

TASS STATEMENT

A session of the NATO Council was held in Washington the other day. Unlike routine sessions, it was timed to coincide with the 35th anniversary of the military-political grouping of Western states.

Thus the session marked the anniversary of an event which legalized the departure of the United States, Britain, France and some other Western states from cooperation between the countries of the anti-Nazi coalition, which had formed during the war years, from the jointly outlined principles of a fair post-war set-up in the world. Counter to that, Washington initiated a policy of cobbling together an aggressive bloc of imperialist states, of ensuring its military-political positions and domination in the world, and of confrontation with the countries of a different social system.

From the very outset NATO was planned as, and became, an active tool of Washington in pursuing the policy of power pressure on the Soviet Union, of the notorious "cold war" policy. Under the pretext of "Atlantic solidarity", the USA has closely geared a number of West European states to its military machinery and created in Western Europe its military springboard against the USSR and other socialist countries. Such is NATO's real role in the history of post-war international relations.

It goes without saying that not a word was said about that at the anniversary session. Yet, there was no lack of claims about the "defensive" character of the bloc, about the peaceful intentions of its members, about their alleged striving for an East-West dialogue and cooperation, and for stability in the world.

That unrestrained self-publicity has been used with the single aim of camouflaging the real character of the bloc. But these propaganda gimmicks and high-flown phrases can mislead nobody. NATO has been and remains a tool of preparing for aggression and serves the interests of the most bellicose circles, above all the USA.

A fresh proof of that was in the form of the final communique of the latest session and the "Washington declaration" adopted at it.

There are a few statements about peace, about the wish to lessen the danger of war. But the keynote of these documents is the stake on military strength, its further buildup in every way possible, and on diktat towards other states. While paying lip service to the principle of the non-use of force, NATO, clearly acting on the orders of the United States, throws it away, trying to turn sabre-rattling and the use of force into norms of international relations, making it the basis of their policy.

The Washington session has reaffirmed the unwillingness of the United States and the other nuclear states of the North Atlantic bloc to pledge, as the Soviet Union has already done, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Neither have its members responded to the Warsaw Treaty countries' proposal to conclude a treaty on the general non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations.

The question arises: What then is the worth of assurances about NATO's allegedly defensive nature? The authors of the above-mentioned documents have unashamedly claimed that the NATO countries do not seek unilateral advantage and military superiority. These are empty words intended to deceive naive people.

It is common knowledge that the new American nuclear missiles have been installed in a number of West European countries. This move is directly aimed at upsetting the regional and global balance of forces. Washington has been frantically carrying out new programmes for strategic nuclear and conventional arms buildups in the illusory and dangerous hope to gain military supremacy.

The delegates at the session, with the exception of representatives of some countries, have reaffirmed that they are bent on continuing to follow this militarist course projected by the White House. The unwillingness to scale down the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe has again shown itself most plainly. The intention to go on deploying American nuclear missiles in Western Europe according to the schedule drawn up at NATO headquarters has again been declared explicitly. This intention cannot be camouflaged by a repetition of hypocritical appeals to the Soviet Union for the talks on nuclear arms to be resumed.

Such a stand is an unequivocal indication of the fact that Washington and some other NATO capitals do not wish to resolve the question of nuclear

weapons on the principle of equality and equal security.

It is highly indicative that NATO has disregarded the recent appeal by the leaders of six states from different continents of the world for an end to the arms race and a freeze on nuclear arsenals. This was proof of the disregard by NATO policy-makers for the vital interests of peoples, including the interests of the peoples of their own countries.

NATO's obstructionist stand is reflected not only in its attitude to nuclear weapons. The same line is clearly visible in the Washington session documents on such issues as militarizing outer space, deploying large-scale anti-missile defence systems, banning chemical weapons, and reducing forces and arms in Central Europe.

While verbally declaring their commitment to the talks, the USA and the other NATO countries actually exclude the attainment of mutually acceptable agreements.

What is the worth of vaguely speculating that it is desirable to study problems concerning the military use of outer space, while the need to take very resolute measures to prevent its militarization is on the agenda? The only way to that is by immediately starting talks on delivering mankind from the threat which the United States is trying to create from outer space. It is clear that those who pursue a policy of militarizing outer space take upon themselves an enormous responsibility to people and to mankind.

Unwillingness to resolve questions pertaining to prohibiting and scrapping chemical weapons, reducing forces and arms in Central Europe is indicated by the collective praise from the NATO countries to the American "initiatives" on those issues. The essence of these initiatives has already shown itself sufficiently clearly. They are aimed at putting up additional roadblocks in the way towards resolving these questions of paramount significance.

The delegates in the Washington session have amply made up for the lack of a constructive effort by repeating false claims about using chemical weapons in some areas and the alleged involvement of the Soviet Union in that.

This is the real price of NATO's statements on its readiness to progress in resolving questions pertaining to limiting arms and to disarmament.

The statements about striving for peace and stability do not tally in any way with the steps taken by NATO leaders to broaden the geographical sphere of activities of that bloc and with its use as a tool of the policy of strength and diktat in various parts of the world. As follows from the papers of the Washington session, it discussed in practical terms the question of not only giving Washington a free hand in pursuing its expansionist and aggressive policy, but also of contributing to that in every way possible.

In addition, the delegates at the session have declared that the alliance respects the sovereignty and independence of states everywhere. This is, indeed, the limit of political hypocrisy. The people of Grenada, Lebanon and Central America - in particular of Nicaragua - of Namibia and other countries have seen for themselves this "respect". In other words, the UN Charter and the norms of international law are being trampled underfoot and the policy of state terrorism is being perpetrated everywhere.

Special mention should be made of the speculation contained in the papers of the NATO session concerning a "split" in Europe and support for trying to absorb the GDR, which is being cultivated in West Germany. At issue are attempts to call into question the whole package of treaties and agreements aimed at ensuring a peaceful and stable development in Europe. Thus they, as a matter of fact, indulge the revanchist forces which have again come to life in West Germany.

The other sections of the declaration contain many references to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. And here the authors of the declaration pretend to forget that the states which signed the Helsinki Final Act, among them all the NATO member-countries, declared that they consider all borders of each other, as well as the borders of every state in Europe, to be inviolable, and will refrain now and in the future from any encroachments on these borders.

The Soviet Union, the socialist countries, all who

prize the cause of peace, resolutely condemn any evidence of the policy directed at undermining the post-war set-up in Europe. They will not permit the tragic past to be repeated. There is no and will never be any return to the past. This must be realized by everyone who now demonstrates an irresponsible attitude to such an important issue.

This policy of Washington and its allies on the fundamental issue of European security clearly indicates that in real fact NATO does not wish a buildup of confidence between states and peoples.

This was reaffirmed by the stand taken by NATO at the Stockholm Conference. They continue to talk of the need for accepting the Western proposals, which are aimed solely at making "transparent" the military activities of the USSR and of other socialist countries, while evading a concrete discussion of the large-scale confidence-building measures proposed by the Soviet Union.

The NATO documents speak at length about a desire for a dialogue with the Soviet Union, about the alleged preparedness for talks. But there is nothing concrete behind that speculation. While the Soviet Union and other socialist states are putting forward practical proposals aimed at reaching mutually acceptable agreements on a wide range of security issues and on developing cooperation, the USA and NATO, which swear their peaceableness, give a negative answer to these proposals. The higher an obstacle they put up in the way of reaching agreement on preventing nuclear war and strengthening peace, the more high-flown and hypocritical calls they make for an East-West dialogue.

The gap between NATO politicians' words and their deeds is also seen in their approach to trade and economic relations. The documents of the Washington session speak a lot on mutually beneficial trade and economic cooperation with the socialist countries. But, in actual fact, new steps are being taken on Washington's initiative to frustrate mutually beneficial East-West trade and economic relations, to use trade as a tool of political pressure.

The West European countries should realize that if they embark on that path, they will inflict serious damage upon themselves. It is apt to recall here the results of all attempts at trade sanctions and discrimination against the socialist countries in the past.

This also concerns attempts at interfering in the internal affairs of the socialist countries, at lecturing the people of other countries on how they should live. That this has again taken place, that the Washington session had again raised this theme does not at all add cogency to NATO's declared "constructiveness" in its approach to relations with the socialist countries.

TASS has been authorized by the Soviet leadership to declare that the results of the 35th "jubilee" session of the NATO Council held in Washington are regarded in the Soviet Union as attesting to that bloc's intentions to continue its militarist course.

Now that the questions of preserving and consolidating peace have become particularly acute, that the nations are more insistent in demanding effective measures to lessen the threat of war and enhance international security, it is the United States and NATO that pose as the main stumbling block on that road, opposing themselves to the will and aspirations of the people and trying to force their ways on all and everywhere.

Such policy is emphatically rejected by the Soviet Union. Those who have not abandoned the dangerous illusory hopes to damage the legitimate interests of the USSR and the interests of its friends and allies, should be reminded once again that this will never come off. Any attempts of this sort are doomed to fail as was repeatedly proved in the past. Those who shape NATO's course should come back to the ground of reality, ponder the consequences of their policy and be aware of the full measure of their responsibility to the people of their countries and to every nation.

It is time that Washington, Bonn and other NATO capitals renounce the policy that leads to undermining the foundations of peace, in favour of practical steps to the benefit of detente, to the benefit of peace. The Soviet Union reiterates its readiness to cooperate with all those who will display a genuine intention to act in this way.

Antisatellite weapons must be banned

The question of preventing militarization of outer space is moving further into the centre of world public attention. There are extremely weighty reasons for this. The matter is not just that space, should it become an arena of military competition, would be a source of constant mortal threat to all mankind. Launching strike weapons into space would have the most dire consequences for the limitation of armaments in other spheres too. He who seeks to open up outer space for his weapons is not just creating a new channel of the arms race – he wants to undermine the prospects for stopping it altogether.

Our country, which opened up the trail into space for mankind, consistently favours accords that would place a reliable obstacle to the penetration of weapons into outer space. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, stressed that "for more than a year the Soviet Union has been striving to achieve an agreement aimed at preventing the spread of the arms race to space. We have constantly posed this question to the leadership of the USA. We have done this because we clearly realize what formidable consequences the militarization of space would entail".

Way back in March 1958, soon after the launching of the first artificial Earth satellites, the Soviet Government proposed that the agenda of the scheduled session of the UN General Assembly include the question of the prohibition of the military uses of space and of international cooperation in the exploration of outer space. With the Soviet Union's active participation, agreements aimed at preventing the spread of the arms race to space were concluded. Among them is, for instance, the operating 1963 multilateral treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests in three media, including outer space. The Treaty on the Principles of the Activity of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, was signed in 1967. Signed and ratified by the majority of countries, this treaty defines the principles of international cooperation in matters of space, bans the deployment in outer space of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation.

These agreements created certain prerequisites for continued efforts aimed at ensuring a peaceful regime in outer space.

Although the United States agreed to conclude these agreements, the US military-industrial complex was already intending to use space for militarist purposes. A special role was assigned to the development and deployment of antisatellite systems. At the same time, American propaganda has launched a false version, claiming that the Soviet Union is instigating the space arms buildup. Facts disprove this allegation. The problem of antisatellite weaponry – one of the ways of militarizing outer space – was engendered thanks to Washington's efforts.

In 1958, the United States started to develop antisatellite weapon systems in accordance with its Spacetrack programme. This work has continued almost non-stop ever since. In 1959, an American missile, Bold Orion, launched from a B-47 bomber, intercepted an artificial Earth satellite. In the early sixties, the United States deployed two land-based antisatellite systems: one on Kwajalein Island, the other on Johnston Island.

A particularly steep tilt towards the militarization of space occurred after the present administration came to power. In the summer of 1982, the president issued a directive on US policy vis-à-vis outer space which, for the sake of ensuring military superiority for the United States, is directly orientated towards a large-scale deployment of antisatellite systems.

The Reagan administration has refused to resume the Soviet-American talks on these systems. The money spent on developing space weapons has increased dramatically. The rise in expenditures for these purposes is considerably higher than the rates

at which the allocations under other clauses of the US military budget are growing. The programmes for developing the latest types of weaponry intended for use in outer space and from space in relation to Earth – laser and particle-beam weapons – are being frantically implemented. A special space command has been set up in the United States, and a joint space centre to control military actions in space is being built. A military cosmodrome for Shuttle reusable craft is also being built. The programme for the use of this is effectively controlled by the Pentagon. So as well as preparing for nuclear war on land, the United States is conducting intensive war preparations in outer space too.

As reported, special antisatellite missiles, which will be launched from high-altitude F-15 fighter-planes, are being currently developed within the framework of the ASAT programme. The first tests of the system have already been conducted. Further tests are scheduled for later this year.

What is Washington trying to achieve by spending many billions of dollars on military space programmes?

According to leading American experts, space weapons, including antisatellite systems, are designed to play the key element in first-strike capability. It would be senseless for the United States, says Thomas Karas, one such expert, to develop antisatellite systems if there were no plans to make a first strike, to start nuclear war. To put it simply, the Pentagon is eager to acquire the capability of knocking out Soviet satellites (which, incidentally, do not carry any strike weapons and whose activity can be compared with that of similar American systems), in order to "blind" the other side, catch it unawares and reduce its capability to retaliate in the event of a nuclear attack. Here is what Fred Ikle, US Undersecretary of Defense, bluntly declared: the use of antisatellite systems as an integral element of the first strike in order to destroy all or many of the adversary's "key" satellites is designed to complicate a retaliatory strike considerably. This idea could not really be expressed more clearly and bluntly.

US antisatellite programmes are closely connected with the frantic buildup and perfection of strategic offensive systems, such as MX, Trident-2 missiles, and Stealth bombers and with the stationing of long-range Pershing-2 and cruise missiles using all forms of deployment near the Soviet borders.

These are all links in the war preparation chain which underlie Washington's claims to military domination over the world.

Washington has set its sights on space, also because it thinks once again that it has found a way of overtaking the other side by launching a new spiral in the arms race. But only fresh disappointments await American strategists in this direction. Imposing a threat from space on the Soviet Union, they will create just as great a threat to the United States itself. The history of Soviet-American relations should have taught Washington that all its attempts at gaining superiority have failed, and that honest accords on an equal footing are the only way to resolve security issues. Those who shape US policy should once again be reminded about this today.

Having embarked upon the development of military space systems for aggressive purposes, Washington is hastily putting up all kinds of obstacles so as to block any limitation or, more so, the prohibition of such weapons. It believes that all means to justify this dangerous activity are good. The scope of the US military space programmes, their actual content and nonconformity with the country's pledges under agreements are carefully concealed from the American public. Negotiations and accords hindering the militarization of space are proclaimed off-hand to be impossible. There are allegations that it is impossible to define the types of weapons to be discussed at such talks, or to monitor accords on non-militarization of space, etc.

The White House also used all these false and far-fetched arguments in a report to Congress in order to "justify" its refusal to hold talks on preventing the militarization of space. But, one might ask, how is it possible to develop antisatellite systems and say at the same time that this is supposedly something unknown? How can one talk about the impossibility of resolving the problem of monitoring without even trying to discuss it within the framework of official negotiations on the elimination and prohibition of antisatellite systems? Obviously these excuses are unconvincing. They point to one thing – that the US administration has an irresponsible attitude to the burning issues of ensuring security on Earth and the future of mankind.

Obviously, monitoring compliance with obligations in the field of antisatellite systems will have its specifics. But the problem can be resolved. The Soviet Union's draft document offers extensive proposals on this score, which could be discussed and, if need be, specified. Obviously, the renunciation of antisatellite weapons would be much easier to monitor before the weapons have been deployed, rather than after they have been adopted for service by the sides.

The task of preventing the militarization of space must not be delayed. And it should be radically resolved before it is too late. Taking into account the vulnerability of missile-attack warning systems and other satellites, the deployment of antisatellite weapons would have a serious destabilizing effect on the strategic situation. Just one attack on a satellite could bring about the gravest consequences. Moreover, even the accidental breakdown of any satellite system, especially during periods of heightened tension, could give rise to an acute conflict situation. One must appreciate this fully.

The Soviet Union has proposed ways of resolving this problem. Specifically, the Soviet Union favours the idea of totally banning the testing and deployment in space of any space-based weapons for hitting targets on Earth, in the air or in outer space. It also favours a radical solution of the issue of antisatellite weapons: the complete renunciation by states of the development of new antisatellite systems, as well as the scrapping of already existing systems like these.

Under the proposed Soviet draft treaty, which prohibits the use of force in space and from space in relation to Earth, the parties would pledge not to destroy, damage or disrupt the normal functioning, and not to change the trajectory of space bodies belonging to other states. Besides, it suggests a ban on the testing and use of manned spacecraft for military, including antisatellite, purposes. They should be used exclusively for scientific, technical and economic purposes.

With a view to making it easier to reach an accord, the USSR unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the launching into space of antisatellite weapons, to be in effect for as long as other countries act in the same way.

The implementation of the Soviet Union's package of far-reaching measures would become a major, really tangible contribution to solving the problem of using space exclusively for peaceful purposes, which was approved earlier by the United Nations.

The Soviet initiative was backed and approved by nearly all the UN member-countries, with the exception of the United States. The need to guarantee mankind a peaceful space is just as obvious as the fact that the spread of the arms race to space would have unpredictable and dangerous consequences.

Responsibility for mankind's present and future means that official negotiations must be started, without any delay, to prevent the militarization of space, to ban the development of new antisatellite systems and eliminate those already existing. Washington must, at last, listen to the voice of reason.

THE "NUCLEAR THRESHOLD" IN NATO STRATEGY

Professor RAIR SIMONYAN, D.Sc.

The "nuclear threshold" problem has come to figure prominently in world press comment and in public statements by political and military leaders in connection with the deployment of American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. In modern military terminology, the "nuclear threshold" means the moment when nuclear weapons are brought into play in an armed conflict.

How much importance is attached to the "nuclear threshold" problem by Pentagon and NATO strategists? Why is this problem being linked today with the American nuclear missiles being deployed in a number of European countries?

In the period when the "massive retaliation" strategy was in force (1953-61) the "nuclear threshold" problem just did not exist. Pinning its hopes on its "overwhelming nuclear superiority," Washington planned to deliver nuclear strikes at the Soviet Union from the very outset of an armed conflict, with the U.S. territory expected to remain invulnerable or almost so. The plan of war against the U.S.S.R., code-named Dropshot, was worked out in 1949 precisely along these lines.

But the Soviet Union's economic, scientific and technological progress deprived Washington of its atomic monopoly. Parity between Soviet and American strategic nuclear potentials set in, and the Pentagon realized that a total nuclear war would now destroy the aggressor himself regardless of distance.

Admitting that such a war would cripple the United States and could result in global devastation, John Collins, the well-known expert in the field of U.S. military strategy, wrote that for the first time in history people were racking their brains for ways to prevent war rather than for ways of waging it. Although generally true, this remark

does not apply to the Pentagon people, who are racking their brains not for ways to prevent a nuclear war, but for versions of waging it against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. These versions are supposed to secure American imperialism's ends, on the one hand, and to preclude a retaliatory strike against the U.S.A., on the other. As a result, the Pentagon worked out the "flexible response" strategy endorsed by the U.S. military-political leadership in 1961 and adopted by NATO in 1967. It remains the official NATO strategy to this day. Proceeding from the assumption that a total nuclear war will play the decisive role in achieving the ends of imperialism—American imperialism above all—this strategy provides for the possibility of "limited" war, with both conventional and nuclear weapons being used.

In the opinion of NATO strategists, such a war, were it to break out in Europe, would first assume the form of an armed conflict without nuclear weapons. Later it could develop into a "limited" nuclear war—or, in a critical situation, into a total war. Nuclear weapons vary in type and function, and can be used in various ways even at the "limited" stage of a nuclear conflict in the theatre of war or even in individual theatres of operations. This, and the danger of such a "limited" conflict growing over into a total nuclear war, gave rise to the "nuclear threshold" and "nuclear escalation" problems. In the opinion of the Pentagon strategists and their West European partners in NATO, nuclear and other "thresholds" are to ensure a systematic escalation of hostilities and a "dosed" use of nuclear weapons.

No secret is made of NATO's intention to take the initiative in "nuclear escalation" and to be the first to cross the "nuclear threshold," if necessary. General Bernard Rogers,

the NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, admitted that "a distinctive feature of Flexible Response is NATO's preparedness to escalate to the first use of nuclear weapons.... This is the nuclear threshold in our strategy." That is why Washington and NATO so stubbornly refuse to follow the Soviet Union in pledging not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

According to the Western press, the Pentagon and NATO have worked out concrete directives for the use of tactical nuclear weapons and have brought them to the notice of the bloc's military bodies. Two of these documents merit special attention. The first—a strictly confidential one—is of a political nature. It lays down the principles of the use of tactical nuclear weapons by NATO and specifies the circumstances and geographical areas in which these weapons can be used. The second document, endorsed by NATO's Defence Planning Committee, relates to intra-NATO political consultations connected with the use of tactical nuclear weapons. NATO publications have reported that under pressure from Washington the Defence Planning Committee had rejected the principle of individual countries having the right to veto the use of nuclear weapons on their territories. It was decided that the President of the United States, who has the final say in the matter, would only conduct close consultations and take the opinions of the interested parties into account. The President's decisions are to be carried out by General Rogers, who has put his deputy, General Hans-Joachim Mack of West Germany, in charge of NATO's nuclear affairs.

The West German Die Welt newspaper reported in openly exultant tones early in September that Rogers had entrusted the West German representative with duties embracing the entire spectrum of questions

connected with nuclear arms, from "target planning" to drawing up annual reports on the NATO armed forces' "nuclear requirements."

Die Welt remarked, however, that General Mack had not been given access to the nuclear button and that Rogers would remain the person issuing orders.

It will be remembered that NATO's nuclear arsenal today comprises about 7,000 rounds of nuclear ammunition. In terms of yield, NATO's nuclear potential is around 460 million tons of TNT. At NATO experts' estimates, this is enough to wipe out all of Europe.

But the U.S. strategists do not seem to be content with that. They have begun the deployment of qualitatively new medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe under the pretext that the U.S.A. and NATO have "fallen behind" the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty member states militarily.

This is a deliberate deception. Statistics prove beyond doubt, as many Western statesmen and military experts agree, that before the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles arrived in Europe approximate parity had been maintained there in medium-range nuclear missiles, while in terms of nuclear warheads NATO was well ahead. Denis Healey, a prominent British politician, said during a parliamentary debate on the "missile option" that the only purpose of deploying the American nuclear missiles in Europe was to be able to strike a blow without getting involved in a nuclear war, thus confining the war to Europe and sparing the United States.

To what extent this may alter the level of the "nuclear threshold" will be seen from the following. In the 1960s and 1970s a "limited" nuclear war in Europe was regarded merely as the first step in a "nuclear escalation" towards crossing the total nuclear war "threshold," rather than as an independent act of aggression against the Soviet Union. In other words, in running the risk of a "limited" nuclear war, Washington was compelled to take into account the fact that such a war would inevitably lead to a total nuclear conflict with all the ensuing consequences for the United States.

The military-strategic parity, i.e., the possession by the sides of nuclear potentials comprising nuclear delivery vehicles of approximately equal range, yield, accuracy and—

what is especially important—equal delivery time, guarantees each side the possibility of striking a retaliatory blow capable of destroying the aggressor. Harold Brown, the one-time U.S. Secretary of Defence, admitted that nuclear parity would play the role of a deterrent in critical periods.

The present Administration cannot reconcile itself to that. It is bent on pulling ahead and upsetting the present global and regional equilibrium. The U.S. strategists pin particular hopes on their medium-range nuclear missiles, regarding them as means not only of lowering the "nuclear threshold" but also of backing their "first strike" concept with a new material base.

After all, it takes a Pershing 2 a mere 8-10 minutes to reach its target, not 25-30 minutes. This tends to create the illusion that they can be used with impunity. Cruise missiles are slower but extremely accurate and hard to detect by radar, which places them in the same category of nuclear weapons. Thomas K. Siemer, an American who took part in developing them, has written that cruise missiles are, without a doubt, offensive first-strike weapons developed for the concrete purpose of hitting Soviet missiles right in their silos, and accurate enough to do that. He added that hitting a silo-based missile was tantamount to a first strike.

Thus, the real purpose of the American missiles is attack, not defence. Washington strategists accept the possibility of unleashing a nuclear war confined to the geographical limits of Europe. Their reasoning is that although such a war would take an enormous toll of human life it would do so far away from their own territory which will emerge unscathed from a nuclear conflagration.

The same purpose is pursued by Reagan's programme for setting up an anti-missile defence system in outer space. Western papers point out that the establishment of the American anti-missile system would divide NATO member states into two categories: one (the U.S. and

part of Canada) covered by the anti-missile umbrella, and the other (the West European countries) left without any such protection. While setting its sights on sealing its own skies tight, the U.S. without a scruple exposes its allies to a retaliatory blow by deploying its first-strike weapons on their territories. This is the idea of the "defensive" space arms programme.

To complete the picture of the evolution of the Pentagon strategists' "nuclear threshold" thinking, mention should be made of Washington's attempts to link the level of this "threshold" with the might of NATO's conventional armed forces and thus to justify the need for a conventional arms race.

On any occasion—be it a NATO session, a U.S. top brass visit to Europe or a discussion of "European defence" problems—the allies are urged to shell out for conventional weapons under the pretext that NATO allegedly lags behind the Warsaw Treaty Organization in such weapons. The conventional weapons in question are of a highly sophisticated kind, with combat capabilities approaching those of nuclear arms.

Since these weapons are, after all, non-nuclear, the U.S. hopes that, using them, it will restrict a war against the U.S.S.R. to the geographical bounds of Europe, i.e., that this war will be waged by Europeans and will be less likely to spread to U.S. territory than a nuclear one. In other words, Washington and NATO are seeking to make Europe the arena of a "limited" war involving "borderline" conventional weapons which would allow a smooth change-over to a nuclear conflict.

The deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe and the development of qualitatively new types of conventional weapons not only spur on the arms race, but lower the "nuclear threshold" and increase the danger of a disastrous holocaust.

This is the gist of the Pentagon's scenario in which Western Europe is assigned the role of a "nuclear magnet."

HITTING ALLIES IN THE POCKETBOOK

VYACHESLAV BOIKOV

"In Ronald Reagan, the Pentagon has found its staunchest friend in years—and in his mammoth defence budgets, it has entered what may well be a 'golden age.'"

This observation in the U.S. News-week magazine is no overstatement. Never before has U.S. peacetime military spending soared as it has under the Reagan Administration. Since 1981 it has increased by 75 per cent and in the 1985 fiscal year Pentagon appropriations will break all records and come close to \$300 billion—more than double the biggest military budget during the Carter presidency.

Under the present Administration the ten-warhead MX missile has gone on the conveyor, the B-1B bomber programme has been re-animated, and the cruise missile and other strategic novelties have been put into mass production. Practical preparations have begun for waging "star wars." Nor can the other branches of the armed forces complain of not being paid enough attention. But even though Federal budget deficits hang like a Damocles' sword over the U.S. financial system, the hawks' appetite continues to grow faster than the budgets.

The Administration is trying to fill the gap between the desired and the possible at the expense of its allies. For instance, the U.S. is out to shift onto the shoulders of the other NATO countries a part of its costly and certainly not creditable police functions in the Third World.

Addressing a session of the North Atlantic Assembly in Luxemburg, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State W. Tapley Bennett sharply criticized the West Europeans, most of whom are not evincing readiness to render the Americans "even passive support" outside the official NATO zone of operations. "European reluctance to do more for so-called 'out-of-area' security," the Washington emissary thundered, "could weaken Alliance solidarity [and] question the value of the Alliance."

Seconding Bennett, the pro-NATO weekly Western World described the Western concept of international security in these terms: "If these two wings [of the bloc, Western Europe and the U.S.—V.B.] were of equal global influence, the Soviets would be permanently reduced to their regional power." In other words, an attempt is being made to involve the West Europeans in the realization of Ronald Reagan's dangerous design for a worldwide anti-communist crusade.

Having begun the deployment of its new nuclear missiles in Western Europe, Washington is now pressing on its allies to take a more active part in the implementation of sweeping plans for the modernization of conventional armed forces. And to a certain extent it is succeeding in this. At their last meeting in Brussels the NATO Defence Ministers announced a new, electronic round in the arms build-up, agreeing to devote prime attention to a number of systems based on the latest achievements in military technology.

The British Economist has described one of these innovations—the Assault Breaker system which belongs in the category of "thinking weapons." Each of its missiles will carry some 80 armour-piercing shells which it will spill out over enemy troop concentrations. After which each shell, equipped as it will be with its own guidance system, will seek out its target and destroy it.

Intensive work is under way to develop a new generation of means of electronic warfare designed to "stun" and "blind" the adversary. At the same time special attention is being devoted to ensure the "survival" of one's own armaments. The purpose of all this is sharply to increase the potential of conventional armaments, and hence also the danger with which their use is fraught.

Innovations of this order are costly. Their development and production requires spending running

into tens and hundreds of billions of dollars. Hence the debates that have erupted over the problem of financing the new round in the arms race.

At their May meeting the NATO Defence Ministers approved a programme for the development of their armed forces in 1985-90, which envisages an annual increase of military budgets by 3.2 per cent. But no sooner had this commitment been undertaken than Washington declared it inadequate.

Speaking at the Brussels Centre for European Policy Studies on May 25, NATO Supreme Commander in Europe General Bernard Rogers demanded that the West Europeans match their senior partner and increase their military spending by 7 per cent annually. Otherwise, he threatened, Congress might recall part of the U.S. forces stationed in Europe. And this, he said, would leave the allies defenceless.

Faced as they are with serious economic problems, the West Europeans have not evinced a desire to fork out. Rogers' prediction has begun to come true. Senator Sam Nunn has proposed that the U.S. legislators consider the partial withdrawal of U.S. military personnel from Europe if the allies do not increase their contribution. In mid-June, however, the Senate turned down Nunn's idea on the grounds that the stationing of U.S. armed forces in Europe is primarily and most of all in the United States' interests. At the same time the Senate warned the allies that it could return to the problem in the future if they do not substantially increase their military spending. Commenting on the debate, Senator Nunn admitted that it did not enter into his plans to reduce the U.S. military presence in Europe. "The main objective," he said, "is to provoke European allies into doing more."

The same purpose is pursued also by a Pentagon report published in mid-July which maintains that the U.S. is spending more on the defence of Western Europe than the West Europeans themselves. In order to squeeze more money out of its allies, the Pentagon is playing ducks and drakes with statistics.

According to NATO figures, the West Europeans account for 90 per cent of the numerical strength of the bloc's forces on the continent and 80 per cent of its tanks and aircraft. The Pentagon report does not tally even with its own conclusions. No earlier than March this year U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger told Congress that the United States' allies were carrying "their fair share of the overall burden."

ing ever stronger pressure to bear on it. By urging Spain to join the bloc's military bodies, they are out to gain possession of such "trump cards" as Spain's advantageous strategic position, its manpower and material resources. All this, in NATO's view, should give it additional advantages over the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

From the very outset, Washington has sought to get the Madrid government to change those aspects of its policy that are undesirable for the



Who gains by Basque terrorism!

Photo from Panorama (Italy)

United States. State Secretary Shultz and Defence Secretary Weinberger tried to convince the Spanish leaders that only alignment with the U.S. and NATO membership can provide a solid groundwork for Spain's foreign policy. Washington has secured renewal of the agreement on friendship and co-operation with Madrid which—even with the subsequent reservations taken into account—is designed to keep Spain in line with the West's overall policy.

The U.S. is making active use of financial and economic levers to pressure the Socialist cabinet. Washington has repeatedly given Madrid to understand that abandoning the referendum idea could be rewarded by bigger investments and by credits from international economic organizations in which the U.S. sets the tone.

Some of the Socialist Party leaders fear that Madrid's withdrawal from NATO would entail economic boycott.

The pro-Atlantic circles are making

use of other unsolved problems, such as the terrorism of the Basque extremists operating from bases in French border areas. For a long time the Socialist government's attempts to induce France to co-operate more actively in tackling the problem of terrorism were unsuccessful. At the end of 1983, however, Paris suddenly changed its position in the matter. The newspaper *El Pais* associated this change with the actions of other NATO countries which link concessions to Spain in the matter of terrorism with that country's membership in the North Atlantic bloc. Attempts of this order are revealed ever more clearly also in the talks on Spain joining the Common Market.

The U.S. State Department has worked out, jointly with the CIA, a plan for "destabilizing" the Socialist government. According to the Spanish *Actual* magazine, the plan provides for setting some ministers against others so as to provoke a government crisis.

The leadership of the North Atlantic bloc is playing a notable part in the campaign of pressure on the Spanish government. Shortly before he resigned his post, Joseph Luns, the former NATO Secretary-General, called upon the Spanish government to postpone the referendum. Luns made no secret of his concern over the fact that most Spaniards want their country out of NATO.

A comparison between the returns of the 1981 and 1983 public opinion polls shows that the number of Spaniards wishing the country to withdraw from NATO grew by 13 per cent and constituted 56 per cent of the total population. Anti-NATO feeling is running ever higher against the background of public anxiety about the growing danger of nuclear war. An anti-war movement has emerged and is gaining momentum in Spain, its chief slogan being "referendum without delay." The 30th Congress of the SWPS, scheduled for December, will probably be decisive in shaping the government's stand in the matter of Spain's relationship with NATO.

I. MIKHLIN

NT COMMENT

THE TWO AGAINST

In an interview granted the Tunisian newspaper *Presse de Tunisie* Massamba Sarre of Senegal, Chairman of the U.N. Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, described the recent Soviet proposals on a Middle East settlement as "a most interesting initiative consonant with the U.N. resolutions and those of the last year's International Conference on Palestine in Geneva." The communiqué of the ninth regional U.N. seminar on the Palestine problem held in Tunis in mid-August stresses that the new Soviet proposals on the Middle East pave the way to a comprehensive, just and stable settlement in the region and meet the basic interests of all Middle East countries and peoples.

The Soviet proposals have been approved by the majority of the Arab countries as providing the key to a cardinal settlement of the protracted conflict. The only ones opposed to these initiatives are the Israeli rulers and their patron, the U.S. Administration. They are opposed for the simple reason that absence of a settlement and continuing tension in this region provide favourable conditions to give effect to the expansionist, hegemonistic schemes of the "strategic allies."

This is borne out by fresh reports about the crimes perpetrated by the invaders on the occupied Arab territories. In its desire to swallow up Southern Lebanon, Tel Aviv has blocked to all traffic the only road connecting the occupied southern part of Lebanon with the rest of the country. What's more, the Israelis are carrying out a monstrous project to divert water from Lebanese rivers to Israel. They are speeding up the construction of settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan. They make barbarous raids on Palestinian refugee camps and other localities in Southern Lebanon.

These crimes are not being committed with impunity, of course. The patriots of Southern Lebanon are offering stubborn resistance.

The task, however, is to eliminate once and for all this hotbed of tension that has been smouldering for so many years. The Soviet proposals point a realistic way to achieving this.

A. USVATOV

In accusing its partners of parasitism and trying to make the U.S. pay for their well-being, Washington is clearly distorting the facts. The West Europeans have far more reasons to be dissatisfied with their transatlantic ally.

The Pentagon's "golden age" is costing the U.S. economy a heavy price. For one thing, it is in debt up to the ears. During the Reagan presidency the U.S. federal debt has nearly doubled, spilling over the \$1.5 trillion mark. Unable to cover all the Pentagon spending by its own resources, the U.S. has dipped into the pockets of its allies. The device used to attract foreign capital to the United States is the jacking up of the bank rate. Last year alone \$86 billion found its way into the



A personal computer, a complex communications system, a weapon that can fire grenades, bullets and smoke bombs—this is how NATO visualizes the equipment of its troops in the year 2000.

Photo from Stars and Stripes (U.S.)

U.S. in this manner. Thus, the allies are made to finance part of the American arms build-up.

The Pentagon's appetite is truly insatiable. It needs ever more billions, and the Reagan Administration has devised a new bait to bring them in. Until July, one third of all interest earnings on capital invested in the United States went for taxes. For American creditors this law still remains in force, but foreign investors are exempt from this tax. Time magazine comments that West Europeans regard expedients of this

order as robbing them of capital, bleeding their economy white and retarding business activity and restructuring of industry.

"Recent American efforts to stem the flow of Western high-technology goods to the Soviet Union and other East bloc countries have further soured the atmosphere," Newsweek observes. "Europeans resent those efforts because they do not square with European notions of détente, and because they hit Europe in the pocketbook."

But it is no simple matter to stand up to pressure from so powerful and arrogant an ally. Especially for the small countries, which are at times compelled to take decisions that run counter to their national interests. A case in point is what is known in Belgium as the Pégard affair.

Speaking in the Senate in mid-July, Belgian Minister of External Relations Leo Tindemans declared against granting the Pégard works a licence for the export to the U.S.S.R. of a horizontal boring mill. Why? The machine tool, the Minister claimed, could be used in the manufacture of missiles. And the West did not propose to help strengthen the Soviet Union's military might. Besides, Washington was against the deal.

The Minister's statement was widely commented. In Andenne, where the Pégard works is located, a press conference was held at which the factory experts said the machine had no value for the war industry. On the other hand, the big Soviet order enabled the works to escape financial collapse. Besides, it ensured jobs for 280 workers for two years. Mayor Claude Eerdeken sent Tindemans a letter accusing him of "deliberate circulation of fabrications" and of pursuing a pro-American policy. In protest Pégard production and office workers demonstratively burned their national passports. The trade unions demanded fulfilment of the contract. Business circles too voiced fears that the move could have a negative effect on Soviet-Belgian co-operation, which is making good headway.

Compelled to react in some way to

these protests, the government asked the Vincotte firm to give its expert opinion on whether the machine tool was of strategic value. The unanimous opinion of the experts was that it was not. The firm's specialists presented a list of American and West European companies which had already supplied equipment of this type to socialist countries. They also pointed out that the Soviet Union possessed analogous technology of its own.

Everything would seem to be perfectly clear. But the U.S. Administration was guided by its own logic in pressuring Brussels. In the cold-war years the U.S. banker and politician Bernard Baruch formulated that logic thus: "Everything has a potential military significance, except, possibly, bubble gum." In the end Washington had its way. On August 9, Belgian Economics Minister Mark Eyskens announced the government's decision. The boring mill would not be exported to the U.S.S.R. but would be acquired by the Belgian Army for use in repairing motor vehicles and other similar purposes.

Voicing the sentiments of the public, the Belgian press sharply criticized the decision. The Soviet contract, press commentators noted, was worth a billion francs. The United States had only given worthless promises. For instance, it had promised to find an American or West European buyer for the equipment, but had not kept its word. In the opinion of press commentators the Pégard affair had damaged not only Belgium's business reputation but the political credibility of the government, which had behaved as if the country's problems are resolved not in Brussels but in Washington. "Brussels," *Le Soir* caustically remarked, "is not yet Grenada."

In the light of all this one can hardly disagree with the opinion of the West German Frankfurter Rundschau that "our American 'friends' are pursuing a policy towards Western Europe which is nothing but a new variety of economic imperialism."

Brussels.

"THE GEM OF AFRICA"— LIGHT AND SHADOW

On August 7, the government of Uganda abrogated the agreement on military co-operation with the U.S., and asked Colonel Baker, the U.S. military attaché, to leave the country. A government spokesman explained that Uganda had taken this step in reply to Washington's slanderous campaign against Uganda and because the U.S. had taken anti-government bands under its protection.

Such meddling in the republic's internal affairs hinders the government's efforts to overcome the pernicious consequences of Idi Amin's dictatorship and to suppress anti-government bands. The imperialists cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that the government of Uganda wants to pursue an independent policy.

Formerly a British colony, the country got its independence in 1962, and in 1967 was proclaimed a republic. The people's struggle for independence was led by the Uganda People's Congress party (UPC) of which the present President Milton Obote has always been the leader.

No sooner had the young republic begun to tackle the problems involved in overcoming the onerous legacy of colonialism than it came under the despotic rule of Idi Amin, a cruel and ambitious dictator who seized power in the country in 1971. The years of his rule were truly dark years in the history of Uganda. Many statesmen and public figures, including President Milton Obote, left the country to escape persecution and quite a few specialists, scientists and teachers emigrated.

The years of the dictatorship were disastrous for Uganda's economy. The output of the key export crops—the famous Ugandan coffee, cotton, tea, tobacco—dwindled sharply. The trade system was disrupted, corruption was rife and smuggling flourished. State funds were embezzled. The nascent industry was gripped by crisis and operated at less than 20 per cent of capacity.

A reign of terror prevailed. After

the fall of the dictatorship, newspapers reported that half a million people in this country with a population of 12 million had perished in dungeons in the eight years of Amin's rule.

After the dictator's troops seized a part of the territory of neighbouring Tanzania in the Kagera River region, the Tanzanian government, together with units of Ugandan émigrés, took combat action against Amin. Lacking support inside the country, Amin lost the war. In 1979 his regime collapsed, and the dictator himself fled abroad.

The majority of the people greeted Milton Obote's comeback with enthusiasm. He enjoys greater prestige and popularity than any other Ugandan statesman and his name is inseparably associated with the Ugandan people's fight for national independence. Milton Obote seeks to lead the country along the road of economic and social progress. He has repeatedly stressed that the policy of the government and the UPC is aimed at protecting the interests of the working people.

However, Milton Obote's return was by no means to everyone's liking. The reactionary forces, having been defeated in the elections, rose against the UPC government—some of them arms in hand. Bands of Amin's henchmen are still operating in the country, committing acts of terror and subversion. Capitalizing on the contradictions between northern and southern tribes, the reactionary forces are trying to overthrow the government.

Imperialist propaganda is fanning the internal strife. Western news agencies refer to the bands operating in various parts of the country as "guerrillas." The governments of a number of Western countries have a hand in this propaganda campaign. A U.S. State Department report alleged, for instance, that the government of Uganda had lost control over the army. Dr David Anyoti, Uganda's Minister of Information and Broadcasting, said that the Reuter, UPI, AP



Independence monument in Kampala.

and France-Press agencies invariably distort the image of any country if the progressive processes under way there do not live up to their expectations.

The fight against anti-government bands diverts the forces of the nation from solving its socio-economic problems, of which there are no few.

Above all, it is necessary to modernize agriculture, to revive industry which operates far below capacity, and to get trade and the transport system back to normal.

Despite all the difficulties, the country has made some headway over the past five years. In 1981-83, for example, its gross national product grew at an average rate of five per cent a year. The output of export farm crops has increased. The average monthly currency receipts increased from \$8 million in 1981 to \$45 million in the last quarter of 1983. Today Uganda is one of the few African countries whose economies are definitely on their way up. While most countries of the continent have to import food owing to the recent drought, Uganda not only produces all the food it needs, but, thanks to its extremely fertile soil and its government's wise economic policy, has even resumed food

TEN REASONS FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF SPAIN FROM NATO

Extracts from a CC Document, Communist Party of Spain

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain held a plenary meeting in Madrid on January 11 and 12, 1986. The meeting adopted a document entitled "Peace Is Possible. Proposal for a Foreign and Defence Policy Outside NATO". We print below Section Six of the document.

1. NATO poses a grave menace to the security of Spain and would turn our country into a first target in the event of a nuclear conflagration. Spanish membership of NATO is bound to result in the deployment of nuclear weapons on our national territory and add to the insecurity of all Spaniards.

2. NATO does not meet our security and national defence requirements, since it neither guarantees the territorial integrity of Spain, including the restitution of Gibraltar, nor serves as a factor in containing third countries.

3. Spanish membership in NATO is an anachronism from the point of view of the country's foreign policy, if the model of international relations which emerged after World War II is recognised in deeds and not in words alone. NATO is based on a distorted vision of a complex world wrestling with grave economic and demographic problems and great imbalances, a world with scant natural resources that cannot be renewed. What the world needs today is neutrality, a new system of international relations, and growing relations with the foremost progressive and peace-loving currents fighting for a just, balanced and democratic international order. Neutrality is an option for the present and the future, aimed against all that is outdated and is symbolised by membership of any military bloc.

4. Spanish membership makes a reckless arms race obligatory and militarising our economy still more to meet the "defence" requirements of a big power, the United States, while ignoring the real needs of our national defence, which should be independent and effective.

5. The presence of Spain in NATO is an anti-European option, since it makes us more dependent on the United States. Europe should play a much more autonomous role in the world as it seeks unity and champions detente, disarmament, and fruitful cooperation with Third World countries. For us, to join the United States would mean failing to identify ourselves with Europe.

They all should, irrespective of differing political, philosophical and religious views, contribute to strengthening the peace movement.

We Communists are working hard to make 1986 Easter marches a striking show of the will for peace and disarmament; we want all peace forces in this country, the working class movement and the peace movement, Social Democrats and Communists, Christians, Liberals and the Greens, all who cherish a peaceful future for our people, to join hands in these marches against the Federal Republic's participation in the militarisation of space, for the elimination of nuclear weapons, removal of Pershings II from this country and non-deployment of cruise missiles.

Like in recent years, we Communists support an effective contribution by the working class movement to the success of these marches. Representatives of work teams and trade unions as well as members of production councils should explain at their meetings that the campaign for peace and for human survival itself are closely linked with the fight in defence of democratic and social rights of the working class and trade unions.

We support a big demonstration planned by the peace drive co-ordination committee for October 11, 1986, at Hasselbach, Hunsrück,

where US cruise missiles are being installed. Five Cologne Points calling for abandonment of missile deployment, lower military spending and rejecting militarisation of space are the political basis for this major action.

We stress the importance of what we said at the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the party Board. In the coming weeks we must show the vast scale of resistance to the insane arms race, using numerous initiatives to still farther promote the peace movement. What is needed is a broad dissemination of information through wide-ranging information measures and protest actions; massive collection of signatures in towns and villages; polls on the national scale; parliamentary initiatives at all levels; demonstrations, primarily outside plants which could be involved in the SDI; more action by scientists opposed to participation in the SDI. We favour all manner of protest—newspaper ads, congresses, forums and hearings capable of rallying more and more people in this country in the drive for peace.

The Soviet Union's comprehensive programme of eliminating nuclear weapons makes us still more confident that the threat of nuclear disaster could be averted and the world's peaceful future secured provided the forces of peace and reason join hands to achieve that!

It follows that a truly European approach must be anti-Atlanticist and reveal the untenability of the arguments of those who advocate "progressive Europeanism" while staying in NATO.

Indeed, it is neutrality that meets the interests of Europe, since it makes the autonomy of the continent its goal and refuses to submit to blocs or to the United States.

6. NATO encroaches on the principle of national sovereignty, since it prevents the pursuit of an independent and active foreign policy. It limits Spain's opportunities in the world and is leading us to international isolation.

Neutrality assures the international position of our country prestige and leverage and enables Spain to carry on a foreign policy in line with its historical, cultural and geographical characteristics.

7. NATO prevents Spain from identifying itself with Latin American countries. We are made to renounce solidarity with them on the problem of their external debt. In colonial conflicts, such as the Malvinas conflict, we will have to back our Atlantic allies while in conflicts like the Central American it would be impossible to take an independent stand or search for peaceful solutions.

8. NATO will bind our country to defend positions running counter to the aspirations of the majority of Arab states by forcing us to unconditionally recognise Israel and support US interests in the Middle East. All this will gravely endanger the development of relations with the Arab world, which is one of the natural foreign policy lines of Spain.

9. NATO prevents broader democracy in Spain, fearing that democratically expressed national interests may win the upper hand over the militarist interests of the North Atlantic bloc.

10. The withdrawal of Spain from NATO is a national necessity. It is a question of defending our sovereignty and the independence of our armed forces, of pursuing an independent foreign policy, safeguarding the security of all Spaniards and working for the lasting goals of peace, disarmament and international detente. This is why we appeal to the conscience of all Spaniards irrespective of their ideological allegiance, so that we may fully restore the national sovereignty of Spain by joint efforts in the upcoming referendum.

Abridged from *Mundo Obrero*, January 23-29, 1986

Colombia

TASKS IN THE CURRENT ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Statement by a CC Plenary Meeting of the Colombian Communist Party

The Central Committee of the Colombian Communist Party held a plenary meeting in Bogota on January 10 and 11, 1986. The meeting considered the political situation in the country, the Communists' tasks in current election campaign and inner-party matters.

The main report was presented by Alvaro Vásquez, member of the CCP Executive Committee. He described the domestic political situation as tense due to reaction's stepped-up resistance to the democratic process and the election campaign of the Left. He said that lately reactionaries have carried out a series of terrorist acts against party and trade union activists as well as against the political movement of the Left—

the Patriotic Union. Their purpose is to intimidate the democratic sections of the population and discourage them from joining actively in the election campaign.

Gilberto Vieira, CCP CC General Secretary, who addressed the meeting, emphasised that the Communists must take an active part in the election campaign, intensify their agitation and propaganda effort, expose reactionary schemes aimed at undermining the democratisation process and building up tensions in the country, close their ranks, and work to win the confidence of the masses.

The meeting approved an electoral appeal of the CCP Central Committee. The text of the appeal follows.

The campaign for the renewal of city councils, departmental assemblies and parliament and for the election of a president of the Republic is unfolding amid the restrictions imposed by the state of siege and against the background of an increasing militarisation of the country. The formation of a mercenary corps and the call-up of thousands of reservists tend to aggravate the situation. This seriously

VORIO-870831DR44

NATO "PREMIERES"

Vladislav Drobkov

NATO has feverishly stepped up its militarist activity of late on the territory of Western Europe, in its skies and in the seas washing its shores. Thousands of American soldiers are being airlifted from overseas. Military transports with hardware are crossing the Atlantic. Tanks, self-propelled artillery and other weapons systems are being put in combat readiness at numerous US bases and special depots set in advance in Europe. Soon this entire avalanche of weaponry is to move to the FRG, to unite with the Bundeswehr forces. British troops are to head there in the immediate future as well.

The latest series of NATO's autumn manoeuvres is thus getting under way. Reforger-87, which is already in progress, is devoted to practicing the transfer of NATO reinforcements to a "theatre of hostilities". Ocean Safari-87, which begins on August 31, will gather in the North Atlantic almost 150 warships and 250 aircraft from ten NATO countries. The Cold Fire-87 air force exercises are to unfold in Central Europe. Slated for mid-September in the FRG are the Certain Strike manoeuvres, in which 90,000 officers and men from the US, Great Britain, West Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands are to take part.

Perhaps the recurrence of NATO's militarist fever every autumn is not deserving of particular commentary in and of itself. It's NATO's job, after all, to keep the allies under constant tension. However, the current manoeuvres differ from the previous ones in a number of respects.

Thus, for the first time, Reforger-87 involves upwards of 30,000 American servicemen, who are being urgently transferred from the US to Europe. This scope is evidently

Mon Aug 31 1987

6

-2-

called upon to demonstrate to the allies the firmness of the "American commitments to defend Europe". Some NATO capitals are voicing "apprehensions" over a possible weakening of such commitments if the US and the USSR scrap their medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. And Washington expects the mass troop transfer to calm the allies.

Nor can the possibility be ruled out that by generously sending its forces to Europe, the Pentagon intends to stimulate the involvement of some NATO members in US watchdog functions in the Persian Gulf. It is an open secret that the US has long been after its partners in the bloc to extend its "zone of responsibility" beyond current frontiers, promising to fill the "gap in the defence of Europe" which can form as a result of NATO subunits and ships being sent to foreign shores.

Another new feature of the current exercises is the broad involvement in them of Spain, which formally is not a part of the bloc's military structure. France, which formally has the same status, is taking a more active part in NATO's militarist efforts as well.

Thus, NATO's military games this autumn stand out for both scope and number of participants. However, the goal which they pursue--to hamper detente in Europe--remains unchanged.

(Pravda, August 29. In full.)

"Literaturnaya Gazeta" 28.3.1984; No 13

NATO KURMAYINI KİM YÖNETİYOR?

(Ernst Henri)

Kuzey Atlantik Bloku'nun Brüksel'deki merkezinde, tepede değişiklik oldu. NATO'nun uzun yıllar genel sekreterliğini yapan Hollanda'lı "diplomat" Jozef Luns emekliye ayrılıyor. Onun yerine, İngiltere dış-
eski işleri/bakanlarından Lord Karington atanmış bulunuyor.

NATO aygıtının üst yönetimindeki bu reorganizasyon neyi gösteriyor? Burada kadro açısından bir yer değişimi mi söz konusudur? Yoksa NATO Kurmayında daha başka şeyler mi gözleniyor?

NATO Merkezi'nin kapalı kapılar ardındaki loş salonlarında olup bitenler, öyle kolay kolay dışarıya yansımıyor. Örneğin, "soğuk savaş"ın en harlı olduğu 50'li ve 60'lı yıllarda Hollanda dışişleri bakanlığı görevinde bulunan ve daha o dönemde aşırı antisovyetik görüş ve tutumlarıyla Batı dünyasında "yıldız" parlayan Luns'un kişiliğinin birçok yanlarının gizli kalması için, NATO genel sekreterliği görevine yükselişinin bir "sır" olarak kalması için hala özengü gösteriliyor. Luns'un "emekliye" ayrılması olayını, NATO'nun saldırgan çizgisinde bir yumuşama yol açabilecek bir gelişme olarak yorumlama olasılığı var mıdır? Anlaşıyor ki böyle bir olasılık yok. Daha doğrusu, bunun tersi gözleniyor.

Luns'un sırrı

Luns'un "parlak kariyeri" hem bilinen hem de "bilinmeyen" nedenlerle açıklanıyordu. Karısı ~~Yvonne~~ baronesa Van-Heemstir aracılığıyla Hollanda aristokrasisine bağlanan Jozef Luns uzun yıllar boyunca sağcı Hollanda Katolik Partisi'nin (şimdi Hristiyan-Demokrat Partisi) çeşitli yönetim kademelerinde bulunmuştur. Kardeşi ise Hollanda Nazi partisinin militanlarındandır. Luns'un nazi partisine üyeliği yalanlanmaya çalışılsa da, kimi belgeler Luns'un nazilere büyük sempatisi olduğunu ve hatta bir süre bu partide çalıştığını kanıtlamaktadır. Ancak daha önemlisi, Luns'un Hollanda askersel-sanayi kompleksleriyle sıkı işbirliği

işbirliği içinde oluşdur. Ve, kural olarak bu gizli tutulmuştur?

Ülkenin yönetimini elinde tutan bu kompleksin en güçlü finans grubunun başında uzun yıllar multi-milyoner Fentener van-Flissingen bulunmuştur. Bu grubun içinde, büyüklük bakımında Batı Avrupa'da üçüncü gelen çelik tekeli Hoogovens (şimdi "Estel" tekeli), daha Birinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında Alman ordusuna uçak sağlayan askeri "Fokker" tekeli, dev elektronik araçlar tekeli "Fillips", İngiliz-Hollanda petrol tekeli "Shell" ve Hollanda'nın en büyük bankalarından "Nederlandse Handel Bank" yer almaktadır. Kral ailesinden Alman asıllı prens Bernard fon Lippe bu "aslar" çetesine dahildir.

İşte NATO şefi Luns'un sıkı ilişki ve bağ içinde bulunduğu Van Flissingen grubu ve prens Bernard aracılığıyla Kraliyet ailesi Hollanda'da ~~WWWW~~ Alman büyük sermayesi için bir köprübaşı görevini görmüş ve uzun yıllar Alman sermayesinin acentalığını yapmıştır. Alman tekellerinin en karmaşık işleri bu kanaldan yürütülmüş ve çoğu kez kendini açığa vurmamak isteyen Alman tekellerini bunu bir paravana olarak kullanmışlardır. NATO elebaşısı Luns'un da dahil olduğu bu grup bugün de, "Fokker" şirketi aracılığıyla Batı Alman avio-roket konserni "Messerschmidt"le bağlıdır.

Luns'un "kariyer"inin kökleri işte buralara uzanmaktadır. NATO Genel Sekreterliği koltuğuna oturtulan Josef Luns, bu küçük ama uluslararası finans bağları açısından büyük önemde olan ülkede, silahlanma yarışını sürekli tırmandıran ve silahlanmayı en kârlı iş sayan Amerikan tekelleriyle Batı Alman tekelleri arasında aracılık görevini yapmıştır. Kaba antisovyetik tutumlarıyla Luns, ~~xxxxxx~~ NATO şefi olarak, hem Amerikan hem de Batı Alman militaristlerine, silah tekellerine, yani asıl efendilerine hizmet etmiştir. Van Flissing grubu ^{bu} bu işlerin "yarlayıcısı" rolünü oynamıştır. Ve kendine düşen payı almıştır. Luns'un NATO genel sekreterliği görevinde uzun süre kalmasında önemli rolü olan prens Bernard ise "Fokker"tekellerinin en büyük hissedarı olarak, bu tekelin senetlerinin yüzde 25'ini Amerikan

askersel korporasyonu "Nortrop" aktarmış ve böylece "Nortrop"un da ortaklarından biri olmuştur.

Aynı penens Bernard'ın Amerikan "Lokhit" uçak şirketinde/büyük miktarda rüşvet aldığı ve bu büyük skandalın üstünü örtmek için Luns'un başında bulunduğu NATO Kurmayı'nın ne gibi entrikalar çevirdiği bilinmektedir. Bilinen, Batı basınında bile sık sık değinilen bir başka olgu daha var: Prens Bernard ve Luns grubunun "Bildenberg Klübü/bü"nün yönettiğidir. Bu Klüp, bilindiği gibi Amerikan ve Batı Avrupa devlet adamlarının, NATO generallerinin yarı-gizli, yarı-açık bir örgütüdür ve her yıl Batı dünyasının "gözden ırak", تنها bir yerinde toplanmaktadır. Pentagon, bütün bunlardan memnundur. Çünkü Luns gibi bir kişi aracılığıyla NATO'nun dizginleri hep Pentagon'un ellerinde tutulmuştur.

Luns, Amerikan ve Batı Alman ~~tekellerinin~~ militaristlerini birbirine bağlama ve ~~yavaş~~ "yapışık kardeşler" durumuna getirme yönünde kendisine verilen görevi yerine getirmiştir ve şimdi köşesine çekilmektedir. Onun yerini ise, onun gibi bir antisovyetik İngiliz "diplomat"ı almaya hazırlanıyor. Kimdir bu "diplomat"?

Rotsild'in çömezi: Lord Karrington?

Thursday, June 12, 1986

VOSS2-860612-501

1

WARSAW TREATY ORGANISATION
POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE COMMUNIQUE

June 10-11, 1986 saw the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance in Budapest.

The meeting was attended by:

From the People's Republic of Bulgaria -- Todor Zhivkov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and Chairman of the State Council of Bulgaria, head of delegation; Georgi Atanasov, member of the Politbureau of the BCP Central Committee and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria; Peter Mladenov, member of the Politbureau of the BCP Central Committee and Foreign Minister of Bulgaria; Milko Balev, member of the Politbureau of the BCP Central Committee and Secretary to the BCP Central Committee; Dobri Djourov, member of the Politbureau of the BCP Central Committee and Minister of National Defence of Bulgaria; and Dimitr Stanishev, Secretary of the BCP Central Committee;

From the Hungarian People's Republic -- Janos Kadar, General Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, head of delegation; Gyorgy Lazar, member of the Politbureau of the HSWP Central Committee and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Hungary; Matyas Szuros, Secretary to the HSWP Central Committee; Peter Varkonyi, member of the HSWP Central Committee and Foreign Minister of Hungary; and Ferenc Karpati, member of the HSWP Central Committee and Defence Minister of Hungary;

From the German Democratic Republic -- Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR, head of delegation; Willi Stoph, member of the

Politbureau of the SUPG Central Committee and Chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; Hermann Axen, member of the Politbureau and Secretary to the SUPG Central Committee; Heinz Kessler, member of the Politbureau of the SUPG Central Committee and Minister of National Defence of the GDR; Egon Krenz, member of the Politbureau and Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee and Vice Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR; Guenter Mittag, member of the Politbureau and Secretary to the SUPG Central Committee and Vice Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR; and Oskar Fischer, member of the SUPG Central Committee and Foreign Minister of the GDR;

From the Polish People's Republic -- Wojciech Jaruzelski, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and Chairman of the Council of State of Poland, head of delegation; Zbigniew Messner, member of the Politbureau of the PUWP Central Committee and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Poland; Josef Czyrek, member of the Politbureau and Secretary of the PUWP Central Committee; Marian Orzechowski, alternate member of the Politbureau of the PUWP Central Committee and Foreign Minister of Poland; and Florian Siwicki, alternate member of the Politbureau of the PUWP Central Committee and Minister of National Defence of Poland;

From the Socialist Republic of Romania -- Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, head of delegation; Constantin Dascalescu, member of the Executive Political Committee of the RCP Central Committee and Prime Minister of the government of Romania; Ion Stoian, alternate member of the Executive Political Committee and Secretary to the RCP Central Committee; Vasile Milea, alternate member of the Executive Political Committee of the RCP Central Committee and Minister of National Defence of Romania; Ilie Vaduva, member

of the RCP Central Committee and Foreign Minister of Romania;
and Nicolae Veres, Romania's Ambassador to Hungary;

From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics -

M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee,
head of delegation; A.A. Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of
the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of
the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the
Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the
Council of Ministers of the USSR; E.A. Shevardnadze, member of
the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Minister of
Foreign Affairs of the USSR; S.I. Sokolov, alternate member of
the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Minister of
Defence of the USSR; and V.A. Medvedev, Secretary to the CPSU
Central Committee;

From the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic - Gustav Husak,
General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist
Party of Czechoslovakia and President of the Czechoslovak
Socialist Republic, head of delegation; Lubomir Strougal,
member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPCz
and Chairman of the government of the CSSR; Vasil Bilak,
member of the Presidium of the CPCz Central Committee and
Secretary to the CPCz Central Committee; Milos Jakes, member
of the Presidium of the CPCz Central Committee and Secretary
to the CPCz Central Committee; Bohuslav Chnoupek, member of
the CPCz Central Committee and Minister of Foreign Affairs of
the CSSR; Milan VACLAVIK, member of the CPCz Central Committee
and Minister of National Defence of the CSSR.

The meeting was also attended by the Commander-in-Chief of
the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty Member States,
Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov; and General
Secretary of the PCC, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of
the Hungarian People's Republic Miklos Barity.

Views were exchanged on the situation in Europe and in the

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 4 -

world as a whole, and topical issues in the drive for disarmament, and to restructure international relations, strengthen European and universal security and expand cooperation between states were discussed.

I.

The participants in the meeting expressed serious concern over the tense situation in the world formed as a result of the intensification of the arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race, in connection with the actions of the United States and NATO which refuse to take the road to curbing the arms race, preventing it from spreading to space, and ending nuclear tests. They are avoiding a constructive reply to such a major initiative as the programme proposed by the USSR for totally eliminating weapons of mass destruction by the end of the 20th Century. The deployment in Europe of American medium-range missiles is continuing, manifestations of the imperialist policy of force, of rude interference in the internal affairs of other states are multiplying. The hopes of the peoples for real steps towards disarmament and a return to detente, generated by the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva and the principled accords reached at it, are yet to be fulfilled.

The world has entered a phase in its development when dodging cardinal issues of the day means to put the destiny of Earth civilisation on the line. In the present conditions no single state or group of states can base their own security and well-being on using military force to dictate their will on other countries and peoples. Such a policy, be it called "neoglobalism" or otherwise, has no future. It is baleful to mankind.

It is the cardinal task of our time to defend peace, stop

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 5 -

the arms race and pass on to concrete measures of disarmament first of all in the nuclear field. It is possible to accomplish this task, to overcome the tendency towards mounting danger of war and to bring international relations back into the channel of detente. Mankind can and must block the road to nuclear catastrophe.

The participants in the meeting are firmly convinced that reliable security for all countries and peoples, and peaceful conditions for their development and progress can be ensured only by political means, through concerted efforts by all countries. This position accords with the realities of the nuclear age and is evidence of a high sense of responsibility for the destiny of their peoples and the whole of mankind.

In the present situation there is no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence of states. Today it is more imperative than ever before to strictly observe the principles of respect for national independence and sovereignty non-use of force or the threat of force, inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in internal affairs, equality and other generally recognised standards of international relations.

II.

Reaffirming the topicality of the goals and tasks set out in the statement of October 23, 1985 by the Sofia meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, the members of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation consider it their duty to persistently and consistently press for the elimination of the nuclear threat, for a turn for the better in European and world affairs, and development of fruitful cooperation between countries. The allied socialist states seek to create an

all-embracing international security system covering the military and political, and the economic and humanitarian fields. The fraternal countries' foreign-policy line, expressed in the decisions of the congresses of their ruling parties, is aimed at building a world which would be safe for everyone -- a world without weapons and without wars.

The participants in the meeting resolutely stand for carrying on and deepening the political dialogue between countries with different social systems and giving it a concrete-to-the-maximum and resultative character. This applies no less to continuation of the summit contacts started in Geneva between the USSR and the USA, and to talks multilateral and bilateral between European countries.

III.

The countries represented at the meeting express readiness for the broadest cooperation with other countries with a view to ending the arms race on earth and preventing such in space, to achieving disarmament, and call for pooling efforts first of all in the following directions:

- Cessation of nuclear tests. This would be a big and easily practicable step towards nuclear disarmament and would raise an obstacle to sophistication of nuclear weapons and to development of new types thereof. A mutual moratorium by the USSR and the USA on nuclear blasts, and the start of talks without delay on a total ban on nuclear tests with most stringent verification are the way to this. The participants in the meeting welcome the new extension of the unilateral moratorium by the Soviet Union and are calling on the USA to join it. At the same time they urge other countries possessing nuclear weapons to discontinue nuclear tests and act towards an early agreement on a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests.

- Total liquidation on a mutual basis of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone on the understanding that Britain and France will not build up their respective nuclear armaments and the United States will not hand over its missiles - strategic and medium range - to other countries. In the event of total liquidation of American medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet enhanced range tactical missiles will also be removed from the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia.

- Attainment of specific accords at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms that would take into account the interests of both sides and all other states. The Warsaw Treaty member countries confirm their adherence to the treaties and accords in the field of arms limitation and disarmament and persistently urge the United States to strictly observe the agreements on the limitation of strategic arms.

The programme "star wars", one for space strike arms, and the involvement in it of other countries and development in a number of West European countries of projects like the "European defence initiative" are of a dangerous nature. Space should be used for peaceful purposes, for the good of the whole of mankind.

- Elimination right this century of such weapons of mass annihilation as chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture. It is a pressing necessity to multiply efforts to ensure successful completion at the Geneva conference of the talks for an appropriate international convention and to refrain from any actions that would obstruct total prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons. The participants in the meeting firmly stand against any further buildup in arsenals of these weapons of mass annihilation and their deployment on the territory of other states and call on

- Total liquidation on a mutual basis of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone on the understanding that Britain and France will not build up their respective nuclear armaments and the United States will not hand over its missiles - strategic and medium range - to other countries. In the event of total liquidation of American medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet enhanced range tactical missiles will also be removed from the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia.

- Attainment of specific accords at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms that would take into account the interests of both sides and all other states. The Warsaw Treaty member countries confirm their adherence to the treaties and accords in the field of arms limitation and disarmament and persistently urge the United States to strictly observe the agreements on the limitation of strategic arms.

The programme "star wars", one for space strike arms, and the involvement in it of other countries and development in a number of West European countries of projects like the "European defence initiative" are of a dangerous nature. Space should be used for peaceful purposes, for the good of the whole of mankind.

- Elimination right this century of such weapons of mass annihilation as chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture. It is a pressing necessity to multiply efforts to ensure successful completion at the Geneva conference of the talks for an appropriate international convention and to refrain from any actions that would obstruct total prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons. The participants in the meeting firmly stand against any further buildup in arsenals of these weapons of mass annihilation and their deployment on the territory of other states and call on

the NATO countries to give up plans to produce and deploy in Europe binary chemical weapons, a particularly dangerous variety.

- Substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments globally and regionally. The Warsaw Treaty member states propose to start such a reduction in Europe where the concentration of troops and armaments has reached particularly dangerous levels. The meeting adopted an address to the NATO member countries, to all European countries with a programme on this matter.

- Effective verification in all fields and at all stages of arms reduction and disarmament with the use of both national technical means and of international procedures, up to and including on-site inspections. The states represented at the meeting are prepared to reach agreement on additional verification measures.

The participating countries confirm their stand in favour of continued efforts internationally with the aim of liquidating foreign military bases and withdrawing troops from foreign territory.

Practical steps to reduce armaments and achieve disarmament will release enormous material, financial and manpower resources for peaceful, creative purposes such as liquidating the economic backwardness in many parts of the world. The participants in the meeting attach much importance to an international conference on disarmament and development in accordance with the decision of the United Nations Organisation.

The disquieting international situation urgently dictates that the existing machinery to bilateral and multilateral talks on limiting and reducing arms and achieving disarmament should function effectively, and should not be used as a screen to justify the arms race.

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 9 -

IV.

The member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation consider one of the central tasks of their foreign policy to strengthen security and cooperation in Europe. They advocate a lower military confrontation for that continent, reduction in the military potentials existing here, and continuous headway towards complete deliverance of the territory of Europe from nuclear and chemical weapons. Greater stability and confidence would be promoted by the establishment of zones free from those weapons of mass destruction in the Balkans, Central Europe, the North and other regions of the continent. This is the goal of the proposals put forward recently by the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia as well as by Bulgaria and Romania, proposals supported by the countries participating in the meeting.

The goals of detente continent *wide* would be served by mutually acceptable agreements at the Vienna talks on reduction in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

A resultative conclusion to the first stage of the Stockholm Conference would contribute to building confidence and security in Europe and to creating more favourable conditions for moving on to consider disarmament matters on a European scale.

As long as military groupings opposing each other exist in Europe, the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty member countries to conclude a treaty with NATO countries on mutual non-use of military force and on the maintenance of relations of peace retains all its topicality. Such a treaty would be open to other countries. In the interests of reducing the acuteness of the current situation, the participants in the meeting favour continuing and developing the dialogue between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO member countries, including the

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 10 -

establishment of direct contacts between the two organisations with a view to appropriate accords.

In the current international situation the countries represented at the meeting consider it important that steps be taken to improve the situation in the Mediterranean, and make the region a zone of stable peace, security, neighbourliness and cooperation. A simultaneous withdrawal of the navies of the USSR and the USA from the Mediterranean could play a great role in this.

Socialist countries attach much importance to the forthcoming Vienna meeting of representatives of the states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), and are ready to make their contribution to further balanced development of the CSCE process in all fields of cooperation defined in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

The establishment of official relations between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and individual CMEA member countries and the European Economic Community would open up fresh opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation.

Calls for revision of the borders between European countries and for change in their socio-political systems contradict the building of trust, mutual understanding and neighbourly relations in Europe. The post-war borders in the continent are inviolable. Respect for the existing territorial-political realities is an indispensable condition for lasting peace in Europe and for normal relations between European countries. The activities of revanchist forces and, first of all, those in the Federal Republic of Germany, and encouragement of revanchism anywhere run counter to the interests of detente, security and cooperation in Europe, to the spirit and letter of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 11 -

Europe is in need of a revival of detente and of moves towards a more steady phase. Only along such lines is it possible to ensure reliable security for all European peoples, to overcome the split in the continent and to create a Europe of peace, friendly cooperation and goodneighbourliness. This is a real goal and it can be attained through active joint efforts.

V.

The leaders of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia exchanged views on the seats of tension and conflict situations existing in the world, and reaffirmed the determination of their countries to promote just settlement through talks. They condemned the imperialist forces' interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries, slanderous propaganda campaigns against socialist and other countries, methods of diktat, and acts of aggression in various parts of the world.

The meeting reaffirmed the participating countries' principled stand, set out in their Sofia statement, on conflicts and seats of tension in the Middle East and South-West Asia, South-East Asia, Central America, the South of Africa, and in other parts of the world. They called for greater peace and security and for the development of relations of goodneighbourliness and cooperation in Asia, the Pacific Ocean area, Africa and Latin America.

The meeting stated solidarity with the peoples who struggle against the imperialist policy of aggression, for independence, social and economic progress, and for the right to free independent development without interference from the outside.

They pointed out the growing role of the non-aligned

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 12 -

movement as a major factor in international relations, and expressed the hope that the non-aligned movement's summit meeting in Harare in 1986 would make its contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and international security.

As principled opponents of all terrorism, and particularly the state-backed terrorism which threatens to disrupt international relations, the countries represented at the meeting are prepared to work constructively with all countries so as to eradicate that dangerous phenomenon from the life of the international community.

Normalising international economic relations is an increasingly important and urgent task. The economic plight of the developing countries and the neocolonialist exploitation of them are fraught with serious consequences for peace and the entire system of international relations. This is one of the deep-seated causes of international tension and conflicts in various parts of the world. The complex problems of world economics cannot be tackled in an isolated manner by this or that group of countries. The leaders of the countries represented at the meeting stand in favour of restructuring the entire system of international economic relations to make them democratic, establishing a new international economic order, which would ensure equal economic security for all countries, and in favour of eliminating the underdevelopment of countries with global and just settlement of the problem of external indebtedness. They firmly call for removing from international life all forms of discrimination, boycotts and sanctions, high interest rates, and artificial barriers to scientific-technical and technological exchanges.

The meeting is for the development of cooperation between all countries to form an international regime for safe development of nuclear power engineering, including creation of a mechanism for prompt warning and supply of information. They are for enhancing the role of the IAEA, and the UNO and

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 13 -

its specialised agencies in this field as well as for convening a special international conference to discuss the entire range of matters connected thereto.

The meeting proposes raising the contribution by the UNO and other international organisations to the cause of preserving peace, ending the arms race and achieving disarmament, and to the solution of all global problems mankind is faced with. The Warsaw Treaty countries are and will continue doing everything for 1986 -- the International Year of Peace -- to be marked by a real turn for the better, towards a more secure world.

VI.

Special attention at the meeting was devoted to strengthening the unity and cohesion of the Warsaw Treaty member countries and their defensive alliance, and to developing cooperation in international affairs, in the elaboration and translation into life of a coordinated foreign-policy course towards ensuring the security of their peoples, removing the threat of nuclear war, achieving disarmament and strengthening universal peace was emphasised.

The invariable stand of the countries participating in the meeting on a simultaneous dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was reaffirmed at the same time.

The meeting declared for a further expansion of exchanges of experience in socialist construction, for a broad mutual acquaintance with the affairs and problems of one another and intensive use of the mass media in these purposes. The importance of raising the effectiveness of economic, scientific and technical contacts, cultural exchanges and broadening contacts between work collectives, the public, local

Thursday, June 12, 1986

1

- 14 -

and tourist contacts, and deepening cooperation in other spheres was pointed out. The countries represented at the meeting reaffirmed their readiness to actively develop relations, cooperative action and all-round cooperation with all other socialist countries in the drive for peace and socialism and against imperialism.

x x x

The meeting gave a positive assessment to the work of the Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and of the Committee of the Ministers of Defence over ^{the} period that has passed since the previous meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, and determined their further tasks.

The Political Consultative Committee took a decision on a report by the Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty Member Countries on the practical work done by the Command.

Provision has been made for the Hungarian People's Republic, as the meeting's host country, to ensure distribution of the Programme and this Communique adopted by the committee.

The next meeting of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the Warsaw Treaty Member Countries is to be held in Berlin, the capital of the German Democratic Republic (GDR). Herbert Krolikowski, representative of the GDR, State Secretary and First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, was appointed the PCC General Secretary for the Subsequent term.

The meeting passed off in an atmosphere of friendship, comradely cooperation and unity of views on all matters discussed.

(Pravda, June 12. In full.)

THE PROGRAMME PROPOSED BY THE WARSAW TREATY
STATES TO THE NATO STATES AND ALL EUROPEAN
COUNTRIES FOR REDUCING ARMED FORCES AND
CONVENTIONAL ARMAMENTS IN EUROPE

Being aware of their responsibility to their peoples and humanity for the destinies of peace in Europe and the whole world, and guided by a desire to achieve a radical change for the better in the present complex international situation, the Warsaw treaty member states hold that decisive action with specific measures towards ending the arms race, embarking on real disarmament and removing war menace are needed more now than ever before.

They support the Soviet Union's programme for complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by the end of the current century everywhere. They are convinced that an end to nuclear testing, with nuclear disarmament and prevention of an arms race in space, a ban and elimination of chemical weapons and other measures for disarmament would mean a safer peace for the European peoples and the nations of the whole world.

The allied states declare for a comprehensive approach to the issue of disarmament, for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction to be backed by a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments. Alongside ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, the matter of reducing armed forces and conventional armaments assumes particular acuteness for the present and future of the European continent where now the biggest groups of armed forces equipped with the latest weapons face each other. And some systems of conventional armaments are coming closer and closer to weapons of mass destruction in operational characteristics. The allied states declare in favour of definite measures in the sphere of

nuclear disarmament, reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments to be accompanied by a corresponding lowering of the military expenditures of states.

Guided by these considerations, the Warsaw Treaty member states put forward to all other European countries, the United States and Canada these proposals which are a substantial addition to the programme for elimination of weapons of mass destruction. At the same time they have an independent character and their implementation would lower considerably the risk of war in Europe.

I

The Warsaw Treaty member states propose a substantial reduction in all components of the land forces and tactical strike aviation of the European states, as well as of corresponding forces and weapon systems of the United States and Canada deployed in Europe. Tactical nuclear arms with a range of up to 1,000 kilometres would be reduced alongside conventional armaments.

The entire territory of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals, would be a cut-back area.

It is suggested that the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe be done gradually, according to agreed schedules, and with a constant military balance observed at lowered levels, so that noone's security is impaired. Alongside the formations and units reduced, their organic armaments, including nuclear weapon systems, would also be reduced.

A one-time mutual reduction in the numerical strength of the forces of states in the opposing military-political alliances by 100,000-150,000 troops from each side within one or two years is proposed as an initial step. Reduction in the

tactical strike aviation would be of much importance as part of this step. Immediately after that, the Warsaw Treaty member states are prepared for considerable further cut-backs, as a result of which, given reciprocal readiness of the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, the land forces and the tactical strike aviation of both alliances in Europe would be reduced early in the nineties by approximately 25 percent on their present level. This reduction would comprise over half a million people from each side. The armed forces of the opposing groups in Europe would thus be reduced by over a million.

The allied socialist countries declare that the process of reduction in armed forces and armaments of the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries should continue. Substantial reductions in the armed forces and armaments of both alliances would make it possible to involve other European states in that process.

The components of armed forces being reduced are proposed to be disbanded by equivalent integral military formations and units alongside their organic armaments and military equipment. Their personnel would be demobilised in accordance with the procedures established in each state.

The armaments and equipment subjected to reduction should be either destroyed or consigned to depots on national territory in accordance with agreed-upon procedures. Nuclear charges would be destroyed. Some types of military equipment on arrangement could be put to peaceful purposes.

The funds saved as a result of appropriate reductions in armed forces and conventional armaments must not be channelled into designing new types of armaments or for other military purposes. They must be used for economic and social development.

All the states party to an agreement on armed forces and

armaments reduction would assume a commitment to refrain from increasing their land forces and tactical strike aviation beyond the limits of the cut-back area.

II

It is proposed to work out a procedure for reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments under which the process of reduction would lead to a lessening of the danger of a sudden attack and would promote consolidation of military-strategic stability on the European continent. For this purpose it is suggested to agree at the very outset on a considerable reduction in the tactical strike aviation of both military-political alliances in Europe, and also on lessening the concentration of troops along the line of contact of these alliances.

Additional measures capable of enhancing the confidence of the Warsaw Treaty countries and the NATO countries, of all European states, that sudden offensive operations will not be launched against them would also be worked out and implemented.

Arrangements are envisaged for restrictions on large military exercises (as regards their number and scale) and on exchange of more detailed information about them, and also about forces and weapon systems drawn into Europe from other areas for the period of exercises. There are other measures envisaged to promote greater mutual confidence.

Confidence-building and creation of more favourable conditions for reduction in armed forces and armaments in Europe would be promoted by such measures as creation of zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons in Europe, gradual reduction in the military activity of the two military alliances, and establishment of cooperation between their

participants on questions of arms limitation and disarmament.

III

Armed forces and conventional armaments would be reduced under reliable and effective control involving both national technical means and international procedures, including on-site inspections.

Alongside measures of verification of the entire process of reduction, it is proposed to establish observation of the military activity of the forces that remain after cut-backs.

Adequate forms of verification of measures for mutual confidence-building, to be implemented in accordance with agreements, would also be used.

To implement control, the sides would exchange, at an agreed upon moment, data as to the total numerical strength of the land forces and tactical strike aviation in the cut-back area and, separately, data on that part of them which is to be reduced, and on the part that will remain after the cut-backs, lists of military units to be reduced (disbanded) citing their unit designation, numerical strength, deployment and number of the main agreed-upon types of armaments subject to reduction. There would also be notifications about the beginning and completion of cut-backs.

An international consultative commission involving representatives of the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries as well as neutral and non-aligned states concerned, and other European states, would be instituted for purposes of control.

On-site verification of the reduction of armed forces, destruction or storage of armaments could be implemented, when needed, with the involvement of representatives of the international consultative commission. Check-points staffed by representatives of the international consultative commission could be set up for such control at large railway junctions.

airfields and ports.

IV

The present proposals for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe could become the subject of definite discussion at the second stage of the Conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe.

At the same time, proceeding from the urgent need to take measures to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe, the Warsaw Treaty member states hold that discussion of these proposals could be started without delay. They also deem it possible to convene for the purpose a special forum consisting of the European states, USA and Canada.

They are likewise prepared to broaden the scale of the Vienna talks on mutual reductions in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe by drawing to them other European states and by changing the mandate of the talks accordingly.

Proclaiming readiness to use all possible channels and forums to mutually lower the level of military confrontation on a European scale, they at the same time confirm their interest in armaments and armed forces reduction in Central Europe and declare once again in favour of an effective conclusion of the first stage of the Stockholm conference.

V

The question of military doctrines is of no mean importance in assessing the real intentions of military-political groups and individual states. It is essential to remove the suspicion and distrust that have been accumulating for years, to analyse thoroughly each other's concerns on that

Thursday, June 12, 1986

2

- 7 -

matter, too. In the interests of security in Europe and the whole world, the military concepts and doctrines of military alliances must be based on defensive principles.

The Warsaw Treaty member states declare with all responsibility that never, under no circumstances, will they launch hostilities against any state, whether in Europe or anywhere else in the world, unless they become the target of aggression themselves. The proposals they advance stem from a consistent policy towards removing the war threat and creating a stable and secure peace; they proceed from the defensive nature to their military doctrine which presupposes a balance of military forces at the lowest possible level, and reduction of military potentials to the adequate limits necessary for defence.

The same peaceful intentions prompt the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty member states for a simultaneous disbandment of both military alliances.

The NATO member countries also declare a defensive nature for their alliance. It follows from this that there should be no obstacles to mutual considerable reductions in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

x x x

In making this address the Warsaw Treaty member countries do not set any preliminary conditions whatsoever for the commencement of a concrete discussion of the proposals contained therein. They are also prepared to study in a constructive spirit any other proposals on this score that might be made by the NATO member countries, the neutral and non-aligned, and other European states.

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria

Todor Zhivkov

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Bulgarian Communist Party, President of the State Council of
the People's Republic of Bulgaria

for the Hungarian People's Republic

Janos Kadar

General Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

for the German Democratic Republic

Erich Honecker

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Chairman of the Council of
State of the German Democratic Republic

for the Polish People's Republic

Wojciech Jaruzelski

First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish
United Workers' Party, President of the Council of State of
the Polish People's Republic

for the Socialist Republic of Romania

Nicolae Ceausescu

General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party,
President of the Socialist Republic of Romania

for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Mikhail Gorbachev

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Thursday, June 12, 1986

2

- 9 -

for the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic

Gustav Husak

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, President of the
Czechoslovak Socialist Republic

Budapest, June 11, 1986

(Pravda, June 12. In full.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV'S LETTER
TO MISKOLC STEELMAKERS

Dear Friends,

I am deeply moved by your warm letter signed by thousands of workers of the V.I. Lenin steel plant. The firm determination of the Hungarian working class to make fuller use of the inexhaustible advantages of socialism and to strengthen the fruitful cooperation with the Soviet Union to the benefit of our peoples is felt in each line of it.

I am sincerely grateful to you for your enthusiastic support for the resolutions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU. It is particularly important that it is backed up by concrete deeds, by the successful fulfilment of the socialist pledges you have assumed. This is a vivid manifestation of your deep understanding of the very essence of the current crucial stage and of the significance of the highest forum of Soviet Communists, which has evolved a strategy for accelerating the social and economic development. Largely similar tasks have been set by the 13th Congress of the HSWP. Translating them into reality demands from us more dynamic and fundamental combination of socialism with the latest technology. I said already in my Csepel speech that the frontline of the battle for acceleration passes through factory departments. Researchers, engineers and, of course, workers are taking part in it. I think this is fully true also of your plant. To make fast headway in the sphere of technological progress it is necessary to develop first of all machine-building. As is known, the "bread" for this is metal, including the high-alloy steel made by your skilful hands.

I was pleased to learn from your letter that your work collective is establishing good contacts with the Cherepovets

steel-makers and other Soviet collectives and that you extensively share experiences. This is highly gratifying.

It is exactly in deeper collaboration between Soviet and Hungarian enterprises and in the establishment of close cooperation and direct production links and, wherever necessary, in the setting up of joint economic organisations that we see a great reserve of acceleration. Such joint efforts will help put to use new deep-lying strata of our cooperation, which meets the fundamental interests of the peoples of Hungary and the Soviet Union and the interests of the entire socialist community.

Dear Comrades, I wholeheartedly wish the personnel of your plant which bears the name of the leader of the world proletariat, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, to continue tirelessly strengthening and multiplying the glorious traditions of the working class and asserting the ideas of international solidarity and friendship of our peoples by your practical deeds. I wish you new labour accomplishments, peace, happiness and well-being!

M. GORBACHEV

* * *

A letter signed by more than 3,000 workers of the V. I. Lenin steel plant in the city of Miskolc (Hungarian People's Republic) was sent to General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. It says that the personnel of this industrial plant, one of the largest in Hungary, actively develops relations with the Cherepovets steel-makers and the workers of other Soviet factories, and that it has successfully fulfilled the socialist pledges assumed in honour of the 27th Congress of the CPSU, and overfulfilled by nearly 50 per cent the plan of supplies of rolled metal to our country in the first quarter of this year.

Thursday, June 12, 1986

3

- 3 -

Expressing their enthusiastic support for the decisions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU, the working people of the plant have launched new initiatives aimed at expanding and deepening relations with Soviet enterprises and associations.

(Pravda, June 12. In full.)

THE END

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI
TÜSTAV

VORI2-870505-509

NUCLEAR-TIPPED STRATEGY

The headline of a France Presse report from London screamed: "British Scientist Claims NATO Is Stepping Up Preparations for a Nuclear War in Europe."

NATO has modernized its nuclear forces in preparation for a limited nuclear war in Europe contrary to official statements, wrote British scientist Dan Plesh of the University of Bradford, in his review published April 14.

Mr Plesh writes that since 1980 NATO has produced more than 600 nuclear warheads for enhanced radiation (neutron) bombs. They are deployed in the state of New York (USA) and can be delivered by military transports to Europe in several hours.

Neutron warheads are designed for W-79 artillery shells and Lance theatre missiles (number 325 and 380, respectively). The M-110 guns, that can also fire neutron warheads, are deployed in Western Europe.

NATO proponents claim that there is no nuclear build-up and refer to the broadly advertized 1983 programme for the withdrawal from European NATO countries of 1,400 nuclear warheads in several years. But Dan Plesh notes that the programme concerns only obsolete weapon types which have been or will be replaced with more up-to-date weapons. To prove his point he cites the February 1987 statement by US Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger.

The scientist also believes that NATO promises never to be the first to use nuclear weapons are highly doubtful. He quotes US General Bernard Rogers, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, who in February last year said to the International Defence Review that in reply to a hypothetical attack with conventional weapons the NATO HQ would use nuclear arms at the initial stage of the conflict.

(Izvestia, May 4. Abridged.)

Wednesday, December 17, 1986

5

VORIO-861217-505

DO YOU CALL THAT AN ANSWER?

E. Nikolaev

A regular session of the NATO Council ended the other day. Though it was a routine session, politicians in Europe were awaiting its results with interest. After six months of analysis and consideration, the bloc was at last to give an answer to concrete proposals of the Warsaw Treaty on the limitation of armed forces and armaments in Europe, the proposals advanced last June. Anyway, NATO promised to give an answer.

A delay could be justified if it were determined by the interests of the matter at hand, for the Warsaw Treaty move means a serious initiative of scheduled substantial reductions in ground forces and tactical strike aviation in Europe as well as in tactical nuclear arms. A serious lead required a serious answer.

And now the "answer" has been given. Extensive declarative documents have been adopted. The declaration and communique adopted by the NATO Council can strike an unsophisticated person as having a businesslike nature. They even mention a broad approach to conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals. Some of the Warsaw Treaty ideas to this effect seem to have been adopted.

A closer look reveals that the NATO documents propose no solutions. Moreover, they lack concrete answers as to where, when and in what way the talks on reductions of armed forces and conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals should be conducted and do not as much as mention the proposals in the Budapest Address of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Hypocrisy, unsubstantiated statements, discrepancy between words and deeds have long been the usual tactic that the West

employs to dodge an answer to any concrete, businesslike proposals of socialist countries for lowering military confrontation, for disarmament in Europe. The results of the NATO Council session are just another example of this approach of the North Atlantic bloc to the most acute problems of European life.

It is not surprising therefore that it has taken NATO six months to issue the documents, and that the documents deal with a philosophy of "conventional armaments control" far removed from realities. It is not surprising either that it is planned to continue such verbal exercises indefinitely and to issue such documents on a regular basis in the future.

NATO's unwillingness to start concrete talks is also indicated by its refusal to establish direct contacts between appropriate working groups of the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty to deal with these matters, by the reluctance of NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Europe General Bernard Rogers to respond to the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty and meet Commander-in-Chief of the Warsaw Treaty forces Marshal V.Kulikov and by the refusal of NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington to hold proposed discussions with the plenipotentiary representative of the Warsaw Treaty, G.Krolikovsky.

NATO talked a lot about alleged "Soviet military threat" in the sphere of conventional forces. It also declared that nuclear disarmament is impossible if high potentials of conventional armaments are preserved. However, when it came to discussion and adoption of concrete measures for conventional arms reduction, Western countries lost all interest.

The philosophy of the so-called conventional armaments control, set out in the documents looks strange, too. One gets the impression that NATO countries wish to stash up all sort of barriers and obstacles they could use to disrupt any

concrete decisions, should the talks on conventional arms limitation start after all.

It follows from the documents that NATO sees its main aim in overcoming the alleged imbalance in conventional armaments in Europe. What it really seeks is unilateral reduction of forces and armaments of the Warsaw Treaty while preserving its own potential. Moreover, NATO's precondition is that the Warsaw Treaty should "admit" its alleged superiority.

NATO's "answer" to the Budapest proposals indicates that NATO wishes the issues of ridding Europe of nuclear arms and of lowering the confrontation in conventional armaments in Europe to remain outstanding.

NATO obstructs the elimination of nuclear arms in Europe by asserted lack of measures in the sphere of conventional arms reductions and puts obstacles to conventional arms reductions by all sort of artificial linkages, conditions and reservations.

Competent Soviet agencies will thoroughly analyse all the documents of the NATO Council session. Consultations on this matter with Soviet allies in the Warsaw Treaty will be held to prepare an official reply. It is clear though that progress in reductions of armed forces and conventional armaments still depends on sincere readiness of NATO countries to approach this matter in earnest.

(Pravda, December 17. In full.)

Friday, January 18, 1985

8

- 2 -

"Not so long ago, Kohl and Strauss, after first claiming in their speeches before the rallies of East Prussian revenge-seeking 'associations' in Bonn that there was no revenge-seeking, went on to declare, in unison with the ringleaders of the 'League of Expellees', that 'the object of the German peace policy' was to 'keep the German question open' and restore the 'German Reich to its borders of 1937' (sic!). Strauss worked himself into such a passion as to cry out: 'The decline of Soviet rule is on'. Isn't that anything short of revenge-seeking?"

"Anyone who knows and remembers what happened in a recent past, just a few decades ago, when a maelstrom of war erupted from German soil, has every reason to be vigilant," Friedrich Hitzler emphasizes.

(Pravda, January 18. Summary.)

- 2 -

the experience of the two world wars -- the sinister products of "power politics" which in all cases were preceded by the illusory hopes for attaining military superiority and, as a result, the aggressor sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind. The correctness of this conclusion stems from the very logic of the nuclear age which has made a war a synonym for a collective suicide, when mankind should choose literally between life and its total destruction.

The Soviet Union thinks that time has come to launch a Soviet-American dialogue on a wide range of issues in the interests of all nations.

x x x

In connection with the decision of NATO's Defence Planning Committee on what is referred to as the Rogers Plan, Vladimir Golubkov, a Soviet expert on disarmament, writes:

The new military doctrine of NATO, which has been proposed by the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO forces in Europe, provides for the possibility of delivering strikes with the use of latest conventional weapons upon the territory of the potential adversary, that is, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In fact, NATO is striving to obtain a capability for neutralizing communication means, control centres and delivery vehicles of the Warsaw Treaty countries with a view to lessening their ability to deliver a retaliatory strike in reply to NATO's nuclear blow which it is planning to be the first to deal.

The NATO-announced "second echelon targeting" formula, which envisages strikes at forces of the socialist countries, is pursuing purely propaganda purposes. In connection with the Rogers Plan, NATO is out to develop and intends to use new combat equipment: high-precision homing missiles and pilotless aircraft with highly destructive charges, and electronic means of warfare. As is believed by experts, all these latest conventional weapons systems, when used for delivering a massive strike, would be "near-nuclear" in their blast capabilities.

- 3 -

The West Europeans have noticed that instead of positional warfare to contain the enemy at the initial stage of a possible conflict, as is planned in keeping with the NATO doctrine of "flexible response" now in effect, the Rogers Plan envisages an immediate start of offensive operations deep in the rear of the Warsaw Pact countries, which, according to US military experts, would be very much like preventive strikes.

Further. The main strike, according to the Plan, is to be delivered with the use of missiles carrying conventional warheads. But, indeed, it would be impossible to find out within a matter of a few minutes what kind of a warhead -- nuclear or conventional -- the missile is carrying in flight.

The Plan is also a further proof that the Reagan Administration continues elaborating upon the idea of a "limited" nuclear war in Europe. Even two years ago, the French press drew attention to the fact that it actually means separation of the US strategic nuclear forces from the West European defences. Planning strikes from Western Europe at rear areas in the socialist countries, the Pentagon, naturally, reckons that a Soviet retaliatory blow would be struck in the first place at Western Europe, and not at the USA.

(APN, November 27. In full.)

THE END

Friday, January 18, 1985

ORIOVO-170

8

"WEST GERMANY AS HOSTAGE"

An article by Friedrich Hitzer in Pravda

"Influential people in the US Administration have recently been talking about the 'possibility' of waging a 'limited nuclear war', instead of playing up its former doctrine of 'nuclear deterrence'," West German political journalist Friedrich Hitzer writes in Pravda. "The latest American 'first strike' doctrine has come to be known as 'Airland Battle'. There is already a guide to it in the shape of a 'Field Manual' of the US Armed Forces. The authors of both documents invoke the experience of the 'Blitzkrieg' strategy developed in Germany in the 30s and 40s.

"Unlike their predecessors, the strategists of the new 'Blitzkrieg' contemplate attacks by nuclear, chemical and so-called conventional arms, rather than combined armour and air strikes," the article says. "Therefore, the Pentagon needs the Federal Republic both as a hostage and as a missile launching site. This is an open secret for whoever it may concern both in Washington and in Bonn. Bonn does know, of course, that the 'Airland Battle' is an even more monstrous replica of the 'Plan Barbarossa'. So what makes the ruling West German coalition support an intention which, if carried out, would unavoidably cause our country to be destroyed?" Friedrich Hitzer writes.

"Perhaps, some leaders of the CDU/CSU - Free Democrats coalition who, ever since they came into office, have been talking about a 'turn' in everything, have completely forgotten what Hitler Germany's ambition to 'turn' the world her own way ended up in forty years ago? For what happened then, the author points out, was the failure of the plans of German imperialism, which found expression in Nazism, the most cruel and criminal of political forms ever known.

NATO WHIPS UP ARMS RACE

V. Drobkov

Brussels, Dec.5 (Pravda's own correspondent). For three days NATO's top military organs have been meeting in sessions at their headquarters in Evere in the suburb of the Belgian capital.

A session of the Eurogroup was followed by those of the Military Committee and the Defence Planning Committee attended by Defence Ministers, Chiefs-of-Staff, commanders of NATO armies and top officials of the military-political establishment of the alliance.

The decisions of the military organs of the North Atlantic bloc and the statements made by those attending the sessions these days make it quite clear that NATO has given a "go-ahead" to an array of new military initiatives. First of all, in spite of the continuing mass protests in the NATO countries against the deployment of Pershing-2s and Cruises in Europe, the alliance reaffirmed its intention to speed up the deployment of the new American nuclear missiles regarded as a first-strike weapon.

It has also mapped out prospects for whipping up the arms race that will lead to conventional weapons buildup and the development and extensive introduction of new arms systems whose destructive capacity approaches that of nuclear weapons. The arms manufacturing industries are to be stimulated. The programme for the development of NATO's military infrastructure in 1985-1990 endorsed in Evere and estimated at billions of dollars stipulates an extension of military bases, air fields and depots, the improvement of communications, the modernisation of the anti-aircraft defence system and many other things. At their session NATO's military organs also backed the so called Rogers plan. The plan, named after Supreme Allied

Thursday, December 6, 1984

3

- 2 -

commander General Bernard Rogers, envisages using new high-technology conventional weapons to launch attacks on targets lying hundreds of kilometres away from the borders of the NATO countries.

The three days during which the NATO military organs met in sessions have indicated that the bloc's militarists are going out of their way to force the NATO countries to launch a new spiral of the arms race.

(Pravda, December 6. In full.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMALARI
TÜSTAV

Değerli arkadaşlar,

Pisotik nedenlerle ya da zaman vb. nedenlerle bazı farklı yerler ayni kâğıdın ters yüzünde olabilmektedir. (Not: güvence siparişinde, sizin ayrı kâğıtları ile ilgili yedek veresileceğimizi (foto kopyası, postane) düşünürüz,

Size Türk Atlantik Anlaşması Derneğini kurulları ile alakalı yazıyorum. Belki yarınki elinize ulaşmaz ve... B.Ş. de As Politika Enstitüsünün adresi var.

Dis Politika Enstitüsü: Mithatpaşa Cad. 28/16 ANK.

Türk Atlantik Derneği: Cinnah Cad. 35/6. ANK.

TÜRK ATLAN-TİK ANLAŞMASI DERNEĞİ DANIŞMA KURULU: (Sancının listesi 1981'e ait).

Haluk Alp

Cihat Alpın

İsmet Altınbaş

Yılmaz Altuğ

Sırrı Atalay

Muhsin Batur

Haluk Bayraktan

Feyyaz Berker.

Suat Bilge

İbrahim Bodur

İ.S. Coşkunozel

Elhan Cevik

Rehber Çeliker

Harunettin Erkenen

Hamza Büyüklü

Melih Erenel

Turan Hızal

Kamuran Gürün

Sadi İsmail

Refet İbrahimşin

Kemal Kayaçan

Hamit Kartay

Fevri Melen

Nurettin Ölc

Faika Sükan

Metin Tokar

Haluk İlman

Aydın Talay

Mehmet Tazıcı

Sitki Tuncalı

T.A.A.D. GENÇLİK KURULU:

Yüksel İnan (Başkan)

Mete Sezanşin (Genel Sekr.)

Zehra Altınbaş

Halim Altınbaş

Sevda Başaran

Haluk Elmas

Ezgi İstik

Can Karadağ

Hasan Kızı

Burcu Şankı

APN INFORMS AND COMMENTS

THE SHORTEST AND STRAIGHT ROADS TO DISARMAMENT

Major General Svyatoslav Kozlov, Rt.

Some developments, which took place in NATO countries last week, stand in contrast to the general favourable reaction to the decision of the USSR and the USA to begin important talks, and even look sinister.

Washington has officially confirmed that the USA does not intend to renounce first use of nuclear weapons in case of necessity. It was also emphasized that the White House Administration would work for the earliest implementation of all the programs of "rearmament of America," first of all, the development of all types of first strike missiles.

The decision of the US President to set up a special united space command within the system of the American united military command has also become known. The new command will direct the preparation and use of different types of weapons in space and from space with regard to the Earth. In other words, Washington gave it to understand that, despite the forthcoming negotiations, it does not intend to change its militaristic policy which creates and aggravates the threat to peace.

At the same time, the Brussels/ session of the NATO leading bodies approved the so-called "Rogers doctrine" (Rogers is an American General who is holding the post of the NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe). The essence of this doctrine lies in the demand to develop new types of more effective conventional offensive weapons for delivering deep strikes against the entire formation of the other side's troops, which means waging a war, which is being prepared by NATO, on the enemy's territory. Decisions on a long-term and costly program of new armaments have been made, but the Brussels

- 2 -

session did not advance a single concrete proposal in the sphere of disarmament.

All this convincingly proves the dangerous commitment of the USA and NATO to a policy from the position of strength and to gearing the bloc's strategy to new technological possibilities.

At the same time, important events were taking place also in the east of Europe. But they were of a fundamentally different character.

Head of the Soviet state K.U. Chernenko sent a message to the world movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. It is stressed forcefully and convincingly in this document that the USSR is prepared for most radical measures leading to termination of the arms race and to prohibition and dismantling of nuclear weapons and that, if space militarisation is not securely blocked, it will cancel everything that has so far been achieved in the area of arms limitation, spur the arms race in other spheres and dramatically increase the danger of nuclear war.

The USSR's call for immediately preventing militarisation of space, for which the Pentagon is working so persistently, pursues the aim of blocking a new, extremely dangerous channel of the arms race. This is top priority. At the same time, it remains necessary to take such an urgent measure as renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons. If such an obligation is assumed by all nuclear powers, this may be the best way to prevent war. Termination of the nuclear arms race implies freezing nuclear arms at the existing quantitative and qualitative level as a stage on the road to their subsequent limitations and reductions ^{consequently} and / their complete elimination. Termination and prohibition of all nuclear weapons tests, which will set the limit to their qualitative development, also figure high on the list of priorities.

- 3 -

It is clear that these measures, proposed as top priorities, are the shortest roads to disarmament.

The constructive and concrete proposals of the USSR are fully supported by its allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. Their ministers of foreign affairs, who met in Berlin a few days ago, stated that they considered termination of the arms race and transition to disarmament, first of all nuclear disarmament, to be a fundamental issue of our time. They deem it necessary that, before it is too late, all nuclear states should do everything in their power to prevent nuclear war and that ridding the peoples of the nuclear threat should become the prime aim of their foreign policy and practical activities.

(APN, Dec. 9. In full.)

THE END

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMALARI

FOLLOWING THE POLICY OF OBSTRUCTION

Vitali Gan

The NATO countries have completed their traditional "Atlantic Marathon race" -- an annual spring series of conferences of political and military leaders of the bloc's member -states. The last lap of the race took place in Estoril, a resort suburb of the Portuguese capital, where the NATO Council had its two-day session at the level of Foreign Ministers.

Summing up the results of the NATO discussions, one can definitely say that NATO's policy towards militarism and stepping up tension has not been even slightly revised in the bloc's aggressive conceptions or practical activity. The final communique adopted in Estoril shows that the Atlantic alliance does not plan any effective measures to lessen the military danger or to clear the logjams which are being placed in the way of the talks between the East and the West by US order. Having surrounded the document with false statements concerning a "Soviet threat", the authors of the NATO communique "swore allegiance" to the continuation of deploying the Pentagon's first strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The communique has unequivocally confirmed the "efforts for perfecting non-nuclear means" of the bloc aimed at achieving the notorious tactical and strategic superiority over the socialist countries.

However, the Atlantic partners had a choice different in principle. If they followed it, they would confirm, not in words but in deeds, their aspiration for detente, stronger international security, a dialogue and cooperation, the aspiration which they are talking about. This choice has been unambiguously proposed to them by the Soviet Union which has put forth a number of constructive peace initiatives, including the introduction of a moratorium on the deployment

Tuesday, June 11, 1985

6

- 2 -

of medium-range missiles in Europe.

No matter what peace-loving phrases NATO may use for the sake of camouflage, its decisions, alas, cannot be regarded otherwise than a negative reply to the readiness and practical steps of the USSR to facilitate the adoption of agreements and to relieve the tension of the armed confrontation. No wonder,

therefore, that the NATO member-states have approved the position of the USA at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, the position which can be qualified without exaggeration as unconstructive with regard to drafting mutually acceptable agreements.

At the same time the results of the meetings have shown that on some questions the allies considered it impossible to support Washington's undisguised adventurism. According to the Western press, the USA's persistent attempts to draw its allies in the "star wars" programme have failed. Moreover, as the London-based Financial Times points out, US Secretary of State George Shultz was forced to report to the President about the opposition of the West-European partners to the American plans of refusing to observe the SALT-II Treaty. They believe that this step will "undermine the process of controlling the armaments".

In any case, the result of the latest NATO assemblages is not reassuring for the international public -- the obstructionist and militarist policy of NATO, with the USA at the head, stands in the way of searches for solutions to urgent problems of peace and security.

(Pravda, June 11. In full.)

NATO: A BASTION OF IMPERIALISM

"From the moment of its foundation in 1949 the North Atlantic alliance has been the main source of war danger on the planet and especially in Europe," Admiral Alexei Sorokin, first deputy head of the Main Political Department of the Soviet Army and Navy, writes in the paper Sovetskaya Rossia. "All the practical efforts by the bloc are oriented to the export of counter-revolution, preparations for war against the countries of the socialist community and suppression of working people's actions and national liberation movements."

"None of the NATO countries has ever been faced with an outside aggression or threatened with a nuclear attack," the author points out. "Nevertheless, over the years of NATO's existence their armies have been involved in more than 130 wars and armed conflicts on the territory of other states in nearly all parts of the world: in Europe, Africa, Latin America. On 19 occasions the United States, which plays the key role in the bloc, has actually placed its forces on a full nuclear alert. In the present situation, the policy of NATO is pushing Europe and the world at large into a new and probably the most tragic period of their history. Never before has the survival of human civilization faced such a grave danger as today."

"The ongoing implementation of the NATO strategists' decision to deploy new American missiles in Western Europe, which is designed to upset the existing strategic military balance, poses an additional nuclear threat," the article reads. "The situation is further aggravated by the NATO refusal to follow the Soviet Union's example and to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Since May this year

- 2 -

the countries of the bloc have produced no positive response to the Warsaw Pact's proposal for signing a treaty on the mutual non-use of force and on the maintenance of relations of peace."

"The US is involving its NATO allies in its space ventures," Admiral Sorokin points out. "There are plans for stationing some of the space operations control and support systems on the territory of a number of European NATO countries. The international climate is being further poisoned by the subversive ideological activities of NATO whose objective is political and psychological preparation for new wars and, first of all, for a "crusade" against socialism and the whole world."

(Sovetskaya Rossia, Dec.21. Summary.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARŞİVİ
TÜSTAV

Monday, October 22, 1984

ORI4VO-3025

6

NATO CHIEFS URGE ALLIANCE MEMBER COUNTRIES
TO BUILD UP THEIR NUCLEAR
POTENTIAL

Yuri Kharlanov

Speaking in Brussels recently, Lord Carrington, NATO's new Secretary-General, said that the member countries of the Alliance must be prepared to expand and use their nuclear capabilities. American general Bernard Rogers, NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, was more specific when he urged the NATO countries to increase their military spending by seven per cent a year.

The statements made by Lord Carrington and Gen. Rogers should be viewed in the context of the decisions taken recently by the Alliance's nuclear planning group when it met in Stresa, Italy, to discuss ways of escalating the arms race in Western Europe. Specifically, NATO is reportedly planning to complete the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe ahead of schedule. The rate of deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in West Germany, Britain and Italy is being accelerated.

The meeting at Stresa also decided substantially to increase expenditures on the improvement of NATO's infrastructure. The United States and West Germany alone are to allocate 7,800 million dollars for this purpose. The participants in the Stresa meeting also discussed Reagan's doctrine of "strategic defence", which envisages an arms race in space. Against this background the clause of the communique adopted at the meeting, which says that NATO intends to keep only as many nuclear arms as is necessary for deterrence, looks like a mockery.

It should be noted that the programme for a dramatic build-up of nuclear missiles was being discussed when the US President

made repeated assurances of his peace-loving aspirations.

One can see a sort of division of labour here: while Reagan and Bush spoke about a desire to negotiate with the USSR, in Italy Caspar Weinberger urged his European counterparts to speed up the deployment of first-strike nuclear missiles trained on the USSR. According to Italian papers, the US Defence Secretary was putting crude pressure on the NATO allies who had not yet taken a final decision on whether to deploy new American nuclear missiles in their countries or not.

Is it the case of the right hand being unaware of what the left hand is doing? No. The kernel of the matter is that while protestations of peace are made from the rostrums of the election campaign in the United States, practical decisions are taken in the Pentagon and NATO headquarters. These are sinister decisions which pose a threat to all humankind.

(Pravda, October 22. In full.)

Monday, October 15, 1984

ORI4VO-2951

4

AT THE PRESS CENTER OF THE USSR MINISTRY OF FOREIGN
AFFAIRS

October 12. A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman held a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen at the Ministry's press center in connection with the NATO nuclear planning group's session in Stresa, Italy, on October 11 and 12.

Vladimir Lomeiko, first deputy head of the press department at the Foreign Ministry of the USSR, said at the briefing that the NATO conference has again demonstrated the discrepancy between Washington's actions and the peace-making statements that American administration spokesmen have been making of late.

The session has shown that Washington has used it as a lever to exert pressure on its allies to speed up the deployment of new American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe to the utmost.

While paying lip service to peace and interest in talks to reduce arms, Washington is in actual fact continuing the effort to build up its nuclear capability in Europe and trying to put the nuclear race into still higher gear.

Washington's pressure is forcing the further stockpiling of nuclear weapons in Europe, Lomeiko said. Another Pershing-2 missile battery has recently been deployed in West Germany, bringing the total of such missiles already on station there to at least 45, while Britain and Italy by today have each had 32 cruise missiles sited in their territories. In other words, a total of 109 new American nuclear missiles are now zeroed in on the Soviet Union.

All these missiles are reported in operational readiness.

The Stresa session has also considered measures to expedite the development of the military infrastructure in the West European nuclear missile staging area and modernize conventional

weapons, with Washington applying massive pressure on its allies to make marked increases in their spending for these purposes.

The Stresa session has represented another step stemming from the continuing U.S. policy for military superiority over the USSR.

As the Soviet leadership has repeatedly stressed, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said, this policy has no prospects and only leads to a further escalation of the arms race and a worse international situation. The USSR, as Soviet leaders have declared on more than one occasion, does not seek military superiority but neither will it allow any military superiority over itself.

The Soviet Union will do everything possible to preserve the military parity between itself and the United States and between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO.

A TASS correspondent asked Iomeiko to comment on the reported discussion in Stresa of the question of building an anti-ballistic missile defense system for Western Europe that would be modelled on the one which President Reagan intends to have for the United States. We believe, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said, that such plans can only spell an added scope for the arms race and carry the threat of militarization of outer space. They cannot but increase the war danger in the world.

Besides anything else, the talking about the development of an anti-ballistic missile defense system for Western Europe also tends to foster a stronger feeling of impunity since it generates illusions about the possibility of dealing a first strike at the Soviet Union, a strike which, it is believed in NATO, will not bring retribution because of the existence of such a system.

So far as the USSR's position is concerned, it is opposed to the continuation of the arms race and to its transfer to outer

space, be it the skies over the United States or the Soviet Union, Western Europe or Eastern Europe. We are for preventing the militarization of outer space, the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said.

Answering a question from a BBC correspondent if the USSR believes it is possible to bring about the unilateral withdrawal of American missiles from Europe, Lomeiko stressed that these missiles have been moved there unilaterally. This is why their pullout would not be a unilateral step. It would be a return to the normal situation which would make it possible to carry on the process of talks on nuclear arms in Europe.

A CBS correspondent asked if the USSR believes the withdrawal of the American missiles is a pre-condition for the resumption of talks on arms limitation. Lomeiko said in reply that the matter at issue is not that of pre-conditions. The matter at issue is that of creating a normal situation for the talks.

Affairs between the Soviet Union and the United States can only be conducted on the basis of equality, mutual respect and equal security for each of the sides, the Soviet spokesman emphasized.

(TASS, October 12. In full.)

NATO'NUN İLKBAHAR 1982 TOPLANTILARI

-DDR'de yayımlanan IPW aylık dergisinden
geniş özet- (Ağustos 1982)

1982 ilkbaharında NATO'nun yapılan toplantıları şunlardır:

-Nükleer Planlama Grubu toplantısı (NPG) 23-24 Mart 1982 ,savunma bakanları düzeyindeki bu toplantı, ABD'de Colorado Springs'de yapıldı.

-Avrupa Grubu toplantısı, 5 Mayıs 1982'de Brüksel'de, savunma bakanları düzeyinde.

-Savunma Planlama Grubu toplantısı, 6-7 Mayıs 1982'de ,Brüksel'de savunma bakanları düzeyinde

-Kuzey Atlantik Konseyi (KAK) 17-18 Mayıs 1982'de Brüksel'de, dışişleri bakanları düzeyinde.

Bu son üç toplantı, 9-10 Haziran'da yapılan NATO devlet ve hükümet başkanlarının katıldıkları doruk toplantısının aynı zamanda hazırlığı niteliğindeydi.

NATO'nun tüm ilkbahar toplantılarında açıkça görülen amaçları:

-NATO'nun uluslararası ilişkilerde çatışma politikasını sürdürdü.

-Varşova Anlaşması Ülkeleri karşısında "askersel üstünlük sağlama çabalarını sürdürdü

-Batı Avrupa'ya yeni Amerikan roketlerinin yerleştirilmesi planları üzerindeki çalışmalar ısrarla vurgulandı.

-Sovyetler Birliği ile ABD arasında orta menzilli roketler konulu Cenevre görüşmelerinin başlaması ve SALT görüşmelerinin yeniden başlatılması konularında, bağlaşıklar, ABD'nin gerçekçi olmayan, Sovyetler Birliği zararına tutumunu desteklediler.

-Bu toplantılarda NATO, sözde görüşmelere hazır bir tutum içinde olduğu demagogisiyi yaydı, görüşmelerin çıkmaza girmesinden sürekli Sovyetler Birliği sorumlu gibi gösterildi.

NATO'nun ilkbahar toplantılarında, bu amaçlar için kullanılacak olan araçlar:

-Sovyetler Birliği'nin sözünce "askersel tehdidi" nasalı. 4 Mayıs 1982'de bu amaçla bir "Varşova-NATO kuvvet karşılaştırılması" yayımlandı. Bu çalışma 1981 Aralık ayında yayımlanacaktı, ama kamuoyunun durumu ile NATO içindeki farklı yaklaşımlar nedeniyle yayımlanamıyordu.

NATO dışı alanlarla ilgili:

- Falkland savaşı konusunda tüm bağlaşıklar Arjantin'e karşı korum aldılar.
- İsrail'in Lübnan'a ve Suriye'ye yönelik saldırısı üzerinde bilinçli olarak durulmadı. Böylelikle İsrail'e hareket serbestliği sağlanmış oldu.

ABD, tüm bu toplantılarda bağlaşıklarıyla guaları dayatmak istedi:

- Çatışma politikası, Sovyetler Birliği ve Polonya'ya yönelik ekonomik baskı yöntemleriyle derinleştirilmelidir.
- 1967'den bu yana yürürlükte olan NATO'nun yumuşama konusundaki ikili tutumundan vazgeçilmelidir (yumuşama yarıdan, silahlanma sürmeli)
- Silahlanma harcamalarına artırma konusundaki %3'lük yıllık artış formülü, %4 yıllık artışla yer değiştirmelidir.
- "Bağlaşıklıkla planlama planı"nın NATO dışına taşınmalı, özellikle Yakın ve Orta Doğu'ya kaydırılmalıdır.

XX ABD'nin bu istemleri, bağlaşıkların farklı güvenlik, ekonomi ve politikaları nedeniyle le tümüyle onaylanmadı. Tüm bu toplantılar sonucunda uzlaşma metinleri yayınlandı. Bağlaşıklarıyla her biri, bu metinleri kendilerine göre yorumladılar.

Ne ki, tüm bu toplantılarda, belli, açık, net konular sınılandı:

- "Stratejik atom silahları, NATO'nun güvenliğinde esaslı bir garanti'dir" görüşü vurgulandı.
- İlk nükleer vuruştan vazgeçilmesi yolundaki kimi burjuva savunma uzmanlarının önerileri reddedildi.
- Esnek karşılık (flexible response) stratejisinin sürdürüğü vurgulandı (Bu, nükleer silahlar da içerisinde, ilk vuruş yapmayı da içeriyor)
- Brüksel kararlarının yürürlükte olduğu vurgulandı.
- Sovyetler Birliği'nin tek taraflı orta menzilli roketlerde moratoryum uygulamasına karşı, moratoryum önerisi reddedildi.
- ABD ile Sovyetler Birliği arasında Cenevre'de somut bir anlaşmaya varılmadan, roket indirimi, ya da kaldırılması görüşülemez" dendi. (Yunanis ten buna karşı oy verdi).
- ABD'nin sıfır gözüm dediği, Sovyetler Birliği'nin tüm roketlerini kaldırması karşılığında orta menzilli roketlerin yerleştirilmesinden vazgeçilmesi biçimindeki sahte öneri desteklendi. Bu, Batı Avrupa'daki kararlar deniden atılan roketleri reddediyor.

- Sovyetler Birliği, Batı'nın görüşmeleri çıkmaza itecek dayatmalarını kabul etmemekle, böylece görüşmeleri erteletmekle suçlandı. Ama Sovyetler Birliği'nin orta menzilli roketleri 1990 yılına dek dört bir indirme üzerisi max reddedildi. Eğitimlik ve eğitim güvencilik ilkesi ise yok farzedildi.

-Sovyetler Birliği ile ABD arasındaki SALT görüşmelerinin bağlanması konusunda görece bir fark görüldü. Barış hareketinin boyutları, somut Sovyet barış önerileri kapsamında, ABD'deki muhalefetin sesini yükseltmesi üzerine bağlaşıklıklar, ABD'yi daha görüşmeye yatkın bir tutuma zorladılar.

-Fakat bu Amerikan tutumunda bir değişiklik olduğu anlamına gelmiyor. 9 Mayıs 1982'deki Eureka/İllinois konuşmasında (bu konuşma NATO bağlaşıkları tarafından onaylandı) temel alındı. Burada Reagan, kıtadan kıtaya stratejik roketlerde önemli indirimler öneriyordu. Bilindiği gibi SB'nin kıta ülkesi olması nedeniyle nükleer başlıklara daha çok kıtadan kıtaya (%70), ABD'nin ise yalnızca %20. Yine bu konuda da deniz ve hava silahları yok farzederek Reagan tek yanlı üstünlük peşindedir. Reagan, SB'ninkilerin ABD'nin dört birine kadar indirilmesini istedi.

ABD SALT-II'yi onaylamayı reddetmeye devam ediyor.

18 Mayıs 1982'de Reagan yönetimi, SB'nin SALT görüşmelerinin, varolan nükleer potansiyelin şu andaki durumu dikkatlenmesi önerisini reddetti.

XXXX Pentagon 1984-1988 mali yılları arasındaki savunma konsepti adı altında, "tüm Sovyet askersel ve politik yapısını sarsıp yıkmak, aynı zamanda Sovyetlerin bağlaşıkları temsilcileri de yerle bir etme planı üzerine çalışmalarını sürdürüyorXXXX

Falkland ve NATO dışı alanlardaki faaliyetleri:

-Falkland savaşı, NATO dışı alanlardaki faaliyete örnek olarak ele alındı. İngilizler savaştı, öteki bağlaşıklar destek verdiler. Buradan yola çıkan bağlaşıklar, gelecekte de böyle NATO dışı alanlardaki müdahalelerin desteklenmesinin gerekebileceği sonucunu çıkardılar.

-Falkland savaşı, yeni silahların denenmesi, İngiliz ordusunun sızma sive çetin iklim koşullarında savaş yürütme gibi acılardan yararlı bir savaş olarak nitelendirildi.

-Buradan yola çıkan ABD ve İngiltere, NATO dışı alanlardaki askersel faaliyet hazırlıklarının yoğunlaştırılmasını istediler. Bonn doruk toplantısında Weinberger, şu soruyu ortaya attı: Artık bu planlamaya derhal başlamak zamanı gelmiştir. Nasıl ki İngiltere, birliklerini Falkland'a ulaştırma konusunda olanaklar kullanmışsa, ABD'de birliklerini Avrupa üzerinden Yakındoğu'ya geçirme konusunda her türlü kolaylığı edimelidir."

"Falkland olayı, öte yandan NATO'nun içyüzünü ortaya koyma bakımından da önemli göstergeler içeriyor: x) Bunalım düzenlenmesi (Crisis Management) tezi, iflas etti. Bunalım konusunda

düzenleme niyetinin olmadığı açığa çıktı.

(Bu, Türk-Amerikan Orta Savunma Grubu için de öne sürülmüş bir tezdî)

- xx) NATO, gelişmekte olan ülkelere askersel saldırıyı hazır olduğunu dünya önünde kanıt lamıştır
- xxx) İngiliz birlikleri, kaldı. Böylece ABD'nin Hint Okyanusundaki varlığını artırmaya için bir gerekece olmuştı.

İdeolojik saldırıyı artırma kararı alındı:

-1981 yılı ilkbahar toplantılarında böyle bir karar alınmıştı. Emperyalizm silahlanma yarışını tırmandırma girişimlerine yönelik tüm eleştirileri etkisizleştirmek için bu çalışmalara daha da hız verilmesi yolundaki bu çalışmalara ağırlık verileceği vurgulanmış. NATO'nun iki askersel örgüt ile ilgili sözüneme karşılaştırma yayını bu kapsamdadır. Ne ki, yayınlanan sayılar, ne tek tek NATO ülkelerinin kendilerinin yayınladıkları sayılarla, ne de Londra'da bulunan Stratejik Araştırmalar Enstitüsü'nün verileriyle tutmuyor.

F. Almanya'da yayınlanan Stern dergisi şöyle yazdı: "Eğer NATO'nun ortaya koyduğu manzara gerçek olsaydı, tüm NATO ülkelerinin savunma bakanları böylece bir geriliğe izin verdikleri için derhal görevden atılırlardı" (21/1982, s.264)

Uzun erimli programı için:

-Savunma Planlama Komitesi, 1983-1988 dönemi için silahlı kuvvetler hedeflerini saptadı. Konvansiyonel gücü artırılması için NATO bağlaşıkları yeni teknolojiler edinmeye özen göstereceklerini vurguladılar.

Anlaşmazlık konuları:

-Yıllık silahlanma harcamaları net artığının %4'e çıkarılması yönündeki Amerikan önerisi kabul edilmedi.

-ABD'nin yunusamadan toptan vazgeçilmesi önerisine karşı çıkıldı. F. Almanya dışişleri bakanı Genscher, Kuzey Atlantik Konseyi toplantısında yunusamanın getirdiği yararların üzerinde durdu. Kanadalı bakan ise NATO'nun yunusama ortamından gerektiği gibi yararlanmadığına savını öne sürdü.

-İkili strateji (yunusama+silahlanma) yürürlükte kaldı. Bunun üzerine ABD bağlaşıkları ikili görüşmeler aracılığıyla, özellikle sosyalist ülkelere ekonomik yaptırım konusunda zorlamaya çalıştı. Öte yandan Doğu-Bata

ilişkileri ise, ustaca "Sovyetler Birliği'nin ve sosyalist ülkelerin 'olumlu' tutumu"na bağlandı. ABD'nin bu hegemonyacı politikası, ustaca öteki bağlaşıklara da dayatılmış sayıldı.

NATO alanı genişledi:

-İspanya'nın üyeliği kesinleşti. 1950'li yıllardan bu yana ilk kez bir askersel pakt genişlemiş oldu.

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI
TÜSTAV

- Doğu-Batı ilişkilerinin tüm konularında NATO devletleri, şimdiye kadar bulundukları yıkıcı, olumsuz tutumlarını sürdürdüler:
- VAÖ devletlerinin 1984 Nisanında yeniledikleri karşılıklı kuvvet kullanmama önerisi görmezlikten gelindi.
 - Çernenko'nun uzayın militarizasyonunun önlenmesi önerileri ele alınmadı.
 - Stockholm Konferansı'nda NATO'nun askersel önlemlerde "saydamlık" yaratma tutumunda ısrar edildi.
 - Kimyasal silahlara duyulan tepki nedeniyle Nisanda Cenevre Silahsızlanma Komisyonuna ABD'nin getirdiği, şu ana dek sağlanmış durumun çok gerisin deki önerisi desteklendi.
 - Viyana'daki orta Avrupa'da güç ve silah indirimi görüşmeleri konusunda toplantıları bloke eden tutum sürdürüldü.
 - Doğu-Batı ilişkilerinde ABD'nin ısrar ettiği sosyalist ülkelere teknolojik transferinin kısıtlanması kabul edildi.
 - FAC'deki intikamcı çevreleri destekleyen tutum alındı. DAC'ni FACnin içine sokma planları yapıldı.

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARASTIRMA VEKİFİ
TÜSTAV

NATO'NUN 1984 İLKBAHAR TOPLANTILARI

(IPW-Berichte, 8/84'den geniş özet)

NATO'nun ilkbahar 1984 toplantıları, 1983 Kasımında Batı Avrupa ülkelerine yeni orta menzilli Amerikan roketlerinin yerleştirilmesinden sonraki ilk toplantılardı. Nükleer bir çatışma olasılığının artmış olduğu koşullarda yapıldı. Çünkü sosyalist ülkelerin uyarılarını, önerilerini, karşı önlem alınacağı yolundaki açıklamalarını dikkate almayan NATO'nun roketleri yerleştirmeye başlamasından sonra, askersel dengenin bozulmasına izin vermeyeceklerini defalarca belirten sosyalist ülkeler karşı önlem aldılar.

Batı Avrupa'ya yeni Amerikan roketlerinin yerleştirilmeye başlamasından sonra, sosyalist ülkeler barışçı girişimlerini sürdürdüler. Avrupa'nın kimyasal silahlardan arındırılması, silahlanma harcamalarının artırılmaması, karşılıklı kuvvet kullanmaktan vazgeçme ve barışçıl ilişkiler kurma önerileri, bunlar arasındadır. Ne ki, NATO ülkeleri, bu önerilerin hiç birini dikkate almadılar. TASS ajansının belirttiği gibi, askersel çizgilerinde yürümeye devam ettiler.

1984 ilkbaharında toplanan NATO organları şunlardır:

- Nükleer Planlama Grubu (NPG), 3/4 Nisan 1984, Çeşme, savunma bakanları düzeyinde.
- Avrupa Grubu (AvG), 15 Mayıs 1984, Brüksel, ^{savunma bakanları} ~~genel kurmay başkanları~~ düzeyinde.
- Askeri Komite (AK), 15 Mayıs 1984, Brüksel, genel kurmay başkanları düzeyinde.
- Savunma Planlama Komitesi (SPK), 16/17 Mayıs 1984, Brüksel, savunma bakanları düzeyinde.
- Kuzey Atlantik Konseyi, (KAK) 29-31 Mayıs 1984, Washington ve Wye Plantasyonu (Maryland eyaletinde), dışişleri bakanları düzeyinde, kimi zaman ABD başkan yardımcısı Bush da katıldı.

Toplantılar, Reagan yönetiminin askersel üstünlük sağlamak, SSCB ve VAÖ üyesi öteki ülkelere karşı askersel çatışma ortamını gerginleştirmek, doğu-batı ilişkilerini sürekli keskin tutmak ve Avrupa'da yumuşamanın kalıntılarını yavaş yavaş yok etme çabası altında oldu. Öteki NATO ülkelerinin büyük çoğunluğunun tutumu, ya bu politikayı doğrudan aktif desteklemek, ya da sükutla karşılaşılarak sessizce onaylamak oldu.

Batı Avrupa'ya yeni roketler yerleştirilmesi politikasına bu toplantılarda Yunanistan, Danimarka ve İspanya rezerv koydular. Öte yandan NATO ABD'nin politikası nedeniyle kesintiye uğrayan Cenevre görüşmelerinin yeniden başlatılması için yapılan önerileri reddetti. Toplantıların

ana ağırlık k merkezi, NATO'nun konvansiyonel silahlanmasının daha da artırılması ve doğu-batı ilişkilerinin nasıl biçimlendirileceği idi.

ABD ile bağlaşıkları arasında, gelecekte konvansiyonel silahların daha da geliştirilmesi konusunda görüş birliği vardır. Ancak bunun yolları ve kimi silah türlerinin finansmanı konusunda önemli görüş farkları bulunuyor.

Bu toplantılarda, gizli bir doğu-batı ilişkiler araştırması onaylandı. Daha önceki toplantılarda, Belçika dışişleri bakanı Tindemans başkanlığında bir ekip bu çalışmayı hazırlamakla görevlendirilmişti. Bu temel alındığı iddiasıyla "Doğu-Batı İlişkileri Üzerine Washington Deklerasyonu" yayınlandı. Ne ki, bu deklarasyonda yalnızca NATO'nun tutumunu kamufle etmek amacını taşıyan güzel sözler vardı. Doğu-batı ilişkilerinin gerçekte iyileştirilmesi yönünde hiçbir adım atılmadı. Bu belgedeki anti-Sovyetik bölümlere Yunanistan ve İspanya rezerv koydular.

KAK toplantısında Luns görevinden ayrıldı, yeni Genel Sekreter eski İngiltere dışişleri bakanı Carrington göreve başladı.

SPK toplantısında NATO üyeleri, esnek mukabele ve böylece de ilk nükleer vuruş ilkesini sürdüreceklerini belirttiler. Hollanda'ya PAC, ABR ve İngiltere yoğun baskılar yaptı. Hollanda hükümeti, yine de daha sonra ülkeye yeni Amerikan roketlerini yerleştirme kararını vermeyi 1985 Kasım ayına erteledi.

NATO'nun bu toplantılarında, Batı Avrupa'ya yeni roketler yerleştirmekten vazgeçme söz konusu olmadı. NATO ülkeleri, askersel dengenin daha üst ve tehlikeli bir düzeyde yeniden kurulmasına, böylelikle, neden oldular.

Öte yandan görüşmelerde takınılacak tutum konusunda da bir değişiklik olmadı. "Silahsızlanma görüşmeleri için hiçbir bedel ödenmemesi" yolundaki tutum, sürdürüldü. Reagan 31 Mayıs'daki KAK toplantısında yine SSCB'nin güç politikası sonucu Amerikan konumlarını kabul etmeye zorlanacağını bir kez daha iddia etti.

NPG toplantısında Weinberger Reagan yönetiminin balistik roketlere karşı korunma sisteminin geliştirilmesi ve konumlandırılması planları hakkında bilgi verdi. Esas sistemlerin uzaya yerleştirilmesinin öngörüldüğü bu plan, aynı zamanda uzayın militarizasyonunu hedefliyor. Bu plan, SSCB'ye karşı askersel üstünlük sağlama girişimlerinin devamıdır. Batı Avrupa ülkeleri, Weinberger'in açıklamalarına değişik tepkiler gösterdiler. ABD'nin araştırma ve geliştirme yolundaki planlarını desteklediler. Ancak ABD'nin böyle bir roket-savar sistemiyle korunmasından sonra Batı Avrupa'nın nükleer çatışmanın yapılacağı alan olmasından endişe duyduklarını söylediler.

Münih'de yapılan 21. Savunma toplantısında ABD başkan yardımcısı konvansiyonel silahların mükemmelleştirilmesinin gündeme geldiğini söylemişti.Şimdi NATO'nun hemen tüm ülkelerinin savunma bakanları, konvansiyonel silahlanmayı,roketlerin tamamlayıcısı olarak en önemli sorun olarak görüyorlar.

NATO'nun ilkbahar 1984 toplantılarında da paktın nükleer vuruş gücünün artırılması bir kez daha karara bağlandı.ABD bir dizi yeni silahın konumlandırılmasını,son derece ileri teknolojiyle üretilecek bu silahlar aracılığıyla sosyalist ülkelerin gerilerinin vurulabilmesini öngörüyor.Ayrıca ABD silahlanmadaki ileri konumlarından yararlanarak, Amerikan silah tekellerine milyarlarca dolarlık kâr sağlamak niyetindedir.

EAC ve öteki Avrupalı NATO üyeleri ise,yeni sistemlerin geliştirilmesi planlarına kendilerinin de çekilmesini istiyor.Batı Avrupalı NATO üyeleri,son aylarda, Fransa'nın de yer aldığı Bağımsız Avrupa Plan Grubu'nun çalışmalarını yoğunlaştırarak,bu dayatmalarını geçerli kılmaya çalışıyorlar.

Su sıralarda NATO bünyesi içinde çokyanlı işbirliğinin geniş programları için belirlemeler yapma çalışmaları sürüyor.NATO devletlerinin silahlanma sorumlularının yönetiminde,yedi ağırlık noktası saptanıyor.Bunlar arasında 1990'lı yıllar için bir NATO deniz savaş gemisi, casusluk sistemleri,yeni mermi türleri,roket yönlendirme sistemleri, taşıyıcı sistemleri ve menzili arayıp bulan silahlar vardır.

Konvansiyonel silahlanmada bu toplantılar sırasında bir kesinleştirme yapılamadı.Bunda altyapı programlarının finansmanındaki ayrılıklar gibi konular önemli rol oynadı.(Şimdi bu ayrılıklar giderilmiştir.)

Nisan-Mayıs 1984'de İran-Irak savaşının kızışmasını gerekçe olarak kullanan ABD, yeniden NATO antlaşması dışında kalan alanlara askersel müdahale edebilmek için hazırlıklar sorununu ortaya attı.NATO devletleri, bu toplantıda,öncekilendeki tutumlarını sürdürdüler,bunun tek tek ülkelerin alacakları önlemlerle bağlı bulunması gerektiğini belirttiler. KAK toplantısında ABD başkan yardımcısı Bush ile dışişleri bakanı Shultz'un ısrarlarına karşın,Basra Körfezi'ne ortaklaşa askersel müdahalede bulunma kararı alınmadı.Bölgedeki batı yanlısı Arap devletlerine ortak destek verme de onaylanmadı.NATO devletlerinin çoğunluğu, böylesi bir,müdahaleden yana olmadıklarını,bunun bu savaş tırmandıracağı görüşünü öne sürdüler.

KAK toplantısının açılışında ABD başkan yardımcısı Bush,SSCB'ye ağır suçlamalar yöneltti.Yumuşama konusunda ABD ile EAC başta kimi Avrupalı bağlaşıklar x arasında tam bir antlaşma sağlanamadı.