and that they do not want to discuss only nuclear armament.

Grinevskiy says: We regard the desired elimination of nuclear intermediate-range missiles in Europe not as an isolated issue. Hand in hand with that, the Warsaw Pact states are also prepared to take serious measures regarding conventional disarmament. Our proposal is valid -- a reduction to half a million soldiers on both sides.

The Soviets do not want to rule out the joining of the MBFR talks, now going on for 13 years, with the Stockholm conference. And again and again it is stated: We want the Vienna follow-up meeting to enrich the Stockholm conference by adding a mandate to negotiate on military disarmament too.

The delegation head of the Vienna conference, Vladmimir Lomeyko, criticizes the irresolute attitude of the United States to the Reykjavik negotiations. When Reagan and Gorbachev talked, the talks were taken down in shorthand. The Soviet Union, he indicates, has no objections to making this stenographic record known to the world public. Tomorrow, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze will present the concrete measures proposed by the Soviet Union in his address here in the Vienna Hofburg. The Soviet position for the Vienna meeting, however, seems to be clear: Everything can be discussed, but results are particularly desirable in the military sector. And in order to move from a purely Soviet-American dialogue to a disarmament process including all 35 CSCE states, there are indications of the possibility of significant compromises on technical issues.

#### USSR Ambassador Interviewed

PM041512 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Nov 86 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Ambassador Yu. B. Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation to the Vienna CSCE meeting, by unnamed correspondents, under the rubric "On the Opening of the Vienna Conference": "Common Responsibility"--first two paragraphs are editorial introduction; date, place of interview not given]

[Excerpt] A meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) opens in Vienna today. After the Belgrade meeting (1977-1978) and the Madrid meeting (1980-1983), this will be the third such meeting within the framework of the all-European process.

Our correspondents addressed a number of questions to Ambassador Yu. B. Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation at the Vienna meeting.

[Correspondents] Yuriy Borisovich, what can be expected from the Vienna meeting?

[Kashlev] Of course, it is a major event not only on the European continent, but outside Europe too. The forum will be taking place in the fundamentally new international situation created by the major Soviet peace initiatives. These are well known. In these conditions, the role of the CSCE states and their responsibility for

the future not only of Europe, but of the whole world are increasing immeasurably. The Soviet Union advocates the attainment of substantive accords on all sections of the Final Act at the Vienna meeting. That is how we understand the task of ensuring "balance" in the Helsinki process. This is spoken of frequently in the West too, although there they have a highly selective approach to the Helsinki accords. For us, there are no "forbidden" topics, and we are prepared to discuss at the Vienna meeting any issues covered by the Final Act. The USSR delegation at the Vienna meeting will take an active position. Independently and in cooperation with the socialist countries' delegations, it will put forward initiatives on all sections of the Final Act and will be prepared to examine other participants' proposals carefully.

[Correspondents] Could you not speak in more detail about the main avenues of the conference's work?

[Kashlev] Within the framework of the first section of the Final Act -- on questions relating to security in Europe -- we attach great significance to the resolution of military and political problems. This is the aim of the large-scale proposals put forward by the Warsaw Pact countries in Budapest concerning the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms from the Atlantic to the Urals. In Vienna, the Soviet Union will advocate reaching agreement on a mandate for the next stage of the Stockholm conference, with a view to continuing the examination of confidence-building measures, but mainly moving on to practical talks concerning the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

#### Genscher Meets Shevardnadze

LDO41821 Moscow TASS in English 1812 GMT 4 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 4 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, had a meeting here today with Hans-Dietrich Genscher, a deputy federal chancellor and minister of foreign affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In the course of their conversation the sides exchanged views on the work of the Vienna meeting of the CSCE member-states, especially in the light of the Reykjavik summit, and also discussed some other questions of mutual interest.

#### Raimond Meets Shevardnadze

LDO41840 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 4 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 4 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, today had a meeting with French External Affairs Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond.

In the course of their conversation, which passed in a businesslike and frank atmosphere that is characteristic of Soviet-French relations, the sides had a detailed exchange of views on the key aspects of the situation in Europe and the world since the Reykjavik meeting and in the context of the Vienna meeting of the CSCE member-countries. Discussing problems of disarmament, in particular, the elimination of nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons in Europe, Eduard Shevardnadze clarified a complex of new Soviet initiatives which reckon with the security interests of all the sides and offer realistic opportunities for ridding the world of nuclear weapons.

Jean-Bernard Raimond reaffirmed French policy on disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, as it had been presented in the summit talks between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and French President Francois Mitterrand.

The ministers expressed their interest in the continuation and development of the Soviet-French dialogue both on the problems of the Vienna follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and on disarmament problems, a dialogue which is especially important at the current crucial point in world development.

#### Zimmerman Criticized

LD050015 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 4 Nov 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] One would think that the United States is in a serious mood for talks. At any rate, at a campaign speech in South Dakota, President Reagan declared: We would like to confirm the accords reached in Iceland and continue to work on their foundation.

But excuse me, how then are we to understand Warren Zimmermann, head of the U.S. delegation at the Vienna meeting? For hardly had he arrived in the Austrian capital when he launched a propaganda attack, accusing the USSR of violating the Helsinki accords. The U.S. diplomat said: First of all, we intend to discuss here the observance of human rights in the Soviet Union and socialist countries, and only then have a talk about security and cooperation in Europe. [video shows Zimmermann speaking]

Is this the battle of Reykjavik Western propaganda was promising and that it prepared for in advance? Almost 30 of the most reactionary private, semiprivate, and I don't know what kind of organizations, including the so-called Resistance International, managed to get their landing-party consisting of paid provocateurs and emigre rabble into Vienna.

This old play is well-known in Madrid. I remember on Castellana Street, by the Palace of Congress where the meeting took place, and inside the building, from time to time there would appear representatives of suspicious groups, loud, impudent, and clothed in pseudonational costumes.

True, all this carnival soon quieted down, and the motley crowd gradually dispersed with shouts. The brief propaganda spectacle had failed. So it is all the harder to understand why it should all be repeated in Vienna. Well, such is the force of inertia of the anti-Sovieteers.

Of course, this provocation will fail too. It will burst like a soap bubble. Europe is starting the search for fresh paths to peace, detente, and mutual understanding, and no showmanship or fairground acts can deflect the forum from this main line.

USSR's Grinevskiy, Lomeyko Interviewed

AU111519 Sofia ZEMEDLSKO ZNAME in Bulgarian 5 Nov 86 pp 1, 4

[Vanya Encheva, Vienna correspondent, report on interview with USSR special envoys Vladimir Lomeyko and Oleg Grinevskiy proceeding the opening of the CSCE Conference on 4 November 1986--first paragraph is Encheva's introduction]

[Excerpts] Vienna, 4 Nov (our correspondent's report)--A little before 1100 local time, today, the representatives of 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada took their seats in the plenary session hall of the Vienna "Hofburg" palace. Dr Peter Jankowitsch, federal minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Austria, announced the opening of the Vienna meeting of CSCE participating countries' representatives.

Immediately preceding the opening of the meeting, I addressed Vladimir Lomeyko, special envoy of the Soviet Union, and Oleg Grinevskiy, special envoy and leader of the USSR delegation to the Stockholm Conference with a request for an interview.

Vladimir Lomeyko stated as follows: "There is a universally known, ancient principle, namely, that agreements should be observed." Dwelling on the assessment of the period following 1975, when the Helsinki Final Act was signed, Lomeyko added: "That is why we are in favor of implementing the Helsinki agreements. I will cite only a few examples of our country's approach to the implementation of the principles laid down in the Final Act. As early as in 1977 the Soviet Union incorporated the 10 basic principles of the Helsinki document into its own Constitution. This is how they became part of our basic law.

"Without awaiting the achievement of international agreements, the USSR was the first to unilaterally renounce the use of first-strike nuclear weapons and introduced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, which has been extended to 1 January 1987. The USSR developed a specific program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the century."

In answering my question how he evaluates the military-political situation in the world in the light of the Europe-wide process, Oleg Grinevskiy pointed out:

"I would like, above all, to stress that the European-wide process has numerous dimensions. One of the essential processes is the achievement of an agreement in the military-political sector. This question always depends upon the topical, political situation. I consider that new prospects for peace in the development of the whole of Europe [obshtoevropeyski kompleks] have emerged today, particularly as a result of the Reykjavik meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. The Vienna meeting is facing new horizons. The question appeals to the will, the desire, and to the imagination of people, so that the new realities may be transformed into agreements. I think that such a possibility exists.

"As for the Stockholm conference, East and West not only met, but worked out certain political rules and norms of behavior for the states. This process was by no means a smooth one. A reliable guarantee now exists at the basis of European security--namely specific confidence measures--including the implementation of on-site inspections. This is a new phenomenon. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries are interested in this because they wish to know whether the agreements adopted are being implemented. We welcome their adoption, but we will very strictly observe their implementation.

"The path to follow is obvious: We must proceed further. That is why we support the thesis that the mandate adopted for the second stage of the Stockholm conference should involve discussion of such an important question as disarmament, the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

"As for the socialist countries, their program is well known. It is based on the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Pact member-countries. We would like to hope that the NATO member-states will gather sufficient energy and strength to give a constructive answer. This would be in the interest of the whole world. I think that serious decisions could be adopted in Vienna, likely to open the path for a full-fledged discussion of the question of disarmament."

#### Second Day at CSCE Meeting

LD051314 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT 5 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 5 TASS -- The Vienna followup meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) went into its second day today.

The delegations of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada led by their foreign ministers took their seats in the festively decorated Grand Hall of the Hofburg Palace again in the morning.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who had missed the meeting's opening session yesterday, arrived in Vienna only today and will speak at the end of the morning sitting.

The very first speeches at the meeting have given enough reason to conclude that most delegations have come to Vienna with a positive mood stemming from the results of the latest meetings and consultations in the framework of the CSCE process.

New and broad prospects for a nuclear-free world and all-round cooperation have been opened by the recent summit meeting in Reykhavik and so the task of the Vienna meeting should apparently be seen as supporting and consolidating these trends in the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act, working out a new package of practical measures to promote political, economic and humanitarian-cultural cooperation and doing that without delay and lengthy discussion.

Romania, its foreign minister Ioan Totu said, attached very much significance to the Vienna meeting, seeing it as an important forum for taking further steps to closer cooperation among all countries in the continent, disarmament, and stronger peace in Europe.



He spoke highly of the Soviet proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik, stressed their special significance and said they would certainly make a strong impact on the international situation.

Totu pointed to the need to do everything possible to achieve success at talks on disarmament and arms control. He criticized the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative".

The United States, the Romanian foreign minister said, should abandon the "Star Wars" program which was heightening tension, increasing the risk of outbreak of a nuclear war, and inviting a new round in the arms race.

Raif Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia's federal secretary for foreign affairs, said it was imperative to support all positive tendencies and take part in the process of lessening tension and achieving accords.

He called for reviving and enhancing detente and broadening European cooperation but warned against illusions that the CSCE process could be used to change the political systems in participating countries.

At the same time, Dizdarevic said, it was essential to try and change policies and practices that were leading to higher international tension and to a slowdown in and departures from fulfilling the Final Act.

There were some more than strange notes struck in their speeches by the foreign ministers of Britain and France.

Britain's chief diplomat Geoffrey Howe, while recognizing the emergent signs of hope in arms control and the desirability of normal East-West economic relations, devoted a sizable share of his statement to the issue of human rights and repeated familiar charges against socialist countries, which are stock ammunition in psychological warfare and-communist propaganda against them.

One is involuntarily prompted to ask if demagogical and far-fetched claims about the political situation in other countries would again be used in an effort to steer clear of resolving the main problem, that of ensuring peace in Europe and in the world as a whole.

Jean-Bernard Raimond of France spoke in a similar vein. As he commented on the results of the Reykjavik meeting, he said that bringing the Soviet and American positions on arms reduction closer would not necessarily mean stronger security in Europe, while a complete elimination of U.S. nuclear arms in Western Europe without rectifying what he called an imbalance in conventional and chemical arms would be even "dangerous".

The French foreign minister made those claims as if he was not aware of the far-reaching proposals of socialist countries also on these issues.

Shevardnadze on Meeting with Schultz

LD060952 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 6 Nov

[Text] Vienna November 6 TASS -- "Contrary to general expectations and to Washington's statements about a desire to continue what has been started in Reykjavik, we have met with U.S. attempts to beat a cavernous [as received] retreat from the Icelandic frontiers back to the previous positions," Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said today of this meetings with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

"The U.S. posture also in Geneva is a mix of old naphthalene views and approaches as compared with the concessions made by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik as part of the package it proposed there," he said before flying from Vienna where he had attended a followup meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

"It is impossible to shed the impression that our partners want to forget Reykjavik as soon as possible," he said.

"Although the talks with the large U.S. team left a bitter after-taste, we do not lose hope that sooner or later in Washington they will realize that there is no way back and that now there must only be movement forward -- to a complete elimination of nuclear weapons," Shevardnadze said.

Shevardnadze: 'Bitter Aftertaste'

LD061017 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT 6 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 6 TASS -- "The success of the Vienna meeting will depend on all the participants in it without exception, on the constructiveness of their dialogue," Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said today before flying out of Vienna, where he had attended the meeting of representatives of the state participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. "Europe is expecting from Vienna substantial practical results, such as those that were recently yielded by Stockholm. If the Vienna meeting passes in the spirit of new political thinking, it will undoubtedly produce decisions which will ensure greater security and a higher level of cooperation in every area," he stressed.

"The beginning of the general discussion bolstered our hopes. Quite a few profound ideas were voiced which undoubtedly are of great practical interest. I will permit myself to single out from among them the Soviet Union's proposal on a forum to discuss problems of cooperation in humanitarian fields. We invite it to our capital," the Soviet foreign minister said.

"Close or even identical views of many questions have become obvious", the Soviet foreign minister said about his meetings with his counterparts from Britain, France, West Germany and the USA. "I will not conceal from you either, however, that some aspects of the position of our partners are disappointing. Reykjavik created a new atmosphere in European Politics but the politicians of the leading NATO countries cannot yet get adapted to it", he stressed.

"Contrary to general expectations and the numerous statements of Washington about its desire to follow up on what was started in Reykjavik, we came against the attempts of the American side completely to retreat from the frontiers reached in Iceland, to draw back to the old levels," Eduard Shevardnadze said about his talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. "The American stand in Geneva, too, is a blend of old mothballed views and approaches as compared with the concessions offered by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik under its package of proposals. One cannot help the impression that our partners would like to forget Reykjavik as soon as possible. Although talks with the large American team left us with a bitter aftertaste, we are not losing the hope that Washington will understand sooner or later that there is no road back and that now we must only advance forward, to the total elimination of nuclear weapons."

In conclusion Eduard Shevardnadze expressed gratitude to the Austrian Republic and the government and people of Austria for the exemplary organization of the Vienna meeting and for their friendliness and hospitality.

#### Moscow Radio Commentary

LD061122 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0350 GMT 6 Nov 86

[Excerpts] At the Vienna meeting of the participants of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, statements are being made by ministers of foreign affairs. On Wednesday, a speech was made by Comrade Shevardnadze. His speech has attracted a great deal of attention. At the microphone is Viktor Levin.

[Levin] The recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik created a new political climate. It is more clear today than ever before that no matter how difficult the struggle for a nuclear-free world might be, it is far from over. And if this fact provides inspiration for those who sincerely strive for peace and makes them confident about the vitality of the chances for elimination of nuclear weapons, with others, who think in terms of force and military superiority, the same fact generates the desire to reshape the accords that were within reach of the USSR and the United States in the Icelandic capital in their own fashion, if not to eliminate them completely.

Vienna also saw a clash of conflicting trends shaping up. Judging from the speech of the U.S. representative, the United States wishes to replace the specific conversation on security with inflated arguments on the subject of human rights.

We believe that disarmament is the most reliable and efficient base for resolving the problems accumulated in any sphere of life. The Vienna meeting could and should lead to real disarmament measures in Europe. Those who are trying to speculate on the subject of human rights have a clear-cut and lucid answer from the Soviet Union: We will persistently implement a policy aimed at expanding communication among people and exchanges in information and spiritual values that serve humanism and peace. The proposal to hold a representative conference of participants of the pan-European conference on the entire range of issues of humanitarian cooperation, including contacts among people, issues of information, culture, and education in Moscow, which was put forward in Vienna by Comrade Shevardnadze, also bears witness to our sincerity in this matter. It is possible to strengthen our mutual European home acting collectively and in reasonable communication. The Soviet Union urges all states represented at Vienna to do just that.

## Soviet Delegation Press Conference

LD051853 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 5 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 5 TASS -- The Soviet delegation at the Vienna meeting held a press conference here today.

The provisions and initiatives contained in today's speech by Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, have evoked great interest of journalists. It dealt primarily with the character and prospects of the Helsinki process after the Reykjavik summit meeting, the ways and forms to translate into life the proposals by the Warsaw Treaty member states for reducing the Armed Forces and conventional armaments in Europe, the use to an ever fuller extent of the potential of the final act in the field of developing economic, scientific and technological cooperation and of environmental protection.

The new proposal by the Soviet Union for holding in Moscow a representative conference of the participating states of the all-European process on the entire range of humanitarian cooperation, including people-to-people contacts, issues of information, culture and education, aroused particular interest.

Anatoliy Kovalev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, clarified the Soviet Union's approach to all of these problems and answered numerous questions by journalists.

### Kovalev at Soviet Press Conference

LD052028 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 5 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna, 5 Nov (TASS)--The Soviet delegation today gave a press conference at the international press center of the Vienna meeting.

In responding to questions put by journalists, Anatoliy Kovalev, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, emphasized that the Soviet side today made an important proposal for convening a representative meeting of the participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to discuss the entire complex of humanitarian cooperation problems, including human contacts, questions of information, culture and education.

The Soviet Union, Kovalev said, "is convinced that cooperation in the humanitarian spheres should proceed and develop in all its components. Such a conference could adopt large-scale decisions."

Characterizing the current atmosphere in Vienna, Kovalev said that the meeting began in a more favourable situation and under better conditions than those in Belgrade and Madrid.

He stressed the importance of the fact that the Vienna meeting opened at political level -- the level of foreign ministers. "Their presence may give a real, constructive impetus to the further work of the delegations."

Kovalev also observed that the third CSCE meeting was taking place in an atmosphere of greater publicity compared with the two previous ones. The Soviet delegation favoured the holding of a bigger number of open sessions. This publicity, openness represented a new element of the all-European process.

At the same time Kovalev observed that the initial stages of the debates contained some alarming moments which could be interpreted as the attempts to induce confrontation or polemics.

But there were also constructive elements. The Soviet Union favoured that the positive tenor be maintained in the work of the Vienna meeting, that the meeting be oriented at concrete business, rather than rhetoric.

"There are definite hopes that following Stockholm, Berne, and Reykjavik, where the Soviet-American dialogue attained a new height, the Vienna meeting will ultimately succeed in achieving positive results."

Commenting on the results of the Reykjavik meeting, Kovalev noted with regret that it was the American Administration's commitment to the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) which became the only obstacle to the prospect of creating a nuclear-free world and achieving exceptionally large-scale agreements that were already within reach.

The same situation remained today. The Soviet Union would not agree to signing with its own hands the death sentence to the ABM Treaty, the foundation and basis of the equilibrium established in the world, even if the execution be put off for ten years.

As to conventional armaments, the USSR favoured Stockholm-2, implying that the Vienna meeting expand the mandate of the Stockholm conference, that the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty countries for reducing conventional armaments and conventional armed forces could become the subject of discussion of all 35 countries participating in the all-European process.

#### IZVESTIYA Previews CSCE Work

PM051615 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents V. Matveyev and N. Novikov: "Specific Steps Needed"]

[Excerpts] Vienna -- Thirty five state flags of various colors flutter atop the Hofburg Palace. The Vienna meeting of representatives of states belonging to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe began its work 4 November. [passage omitted]

The first stage of the meeting will continue through 19 December, when participants will recess, to reassemble in Vienna 27 January.

The meeting's official opening took place under the chairmanship of Austrian Foreign Minister Peter Jankowitsch.

The foreign journalists gathered here in Vienna have no shortage of topical themes connected with the beginning of the Vienna meeting's work. The continuing animated discussion of the recent Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik takes pride of place. In addition, one's thoughts also inevitably turn to the previous important international forums and talks held in the Austrian capital. Quite a few positive and encouraging things have occurred here, but there have also been disappointments. The city's name is linked with the talks on Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe. They have been going on for more than a decade now, and still no progress!

It is said that some Western diplomats who have arrived here for the present meeting are gearing themselves up for a lengthy stay. The possibility of fairly rapid fundamental improvements in the work of the meeting frightens rather than inspires them, by all accounts, and, of course, given such a frame of mind, they are not going to help the forum make rapid progress.

As happened 6 years ago, when the previous meeting of representatives of All-European Conference countries was beginning in Madrid, and even earlier, prior to the opening of the Belgrade forum meeting, the international atmosphere is clouded by the negative voices raised by the enemies of the disarmament cause. In this respect there is no difference between the past and the present; save, that is, that the political situation in the world is markedly different now. And it is the peace-loving initiatives of the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries that are the most powerful catalyst of those changes.

Just prior to the opening of the Vienna meeting it became known that a NATO "working party" had completed the "first stage" of its lengthy work: the examination of the proposals put forward at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference in Budapest in June this year on a program to cut armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. Does this mean that there is at last a definite Western response to those proposals? The answer is no. It transpires that the "analytical phase" alone is completed. The conclusions and recommendations..still have to be worked out. The wheels of "Atlantic diplomacy" are thus turning at a snail's pace. Whereas broad sections of the public, including prominent representatives of mass parties in the West, have no wish to mark time.

It can be said in advance that much work and persistent and consistent effort will be required of the participants in the Vienna meeting if the noble ideas of peace, security, and cooperation are to be implemented. Only thus will it be possible to open up broad horizons for ensuring peace, security, and fruitful cooperation among the countries of Europe.

#### Shevardnadze Speech to CSCE

PM 061156 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Speech given by Eduard Shevardnadze, foreign minister and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, on 5 November at a meeting of the representatives of the participating states held in Vienna]

[Excerpt] Esteemed comrade chairman:  
Ladies and gentlemen!  
Comrades!

The Vienna meeting has opened in the conditions of new times. It is a time of vigorous actions which brook no delay. Europe is capable of speeding up the course of events, channelling them into a course of new political thinking. The recent lessons of Geneva, Budapest, Berne and Stockholm bear witness to the fact that this is possible. The lessons of Reykjavik insist that it is necessary. Reykjavik showed that a maximal amount of positive results is possible over a minimal amount of time. Reykjavik also bore witness to the fact that a maximal amount of disappointment is also possible over a minimal amount of time.

However, despite the attempts to destroy the building commenced there, we assert that the foundations are intact, the shell has been preserved and construction can continue.

Reflecting on this we return time and again to Reykjavik, its lessons and the truth about it.

The Vienna meeting cannot pass over Reykjavik, for it was there that a turning point in Europe's movement toward a nuclear-free world was marked. A historic chance for it arose there as well. Finally, the finest hour might have come for all mankind there as well.

Why did it not come? The answer is not one that any of us would be indifferent to.

A profound and precise analysis of the events of 11-12 October has been made by M.S. Gorbachev. It only remains for me to add a few words in connection with the growing wave of political speculation and tendentious interpretations of the Soviet-U.S. meeting.

The truth must be established not for the archives, but for the present and the future. In the interests of the latter, is it extremely important for all to know where the points of mutual understanding, which could today serve as the line from which to depart in subsequent steps forward, were established in Reykjavik.

The pinnacle of the talks was, undoubtedly, the coincidence of the stands of the leaders of the USSR and United States on elimination of all nuclear arms. We pay our due to the U.S. President, who agreed to doing this in an even shorter time than what was originally proposed in our 15 January statement.

As a participant in the talks I personally was reassured by the President, who said it would be very good to eliminate all nuclear explosive devices, including bombs, battlefield systems, cruise missiles, submarine weapons and intermediate range systems by the end of two 5-year periods. He directly proposed entrusting an accord on this score to our delegations in Geneva for them to prepare a treaty that could be signed during our party general secretary's visit to the United States.

The mutual understanding that during the first stage the sides would reduce all elements of the nuclear triad by 50 percent was just as specific. This also concerned Soviet heavy missiles.

The general secretary and the U.S. President adopted a formula for resolving the question of medium-range nuclear missiles according to which neither Soviet nor U.S. missiles of this class should remain in Europe.

In essence the Geneva talks were given a fresh start. If the United States really wishes to continue from this starting line then the delegations in Geneva can immediately set about preparing the appropriate agreements.

Our delegation is ready for this work.

A single obstacle remains on the path toward this -- the U.S. "Star Wars" program.

We have done everything to reach a solution here. Regardless of our quite definite opinion on SDI, we made a compromise which is being stubbornly kept quiet. We agreed to a 10-year cycle of U.S. laboratory research work on this program. In 10 years, under conditions of reduction and liquidation of nuclear arms, it would then be clearer what to do next, what final solutions to look for. This is an honest position.

Judge for yourselves whether the counter position is sensible: To deploy SDI immediately when the 10-year period expires. The President said clearly that following it, the United States would immediately inform us about its withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. In other words, they have invited us to sanction the deployment of space weapons and sign the death sentence for this treaty, only postponing its execution for 10 years.

No matter how the "great dream" about the anti missile "shield" is presented the intent of this venture is transparent: To allow the space genie out of the test tube as soon as possible so as to gain military superiority.

The issue is in fact not as simple as it is depicted in Washington. And inasmuch as nuclear disarmament affects all peoples, and space is the common property of mankind, then efforts to figure out what SDI and the new spiral of the arms race associated with it will mean for mankind must be made jointly. If that is not done then there can be no solution to any of the problems of the package that has now emerged -- be it the problem of strategic weapons or that of medium-range missiles.

Let me stress: What we have here is not a package of conditions; rather it is a package of compromises, and it must be seen in that context.

From the lessons of Reykjavik we draw the following conclusions:

First [preceding word underlined by TASS]: However tough may be the struggle for a world without nuclear weapons it is far from being devoid of promise. The hope for attaining mutually acceptable accords rests on real grounds. The work done at Hofdi House prepared the ground quite well for finally beginning a move toward a non nuclear world.

Second [preceding word underlined by TASS]: There is a lack of logic in the position of some European leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. [paragraph continues]

When there finally arose the real possibility for clearing the continent of missiles they began to speak of the need to retain U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe and to defend their imagined privileges to nuclear status.



What a lot of furious words erupted at one time concerning our stand on British and French nuclear arsenals. But now that a concession which is bold and to some extent even risky for us has magnanimously been made, we are offered a modern version of the comedy "Much Ado About Nothing." As if nothing had in fact happened, as if we had not taken such a serious and responsible step to accommodate our partners. There are even some cynics who are now saying that the NATO governments never seriously wanted this. They put up their argument about the British and French weapons because they were certain that the Soviet Union would never accept it. In other words, they were bluffing, engaging in demagoguery.

Now, instead of saying "We will join with you in time," they are all but declaring their nuclear weapons to be eternal.

Does this mean that our missiles in Europe are a threat, but their missiles are a chocolate selection from a candy box?

It is a pity that some political leaders have proved to be unprepared to think in terms of a nuclear-free Europe.

I would link the third lesson with the sphere of morals and ethics. Here in Vienna where Metternich and Talleyrand once broke the record for duplicity, it is appropriate to say that procedure in interstate relations must also be based on elementary personal probity. This all-European home that we are building and in which all are equal will not become reliable and strong if deceit, half-truths and disinformation are mixed into the mortar that holds it together. A shortage of trust must not be created because of false understanding of national prestige or election campaign concerns.

In light of what has been happening since Reykjavik, we are obliged to observe that the virus of disinformation has penetrated the highest echelons of the leadership of certain Western countries. Permit me to say on this matter that it is immoral to pray before national holy relics in the language of political deception.

It is immoral to start a "battle of expulsions" for the sake of pre-election strategy and to please one's "hawk" friends. This is dishonorable politicking which sometimes leads to tragicomic results. But they, too, are useful, because they are instructive.

There is one lesson here: When you are talking about relations between countries like the USSR and the United States, it is pointless to hope for victory, and not only in nuclear war -- you can't even win small "diplomatic" wars. In the White House they have recently had the opportunity to convince themselves of this.

You can't manage or remove the barriers of confrontation without parity in dignity and honesty.

The daily statements about the overriding importance of military might do not help our trust in our partners. It is no longer a time for serious people to accept without irony talk to the effect that with the Russians one has to do business from a position of strength. This is a dangerous mania. It is well known from history that such superman self-hypnosis has always led to sorry results.

Our ideal is not the policy of strength but the strength of policy. This is what the new political thinking is, and we appeal for it to be considered.

It commands us to act in order not miss the historic chance to get out of the deadlock.

In these conditions the importance of the all-European process grows sharply. The Vienna meeting testifies to its vitality.

Despite all the twists and zigzags in the past, today it is confidently moving along the main road of our times, asserting the concept of peaceful coexistence as a supreme universal principle of relations between states.

The concept of security is also acquiring new parameters. More and more, it is coming out as the task of creating, by joint efforts, the political, material, organizational and other structures for the preservation of peace which would exclude the very possibility of war arising.

In point of fact the fundamental aspect of the all-European process and those of the system of comprehensive security formulated by M.S. Gorbachev are to a large extent similar. They are located, as it were, in a single system of coordinates, and directed toward one aim.

The three "baskets" of the Helsinki accords are integral parts of the proposed concept of security. Arguments as to which to give preference to are fruitless. What is needed is not argument, but action, in order to achieve real progress in each of the directions. Here one complements and strengthens the other. For this reason, given all-round development, the all-European process could become in its own way a model for the realization of a system of universal security.

It goes without saying that the initiatives put forward earlier by the Soviet Union remain in force: on the dissolution of the military-political alliances that confront one another, nonaggression, on the non-use of force and on the strengthening of security in the Mediterranean region. All these are directly written into the proposal on university security.

We are glad to note a growing concentration of fresh ideas and specific proposals in the all-European dialogue. In literally a year it has been enriched to an exceptional degree in content and form. There are many more facets to it today than there have ever been. A highly active role is played in it by the neutral and nonaligned states, public movements and political parties and by youth, women's and religious organizations.

In the political field, lines of communication have been restored between governments, interstate contacts have acquired new vitality, and an even wider range of problems is becoming the subject of bilateral and multilateral talks and consultations.

Slowly but steadily contacts are being established between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the European Economic Community.

It was found possible to make a very big step in the field of military detente and confidence building measures. I have Stockholm in mind here. We would like to believe that this success will mark the emergence of a new tendency within the framework of the all-European process.

Stockholm number one leads to Stockholm number two -- to measures of real disarmament in Europe. All European countries and governments have come out in favor of attaining this goal. After all, disarmament is the most reliable and effective base to solve the problems that have accumulated in any area of our life.

Naturally, states may have different views on how to embark on disarmament in practice. This must be examined in an honest and frank manner within the wide circle of the participants in the all-European process.

However, it is important not to lose momentum, not to drown things in protracted debates.

We are in favor of these discussions being dynamic and flexible. Why not proceed here on several levels in parallel? It would be possible, let's say, to organize contacts among working groups representing the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, as was proposed by M.S. Gorbachev, without waiting for conclusive formulation of a mandate for a conference on reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe.

We think of this as a first practical step toward an all-European conference. The fate of Europe is above any approaches based on blocs and it must be determined by all European countries. The continent has no need for concerts by "elite" powers. What it needs is harmonious polyphony with the voices of neutral and nonaligned states sounding as strongly as others. However, the work by expert groups from the two military-political alliances may produce an extremely interesting political result.

At the conference in Budapest, the Warsaw Pact countries worked out a balanced program of European disarmament in a broad geographical zone -- from the Atlantic to the Urals.

This is not simply a reduction of arms and armed forces. The socialist countries have advocated a sequence of reduction through which the danger of a sudden attack would be reduced, military-strategic stability would be strengthened, and trust would increase.

Reliable verification [kontrol] of such a reduction can be ensured both by national technical means and by international forms of verification [proverka], including on-site inspections. Incidentally, inspections, which will take place from the beginning of next year in connection with the agreement on confidence-building measures, will help to test possible methods of verifying European disarmament.

We are steadfastly moving forward completely ridding the territory of Europe of chemical weapons. Soon the Soviet Union will submit new and promising proposals in this regard which substantially develop the ideas being discussed and which take into account proposals from Britain and other countries.

The consolidation of stability and trust will undoubtedly be furthered by the creation of zones free of chemical and nuclear weapons, in the Balkans, in the central, northern and other part of the continent.

Today, not a single chance must be missed. Mankind loses too much already. Surely we Europeans are not incapable of doing anything toward the total ending of nuclear explosions? The test ranges are silent to the east of many of you, that is, in the Soviet Union. They continue to be shaken by blasts in the Western hemisphere. Is the world not paying too high a price for so-called Atlantic solidarity?

Why should mankind pay with alarm and privation for the desire of the U.S. military-industrial complex to acquire a new field of operations for pumping out super profits?

Why should disarmament, so much needed by the peoples in order also to improve their lives, be a hostage to the imperial hegemonistic interests of someone or other?

A sober and honest answer to these questions clarifies in a thorough going way the truth, which is that the Strategic Defense Initiative not only wrecked the accords at Reykjavik but also blocked the way to fundamental changes in all spheres of the life of mankind.

#### Shevardnadze Statement on CSCE Talks

LD061026 Moscow TASS in English 1018 GMT 6 Nov 86

[All quotations as received]

[Excerpts] Vienna, 6 Nov (TASS)--Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, made a statement at Vienna airport before leaving the Austrian capital. Follows the text of the statement:

"Saying goodbye to Vienna and to you, I would like to say a few words.

I shall not conceal from you, however, that some aspects of the position of our partners are disappointing. Reykjavik has created a new atmosphere in European politics but politicians of the leading NATO countries have not yet been able to adapt to it.

A few words about my meetings with State Secretary Shultz. Contrary to general expectations and numerous statements by Washington about its desire to follow up on what has been started in Reykjavik, we encountered attempts by the American side to beat a complete retreat from the high ground reached in Iceland, to draw back to the old levels.

If one is to sum up the American position briefly, one should say that both here and in Geneva it is a mix of old mothballed views and approaches as compared with concessions made by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik as part of its suggested package of proposals.

One cannot help the impression that our partners would like to forget Reykjavik as soon as possible.

There is no way they can do this. Reykjavik has left such a deep trace that it cannot be deleted. Although the talks with the large American team left us with a bitter aftertaste, we are not losing the hope that Washington will understand sooner or later that there is no road back and that now we must only move forward -- to a complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

In conclusion I would like to say that Vienna can become a historic landmark in the European nations' march to a better future.

## Vienna on Shevardnadze Statement

AU061217 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1113 GMT 6 Nov 86

[Helmut Opletal report on a statement given by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on 6 November at Vienna's Schwechat Airport before leaving for Moscow -- recorded; Shevardnadze's statements in Russian with consecutive German translation, monitored from German]

[Excerpts] Shortly before his departure Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze faced the journalists -- he was calm and self-assured although the written statement that the foreign minister had handed out is very negative about his meeting with U.S. State Secretary George Shultz. [passage omitted]

Eduard Shevardnadze then explains specific items of the statement. Asked about further contacts and the continuation of the dialogue he says:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] I can tell you frankly -- and this is also contained in the statement -- that the position of the United States is bad. In essence the U.S. proposals are the old proposals with the addition of the Soviet concessions. This is the nature of the American proposals. This is what the position is like at present. Let us wait to see what is going to come next. The contacts will be continued -- we agreed on that with our interlocutors. The dialogue will be continued. [end recording]

Is the spirit of Reykjavik dead now, one journalist asks the Soviet foreign minister.

[Begin recording] No, the spirit of Reykjavik has not evaporated. I can tell you with some (?responsibility) that the Soviet Union will strictly defend the positions and the mutual agreement reached in Reykjavik. We have no moral right -- and this refers not only to our responsibility toward our own people but to our responsibility toward all of mankind -- to withdraw from these principles. [end recording]

Another journalist asked in which concrete aspects the Americans are retreating from the agreements reached in Reykjavik.

[Begin recording] In all important issues. [end recording]

For instance, in strategic offensive weapons, Shevardnadze explains. A principle agreement was reached about the elimination of all nuclear arsenals by 1996, and now the U.S. side is pulling away from this position. In our opinion, Shevardnadze says, this must not happen. Shevardnadze does not want to absolutely exclude the possibility of another summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev this year.

[Begin recording] We have not fixed any dates for the meetings between the ministers, not to speak of the summit. [end recording]

Anyway, the Soviets will submit their positions this week at the disarmament talks in Geneva -- positions essentially based on the agreements reached in Reykjavik, at least according to Soviet interpretation. What is going to happen in the future, one has to wait and see, says Shevardnadze, who is now in a hurry and says farewell to Vienna.

[Begin recording] Ladies and gentlemen, we will be punished if we cause a delay to the plane. Good-bye, thank you for your attention. [end recording]

## Foreign Delegates Cited

LD060710 Moscow TASS in English 0523 GMT 6 Nov 86

[Excerpt] Vienna, 6 Nov (TASS)—Sten Anderson, Swedish minister of foreign affairs, has called on representatives of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) participating states to have a frank dialogue and to achieve concrete results here at the Vienna meeting as soon as possible.

"The success in Stockholm", he said, "should prompt us to carry on talks within the framework of the CSCE process. We must build confidence both globally and between our countries, including that in the economic field".

"The CSCE results have stood the test of time and have shown their ability to engender new political processes in the world", stated Paavo Vayrynen, Finnish minister of foreign affairs.

He emphasised that the success achieved in Stockholm showed the existence of possibilities at the Vienna meeting for the elaboration of a mandate to holding the second stage of the Stockholm conference, at which matters of disarmament in Europe would be discussed.

"We believe that a substantial contribution to strengthening European security and to deepening fruitful cooperation between countries and peoples will be made as a result of the Vienna meeting", stated Peter Varkonyi, Hungarian minister of foreign affairs.

"The Vienna meeting is taking place in favourable conditions", emphasised Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek. "This has been promoted by the summit meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik".

"The new political thinking", the speaker said, "meets with growing support. New realistically-minded forces, which are prepared to act in favour of peace, are emerging in the world arena".

He suggested holding an "economic forum" in Prague with the participation of representatives of business, financial and scientific circles in the interim between the Vienna meeting and next follow-up meeting. They could discuss matters aimed at stimulating the development of mutually beneficial relations between East and West in the nineties.

Marian Orzechowski, Polish minister of foreign affairs, reminded the participants in the meeting about the fact that his country had already suggested receiving representatives of the countries which had signed the Final Act of the Helsinki conference in Warsaw in September 1989 with a view to discussing the key problems of peace, security and cooperation in Europe.

He expressed indignation over the fact that Europe has to pay for the policy of the United States which brings to the fore only its private interests to the detriment of the security and interests of European countries.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz maintained that the lack of results at the Reykjavik meeting had been accounted for by a desire of the Soviet side to extend the provisions of the ABM Treaty to cover research under SDI in order to undermine that programme which, he said, the West badly needed and which ostensibly fitted into the ABM treaty limits quite well.

The negative approach to disarmament matters also manifested itself in his pronouncements to the effect that the United States intended to link the arms limitation process with the human rights issue.

Thereby the U.S. secretary of state showed once again that the United States did not abandon attempts at unceremonious interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries.

Mr Kovalev said he would study the documents, the society said, adding that it thought this a "positive development" in the light of Moscow's persistent refusal to accept such documents in the past.

#### Phase One Closes

LD071913 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Excerpt] Vienna, 7 Nov (TASS)--TASS special correspondent's report:

The first phase of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe closed today. It was held on the initiative of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries at the level of foreign ministers to give an effective impetus to the work of that international forum. Speakers at it noted that the European process, initiated in Helsinki more than 11 years ago, is making progress in spite of numerous obstacles that were raised in its path. Statements on neutral and nonaligned countries indicated their growing interest in the CSCE as the meeting gave them an opportunity energetically to contribute to the advance of the European nations to a better future.

Some speakers voiced ideas which were consonant with the Soviet Union's appeal for new thinking and a new approach to the more urgent problems of the continent.

At the same time worries were voiced over the continued amassing of weaponry in the European continent, responsibility for which is borne by the U.S. and other NATO countries. In this situation delegates from socialist countries stressed the imperative need of new urgent and effective measures to strengthen peace, to put an end to the arms race and to preserve and develop the "spirit of Helsinki." They called for a policy of lessening the war threat, respecting all the principles of the final act and promoting cooperation among states with different social systems.

Delegates from socialist countries expressed the conviction that a resolution of the Vienna meeting on holding during the second round of the conference on confidence and security building measures and disarmament in Europe talks on substantial reductions in the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe and further confidence and security building measures in the continent would have special importance.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1158



## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### USSR: ASSESSMENTS OF VIENNA CSCE PHASE ONE

#### Ambassador Kashlev on Process

LD102055 Moscow TASS in English 2028 GMT 10 Nov 86

[Excerpt] Vienna, 10 Nov (TASS)--By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Tyupayev:

The delegations of the 35 attending countries at the Vienna followup meeting of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) today began exchanging opinions on the fulfillment of the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid Final Document.

Speaking there, the leader of the Soviet delegation, Ambassador Yuriy Kashlev, pointed to the profound interest of participating countries in consolidating the CSCE process, an interest demonstrated in the speeches by their foreign ministers last week.

The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik, he said, had created a fundamentally new situation in the world, in which the role and responsibility of all European nations for making maximum use of the opened prospects for a nuclear-free peace and a nuclear-free Europe had grown immeasurably.

The USSR, Kashlev said, stood for maximum progress in all areas of the CSCE process, which meant all "baskets" of the Final Act, and for substantive accords.

There were no "prohibited" or "uneasy" themes for the Soviet Union in the range of subjects related to the Helsinki process, he added.

Speaking of the military-political field, Khashlev said that military detente, which was something that had been dreamt about in Helsinki eleven years ago, had not materialized because the NATO countries had rejected one proposal after another by the USSR and other socialist countries.

#### Moscow Radio on New Stage

LD102147 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 10 Nov 86

[Text] A new stage has begun at the Vienna meeting of the CSCE participant states. The meeting's participants are entering a new phase of their work -- concrete talks in specially set-up working groups. Eduard Mnatsakanov, our political observer, is at the microphone:

[Mnatsakanov] The main problem at these talks is well known. The foremost issue at stake revolves round the task of working out measures to reduce the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. Can one hope that this task will be resolved successfully? I think yes, one can. Here are only some of the existing European realities that make it possible to assess the prospects for the Vienna meeting with a certain degree of optimism.

A complex of military and technical measures to strengthen trust and security on the continent, a complex that has already been worked out, comes into force on 1 January next year. The USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries have addressed to the NATO member states a program providing for major reductions of the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

We have worked out a detailed plan for armed forces reductions during the next quinquennium, providing for a reduction of more than half a million men on each side -- that is to say on the part of the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

Other USSR initiatives also remain in force: to dissolve military-political alliances, to refrain from attacking each other, and to refrain from using force. In his television address, Comrade Gorbachev proposed that contacts between special working groups of the two military-political alliances should be organized already at this stage. As far as is known, this proposal has not given rise to objections -- at least not public objections -- in the European NATO capitals.

The main thing now is to work vigorously and creatively precisely in this direction and not to regress or wreck matters through diplomatic vagaries or hollow arithmetical exercises. Attempts of this kind, however, are unfortunately being made even now -- again on the part of the Washington administration. As has become known, Weinberger, the U.S. Defense Secretary, who has never felt particular sympathy toward Europe's nonaligned or neutral countries, would like to keep these countries away from the talks in Vienna altogether. How is it possible to preserve discipline within NATO at a forum attended by 35 states, asks Zimmermann, the U.S. representative.

For them, discipline within NATO is more important than anything else. That is indeed why they arranged for an absurd controversy around the forms and participants of the talks. Replying to attempts of this kind, Comrade Shevardnadze emphasized in Vienna that the Continent of Europe has no need for a concert played by the powers, that the destiny of Europe is something that is far above any approaches taken by the blocs, and that it ought to be determined by all European countries.

Thus we face two views with regard to solving urgent problems, two different approaches to the peoples of Europe, and, finally, two moral principles. Let Europe make comparisons and draw conclusions here.

#### IZVESTIYA on Follow-up Proceedings

PM111239 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Matveyev, N. Novikov Vienna dispatch: "The Main Task Is Still Ahead"]

[Text] General political discussions at foreign minister level have come to a close at the Hofburg Palace in Vienna in the third meeting of CSCE representatives.

From this point on the participants in the meeting will work for the main part behind closed doors. It is expected that this will give the meeting a businesslike nature. Accord has been reached to make every effort to agree on a final document no later than 31 July 1987.

Has the Vienna meeting been given a lot of time or not very much? This will become clear in the coming months. The Austrian press has coined the phrase "the moment of truth," envisaging the possibility of making progress during the Vienna meeting on a broad front. A considerable number of ideas of practical interest have been suggested these last few days. The main thing, without doubt, is the belief shared by the overwhelming majority of the meeting participants that efforts must be concentrated on the problem of real disarmament. [paragraph continues]

In this connection speakers noted the accords reached in Stockholm with regard to measures to strengthen confidence and detente in the military sphere, and also the prerequisites for ridding Europe of nuclear weapons that come to light in Reykjavik.

The socialist countries have put forward initiatives in Vienna aimed at removing war from society's life, ending the arms race, and building relations of confidence and all-round cooperation among peoples. Proposals were submitted, in the spirit of the new type of political thinking, which advance the all-European process begun in Helsinki. A great deal of interest was aroused by the Soviet Union's proposal to convene a representative conference in Moscow on the entire complex of problems relating to humanitarian cooperation. It goes without saying that the initiatives the Soviet Union proposed earlier still hold good -- on dissolving the military and political alliances opposing one another, on refraining from aggression, on the nonuse of force, on strengthening security in the Mediterranean region, and so forth.

In conjunction with the GDR, Czechoslovakia proposed the creation of a zone in Central Europe free of chemical weapons. Together with other socialist countries, Czechoslovakia proposes the convening of an "economic forum" to discuss effective forms to develop economic cooperation and the directions to take in this respect.

The Warsaw Pact Budapest Appeal, which contains a program to reduce all components of the European states' ground forces and tactical strike air forces, and also the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces and weapons in Europe, generated a broad response among the meetings's participants.

Many participants in the discussion spoke in favor of ending nuclear tests completely and moving on to the second state of measures for military detente -- reducing conventional weapons in Europe -- and stressed the need to curb the nuclear arms race. These speeches, delivered in a more or less realistic spirit, show that there are grounds for establishing working contacts between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, as E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, mentioned in his own speech at the Vienna meeting.

It is important that the positive ideas and recommendations put forward be put into practice to improve the situation in Europe. The desire to do this can almost be felt in the very atmosphere of the Hofburg Palace. It reflects the attitude of broad public strata. This was noted in the speech by the Swedish foreign minister, who pointed out that we must take account of the concern of millions of people regarding the threat stemming from the nuclear arms race.

Against this background, attempts by some NATO countries to lead the meeting away from discussion of topical, really important all-European problems and impart to it a polemical, if not frankly confrontational tone seemed all the more negative. Trouble was stirred up over the human rights issue for precisely this reason. And, at the same time, there were no fresh ideas, no specific proposals in the key sphere of disarmament. Some actually "cautioned" against the prospect of a Europe free of nuclear weapons (the French representative took this thankless task upon himself. He was not even supported by his Western colleagues). The fuss created in Vienna over human rights seems to be the screen with which Washington and its closest partners would like to conceal their "nudity" in disarmament issues. But here is a very illuminating fact. While the chief of the State Department sang the praises of the U.S. military program in space, not one of Washington's allies took up the refrain.

Addressing the opening of the Vienna meeting, Austrian Federal Chancellor F. Vranitzky said in particular: "A historic achievement of the all-European process is the fact that, despite differences in our ideological views, we have managed to lay the foundation of that common political will thanks to which solutions have been found that are accepted by all."

Yes, considerable experience of joint action has been accumulated. We also have a considerable reserve of new, fresh ideas for Europe to become a model continent where the concept of an international security system is put into practice. These, in the broadest sense, are the tasks facing the Vienna meeting. It is expected to be an important turning point for the continent.

#### Moscow Radio Commentary

LD082145 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Nov 86

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] The general political discussion at the Vienna meeting of participant states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has ended. A latest news commentary; at the microphone we have Viktor Levin:

In the course of this discussion ministers of foreign affairs spoke. They put forward their appraisals of the international situation and the general European process, and set forth proposals on questions of principle. Vienna became the first major international forum after Reykjavik and in so far as the Soviet-American summit meeting created a new situation in international relations and clearly showed that there can be no turning back, while the way forward lies in new political thinking and in the realization of the present-day diversity of a contradictory and integral world, Reykjavik left a noticeable mark on the first stage of the Vienna meeting.

There were no speeches that failed to mention the Soviet-American meeting in the Icelandic capital, but the appraisals and forecasts put forward unfortunately were not straightforward; particularly upsetting was the position taken by the Americans. Briefly, this position is determined by the desire to evade the Reykjavik accords and to withdraw from the Iceland frontiers. The impression is being given that the United States wants to forget Reykjavik as quickly as possible. This hope is futile. Reykjavik has gained a firm hold in the consciousness of the peoples and in international relations as evidence of the practicability of plans for the complete destruction of nuclear weapons and as a confirmation of the possibility of solving the complicated and acute problem of security, and I would add, one arousing particular sensitivity in every state, through negotiations and political means.

In the light of these facts, the frank attempts by the United States to go into reverse cannot but arouse disillusionment even in countries whose governments obediently follow Washington's policy. For example, London's THE TIMES writes that for the Americans Vienna has become a major failure in the struggle for the hearts and minds of Europeans. In this context, the appraisals that that very same bourgeois press gives to the speech of Comrade Shevardnadze, the Soviet minister of foreign affairs, is of special interest. The new style of the Soviet leadership, notes Italy's TEMPO, has made a positive impression on the audience.

It is necessary to add to this that there was also wide response to the specific proposals of the Soviet Union to hold a representative conference in Moscow of participant states of the general European conference on the whole set of problems on humane cooperation. The correspondent, Kobayashi, of NHK, the Japanese television company, called this an epoch-making proposal in as much as it means, the Japanese journalist thinks, that Moscow in the first place is advocating wide-ranging dialogue and, second is prepared for the battle with Washington on that bridgehead that the United States has always proclaimed as their own exclusive field of action. The Soviet Union came to Vienna with a constructive program and it made a strong impression on the public.

#### IZVESTIYA Contrasts Ministers' Speeches

PM071635 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondent V. Matyveyev and N. Novikov under the rubric "Topics of the Day": "Two Approaches"]

[Text] Vienna -- In the initial days of the Vienna meeting the most frequently occurring name in the speeches by the statemen who have come here is that of the Icelandic capital. What was discussed in Reykjavik has a direct bearing on the destiny of Europe too. It is a question of an inspiring prospect of a continent free from nuclear weapons.

USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz made speeches at the meeting, the one directly after the other. This fact emphasized even more sharply the positive and constructive nature of the Soviet approach to key items on the Vienna meeting agenda and, as a correspondent of a major London newspaper cautiously remarked in conversation with us, brought out the "superficiality" of the U.S. position.

The State Department chief did not put forward a single new proposal, but categorically defended the thing that, as is known, wrecked the important accords that were taking shape in Reykjavik -- the U.S. military program in space. The U.S. secretary of state embarked on a discourse on the issue of "human rights," making attacks in the USSR. Even the right-wing Viennese paper KURIER saw this discourse as an effort to "muffle the dynamic USSR stance" in the disarmament sphere. A shrewd observation! The more difficult Washington officials' position becomes in the eyes of the world public on problems of real steps in the disarmament sphere, the harder they try to cloud the issue in connection with the human rights problem.

The statement made by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze before leaving Vienna (see IZVESTIYA No 311) gives an idea of what the USSR delegation and the U.S. delegation brought with them to Vienna. The assessment was full and valid.

Shultz, in his statement at the press conference, on the one hand tried to give assurances that the United States remains faithful to what was said in Reykjavik. On the other hand, the State Department chief willy-nilly admitted that Washington is now backtracking on what the U.S. President agreed on in Reykjavik. Once again we have phrases about "sublimits," phrases to the effect that equal cuts must not be allowed to occur, apparently, that the USSR "must" reduce its own arsenal of strategic land-based missiles by larger figure than the United States would be prepared to accept...

So Washington's official position is essentially a retreat from Reykjavik rather than progression forward. No propaganda methods can conceal or obscure it.

#### CSCE Results Reviewed

LD092319 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Nov 86

[From the 'International Panorama' program presented by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Excerpts] And now to Europe. Attention is now focused there on the main problems of the present time.

[Begin recording by special correspondent Georgiy Zubkov, identified by video caption] [passage omitted] The Vienna meeting became an event in the life not only of Europe, but also of the whole world. It started and was held in new conditions, in a new situation, that has arisen thanks to the large-scale, decisive initiatives of the Soviet Union, which were formulated in the January statement by Comrade Gorbachev as a program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and also in the package of effective measures presented at the Soviet-U.S. talks at Reykjavik.

It has become obvious from the very first days in Vienna that a number of Western countries are planning on transferring the emphasis in the work of the meeting from a constructive search for paths toward disarmament, to futile discussions about old and ill-founded conceptions of human rights.

The Soviet Union has introduced a new proposal -- to convoke a conference of states participating in the all-European conference on the whole range of humanitarian issues from contacts between peoples to the issues of information, education, and culture.

The exchange of foreign ministers' views took place in Vienna not only in the Hall of Congresses in the Hofburg Palace, but also behind the scenes, during personal conversations and talks. The talks between Comrade Shevardnadze and Shultz, the U.S. secretary of state, aroused particular interest. They showed that the U.S. side is attempting to withdraw entirely from the Iceland positions, as if the United States wants to forget about Reykjavik as quickly as possible.

From the very first days, the Vienna meeting acquired the character of not only a diplomatic, but also an information and propaganda forum. Forces acting on behalf of the primary human right, that of freedom from the threat of war, and forces striving virtually to perpetuate that threat, inasmuch as it brings profits and dividends, clashed.

Press conferences by Soviet diplomats and experts were held in Vienna. The position of the Soviet side at the Vienna meeting was vigorously clarified; why it thinks the time has come for energetic and urgent action in favor of disarmament, and thereby, the creation of conditions for peace and social progress.

The peoples of Europe are hoping and waiting for their old continent to acquire a long-awaited calm, to become free of stockpiles of various weapons, and for the level of military confrontation to be reduced, as a result of the Vienna meeting. The Europeans want to live with the assurance that tomorrow will bring only peace, well-being, and joy. [Video shows correspondent speaking to camera, then shot of delegates assembled in conference hall, close-up of Shevardnadze addressing the conference. There are more shots of delegates, then video shows Shultz and Shevardnadze standing next to each other.] [end recording]

[Kolesnichenko] I should like to draw your attention to three important aspects of the Vienna meeting. First, this meeting is continuing the Helsinki process, that is, it is focusing attention on the problem of security. Success must be achieved in precisely that direction. A lot of concrete proposals have been put forward by our side, right up to the creation of an all-embracing security system. Why not start with Europe, which is, incidentally, the most volatile region, if only because it is more crammed with nuclear weapons than all the others. The Soviet proposal on disbanding the military and political alliances that are confronting each other, on nonaggression, on the nonuse of force, the Budapest program of the socialist countries for a reduction in conventional weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals, and finally, our proposal on the elimination of all strategic medium-range missiles in Europe, which is part of the Reykjavik package -- all that opens up a path toward genuine detente in Europe, since political detente without military detente does not lead to the strengthening of security on the continent or trust between peoples.

The final, but perhaps the main point is that the meeting in Vienna is being held after Reykjavik, as it were, in the conditions of a new time frame. It is already impossible to resolve purely European problems without the lessons of Reykjavik, either. We must not lose heart, but continue the struggle to build our European house jointly, rationally, not on the basis of a policy of force, but on the basis of the force of policy.

#### Experts Hold Press Conference

LD072057 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 7 (TASS) -- The position taken by the American side in Vienna "is not what it was at the Reykjavik meeting," Soviet experts on foreign and economic policies said at a press conference here today. The Soviet stand on security problems in Europe was presented at it by Ambassador at Large Vladimir Limeyko and Andrey Kokoshin, a deputy director of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

One gets the impression that the United States would like to forget Reykjavik, the Soviet experts said. It would like "to pick up the Soviet Union's one-sided concessions like raisins out of a cake and for its part put on the negotiating table only mothballed wares."

Answering questions about the meeting of Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz here, the Soviet experts said that the Soviet side, true to the Reykjavik line, was intended "to discuss the various aspects of security and disarmament as a package."

#### Further Details on Press Conference

AU071504 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1117 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Raimund Loew report on a press conference given by the USSR delegation to the CSCE conference on 7 November in Vienna--recorded]

[Text] Even after the failure of the talks between Shultz and Shevardnadze in Vienna there must not be a glacial period in the relations between the super-powers.

This was the gist of today's Soviet press conference in Vienna's Hofburg Palace. The Soviet Union is not willing to forget Reykjavik; after all, it was there that the first agreement was made to eliminate all nuclear weapons within 10 years. Today the American side is trying to interpret these results differently. Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Vienna delegation, said:

[Begin Lomeyko recording] Statements and interpretations are as if the President had agreed that only heavy missiles are to be liquidated and not all nuclear weapons, as if he only spoke about ballistic missiles. It is also said that the President did not speak as clearly about the full elimination of intermediate-range missiles, that he did not mean this and that. To put it briefly, what was agreed on by the American side is now revised and questioned, and this is what makes our negotiations with the Americans more difficult. The proposals that are being discussed in Geneva are being discussed by the two delegations at this level. [end recording]

The Soviet representatives were asked whether the Soviet offer would return to that made before the summit in Iceland if the United States were to stick to SDI and the package aimed for in Reykjavik -- that is, renunciation of SDI and a radical reduction of nuclear weapons on both sides -- could not be concluded. Andrey Kokoshin, the Soviet expert for the United States, said that although there is disappointment and there remains a bitter aftertaste after the Vienna meeting between the two ministers, the Soviet side does not want to retreat to the time before Reykjavik. The next round of the attempt to proceed from the talks between Reagan and Gorbachev in Reykjavik will be started in Geneva during the current days, he stated.

Ambassador Lomeyko, nevertheless, considers that the failure of yesterday's meeting between Schultz and Shevardnadze puts a certain strain on the current CSCE follow-up conference in Vienna. Lomeyko thinks that the degree to which it will be possible to overcome the tensions between the two superpowers will depend mainly on the Europeans.



## Soviet Initiatives, U.S. Isolation

PM131431 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Special correspondents V. Matveyev and N. Novikov report: "Vienna: High Responsibility"]

[Text] On 10 November the participants in the Vienna meeting began exchanging opinions on the fulfillment of the provisions of the Final Act and the Madrid final document and on ways to move forward in the process begun in Helsinki in 1975. One is closely linked with the other. What is needed is not debate for debate's sake but an orientation toward work that will ensure for years to come the development of all-European cooperation in all the main directions: military, political, economic, and humanitarian.

This is the Soviet Union's viewpoint expounded in the speech of Yu. B. Kashlev, our delegation head, at the meeting on that same day. He recalled that over the years since the Helsinki accords were adopted the USSR has advanced dozens of major initiatives addressed to Europe and embracing a broad spectrum of security problems. "The progress made in Stockholm," the Soviet spokesman pointed out, "makes it possible to really begin examining a new generation of confidence- and security-building measures, as well as questions of disarmament." The Stockholm conference could tackle them at its next stage.

The Soviet spokesman pointed in his speech to the need to extend to the Mediterranean the confidence-building measures that have already proven their worth in international practice, up to and including the withdrawal of the U.S. and Soviet military fleets from the Mediterranean.

## PRAVDA Assessment of Follow-up Forum

PM241715 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 86 First Edition p 6

[Special correspondents B., Dubrovin and V. Mikhaylov dispatch: "Vienna-86: The Difficult Path to Reason" -- passages within slantlines printed in boldface]

[Text] Vienna-Moscow -- /One experiences particular emotion through contacts with the living past in Vienna. This is when coming across the distinctive architectural monuments in the old city. Here one can also read numerous pages of the history of the most protracted battle of our century -- the battle for outlawing war from the life of earth's inhabitants. One can compute, compare, and understand the importance of the current Vienna meeting of representatives from CSCE member states./

It was here, in 1952, that one of us had the opportunity to attend the congress in defense of peace and to hear the appeal by the great scientist and citizen Frederic Joliot-Curie "to put an end to collective insanity (the 'cold war' and the arms race) which, unless it is halted, could make a return to reason very difficult."

The "cold war" had been raging for almost 2 decades then [sentence as published]. But the new outbreak of insanity in the eighties has not been able to destroy the foundations of peaceful cohabitation in Europe, which were laid in the preceding decade. And the building of the common European home according to the plan approved in Helsinki in 1975 by 33 European states, the United States, and Canada, is going on. /The first weeks of the Vienna meeting reinforce the hope that it will elaborate solutions capable of offering Europe greater security and enhancing the level of cooperation in all spheres.

Of course, the all-European construction project is not proceeding in isolation. It is not detached from the outside world. Lines of forces with opposite signs -- either of confrontation or of cooperation -- run through the European continent's political life. This is why here, at the first East-West meeting since Reykjavik, there is exceptional interest in whether the turn toward a move in the direction of a nuclear-free world and, consequently, a nuclear-free Europe, which became noticeable there, could become a reality. Naturally, attention at the Vienna meeting focused on the speeches by the participants in the Reykjavik talks -- USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and Secretary of State G. Shultz.

The truthful analysis of what happened in Reykjavik, contained in the Soviet speech, the convincing proof of the importance of continuing the struggle to consolidate the historic frontiers reached there along the path toward nuclear disarmament, and the confirmation of the USSR leadership's resolve not to deviate from its aim of radical reduction and subsequent liquidation within a 10-year period of all types of strategic offensive weapons in combination with the prevention of an arms race in space -- all this made a profound impression on the representatives of the 35 states who had assembled in the Hofburg Palace.

/The truth about Reykjavik was successfully brought to the notice of participants in the all-European forum in Vienna. And this is exceptionally important both now and for the future./

The speech by the U.S. secretary of state sounded in sharp discord not only with the Soviet, but also with most of the other statements in the Hofburg. It contained no new ideas, and only went to confirm Washington's commitment to the senseless and dangerous "Star Wars" program. As far as the European participants in the Vienna meeting were concerned, this meant that the White House intends to continue blocking earth's liberation from nuclear weapons.

It proved impossible, however, to wipe off in Vienna the deep impression left by Reykjavik. "Now no one can say any more that the liquidation of nuclear arms is a hopeless utopia," Hungary's Foreign Minister P. Varkonyi noted in his speech, "or that the pursuit of this goal is tantamount to tilting against windmills." "The Reykjavik meeting," Sweden's Foreign Minister S. Andersson declared, "emphasized even more strongly the importance of the all-European process." "Let us take advantage of the opportunities offered by the favorable international situation," Finland's Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen appealed to the participants in the Vienna meeting, "to achieve progress at this forum." /The weight and influence of all states in the continent must be put in the balance in favor of a nuclear-free world./

Neither any of the European countries, nor Canada said a word in support of the U.S. secretary of state's statement that "the West needs a vigorous SDI program..." On the contrary, in the ministers' speeches there were repeated demands for careful observance of agreements limiting the arms race. Only the French delegation's words sounded sweet to the Pentagon, words to the effect that "mankind has no alternative to nuclear deterrence" and the "total destruction of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe... would be dangerous for the continent." Although one can also hear similar things from London and Bonn at the moment, here, in Vienna, the British minister chose to avoid the topic. But H.-D Genscher, leader of the FRG foreign policy department, said that for Europeans the elimination of medium-range missiles "remains in the foreground." "Nothing that was gained in Reykjavik," he said, "must be lost."

The main hall of the Hofburg Palace has been for a long time a place of great and difficult work for Europe's benefit. The sheen of the dance floor is concealed by a dark red carpet. The rows of tables for the delegations are arranged in strict alphabetical order, like the flags in front of the entrance to the palace and in the hall. And the representatives of all 35 countries take turns in chairing the forum. /Equality in details and in substance is a token of the increasing democratism in international relations. It is dictated by equal responsibility for and commitment to the shaping of a life without fear of war, to progress, and prosperity./

But not everyone likes the idea, let alone the practice of equality. Especially those who would rule the world and are trying to conduct a policy of neoglobalism. The U.S. secretary of state plainly stated in the Hofburg: We cannot accept others' claims to the right to so-called 'equal security'..." The Pentagon is worried lest Europe move on to practical arms limitation following the success at the Stockholm conference in elaborating confidence-building measures. It fears a chain reaction. Indeed, in the event of the U.S. blockade against disarmament issues being breached here, it would be far more difficult to keep to an arms race course. "The neutral and nonaligned countries which gave assistance in reaching compromise accords in Stockholm," according to C. Weinberger, "will have no place at all at the negotiating table when it is a matter of limiting conventional arms from the Atlantic to the Urals." U.S. delegation head W. Zimmerman, on leaving for Vienna, was fairly frank in his explanation of the reasons for this Pentagon guideline: "How can discipline be maintained in NATO ranks at a forum of 35 states!"

From the start of the forum in the Hofburg there was a discernible intention to use another method as well to prevent Europe from switching to lowering the level of military confrontation. From what constitutes the organic unity of the basic spheres of all-European cooperation -- military, political, economic, and humanitarian -- the latter element has been separated. Its significance has been exaggerated to the point where it obscures all the rest. It would be different if humanitarian issues were being emphasized in order to actually improve cooperation in that area. [paragraph continues]

But not so, the main purpose is to provoke confrontation to prevent viewpoints from coming closer together. It follows the recipe of the bad old days: The "values" of bourgeois society are declared to be universal and the countries which have long rejected them and have shaped a far more humane and just way of life are anathematized. Of course, the representatives of the United States and certain NATO countries, who tried to get such a debate going in the beginning, are very well aware that it is futile to try to impose one's own ideological views on others. But they are not doing it for that purpose. Their aim is to lead the discussion of humanitarian problems into a blind alley straight away and then, on the pretext that there is an

"imbalance" in the all-European process, block movement in all other directions. And above all prevent the transition to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. And if there is no progress in this sphere there will be a "plausible" argument for not commencing to rid the continent of nuclear weapons. Was it not to create evidence of humanitarian problems "lagging behind" in the overall equation that the U.S. side rejected the final document of the Bern experts' conference which had been approved by all the European participants, on contacts between people and prevented the Ottawa human rights conference from being successful?

However, at the Vienna meeting those schemes were immediately undermined. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries were open to the discussion of all questions affecting the Final Act. As far as they are concerned -- and this was immediately shown in Vienna -- there are no "prohibited" or "inconvenient" themes, no taboos. Confirmation of this stance was provided by the Soviet side's proposal to hold in Moscow a representative conference of participants in the all-European conference and to approach the whole range of humanitarian cooperation with new historic criteria. This initiative has already received wide support.

In many speeches at the Vienna forum the idea could be perceived that only constructive dialogue can lead to major decisions in Europe's favor. "Our work must be in earnest, it must not be characterized by polemics," Italian Foreign Minister G. Andreotti noted. "Our task is to achieve unity while ensuring the full respect of the political, economic, and social regimes of the continent's countries and preserving the European peoples' cultural and national appearance."

The discussion of the main areas of European cooperation is becoming richer and more meaningful. Among most of its participants an inner confidence has appeared in the durability of the general continental system founded in Helsinki. And the participants in the Vienna are boldly embarking on constructive criticism. For example, many speeches voiced dissatisfaction at the level of economic ties. It clearly lags behind the potential being created by scientific and technical progress. Some, mainly from the NATO countries, put this down to restricted information and obstacles to trips by business people. Others looked deeper. The discriminatory prohibited lists of goods for export foisted on Western Europe from across the ocean, the imposition of boycott and embargo, and other artificial barriers are flagrant breaches of the Final Act's provisions. Even now they are threatening to become the main obstacle to the strengthening of the continent's independence. CSSR Foreign Minister B. Chnoupek proposed that a special economic forum be convened in Prague. The proposals from Romania -- on holding a meeting of experts to formulate measures and forms which would promote scientific and technical exchange -- and from Bulgaria -- on ecological problems -- have been receiving support. There has been interest in the ideas expressed by Italy, the FRG, and others. The convening of special forums would help to produce new incentives for the attainment in the nineties of a change in East-West economic relations of benefit to all and for promoting the concept of international economic security.

/The success of the Stockholm conference in ensuring military security inspired the Vienna meeting. Many of its participants have already proposed coming to an agreement on a mandate for moving on to the next state -- disarmament. The Warsaw Pact states' proposals, put forward in June this year, should be the basis for a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, as Greek Foreign Minister K. Papoulias noted./

Finland and other Scandinavian countries are urgently proposing that military activity in the Baltic, the northern seas, and the Atlantic be subject to the Stockholm "rules of conduct." The USSR's new practical actions in this sphere, the proposals to strengthen confidence in northern Europe, and to limit naval activity have been received at the Vienna meeting as important steps requiring reciprocity.

When determining the mandate for the second stage of the Stockholm conference it is also necessary to extend confidence-building measures to independent air force and naval exercises and to reach agreement on limiting the scale of all military exercises. Thought must also be given to ways to eliminate the inequality which has emerged in the application of confidence-building measures between the European countries and the non-European countries -- the United States and Canada.

After the general discussion ended at the Vienna meeting a thorough exchange of opinions began on what had been done and what has still to be done. /Like the entire all-European process, the Hofburg forum is a special school not only of the new political thinking but also of a new creative and bold practice on the scale of the whole continent./ And the degree of its success will determine how far Europe will become a model for the creation of a universal system of security and cooperation, one worthy of imitation. Thus, we wish this important work success!

#### Tatarnikov Criticizes U.S. Stance

LD012024 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Vienna December 1 TASS -- "The U.S. Administration's actions undermining SALT-2 open up the road to an uncontrolled buildup of strategic offensive arms," said Major-General Tatarnikov, a member of the Soviet delegation, at the Vienna meeting of representatives from the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Addressing a full-delegation meeting, he said that the United States continued working toward the realization of the SDI program.

"This means the transfer of the arms race to space and the erosion of the ABM treaty. Such an approach attests to the fact that the course toward renouncing U.S. commitments under treaties has prevailed in Washington. This cannot but cause concern also among the participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe," the speaker emphasized.

The Soviet representative gave a well-reasoned reply to the U.S. side's attempts to accuse the Soviet Union of violating its commitments concerning the limitation of strategic offensive arms and those arising from the ABM treaty.

It is noted here that in recent time the delegations of the United States and some of its allies have been trying to aggravate the atmosphere at the Vienna meeting, turn it into an arena of confrontation and steer it away from discussing really important issues of confidence and security building in Europe.

## Report Contrasts East, West

ID261504 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 26 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 26 TASS — TASS correspondent Igor Revyakin reports:

Two approaches have jelled up at the Vienna meeting of the representative of the CSCE states in discussing trade, economic, scientific and technological cooperation. The delegates of the socialist countries stand for a constructive East-West dialogue and have put forward a series of concrete proposals to promote in every way the development of business contacts between the CSCE countries. The Western delegates are trying to avoid the vital problem of removing obstacles to trade and to shift emphasis to secondary problems such as foreign trade statistics, telephone communications and contacts with "end consumer".

Delegates from the USA, Britain, and some other Western countries claim that centralized planning and the monopoly of foreign trade in socialist countries are the main barrier to trade between states with different socio-economic systems.

Some Western delegations are also trying to link progress in discussions on trade at the Vienna meeting to the state of affairs in other areas of the European process, primarily in the humanitarian field.

The delegations of socialist countries cite concrete examples to show how the policy of sanctions, embargoes and technological and crediting blockades pursued by the USA and other Western countries adversely affects the overall climate of East-West business cooperation.

The CEMA member-countries are simultaneously calling for a constructive tenor of discussions on economic, scientific and technological problems.

The Soviet delegation explains that a complex of measures carried out in our country to improve external economic relations is offering great opportunities for extending and developing economic cooperation. It says that it is important to reach an agreement on the establishment of a system of international economic security in the region further to boost trade.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1158

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### USSR'S GENERAL TARTARNIKOV ADDRESSES VIENNA CSCE FOLLOW-UP

#### TASS Report

LD130430 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1932 GMT 12 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna, 12 Nov (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Anatoliy Tyupayev writes:

The strengthening of security in Europe is one of the most important directions of the all-European process, said Major General V. Tartarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation at the Vienna meeting of representatives of the members-states of the CSCE. The Soviet Union is doing everything it should in this direction. Thus, in the period between the Madrid and Vienna meetings, it unilaterally withdrew 20,000 servicemen from the GDR, 1,000 tanks and other military hardware, declared its willingness to discuss the question of giving nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea, unilaterally ceased all nuclear-weapons tests, and put forward a large-scale program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. The Warsaw Pact countries turned to the NATO countries with a proposal to conclude a treaty on the nonuse of military force and support for relations of peace, and also put forward a program for reducing the level of armed forces and conventional weapons.

At the same time, the NATO countries deployed first-strike missiles in Europe and adopted a plan for radical rearmament in the sphere of conventional weapons; they are also holding large-scale military exercises. U.S. vessels are violating the maritime borders of states; U.S. planes bomb independent Libya, and so on. It is no secret that someone in the West is already attempting to make European disarmament dependent on the resolution of other problems being discussed in Vienna.

In the opinion of the USSR, said V. Tartarnikov, the Vienna meeting was supposed to equip the Stockholm conference with the kind of mandate that would make it possible to be working out accords to cut the level of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe. A good basis for this is the balanced program for European disarmament proposed at Budapest by the Warsaw Pact states. It takes in a broad geographical area -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. It should, in the USSR'S opinion, be resolved in stages. As a first step, a once only mutual reduction could be carried out in 1 to 2 years in NATO and Warsaw Pact troops by 100,000 to 150,000 men on each side. Then, at the beginning of the 1990's, a further reduction in ground forces and tactical aviation by 25 percent compared to the current level could be effected. Such reductions would amount to over 1/2 million on each side.

Such responsible steps, of course, require reliable monitoring. The socialist countries propose that for this purpose use be made of both national and international means, including on-site inspection.

The European public is concerned over the increased tension resulting from the policy being pursued by NATO countries. In order to justify the militarization of the European Continent, the United States and certain NATO countries are using various forms of propaganda. There is talk about a "Soviet military threat," while they themselves are discussing questions related to the use of medium-range missiles to carry out a first-strike, as was the case at the meeting of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group from 21 to 23 October this year. There is talk about "openness" [otkrytost], but they employ this concept only with regard to land forces; when it is a question of the Navy or the Air Force, that is, of multipurpose and dangerous forms of strike armaments, the openness vanishes. Or take the confidence-building measures: It is well-known that despite the measures that were drawn up in Stockholm, the territory of a number of states participating in the all-European process remains beyond the scope of those measures.

Naturally other participating states, which have undertaken far-reaching commitments, would not want to remain uninformed about what is going on in that territory. It is essential indeed that this whole complex of questions be considered in detail at the next stage of the Stockholm conference.

#### Army Paper Report

PM141405 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 86 Second Edition p 3

[Text] Vienna, 13 Nov--Major Gen V.M. Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation, spoke in the discussion that is continuing at the Vienna meeting of representatives of the CSCE states. His speech was devoted to military aspects of security on the European continent.

In the USSR's opinion, he noted, the Vienna meeting is designed to provide the Stockholm conference with a mandate that would enable it to work out accords on reductions in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. The balanced program for European disarmament proposed by the Warsaw Pact states in Budapest is a good basis for this. It encompasses a wide geographical area -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. In the USSR's opinion, it should be phased in.

As a first step a one-time reciprocal reduction in NATO and Warsaw Pact troops of 150-200,000 men could take place over 1-2 years. Subsequently, in the early nineties, there would be further 25 percent reductions in comparison with present levels in ground forces and tactical aircraft. These reductions would amount to over 500,000 people on each side.

Needless to say, these responsible steps need to be reliably monitored. The socialist countries propose using both national and international means for this purpose, including on-site inspection.

The public in the European countries are concerned at the intensification in tension as a result of the policy being pursued by the NATO countries. The United States and certain NATO countries use various types of propaganda schemes in order to justify the militarization of the European continent. They talk about the "Soviet military threat" while themselves discussing questions of using medium-range missiles to inflict a first strike, as was the case at the 21-22 October NATO Nuclear Planning Group session. They talk about "openness" [otkrytost], but apply the concept solely to ground forces; when



it is a question of the navy or air force -- that is, multirole strike weapons and dangerous types of arms -- this openness evaporates. Or take the question of confidence-building measures. It is well known that, despite the measures worked out at Stockholm, the territories of a number of states participating in the European process are still beyond the scope of these measures. It is natural that other participating states which have undertaken far-reaching commitments would not want to remain ignorant of what is happening on those territories. This entire range of questions must be examined in detail at the following stage of the Stockholm conference.

In the Soviet Union's opinion, the questions of strengthening security and ensuring disarmament concern all Europeans and require corresponding status. That is why the USSR calls on the participants in the Vienna meeting to work persistently in all avenues of the Final Act without exception.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1158

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### USSR: VIENNA CSCE FOLLOW-UP PROSPECTS IN POST-REYKJAVIK CONTEXT

PM261615 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 86 Second Edition p 5

[Dimitriy Luzhkov "International Review": "The Vienna Test"]

[Text] Yes, one sometimes hears the truth even from the lips of Western journalists. LONDON TIMES correspondent Andrew McEwen recently reported from the Austrian capital: "The first test of the superpowers' political will on the basis of Reykjavik will take place in Vienna." One should add: And the political will of all the other countries that are part of the all-European process. But first of all: What, nevertheless, is the situation with the political will of the "superpowers"?

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, having gone to the meeting in Reykjavik with a fundamental nuclear disarmament program, it is consistently keeping to it now. Having initiated the historic conference in 1975 which was the beginning of the "Helsinki process," the USSR has sincerely tried to be guided by its spirit and letter ever since. What is more, it has proved that it is prepared to creatively develop it further. Our entire policy is evidence of this. It has been demonstrated by the strategy and tactics of Soviet delegations at conferences in Belgrade, Madrid, Ottawa, Budapest, Bern, and Stockholm. It was also shown by the speech of E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, at the opening of the Vienna meeting.

Things are far more complex as far as the United States is concerned. Of course, without U.S. agreement there would have been no Helsinki and no Stockholm, where the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe came to a successful conclusion to the satisfaction of all concerned. There would also have been no summit meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik and, at the latter, such impressive progress along the road to a potential agreement on nuclear disarmament would not have been made. Finally, there would have been no all-European meeting in Vienna or, within its framework, the conversation between E.A. Shevardnadze and G. Shultz without the wish of the United States. One would like to believe that all this is proof of some positive trend in U.S. policy and, behind it, the influence of forces in this country which carry some weight and are seeking greater U.S. security without harming the security of other countries.

But Andrew McEwen is right: Wishes alone in politics are not enough--the political will is also needed. The journal U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT recently raised the following question in its "Hearsay" section: What would Reagan most like to achieve in international policy before leaving office, "apart from arms control and another summit meeting" (the journal believes it goes without saying that the President desires these two things)? "Personal friends" of the President have said: to overthrow the Libyan leader M. al-Qadhafi and Nicaraguan President D. Ortega.

In this respect not only "personal friends" but the whole world can testify: In the fulfillment of these last two tasks the U.S. leader shows enviable political will, as he does, incidentally, in the realization of his so-called "strategic defense initiative."

With regard to other most important areas of policy, Mr Reagan has run up several deficits: In addition to the balance of payments deficit there is also his political will deficit and his realism deficit when evaluating the contemporary world and America's role in this world. The combination of these three features naturally engenders a fourth: a deficit of confidence in Washington's words and deeds. U.S. voters have already reacted to this: some "by voting with their feet" and others by voting for the Democrats in the recent Senate elections. The Europeans' reaction, however, will become clear in Vienna.

How does U.S. policy in the "post-Reykjavik" period look from here from the standpoint of the all-European process? London's FINANCIAL TIMES was right when it observed that after the "fascinating progress" made in Reykjavik in the sphere of nuclear arms control, "expectations have risen to such an extent in the countries of east and west that a return to the previous inflexible positions appears inconceivable."

Sad to say, however, the inconceivable is becoming quite evident in Washington.

Any new philosophy introduces something new to culture also, including the culture of speech. Some evidence of how far Washington still is from the new political thinking is provided by the poverty of its political vocabulary. It consists of few words, and they are virtually all imperatives.

A favorite word is "must." For example, in order to break the negotiations deadlock the "Russians must," they say, agree on medium-range missiles as something separate from the complete package of Soviet proposals put forward in Reykjavik, but in return they will take into consideration here our concessions which are possible only in terms of the "package." We, it transpires, "must" be "more flexible as regards the permitted limits on research into space weapons" (that is, allow the Americans to hang satellite weapons over our heads). Finally, we "must" resolve humanitarian problems outside any connection with security problems and the status of interstate relations, that is, despite the fact that they are poor [plokhiye].

It is clear that the Vienna meetings between E.A. Shevardnadze and Secretary of State G. Shultz could hardly end in great success on this kind of "basis."

At this point one should note the kind of poker game played by the Americans since Reykjavik with their main European NATO allies. It now seems that their ardent approval of Reagan's appeals to scrap nuclear weapons in Europe, including his "zero option" was nothing more than a tribute of respect for the President's "great dream." When it became clear in Reykjavik that the "dream" was suddenly beginning to rapidly materialize into reality, groans were heard from Paris, London, and Bonn instead of jubilation, followed by sighs of relief that, "thanks to" SDI, no agreement was actually reached. Now Washington is playing the role of the "naughty child who has come to his senses," assuring its allies that in the future it will be more careful with its dream"...

The U.S. representatives have brought two "initiatives" with them to the Vienna CSCE meeting. The first concerns verification of the fulfillment of the Helsinki accords: Three "prominent citizens" from each of the countries involved are to travel through Europe as monitors. The second concerns... ending the jamming of radio broadcasts.

Ideas, as a whole, appear to be thin on the ground, although it goes without saying that the observance of agreements must be monitored and information exchanged. Only this must be done, as befits the family of nations, on equal terms, without assuming the role of judge or public prosecutor. But let us see what the U.S. officials have to say--Messrs Zimmerman and Thomas, for example. Here are some examples of their political vocabulary: "In Vienna the United States will be aiming for more scrupulous observance of the agreement... We will compare their promises with what they actually do... Our aim is to expose... Step up the pressure... Compel... And only after this will we be able to consider what kind of new pledges we need." All this applies to human rights issues and is aimed exclusively in one direction--at the East.

With regard to the Western allies' attitude to security issues at the Vienna meeting, it appears it "has yet to be determined." The United States also does not intend to discuss its "strategic trade policy" (that is, its policy of blockades and embargoes on trade with socialist countries). After all, what is the hurry? All effort is being thrown into preparing a "bill of indictment" and "legal proceedings"!

All this seems so awkward and unceremonious that it has given rise to a mass of questions even among Western correspondents. How can one demand fulfillment of obligations exclusively in the "third basket" of the Helsinki Final Act while not only completely forgetting but actually ignoring the provisions of the "first" (security issues) and the "second" (trade and economic ties)?! But none other than the United States, in the shape of the President and the secretary of state, has more than once encroached on the very foundations of Helsinki--the principle of the inviolability of borders on the continent--by talking about "rejecting the artificial division on Europe." It is the

United States that has initiated all kinds of "proscriptive lists" restricting the freedom of European trade. And finally, how can one seriously count on success on the main issues in Vienna when there is no intention of seeking accords--only the intention "to lambast" one's eastern partners?!

No enlightening answer to these questions is as yet forthcoming, and this is causing the Europeans serious concern both for the outcome of the Vienna meeting and for the successful continuation of the "Helsinki Process" as a whole.

Yes, a great deal depends on the United States and on the direction the formation of its policy will take. A great deal, but by no means everything. Also important is the stand taken by neutral and nonaligned countries, and they are firmly in favor of military and political detente and cooperation in Europe. Also important is the fact that many NATO countries are arriving at the conviction that constructive results must be sought.

But the policy of the Soviet Union and all the countries of our socialist community is particularly important. We are awaiting discussion of the proposals submitted by the Budapest Political Consultative Committee conference on sharply reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe; discussion of our proposals on strengthening security in the Mediterranean region; on freeing Europe from chemical weapons; on forming an economic security system on the continent. Finally, we have submitted a proposal on holding a conference in Moscow involving the participants in the all-European conference to discuss the whole complex of problems relating to humanitarian cooperation. These questions are no less significant for the socialist countries than they are for the Western countries, and we are open to their being consistently resolved; what is more we are in the process of improving our own legislative and executive practice within the framework of further democratizing our socialist system. Incidentally, what has happened to our proposal on the possibility of relaying Moscow radio broadcasts to the United States if Voice of America broadcasts to the USSR are allowed to proceed unimpeded? There has been no reply from Washington on this.

Everyone, of course, is concerned about the future. Vienna is "destined" neither for success nor for failure. But we nevertheless believe in the triumph of common sense, as we did in Helsinki and Stockholm. Peace is preserved and supported by political will. Not only the will of governments but also the will of millions of men and women capable of forcing even those who would like to limit themselves to "wishes" alone to implement this will.

/9738:

CSO: 5200/1158

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### BRIEFS

POLISH UN RESOLUTION ON CDE--New York, 3 Nov (TASS)--The draft resolution "Confidence-Building and Disarmament in the Sphere of Conventional Armaments in Europe" has been submitted to the first committee of the United Nations General Assembly by the Polish People's Republic. The draft resolution highly assesses the results of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe which set the example of resolving important problems, given political goodwill and respect for the principle of equal security of all states concerned. The document expresses the hope that further steps aimed at confidence building, lowering of the level of military confrontation and reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe will be agreed upon soon. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2336 GMT 3 Nov 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1158

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### BRIEFS

SOVIETS ON KOLA WITHDRAWALS--Vienna, 14 Nov (AFP)--The Soviet delegation at the European security conference here Friday rejected allegations that Moscow announced the withdrawal of its medium-range nuclear missiles from the Kola Peninsula in order to divert attention from human rights issues. Soviet delegate General Viktor Tatarnikov at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) described the claim as "naive and without foundation" in a news conference here. He said the three parts of the CSCE conference--security, economy and human rights--"are for us of equal importance." Soviet number two leader Yegor Ligachev announced in Helsinki Thursday that all medium-range missile launchers in the Kola Peninsula, adjoining Finland, had been dismantled, along with most of launchers in the Leningrad and Baltic military districts. [Text] [Paris AFP in English 1656 GMT 14 Nov 86 AU] /9738

CSO: 5200/1155

RELATED ISSUES

USSR REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY SPEAKERS VIEW REYKJAVIK, TESTING

Ligachev Speaks at Meeting

LD061540 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1402 GMT 6 Nov 86

[Report by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at festive gathering in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses to mark the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution; video shows Ligachev speaking interspersed with shots of the presidium and the audience---live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed comrades, we are gathered here in the Kremlin, in this, the country's central auditorium, to mark the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The country is marking the current anniversary at a time of a great turnabout in the development of Soviet society, begun and guided by the party on the basis of the decision of the April Central Committee plenum, on the basis of the program tenets of the 27th party congress.

The role of the peoples in the struggle against war and the arms race for security and wide international cooperation, is growing. All this determines the face of the modern world. However, the picture of it would not be complete if one were to ignore the influence our October has had on the very essence of international relations. It suggested a fundamentally new approach to the solution of the most complex and dramatic problem for mankind -- war or peace. Soviet Russian called for the behavior of states on the international scene to be radically changed, subordinating it to a striving toward the preservation and maintaining of peace between peoples on a fair, democratic basis. Since the first days of its existence it has been building its foreign policy on precisely such a basis.

The continuity of the international strategy of the party, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in the political report of the Central Committee at the 27th Congress, has nothing in common with the simple repetition of things of the past. The development of military technology has set the world a choice: Either survive, and learn to live in a humane way, or perish; as they say, there is no other option. This demands a courageous and profound reevaluation of the situation that has arisen, a new, genuinely new political way of thinking, making a break with the conceptions and views of the pre-nuclear age.



Our Leninist party has fearlessly heeded the call of the times. The enormous significance of the April plenum resides in the fact, comrades, that it laid the basis for the formation of such a new political way of thinking. It acquired its complete expression at the 27th Congress, which came to the conclusion that in present circumstances, when the very existence of the human race is under the threat of death, the struggle between Capitalism and Socialism can only take place in the form of peaceful competition and rivalry, without exception. Relying on that fundamentally important conclusion, the congress worked out the party's international strategy in conformity with the realities of the modern world. Only a little time has passed. But it is already clear now, comrades, that the party's course was the right one, and our party is acting correctly.

The new approach [applause], the new approach to foreign policy problems is dictated above all by the fact that the guaranteeing of security has now become above all a political task, and not a military one. Security cannot be guaranteed for oneself if other states feel themselves threatened. There is no other way, as they say. All our party's work on the international scene proceeds from this, too.

Have we achieved a lot since the congress? The answer, as they say, is not so simple. The threat of nuclear war remains a real one. The arms race continues. But after all, it was naive to count on everything changing immediately and abruptly in that respect.

The line of peace, which the Soviet Union and the socialist countries are actively pursuing is stubbornly and sometimes aggressively opposed by a different line, aimed toward undermining the military and strategic balance, toward preparations for war.

This is the line of imperialism; it is the line of reaction. It is the line of those who do not want dialogue between states and are afraid of it, who are ready to risk mankind's destiny for the sake of imposing their way of thinking and their way of life on other peoples.

Yes comrades, the struggle for peace is truly a difficult and fierce struggle, one demanding both wisdom and stubbornness, and consistency and responsibility when making decisions. The party is ready for this struggle, considering that it must be won and can be won. Such is the moral, humanitarian foundation for the Soviet Union's conduct in international affairs. [applause]

It is not through words and appeals, but through specific actions in the world arena that we have been able to impart dynamism to international relations. Comrades, this has already brought its first specific results. The struggle for elimination of nuclear weapons has moved on to a qualitatively new practical plane following the advancement by the Soviet Union on 15 January this year of a specific program to remove these weapons from the face of the earth by the year 2000. Recognition of the significance and value of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, in effect form more than a year now, it becoming wider.

In Stockholm it was possible to make steps forward in matters concerning the strengthening of trust between states and the assertion in international practice of the principle of nonuse of force or the threat of force. An important place in forming trust was played by the IAEA conference in Vienna. There is every reason to hope that the meeting of representatives of the states taking part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which opened only yesterday, may substantially move this necessary process on even further.

In a word, there have appeared quite a few tangible signs of realistic opportunities for a reduction in tension along the paths of broad dialogue between East and West. For example, our country attaches fundamental importance to the joint proposal of the SED and the FRG's SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] for creation of a corridor free of any kinds of nuclear weapons in Europe, on both sides, separating NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The Soviet Union has not just put forward realistic plans for elimination of mass destruction weapons, for radical reductions in conventional weapons, for elimination of hotbeds of international tension and resolution of many conflicts and disputes in relations between states. The Soviet Union has striven to have virtually all of its initiatives become the subject of talks of dialogue between state figures in a public and political circles. In this sense, the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Reagan in Reykjavik was a major event. It would like to stress once again that it was held on the initiative of the Soviet Union. This step proved to be correct and timely. It emphasized the importance of activeness and staunchness in international affairs, the need to persistently search for untraditional approaches to pressing problems, and to reject all the secondary matters that hinder this.

The Reykjavik meeting became a kind of touchstone of the policy of the two major nuclear powers, having shown to the whole world just who stands for what.

The Soviet Union proposed bold and radical plans for a sharp and balanced reduction in nuclear potentials and thereafter for their elimination over a short period. The United States, for its part, showed its inability not just to move half way but to make any movement at all. It pursued one goal: That of preserving the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, the SDI, that sinister "Star Wars" project, that concentrated expression of militarism -- in other words, the right to develop [sozdaniye] new types of death-dealing weapons capable of becoming the tool of aggression against any state, and the right to blackmail our country and the whole of mankind. Thus the Reykjavik meeting confirmed that the desire of the U.S. leaders for military superiority and for the militarization of space has been turned into the main obstacle on the road towards radical disarmament.

This meeting showed something else as well: Accords leading to nuclear disarmament are possible. The struggle for a nuclear free world has reached a new and higher frontier from which the peace offensive must now be continued in all directions.

To counterbalance SDI the Soviet Union put forward a proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful assimilation of space -- incidentally this opens up great opportunities for employment for people, which is very important in the unemployment conditions of the West, and for developing and applying the latest technology both in space and on earth.

A very great deal indeed today depends on the state of Soviet-U.S. relations when it comes to questions of war and peace. That is how history has ordered things. It is primarily from this point of view that our country approaches them considering it to be an urgent requirement to maintain a businesslike dialogue at a high level in order to move toward resolving the most important question of all, namely the elimination of the nuclear threat for even on the basis of the platform put forward by our country in Reykjavik.

But in general we do not aspire to reduce our foreign policy down to Soviet-U.S. relations. We are not doing that. Our course is one of dialogue and cooperation with all countries and in all spheres, and first and foremost in matters concerning the building of an all-embracing system of international security. However such a system can become universal and just if the world community learns to reckon with all the realities of the modern world. The first and most indisputable of these realities is that peace has become the highest value of mankind and furthermore an indispensable condition for mankind's survival on the earth. But that does not mean that other realities have retreated into the background. On the contrary, comrades, recognition of the right to freedom, independence, democracy and, in brief, the right to social progress is a compulsory prerequisite for the world, purified of nuclear weapons, to become truly secure, truly just and democratic.

#### Lushev Addresses Parade

LD070744 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0711 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Speech by P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister, at 7 November military parade in Moscow's Red Square marking 69th anniversary of Great October Socialist Revolution--live]

[Excerpts] Comrade servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces, working people of the Soviet Union, esteemed foreign guests: On behalf and on the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government, I welcome and congratulate you on the nationwide holiday, the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

A convincing expression of this is the position and the proposals presented by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik. It was only the lack of readiness on the part of the U.S. Administration to take reciprocal steps that hindered the start of a real process of ending the nuclear arms race and reducing the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet state's peace-loving policy accords with the interests of the whole of mankind. Evidence of this is in the broad support around the world for the Soviet initiatives at Reykjavik and for our unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. The Soviet Union, firmly defending the mighty gains and interests of socialism, as well as the cause of the freedom and national independence of peoples, is doing all it can to prevent unilateral military advantage for the United States and NATO. Enhancement of the defense might of the socialist motherland and of the combat might of the USSR's Armed Forces, of their vigilance and constant readiness, remains a most important task for us.

#### General Yazov Speaks at Khabarovsk

OW072328 Khabarovsk Domestic Service in Russian 0010 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Speech by Army General Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, CPSU Central Committee candidate member and commander of the Far East Military District, at the Khabarovsk military parade and demonstration of working people devoted to the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution--live]

[Excerpt] The party's cardinal strategic tasks in the field of social-economic development of our country are dissolubly connected with the CPSU's international policy, in which the main line is the struggle against the nuclear

threat and the arms race, and the preservation and consolidation of universal peace. With its foreign policy, the Soviet Union demonstrates a bold innovative approach [words indistinct] for the sake of ensuring international security. This is very vigorously shown by the Soviet program for eliminating nuclear arms proposed by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik. The Soviet-U.S. dialogue did not produce positive results [words indistinct]. U.S. leaders have shown that they are incapable of thinking in a new fashion and taking into consideration the political realities of the present-day world. The United States is seeking military superiority over the Soviet Union through the realization of its Strategic Defense Initiative, which will inevitably lead to a new stage in the arms race and its transfer into outer space. The United States continues to conduct a policy of strength and diktat, supports antipeople regimes, and creates situations of conflict in various regions of the world. The military-political situation continues to be complicated and tense in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region where (?integration) is being intensified and the military threat is growing.

Speaking in Vladivostok, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated that the Pacific Ocean is turning into an arena of military-political confrontation. That leads [words indistinct] security considerations for the Asiatic part of our country. Under such conditions the Communist Party and the Soviet government maintain the defensive might of the Soviet Union at a level which reliably protects the peaceful constructive labor of the Soviet people. The Soviet Armed Forces are in a constant state of readiness to defend the socialist gains. The soldiers of the Red Banner-bearing Far East Military District and the Pacific Ocean sailors, and the border guards and internal troops are greeting the Great October anniversary with high scores in military and political training. Fulfilling the 27th CPSU Congress resolutions, they persistently perfect their military skills, tighten military discipline, and reliably defend the peaceful constructive labor of the people of the Far East.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1150

## RELATED ISSUES

### MOSCOW: MILITARY OBSERVER ON VERIFICATION ISSUE

LD172343 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 17 Oct 86

[Text] The issue of verification has always been a stumbling block at many disarmament talks. Here is what our military observer Colonel Eduard Grigoryev writes on the subject.

At a news conference in Reykjavik on 12 October, Mikhail Gorbachev clearly defined the Soviet position on verification. He noted for one that at the present time verification should be toughened. The Soviet Union advocates a triple verification that would make each side certain in full that it wouldn't fall into a trap. Thereby this country reaffirms its readiness for any type of verification, on-site inspections included. At the recent Stockholm conference the Soviet Government considered it possible to agree to inspections to verify military exercises in Europe. This is the first ever arms accord providing for on-site inspection.

But these are only a few facts confirming the Soviet Union's intention to search for mutual understanding and for a mutually acceptable balance. Not long ago there were opened to inspection many GDR areas that used to be closed to American, British, and French military missions. Set up to monitor the allied troops' military activity in the former occupation zones, the missions have been operating since the end of World War II. Nearly two-thirds of the country's territory, and not one-fourth as used to be in the German Democratic Republic, are now open for Western missions. Access for Western missions has been considerably expanded in the zones that Western strategists have called NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries (?adjacent lines). This is another token of the Warsaw Treaty countries' desire to consolidate and deepen what has been achieved in measures of trust between East and West.

It is common knowledge that in the situation of mutual mistrust excessive suspicion builds up. In such conditions every state seeks to count mainly on reconnaissance up to the use of satellites with powerful optical devices and sophisticated systems to register possible radiation. But no matter how impeccable the methods and means of reconnaissance are, their capability is limited. This truth has been confirmed to a considerable degree by the inspection by Western military missions on the GDR territories that used to be banned for visits. The motor vehicles of military missions with the huge images of national flags on the sides travel from Potsdam to the frontier with

Poland in the east and the Baltic coast in the north. They visited many military test sites in the vicinity of the GDR capital, Berlin. Through visual operations they established that the scale of military equipment there was much less than had been expected in line with reconnaissance data whence the conclusion--one more unnecessary suspicion has been lifted. This suspicion has led to the excessive deployment of arms in Europe and has increased the risk of a new war in the continent.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1150

## RELATED ISSUES

TASS HITS KOHL'S BUNDESTAG STATEMENT ON SDI, INF, TESTING

LD062248 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 6 Nov 86

["With an American Accent"--TASS identifier]

[Text] Moscow November 6 TASS--Political news analyst Aleksey Shestakov writes:

Chancellor Helmut Kohl made a government statement in the Bundestag today on the results of his trip to the United States and conversations with President Ronald Reagan.

This document is of interest for many reasons. Because Kohl was the first West European head of government to visit Washington after the Soviet-American summit and represented in the American capital, as he said himself, the security interests not only of the FRG but also of France, Britain and other West European countries. And also because for the first time ever the chancellor had presented with sufficient fullness the view of the ruling circles of the FRG, America's chief military partner in NATO, on the range of issues discussed at the meeting in Reykjavik. And also because the statement by the head of the cabinet spelled out the role that Bonn intends to play in solving those pressing international problems that are of concern to Europe in the first place.

Let us try to single out the key moments in the West German chancellor's statement without lingering on his numerous and already traditional expressions of gratitude to President Reagan and assurances that all members of the Western community are following the United States in closely bunched ranks.

Likewise there is hardly any need to comment on the quite obvious truths expressed by Kohl that the meeting in Reykjavik was an important stage in the East-West dialogue and that never before had the positions of the two great powers just as, may I add, the possibilities for concluding large-scale agreements been so close.

Let us turn to the main problem of Reykjavik. So what is Chancellor Kohl's stand on the American "Star Wars" programme?

The United States does not want to make the substance of its SDI research programme a subject of the Geneva disarmament talks... The United States wants this programme to be regarded as a necessary guarantee of security against a possible violation of agreement... But who is saying all this? Ronald Reagan? Yes. But in this case this was said by Helmut Kohl who quite approves of Washington's actions.

He also stressed West Germany's "exceptional interest in an agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe" and added immediately that such an agreement is possible if the USSR goes back on its "condition that problems be solved in a package" because this stand is "harmful to the matter at hand". So again we have a literal translation from English into German, again we see the desire to present the major Soviet proposals not as a package of compromises but as a package of conditions.

It was none other than Bonn which only three years ago loudly campaigned for Reagan's "zero option". But when today there appeared a real chance to clear Europe of medium-range nuclear missiles owing to the bold and in some ways even risky backpedalling or, to quote Helmut Kohl, are "fearful of their own courage". Nothing else can explain the stubborn desire to rip apart the package of Soviet proposals and then to reject them one by one.

The people in Bonn spoke just as loudly only eighteen months ago about the need to stop nuclear testing. For already exactly one year and three months the USSR is observing its moratorium while nuclear blasts continue to rock the Nevada desert in America. What was Chancellor Kohl to say on this score? He says that he "encouraged the United States President in his advance along the road of gradually solving problems".

The government statement read out in the Bundestag contains the words that the FRG's relations with the USSR and other socialist countries carry "special weight" for Bonn. It is also said in it that the West German Government remembers the losses suffered by the Soviet people as a result of Hitler's aggression. But the question arises: How can one remember this and yet constantly proceed from the premise of "Soviet aggressiveness"? How can one speak of strengthening trust and at the same time create a shortage of it be it because of the notorious Atlantic solidarity or because of considerations of election campaigning? All this is far from the new political thinking which is the only guarantee that mankind will not cross the final line of danger.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1150



## RELATED ISSUES

### DANISH PRIME MINISTER VISITS USSR 21-24 OCTOBER

#### Talks With Gromyko, Gorbachev

PM281055 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 22 Oct 86 p 9

[Michael Kuttner dispatch: "Two-Hour Meeting With Gorbachev"]

[Excerpts] Moscow--Prime Minister Poul Schlueter tried to put the case of the smaller European countries yesterday when he met with Soviet President Andrey Gromyko and later with party leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

The prime minister also touched on the small nations' view of the superpowers when they talk about the total elimination of nuclear weapons. "We have to ask ourselves whether it is realistic and safe to imagine that the superpowers themselves will eventually accept not having nuclear weapons at all. This all sounds very nice, and we will certainly not disagree with the final aim. But is it really likely that they will both separately renounce all forms of nuclear arms? Will they really destroy their very last little nuclear device? I hope that this is realistic, but we have to put a lot of question marks after it."

#### Ryzhkov Dinner Speech

PM221005 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

["In a Friendly Atmosphere; N.I. Ryzhkov's Speech"--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpts] The visit of the Danish prime minister to the Soviet Union is an important event in Soviet-Danish relations, he said. It proves that both sides show interest in the development of broader mutual ties and in the utilization of those advantages which each country gets from international cooperation. This can only be welcomed. We consider Denmark as our neighbor in our common European home, our common Baltic Sea, where you can stretch an arm from the Soviet to the Danish shore, so to speak.

It must, however, be emphasized that despite all this, problems such as ending the arms race and nuclear disarmament, and questions of international security and trust have stood and still stand at the center of our relations, just as of the whole complex of East-West relations. Life itself, and the realities of our time, ensure that they are

the key problems in present-day European and world politics. And in spite of all the differences in our socioeconomic systems and the adherence of the Soviet Union and Denmark to different military-political alliances, a solution to these problems has been and remains our common concern and our common responsibility. The proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe is an integral part of them.

The outcome of the meeting in Reykjavik between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and R. Reagan, president of the United States, showed just how complex the situation is that has arisen, and how difficult is the struggle which must be waged to end the arms race and for nuclear disarmament. There is a worthy place in this struggle for all states, in our opinion, and of course for the European ones. For it was they who, by signing the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, gave life to a unique phenomenon in the practice of European, and indeed world, politics.

We cannot but be inspired by the successful results of the Stockholm Conference. The results of Stockholm are a great step toward reducing international tension. They reflect the traits of a new political thought, and in practice confirm the possibility of coming to an agreement on questions of security if there is the political will and desire for it. The weighty political document worked out in Stockholm is the first real agreement in the sphere of military detente for the past many years.

A serious start has been made. Whether it receives further development in Vienna also depends, of course, on the joint efforts which you and we make.

We are convinced that everybody who cherishes peace must now realistically assess the position which has arisen since Reykjavik and actively work to exploit the historic chance created by the efforts of the Soviet Union in the interests of reducing and scrapping nuclear weapons.

The first step in this direction must be the banning of all nuclear tests. Our position on this point is well known. The Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests speaks for itself. It is an important fact that the overwhelming majority of states are now also aware of the need to halt testing. As we know, this idea is also supported in Denmark.

Mr Prime Minister, I think you will agree that, in view of the fact that states are becoming more and more dependent on each other, not one of them can stand aside from the solution of urgent international problems.

We are impressed by the Danish Government's expressed desire to contribute to the development of detente, to the creation of an atmosphere of trust between East and West. In this respect the Soviet Union is prepared for most active cooperation and dialogue with Denmark, both within the framework of our bilateral relations and in the international arena. The search for better mutual understanding is something we are both concerned about, and success here depends on joint efforts. Mr Prime Minister, we regard your visit and our conversations and talks as an important event, which should serve the interests of our countries and the cause of peace and cooperation in Europe.

We wish you success in this, and we wish the people of Denmark, for whom we have sincere respect, peace and progress.

Schlueter News Conference

PM231415 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under general heading "Visit Continues"]

[Text] The official visit and the Danish-Soviet talks held in Moscow will contribute to the further development of relations between the two countries, P. Schlueter stressed at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists held before his departure for Tbilisi.

I liked the pointed [ostryy] and frank discussion of international issues which was held during my meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. My main impression is that despite the inconclusive meeting in Reykjavik, the Soviet side is prepared to keep its proposals on the negotiating table.

I share the view that the meeting in Reykjavik was not futile. It has to be regarded more as a success than a failure. It could provide the impetus for further talks at which the dialogue must be expanded to encompass all aspects of East-West relations.

P. Schlueter answered journalists' questions.

Soviets Noncommittal to Nuclear-Free Zone

PM281109 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 23 Oct 86 p 8

[Michael Kuttner dispatch: "Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone of Little Interest"]

[Text] Tbilisi — For 2 days the top Soviet leadership has been holding talks with Prime Minister Poul Schlueter (Conservative) without wasting many words on the idea of the Nordic area as a nuclear-free zone.

At a news conference in Moscow yesterday immediately before his flight to Tbilisi in Georgia the prime minister said that there does not seem to be any great interest in the issue among the Russians at present. The nuclear-free zone was not discussed directly, Poul Schlueter said.

A high-ranking spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry insisted to *Berlingske Tidende* yesterday that the zone was mentioned during some of the talks but not discussed in any great detail.

Asked why the Soviet leadership is not using the prime minister's visit to promote what has up to now been one of its central concerns in its contacts with Denmark, which plays a central role in the zone issue, the spokesman replied: "There is not time to go into all topics in depth."

The idea of the Nordic area as a nuclear-free zone was first put forth by Finland with Russian support. However, the Soviet Union has not been much inclined to put forth a detailed plan. There has been talk — in pretty vague terms — of a willingness to "consider certain steps on the Soviet Union's own territory," if the Nordic countries make a joint approach to Moscow on the issue.

In the view of Western observers the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Soviet Union for the implementation of a proposal which it supports officially is due to the fact that the Nordic area is and always has been nuclear-free with the exception of the Kola Peninsula and other areas east of the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union is thought not to be interested in renouncing its own nuclear armaments in order to achieve a treaty-enshrined nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area.

Yesterday diplomatic observers were interpreting the low Soviet profile on the zone issue in the talks with the prime minister as confirmation that the Russians are not seriously interested in the zone and that "the discussion of and the activity for such a plan in the Nordic countries, rather than its achievement, is the Soviet Union's primary objective."

/6091

CSO: 5200/1150

## RELATED ISSUES

### CANADA: LIBERALS REJECT CRUISE TESTS, NUCLEAR ARMS

#### Convention Policy Resolutions

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 1 Dec 86 p A4

[Article by Jane Taber]

[Text]

In a tense and emotional debate, Liberals voted this weekend to end cruise missile testing and make Canada a nuclear weapons-free zone, reversing previous party policy.

These policies are not binding on Liberal leader John Turner and he has not supported them in the past but he's backed himself into a tight corner by telling delegates during the four-day national convention he was there to listen to their concerns.

Sunday, Turner repeated his grassroots initiative but reminded everyone the policy resolutions do not strictly bind him.

"But I consider them highly persuasive," he later told reporters when asked about the cruise and the nuclear weapons-free zone.

"They will form the general direction for the party going into the next election."

Turner said his caucus will have to "take another look" at its direction in terms of the cruise.

During the 1984 election campaign, Turner said: "I believe that (the Liberal government) made

the correct decision in allowing the testing of the cruise missile.

"It is an unarmed missile, it is in furtherance of our treaty obligations to our European allies and our European partners and, if we are going to have any influence in working towards world peace, we first of all must fulfill our commitment to our NATO allies."

In 1983, the Liberal government voted to allow cruise testing.

Liberal defence critic Len Hopkins was fighting mad during the debate, warning that creating a nuclear weapons-free zone would take the country out of NATO.

"Let's face reality. We're talking about the national interest, not the emotional interest," he said.

"(It) will virtually take us out of NATO and be a disgrace to the Liberal Party of Canada."

The resolution came from Manitoba Liberal MP Lloyd Axworthy who urged the Liberal party to take "a new step in elaborating nuclear policy."

His proposal took one step further an already-adopted resolution calling for the government to stop the testing of the cruise.

"A nuclear free zone clearly demonstrates to Canadians that our objective is to pursue a new world."

Said Liberal MP Warren Allmand: "This resolution is not simply a question of the quality of life, but a question of survival of life."

An angry Hopkins said later in an interview the resolution means that if any NATO allies such as Holland, Germany, Italy, Britain or the United States come into Canadian harbors with nuclear weapons on board their ships, Canadians would not be able to fuel them or provide maintenance.

"This means non-co-operation with our NATO allies and therefore if you don't co-operate in an alliance, you don't belong to one."

However, Hopkins says he takes some comfort in the fact that one other resolution which was passed called for Canada to stay in NATO and use its role in that organization to promote peace.

He says it is now up to the caucus and the party to see how they will deal with the two resolutions, and which one will become Liberal policy.

TORONTO STAR Editorial

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 1 Dec 86 p A16

[Editorial]

[Text]

For the first time since 1963 and the crisis over Bomarc missiles, Canadians appear poised for a debate on nuclear weapons and their country's involvement in their use and development.

Back then, the Liberal party favored stationing nuclear missiles in Canada as part of the country's alliance commitments. But this past weekend, the Liberals voted to ban cruise missile tests and to make Canada become a "nuclear weapon-free zone."

For the Liberals, this policy statement represents a dramatic shift — not only from their stand in 1963, but also from their position just three years ago. Then, the Liberal government signed the controversial accord with the United States permitting the testing of cruise missiles in our North.

The Liberal convention stand also follows closely on the heels of a similar vote by the Ontario Legislature declaring this province to be a nuclear weapon-free zone. Also this month, the True North peace conference in Edmonton, which addressed the same issues, attracted a surprising 5,000 people. Delegates voted to urge the federal government to consider making Canada a "neutral" country and end its limited endorsement of the U.S. Star Wars program.

Clearly something is up here.

The problem is that the debate is taking place in a vacuum. If we are to renounce nuclear weapons in every way (for example, aboard submarines that visit our ports), should we stay in NATO and NORAD? Would we be allowed to? Are we more effective in working toward peace inside or outside military alliances? Should we stay in NATO but change our role? Should NATO renounce first use of nuclear weapons? Would that mean a build-up of conventional forces?

These are questions that ought to be addressed. A good starting point would be a government white paper on defence, long promised but still undelivered. The public increasingly seems anxious to debate these issues, even if the government isn't.

[Editorial]

[Text]

If the sheer volume of resolutions debated at the Liberal party convention is any indication, Liberals have plenty to say about what this country's foreign policy should be. Unfortunately, in light of Canada's role in the world, not all of it makes sense.

It's healthy that interest in foreign affairs is so high in Liberal circles. What's needed now is more focus, realism and maturity, based on greater knowledge and a sense of the meaning of partnership among like-minded nations. A look at the perceptions of Louis St. Laurent and Lester Pearson would help for starters.

At the Ottawa conference, the focus in non-domestic matters was on free trade, cruise missile testing, a nuclear weapons-free zone for Canada and NATO membership.

What emerged was a vision of a Canada groping for bilateral, sectoral and multilateral free trade all at once. A Canada denying NATO's superpower access to our territory to test unarmed cruise missiles or to dock its ships. A Canada, in short, still inside NATO but in some indeterminate way trying to promote peace with the rest of the world.

Liberals also agreed to maintain foreign aid at least at its present level, and allow more immigrants to come to this country.

All in all, quite a mixed bag. To give it

more coherence, newly-confirmed party leader John Turner would do well to focus on principles first. We suggest the following:

- The principle of free trade should be synonymous with Liberalism. While a universal GATT solution must be pursued — even Brian Mulroney is doing that — priority should be given to lowering Canada-U.S. trade barriers. The American market is essential to Canadian prosperity.

- Canada's security policy has to be an alliance one. Membership in NATO is the best guarantee of maximum freedom of manoeuvre for Canada vis-à-vis the U.S.

But it entails responsibilities as well as rewards. One of these is that matters affecting the defence of alliance territory have to be settled together, not unilaterally. We cannot become a nuclear weapons-free zone unless and until NATO determines that should be its policy. Otherwise it just doesn't make defence sense.

Testing the cruise or any other weapons in Canada is not a principle. It's simply helping an ally strengthen a deterrent that helps prevent war and preserve peace. If we don't want to help in that way, we don't have to.

If Turner sticks to alliance principles, he won't go far wrong. If he strays very far from them, he'll be courting trouble.

/9274

CSO: 5220/17

RELATED ISSUES

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY DISCUSSES UN DISARMAMENT RESOLUTIONS

HK100713 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 6 Dec 86 p 6

[Article by Chao Yang [2600 7122]: "A Just Voice"]

[Text] On 3 December, the UN General Assembly passed 45 resolutions regarding disarmament, including the 2 draft resolutions introduced for the first time by the Chinese delegation on nuclear and conventional disarmament. The General Assembly has also reached a consensus to hold the third special UN General Assembly on disarmament in 1988. This reflects the serious concern and urgent demand of peace-loving people throughout the world on the disarmament issue.

Notwithstanding that 1986 is the International Year of Peace, there is not much cause for optimism. Since the Iceland summit of the United States and the Soviet Union, the stances of the two countries have retreated to some extent from their earlier positions on nuclear arms cuts.

The United States has exceeded the limits of the SALT II arms control agreement by ordering the deployment of its 131st B-52 bomber armed with nuclear cruise missiles. The reaction of the Soviet Union was to proclaim that all its measures for disarmament have a limit and to imply it would resume nuclear tests at the beginning of next year. The hardline positions of both sides have generated fears that a new round of the arms race is accelerating. It is exactly under this circumstance that the UN General Assembly passed a series of resolutions on disarmament to move the U.S.-USSR disarmament talks from closed-door rooms onto the world platform to give all the peace-loving people around the world access to the discussion and resolution of this "life-and death" issue and bring into full play the strength of world opinion. At present, the question is whether the two superpowers in the coming year will listen to the just voice of the world and conform to the historical demand of the times to make genuine efforts to greatly reduce armaments, an action that would help maintain world peace and promote economic development in all countries.

/6091

CSO: 5200/4039

- END -