

## 6.FİLO'NUN GELİŞİ VE GİDİŞİ

Amerikan 6. Filosu'na bağlı Independence adı bir nükleer savaş gemisi ile bir muhrip, Pazartesi öğle üzeri İstanbul limanına girdi. Daha önce İstanbul'da bir hafta kalacağı bildirilen bu gemiler, Salı sabahı yeniden Lübnan halkının üzerine bombalar yağdırmak üzere, İstanbul'dan ayrıldılar.

Tam 5 bin Amerikan subay ve askeri var bu gemilerde... Bu gemilerden kalkan uçaklar, aylardır, günlerdir Lübnan halkının, Filistin halkının üzerine bombalar yağdırıyor. Kadın - çocuk, genç, yaşlı asker-sivil demeden binlerce Lübnanlının canına kıyıyor. İşte Dolmabahçe önüne demir atan Amerikan 6. Filosuna bağlı gemilerin içyüzü budur,... Lübnan halkını bombardımana tutup İstanbul'a gelen bu kaatil gemiler, şimdi yine aynı masum insanların canına kıymak için Beyrut açıklarına doğru yola koyuldular.

Binlerce Lübnanlıyı, Filistinliyi toplu kırma uğratan bu 5 bin Amerikalı kaatili, bu azıllı teröristleri güzelim İstanbul'da konuk etmek için Evren diktatörlüğü, Özal çetesi seferber oldu. 5 bin Amerikalı azıllı cani, İstanbul'da keyiflerince eğlensin, başlarına bir şey gelmesin diye sıkıyönetim birlikleri alarma geçirildi, seferber edildi. Bu kaatil gemiler, bu 5 bin çirkin Amerikalı, İstanbul'a girerken, sıkıyönetim komutanlığının Selimiye Kışlası'ndan top atışlarıyla selamlandı. Valisi, belediye başkanı, garnizon komutanı, Kuzey Deniz Saha Komutanı, hepsi bu canileri, bu kaatileri selemlemek, onları kabul etmek için sıraya dizildiler.

Şöyle bir düşününüz; Kimler top atışlarıyla bizim topraklarımızda bizim limanlarımızda selamlıyordu İstanbul Sıkıyönetim Komutanı Orgeneral Necdet Öztörün? Yüzbinlerce Filistinliyi yerinden, yurdundan, topraktan eden Siyonist İsrail yönetimine, terörist Şamir'lere kol kanat



geren Amerikalı kaatileri... Binlerce Filistinliyi, Lübnanlıyı barbarca öldüren bu canavarları selamlıyordu İstanbul Sıkıyönetim Komutanı... Ve aynı sıkıyönetim komutanlığına bağlı askeri mahkemeler, her gün sayısız yurtsevere ölüm fermanları kesiyor, halkımızın en yiğit, en cesur evlatlarına işkenceyle, ağır hapis cezalarıyla saldırıyor. Kaatil Amerikan filosunu limanlarımızda konuk edenler, Amerikan teröristlerini top atışlarıyla selamlayanlarla, cezaevlerindeki tutuklu yurtseverleri diri diri yakanlar aynı kişilerdir. Kendi öz yurdumuzda kaatil Amerikalı eğlensin diye orduyu seferber edenler, aynı orduyu kendi öz yurdumuzda yurtseverlerin üzerine saldırtan yine bunlardır.

5bin Amerikalı terörist, 5 bin Amerikalı caninin önünde selam duranlarla, Metris'de Türkiye Barış Komitesi yöneticilerini 20 metrekaarelik koğuşa tıkanlar, yarım milyonu aşkın işçimizin örgütü DİSK yöneticilerini ölüm cezalarıyla yargılayanlar yine bunlardır.

Halkımızın en yiğit evlatlarına, onbinlerce yurtseveri kendi öz yurdunda tutsak edenlerle, Amerikalı teröristlerin önünde selam duranların içyüzünü iyi tanımak gerekiyor.



9.2.1984

## SELİMİYE KİŞLASINDAN YÜKSELEN TOP SESLERİ

6 Şubat pazartesi günü iki Amerikan gemisi İstanbul'da Dolmabahçe önlerine demir attı... Gemi, ama bildiğimiz sızdan gemilerden, yolcu gemilerinden, yük gemilerinden değil... Nükleer silahlar da taşıyan Amerikan savaş gemileri bunlar... Lübnan'ın altını üstüne getiren, binlerce Lübnanlıyı çocuk- kadın, yaşlı- genç, asker- sivil demeden öldüren kaatil uçak gemileri, bu gemiler... Birinin adı "Independence" Yani bağımsızlık... Ama Amerika'dan binlerce kilometre ötede, ülkelere bağımsızlığını ayaklar altına alan kaatil bir gemi bu...

Tam 324 metre uzunluğunda... 76 metre genişlikte... Bu geminin içinde tam 70 savaş uçağı var... Ötekinin adı, Claude Ricketts roket muhribi... Bu gemiler, ülkelere silahlarla, roketlerle, bilyalı- kasetli bombalarla tıkebasse dolu... Ve bu iki gemide 145'i subay, 5 bin Amerikan askeri var...

Ve 6 Şubat pazartesi günü öğle üzere top sesleri yükseliyordu İstanbul üzerinde ... Önce Amerikan gemilerinden birbiri ardı sızra 21 parça top ateşi... Ardından Sıkıyönetim Komutanlığının bulunduğu Selimiye kışlasından 21 parça top atışı... Birinci Ordu ve İstanbul Sıkıyönetim Komutanı Org. Necdet Öztörün, bu Amerikan savaş gemilerini selamlıyordu. 5 bin Amerikalı subay ve askeri selamlıyordu top atışlarıyla İstanbul Sıkıyönetim Komutanı.

Kimdi bu 5 bin Amerikalı subay ve askeri? Binlerce Lübnanlıyı, Filistinliyi kadın- çocuk demeden bu gemilerden kalkan uçaklarla bombalayan öldüren kaatiller, teröristlerdi bunlar... Onbinlerce Lübnanlı Filistin'liyi sakat bırakan, yerinden yurdundan eden kaatiller, teröristlerdi bunlar...

Bunlardan Amerikadan binlerce kilometre ötede Reğin'in emriyle korsanlığa çıkıp, gidip Lübnan'ı bombalayan... Gittiler, Beyrut'un altını üstüne getirdiler... Geldiler, Dolmabahçe önlerine demirlediler.



Sıkıyönetim komutanı, top ateşleriyle selamladı bunları... Valisi, belediye başkanı, boğaz komutanı, garnizon komutanı bunları, bu en azılı teröristleri selamlamak için sıra sıra dizildiler... Şimdi bu kaatil gemiler, bu gemilerdeki 5 bin Amerikalı terörist, yeniden Lübnan'ı Filistinlileri, komşu Suriye birliklerini ateşe tutmak, yeni cinayetler işlemek için yola koyuldular. Ve Başbakanlık koltuğunda oturan Özal, dünkü basın toplantısında bu Amerikan teröristleri için, öyle tek tabancalı, tüfekli değil, tepeden tırnağa bombalarla, toplu kırım silahlarıyla donanmış bu teröristler için, "isterlerse yine limanlarımıza gelebilirler" diyor.

Ve Selimiye kışlasından 21 parça top atışıyla Amerikan teröristlerini selamlayan sıkıyönetim komutanları, faşist cuntanın bu cellatları, onların engizisyon mahkemeleri kendi öz yurdumuzda bizim insanlarımıza ölüm fermanları kesiyor, yurtseverleri diri diri çayır çayır yakıyor zindanlarda... Amerikalı kaatillerin, teröristlerin önünde selam duranlarla, DİSK yöneticilerini ölüm cezasıyla yargılayanlar aynı kişilerdir. Türkiye Barış Komitesi'nin 18 yöneticisini Metris'te 20 metrekaarelik koğuşlarda çürütmeye bunlardır. Kanseri teşhisi konan 69 yaşındaki emekli büyükelçi Mehmet Dikerdek'i barışı savunuyor diye 8 yıl hapse, fiilen ölüm cezasına mahkûm eden yine bunlardır.

Bu gemiler, yalnız Lübnan halkının, yalnız Filistin halkının kaatilleri değildir. Bundan 16 yıl önce aynı dev savaş gemisi yine Dolmabahçe önlerine demir atmıştı. O zaman 25 yaşında olan Hukuk Fakültesi son sınıf öğrencisi Vedat Demircioğlu, Ortadoğu halklarının bağımsızlığını ayaklar altına alan bu kaatil gemilere karşı çıktığı için şehit edilmişti. Yaşasaydı, bugün 41 yaşında olacaktı Demircioğlu...

Yine aynı Independence adlı gemi, 1969'da yine İstanbul'a demir attı. Bundan tam 15 yıl önce, 16 Şubat 1969 günü bu kaatil gemilerin gelişini protesto eden 30 bin yurtseverin üzerine zamanın hükümeti,



faşistleri saldırttı. Tarihe "Kanlı Pazar" diye geçen o gün Türkiye İşçi Partisi Üyesi Ali Turgut Aytaç ile işçi Duran Erdoğan barbarca öldürüldü. Güzel bir havada karısı Eflar'la Üçbüçuk yaşındaki kızı Elif'le yürüyüşe katılmıştı Ali Turgut Aytaç... Sopalarla, coplarla, bıçaklarla saldırdılar Ali Turgut Aytaç'ın üzerine... Ve bugün 13 yaşında genç bir kız olan Elif Aytaç'ı yetim bıraktılar.

Bu gemiler, yalnız Lübnan halkını, Filistin halkını toplu kırıma uğratmakla kalmadı. Demircioğlu'nun, Erdoğan'ın, Aytaç'ın kaatilleri, küçük Elif Aytaç'ı babasız, öksüz-yetim bırakan yine bu kaatil gemilerdir. İşte sıkıyönetim komutanı, valisi, belediye başkanı, garnizonu komutanı bu kaatillerin, bu 5 bin Amerikalı teröristin önünde selam duruyorlar. Ve bugün halkımızın değerli, yigit evlatlarına karşı işkenceyle, baskıyla, zulümle saldırıyorlar. Bunların içyüzünü iyi tanıyalım!

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARŞİVİ



14.2.1984

## DEVLET ELİYLE MUHABBET TELLALLIĞI

Biliyorsunuz, kadın alıp satanlara kibarcası "muhabbet tellâlı" denir. Fuhuşta aracılık yapan kişidir "muhabbet tellâlı". Halk dilinde "muhabbet tellâlı"nın adı başka bir şeydir, ama bu sözü kullanmaya <sup>radıyonun</sup> kuralları elvermiyor.

İşte geçen hafta İstanbul'a demir atan iki Amerikan gemisindeki 6 bini aşkın Amerikan subay ve erinin de "muhabbet tellalları" vardı. Amerikan 6. Filosuna bağlı bu gemiler ilk plana göre bir hafta kalacaklardı İstanbul'da. Ama 19 saat kalabildiler. Regın'ın emriyle, Lübnan'da işler daha da zorlaştı denince, apar topar, palas pandıras yeniden Beyrut kıyılarına doğru yola çıktılar.

Hükümet sözcülerine bakarsanız, bu gemilerdeki Amerikan askerleri "moral tazelemek" için İstanbul'a gelmiş, Her asker ve subayın cebinde bir hatunun adresi ve telefon numarası varmış. Şöyle bir düşününüz, 6 bini aşkın Amerikan subay ve askerine Beyrut'ta işledikleri bunca cinayetten sonra "moral tazelemeleri" için en az 6 bin kadın gerek. Çekirge sürülgü gibi dalmışlar İstanbul'a... Her biri önce telefon kulübesine ya da cüzdanında sakladığı adresteki hatun kişiyi bulmaya yola düşmüş.

Bu hatun kişilerden biri Konservatuar öğrencisi Meral Yüksel. Gazeteye verdiği demeçte, "çok heyecanlıyım" diyor bu Konservatuar öğrencisi. "Amerikan Filosunun gelişine çok sevindim. Böylece üç yıl önce İzmir'de tanıdığım Yüzbaşı MacGregon'la yine birlikte olabileceğiz" diyor.

Bilmiyoruz, acaba Meral hanım dört gözle beklediği Amerikalı sevgilisi yüzbaşıyla felekten bir gece çalabildi mi ? Ama bildiğimiz bir şey varsa, o da, bu iki gemideki 6 bini aşkın Amerikan askerinin her birinin cebinde daha karaya inmeden en az birer kadının adres ve telefonunun olduğu. Demek ki, Filistin ve Lübnan halkının kaatili bu amerikalıların cebinde daha karaya çıkmadan en az 6 bin Türk kadınının



adresleri var. Az-buz değil, adına hayat kadını deyin, ne dersiniz deyin, en az 6 bin İstanbullu kadının adresleri bu Beyrut kasabı conilerin cep defterlerinde yazılı.

Eskiden olduğu gibi, karaya çıktıktan sonra rasgele Beyoğlu'nun arka sokaklarına da dalmıyor adamlar. Önceden her şey planlanmış, kotarılmış. En az 6 bin kadının telefonları, adresleri tek tek sağlanmış Amerikan subaylarına, Amerikan askerlerine.

Demek ki, bu işte kendilerine yardımcı olan birileri var. Demek ki, bu kadar kadının adresini birilerinin Amerikalı dostlarına toplu olarak vermesi gerekiyor. Özel muhabbet tellallarının bu işi tek başlarına becermesi kolay olmadığına göre, kimler bunlar ?

Öyle ya. 6 bin kişilik Amerikan filosunun "moral tazeleme" işinde, birilerinin bunlara aracı olması, birilerinin bunlara "muhabbet tellallığı" yapması gerek. Hele iş, böylesine önceden planlanmış, önceden kotarılmış olduğuna göre, daha Amerikan subay ve erleri karaya çıkmadan önce, hepsinin cebinde adresler çok önceden bulunduğuna göre, kim örgütleyebilir bu çapta bir muhabbet tellallığını ? Kim, Filo komutanı Amerikalı generalle, onun kurmaylarıyla bu "moral tazeleme" işini bu çapta toplu bir muhabbet tellallığını birlikte kotarabilir ? Amerikan Filo Komutanı, onun kurmay heyeti önceden İstanbul'un her biri kendi çapında muhabbet tellallarıyla tek tek temasa geçecek değişler ya

Demek ki, Amerikan amiralleriyle, Amerikan generalleriyle, Filo Komutanlarıyla bu muhabbet tellallığını tek elden kotaran biri, birileri olmalı.

Öyleyse kimdir bunlar ? Kim ki, Amerikalı "müttefik"yle kapalı kapılar ardında gizli anlaşmayı bağlıyorsa, bu muhabbet tellalı da muhakkak odur, onlardır. Kim ki, Selimiye kışlasından bu kaatil filoyu top atışlarıyla selamlıyorsa, odur, onlardır. Kim ki, Amerikan doları geldi, hoşgeldi diyorsa, odur, onlardır. Kim ki, dolar serbest, ticaret serbest diyorsa, odur, onlardır. 6 bin Amerikan askerinin muhabbet tellallığını da yapan, yaptıran işte bu Evren-Özal çetesidir.



Bir kez vatani Amerikalıyı satmaya gör, vatan toprağını üssüyle, füzesiyle Amerikalıya satmaya gör. En küçük bir kutsal değerleri kalmayanlar, döviz diye, para diye daha çok şey satarlar. ~~Kadın~~..... kuralları adıyla sanıyla bunların bu rezilliğini söylememize elvermiydr, böyleleri kibarca söylemek gerekirse, muhabbet tellallığı da yaparlar. Kadın da satarlar.

Bir kez vermeye gör elini Amerikalıya. Kolunu da kapar. Toprağına da, her yerine de el atar. Ve sana devlet eliyle muhabbet tellallığı da yaptırırlar.

---

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMALARI  
TÜSTAV



IT'S WORTH REMEMBERING

A.Bovin, Izvestia Political correspondent

The Government of New Zealand is known to have decided quite a long time ago not to allow any US nuclear-armed or nuclear-powered warships into her ports. In Washington's opinion, this decision runs counter to New Zealand's commitments arising from her membership of the ANZUS military-political bloc.

After 18 months of what have proved to be pointless negotiations and persuasions, US Secretary of State George Shultz, speaking in Manila, declared that the US and New Zealand were no longer military allies and that the United States would not consider itself under obligation to defend New Zealand. "We are parting as friends, but we are parting", the Secretary of State added.

Prime Minister David Lange of New Zealand is reported to have taken that parting rather quietly. First, Lange said, it is not the ANZUS Treaty, but the US interests that determine the US strategy in the Pacific (he must have said that to reassure himself). And second, New Zealand is by no means deserting the Western system of alliances (that must have been intended to reassure Shultz).

Let us see, by the way, who threatens New Zealand and against what threat has the US ceased to be defending her? The Secretary of State passed over that circumstance of no mean importance. Of course, he knew why but was not bold enough to say it... After all, he was in discharge of official government duties.

Now, Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick, a former US Ambassador to the UN and much more of a Reaganite than her former chief, is not in discharge of such duties. So she has no reason to mince her



Monday, July 14, 1986

6

- 2 -

words. The point is, she knows that for sure, that the Soviet Union has insidious designs. Not so long ago, Mrs. Kirkpatrick scared her Washington Post readers, the Kiribati Islands have signed a fishing agreement with the Russians. Moreover, it has been announced that diplomatic relations have been established between the Soviet Union and the island State of Vanuatu. Furthermore, Vanuatu and Fiji have been reported to be intending to conclude fishing agreements with the Russians, too.

So that's it. By refusing to defend New Zealand, the US is leaving her face to face with the "Russians" who, of course, are "getting more active", "intensifying their influence", "penetrating" and so on and so forth. For some reason, Mrs. Kirkpatrick has not disclosed the actual timing of the Soviet naval landing in New Zealand or, at least, in Vanuatu, although she could have done that without any difficulty.

Now let us talk seriously. The Soviet Union is a Pacific Power. So our involvement in Pacific affairs is natural to our geopolitical position and our interests. I think that interest will grow as further progress is made in the development of Siberia and our entire Eastern coast. It will grow along with the rising share the Asian and Pacific region has in world economics and world politics.

All these are fairly elementary things. But it is worth remembering some elementary truths once in a while.

Much is being written and said about a Pacific Community. If it means an alliance of some Pacific States under American and Japanese control, one can hardly regard that initiative as constructive. It will certainly exacerbate the major existing contradictions and difficulties. It would be more advisable to plan the future of the Asian and Pacific region as a joint project based on the equal participation of all the States within this region as a factor conducive to their economic



Monday, July 14, 1986

6

- 3 -

prosperity and assuring their mutual security.

This is the approach that the Soviet Union, at any rate, has been and will be advocating.

(Izvestia, July 13. In full.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI  
TÜSTAV



DREAMS AND REALITY

A. Cherepanov

The USA is squeezing the ring of war around revolutionary Nicaragua. Today, nearly 5,000 paratroopers from the American 82nd Cavalry Division which took part in the intervention in Grenada are at a distance of a short assault march from Managua.

X X X

Not long ago the US Defense Department explained that the headquarters of the American task forces would soon be transferred from Ft. Gordon, Georgia, to Fort Clayton in the Panama Canal zone. The logistic-support units have already been moved there. Three thousand servicemen from the 193th Infantry Brigade which also landed in Grenada are preparing to be lifted there, too.

Jay Farrar, the Pentagon's official spokesman, has stated that the task forces are being lifted to Panama to ensure rapidity of their operations. It is perfectly clear in what country the Pentagon wants to see them as quickly as possible. American spy Sam Hall, who was recently caught red-handed in Nicaragua, had to admit at a press conference held in Managua the other day that he had been infiltrated into Nicaragua by the Pentagon and CIA to collect secret information of a military character.

After the provocative air attack of the Honduran air-force on the Nicaraguan populated areas which resulted in the dramatic deterioration of relations between the US partner, Honduras, on the one hand, and Nicaragua on the other, the American troops in the area were put on red alert. This concerns first of all the units deployed in the Panama Canal zone. And the US battleship Missouri, which carries missiles,



may be, even equipped with nuclear warheads, is plying the ocean along the Pacific coast of Central America.

Washington has long prepared a plan of unleashing a war against Nicaragua. Judging by all indications, it assigns the central role to Honduras which is to provoke an armed conflict on the border with its neighbour. And then the Americans would directly intervene under the pretext of "defending" their ally against an outer aggression.

After the raid from the territory of Honduras the Sandinists have displayed reserve but Honduras is continuing its provocations. It was officially stated in Tegusigalpa that the "operation" would be repeated if need be. Managua reacted to this demarche with self-command characteristic of the Sandinists. Furthermore, this week Nicaragua's leaders asked the United Nations to set up an international commission which would establish control over the Nicaraguan-Honduran border with a view of preventing an armed conflict between the two countries. In the past, the Sandinists more than once addressed Honduras with a proposal to establish such a commission consisting of representatives of both countries, but Honduras refused each time.

The only country to benefit by the heightening of tension in the area is the United States whose ruling quarters dream of Nicaragua's surrender. But reality differs greatly from dreams. Though the Sandinists have done all possible to settle the conflict in a peaceful way (and are supported in these efforts by a sweeping majority of the members of the world community), they are ready to defend their independence by means of arms.

(Izvestia, December 24. In full.)



VORIO-870806DR36

UNTYING THE HANDS OF THE PENTAGON

S. Guk

The whole thing is as simple as ABC: the US is moving its fleet from the Mediterranean and the Atlantic Ocean into the Persian Gulf, while the resultant "gap" in NATO's military defences is to be filled by the West German Bundesmarine, which for the period of absence of its senior partner, will take over its duties in protecting the sea frontiers of the Western alliance. Details of this operation were just now discussed in Washington between West German Defence Minister Manfred Woerner and his US counterpart Caspar Weinberger.

Bonn had refused to send its ships directly into the Persian Gulf to support the US: it was not worthwhile the try and could besides create quite a stir. The West German constitution prohibits using the country's armed forces for any purposes except defensive ones. At any rate, they cannot be dispatched to seats of tension. Besides, the Persian Gulf is now a far from safe place.

But the senior partner in the bloc has no reasons to be displeased either: Bonn is leaving the US free to act in the Persian Gulf. For West Germany it is an additional occasion to show to the whole world that it is not a minor member of the NATO alliance but almost military power No.2.

In Bonn itself, these plans have been welcomed by far from all.

Social-Democratic deputies demanded that the foreign affairs commission of the Bundestag meet in urgent session. The government must explain the considerations it guided itself by in taking the action, they think.

(Izvestia, August 5. Abridged.)



USA: AN ISRAELI BACK-YARD?

Why Washington is so Benign About Israeli Espionage

Victor Bashkin

The Israeli Embassy in Washington has become the centre of espionage, with diplomats turned spies seeking in all ways to get classified information which the American government has refused to give Tel Aviv legally. Profiting by its friendly attitudes, Mossad agents with diplomatic passports act in a brazen and self-assured manner, travelling all over the country and making numerous contacts.

Of course, occasionally Mossad gets in a "quandary", but always comes off unscathed. At worst, some much too "zealous" Israeli "diplomats" would pack their things unobtrusively and leave for Tel Aviv.

Yet, last November, like a bolt out of the blue, there came the arrest of Jonathan Pollard, a US naval intelligence officer, who was taken outside the Israeli embassy compound in Washington with a briefcase containing classified intelligence documents.

The investigation revealed that for a few years he had been passing to some embassy staff members highly sensitive information concerning the US armed forces and their technical intelligence installations in the Middle East. But what is most important, Mossad had urged Pollard to get the codes of the 6th Fleet stationed in the Mediterranean.

The arrest of the Israeli spy produced a mixed reaction in the USA. On the one hand, Tel Aviv's brazen behaviour caused indignation in the US public and among some Washington officials. On the other, pressed by the Zionist lobby, many high-ranking members of the Administration tried, if unsuccessfully, to drop the matter. The ensuing row was too



great. Pollard had to be taken to court. The Israeli government had to apologize and return part of the classified documents. Rafael Eitan, the high-ranking intelligence officer heading the "research" section at the Ministry of Defense, was rushed into retirement. An official scapegoat, he had allegedly started the Pollard affair on his own without his government's knowledge.

But even this row has failed to darken the US-Israeli cooperation in intelligence exchanges. The thing is that Israel passes to the United States approximately the same amount of classified information concerning the Middle East as it gets from it. It is for this reason that Washington prefers to be benign about "pranks" Mossad agents are committing on the shores of the Potomak.

(Sovetskaya Rossia, July 7. Abridged.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH  
TÜSTAV ARASTIRMA



Scanning Periodicals

REVIEW OF THE JOURNAL USA: ECONOMICS,  
POLITICS, IDEOLOGY NO.12, 1986

The issue opens with an article "Reykjavik and After" by V.Berezhkov. Having considered the results of the Reykjavik meeting, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee stressed the need of continuing contacts and talks, specifically in Geneva, on the whole complex of issues of nuclear and space armaments on the basis of the package of proposals submitted by the Soviet side in the capital of Iceland, the author writes.

The whole world is concerned over the fact that no accord was reached in Reykjavik. This happened because the American side stubbornly clung to the fantastic and extremely dangerous idea of SDI, because influential quarters in the United States have not yet given up the unrealizable dream of gaining military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The intensive propaganda activity of the US official representatives after Reykjavik is directed at embellishing Washington's unseemly stand at this meeting. Some members of the Administration, among them its head, have gone to the length of ascribing to themselves the main desert in the drawing closer of the two powers' stands on the crucial issues of disarmament, though it is perfectly clear that exactly the Soviet side created conditions for ending the deadlock by its initiative, persistence and boldness.

There should be no return to the situation existing before the meeting in the capital of Iceland, what the US Administration is clearly tending to, V. Berezhkov emphasizes. It is necessary to preserve the positions reached in Reykjavik, and to advance further from them.



It is to be hoped that the nuclear danger now threatening all mankind, including the people of the United States, will eventually impel the leaders of that great power on which a lot depends in the present-day world to display a realistic approach. The struggle for settling the nuclear weapons issues, for peace continues. It is waged by politicians, public movements and multimillion masses of people. It must and will certainly result in adoption of measures which will save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe and ensure stable peace, security, equal cooperation, and friendship of all peoples on our planet.

"Some Aspects of SDI Impact on U.S. Economy" is the title of an article by A.Vasilyev and A.Konovalov. Even at its current stage, the two authors write, the SDI program is regarded as crucial to the interests of major arms manufacturing corporations.

Big orders have been placed with the leading U.S. arms manufacturing corporations. Even so, the Pentagon has sought to involve in the program smaller research companies, laboratories and universities. Money for SDI research has been provided for over 600 universities and industrial laboratories in the United States and Western Europe. In the 1985 fiscal year the Pentagon's outlays for university research have reached 930 million dollars to double its allocations for the purpose in the 1980 fiscal.

Evaluating the U.S. approach to SDI, A.Vasilyev and A.Konovalov write, one ought to state that the U.S. ruling quarters so stubbornly stick to the Star Wars plan because of its alleged "political advantages". As for SDI's economic aspects, Washington pins its hopes not so much on acceleration of science and technology progress as on Star Wars capability to meet the needs of the military and Big Business as well as on a disastrous impact the program is likely to bear on the



economies of U.S. chief rivals from among the Western industrialized nations.

The United States also hopes that the Soviet Union, faced with the need to devise a response to SDI, will be unable to cope with its social and economic priorities. Yet everybody knows that attempts to undermine the Soviet economy by military preparations have never succeeded and will certainly prove futile again.

Washington's bid to ensure its security to the detriment of the other side betrays its outdated political thinking which is inadmissible in the nuclear era. As was repeatedly stated at the 27th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, the continuing arms race on Earth, more so its projection into outer space, as well as attempts to achieve a military superiority will objectively fail to bear political fruit for anybody. In contemplating SDI potential to weaken the economies of other states, including both the rivaling allies and ideological adversaries, the U.S. ruling quarters go against the interests of the American people by gearing vast material and intellectual resources to non-productive military needs.

G. Sturua's contribution is entitled "Security in the Mediterranean--Navy Issue".

Reducing naval presence in the Mediterranean is extremely important for reducing the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. The documents of the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty states of June 11, 1986, described the issue as especially topical for Europe today and tomorrow, as two major military groupings armed with sophisticated weaponry confront each other in that part of the globe, with some of their conventional weapon systems coming ever closer to mass destruction weapons in their combat properties.



The US military-political circles have lost former unity of mind as far as the necessity goes to steadily uphold the former levels of Mediterranean naval presence. But, most regrettably, they don't soberly realise the simple fact that, however much the United States may wish it, it cannot turn the sea back into an "American lake". In its striving to reach naval superiority, the US Administration is extremely unlikely to recognise that it is desirable to reduce its naval presence in the Mediterranean and elsewhere. It is clear, nevertheless, that improved European and world situations will encourage trends that might help the US military-political circles to accept the idea of regional restrictions on naval activities. The Soviet programme for nuclear disarmament, and reducing the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe has its positive effect on Mediterranean security prospects, the author says.

The issue also carries contributions by S. Yershov, "Current Labor Union Problems (100 Years of AFL)"; V. Kirichenko "U.S. Policy in Central America: Past and Future"; A. Cherkasov "Experience of Developing Canadian North", and other materials.

(APN, December 22. In full.)

THE END



Monday, July 21, 1986

OIRI19-GVT-860720-601

9

MEDITERRANEAN: WHAT HAMPERS BUILDING OF  
CONFIDENCE BRIDGES

E. Ryabtsev, APN political analyst

The tour of US Vice-President George Bush of some Middle East countries, which is to begin on July 25, draws attention for two fundamental reasons. They are as follows: Is the US Administration prepared to help establish confidence measures in the Mediterranean and settle the Middle East issue at an earliest date?

Proceeding from the aims of Bush's visit to Israel, Egypt and Jordan, this is not on his plans. He intends only to reaffirm the earlier American obligations with regard to Tel Aviv and Cairo. The American approach to Middle East settlement, aimed at ensuring notorious security of Israel at the expense of its Arab neighbours, remains virtually unchanged. This is also the goal of Bush's visit to Amman. The idea behind the Washington efforts to draw Israel and Jordan closer together is to remove the PLO from the process of Mideast settlement. In other words, we are witnessing the attempts to replace the PLO by a group of persons recruited at the Israeli-occupied territories, who are ready to give up the idea of setting up an independent Palestinian state.

This unrealistic policy explains also the reason why the United States does not intend to withdraw its 6th Fleet from the Mediterranean. Though the Washington Administration keeps stating that the presence of the Fleet there ostensibly serves to strengthen stability, it is really the demonstrative and provocative manoeuvres of the 6th Fleet that have resulted in the escalation of tension in the whole Mediterranean in the past few months. It is to blame for the outburst of hostilities in the Gulf of Sidra in March. In April, using as



Monday, July 21, 1986

9

- 2 -

a pretext Libya's alleged "involvement" in the terrorist actions in West Berlin, the USA decided to teach that non-aligned country a lesson by attacking it with the air-force of the 6th Fleet and with the fighter-bombers based in Britain.

This month the situation in the Central Mediterranean gravely deteriorated for the umpteenth time because of the new provocative manoeuvres of the 6th Fleet at Libya's coast. The Fleet again includes a third aircraft-carrier, and the B-52 strategic bombers were urgently lifted to the US bases in Britain. Political observers deem this to be an intention of the United States to resort anew to force against Libya in order to suppress the Government of Gaddafi by means of non-nuclear missiles which the B-52 bombers can carry. Actually, the American policy of power pressure is blocking both normalisation of the whole situation in the Mediterranean and settlement of the crisis situation in the Middle East area.

The Soviet Union, suggesting to unblock the approaches to Middle East settlement, has recently tabled a proposal to set up a preparatory committee, consisting of five permanent members of the UN Security Council, for holding an international conference on the Middle East. This initiative was positively appraised by Egypt, Jordan and many other states which are sincerely interested in seeking realistic ways to establish peace in the area.

The USSR's proposals, which take into account the desire of the non-aligned countries to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and cooperation, are also directed at normalising the situation there. The Soviet Union's striving to put an end to the attempts to turn the Mediterranean into an arena of military confrontation glutted with various armaments, including nuclear ones, was expressed in the recent



letter addressed by the Soviet Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary General.

The Soviet leaders are convinced that establishment of confidence measures in the Mediterranean is directly linked with the reduction of armed forces, withdrawal of nuclear-capable ships from the Mediterranean, renunciation of deploying nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear countries and with non-using such weapons against states which do not let nuclear weapons to be placed on their territories. The confidence-building measures also include the Soviet proposal on the withdrawal of Soviet and US military fleets from the area.

But Washington has not introduced any constructive proposals in reply to all these Soviet initiatives. In this context, right are those who hold the view that the US Administration is not at all interested in lessening tensions in the Mediterranean. Evidence of this is its refusal to pull out the US 6th Fleet which has, in effect, become a tool of US state-sponsored terrorism.

As we see, Washington is clearly unwilling to help building confidence bridges in the region, apparently because this may prevent it from interfering in the home affairs of other countries. Blocking the road to the normalisation of the situation in the Mediterranean and settlement of the Middle East issue, the United States is, in effect, openly ignoring the vital interests of all the states in the area.

(APN, July 20. In full.)

THE END



Friday, May 30, 1986

6.76  
VORIO-860530-506

6

### THE POLICEMAN FLEET

By Nikolai Miroshnik

Greece has filed in an official protest to the United States, saying that during the recent NATO war games in the East Mediterranean, which involved the 6th Fleet, American warplanes violated Greek airspace on 46 occasions.

The impudent behaviour of American fire-eaters, against which, as the Greek incident shows, no sovereign nation can be guaranteed, draws public attention to provocative actions of the Pentagon's "floating gendarme", the U.S. 6th Fleet. Everybody still remembers a recent aggression against Libya, which was hardly a debut for the 6th Fleet.

Its aircraft carriers and other warships have always been advanced to the foreground of dramatic events in the Mediterranean. Perhaps, of all the conflicts that have erupted in the area during the past few decades none has been handled without the involvement of the Pentagon relying on its 6th Fleet and a vast network of military bases in the littoral countries.

These aggressive actions, which from time to time win applause in far-away Washington, have triggered off a good deal of outrage and protest among the people of the Mediterranean countries. For even the U.S. Mediterranean partners seem to have realized that the Pentagon's bid to play with fire is also aimed, if indirectly, against them. With its gunboat diplomacy the United States also wants to remind Western Europe how narrow the framework of its independence is, which is nevertheless not to be kicked over, said the Italian magazine, Rinascita. But the U.S. "reminder" was also meant to curb Western Europe's interest toward the Soviet peace initiatives, including a proposal to withdraw both the U.S. and Soviet navies from the Mediterranean simultaneously.



Western Europe's interest is only natural. To turn the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and cooperation is what the public in many countries of the region wants. It is also to be noted here that the presence of the Soviet ships in the Mediterranean is conditioned by the fact that the U.S. 6th Fleet has been deployed in the proximity of the Soviet borders.

Clearly, it is not the build-up of the U.S. militaristic effort in the Mediterranean but rather a pullout of the American naval armada that appears to be a major precondition for the region to stop being a powder keg that poses a threat to three continents at once.

(Pravda, May 30. In full.)

TÜSTAV  
TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA KURUMU



Monday, July 28, 1986

VOKPO-860728-506

3

PRAVDA INTERVIEWS ADMIRAL V.N.CHERNAVIN

The Soviet Navy, along with the other armed services of the USSR, is developing within the limits necessary for the country's defence. It stands on guard for the nation's security, the peaceful labour effort of the Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist countries.

The main strike force of the Navy is the nuclear powered submarine missile carriers, to which there are no inaccessible areas in the world ocean, and the naval aviation. Among the surface ships are aircraft carrying cruisers, nuclear-powered missile cruisers, big anti-submarine ships and destroyers. The Marines are equipped with landing ships, armoured equipment and other combat vehicles. The units of the coastal missile-artillery troops have effective weapons.

The Soviet Navy has a big firepower and is highly mobile. It is capable of carrying out combat operations in various parts of the World ocean against aggressor ships at sea and at bases and of destroying its ground objectives.

I would like to stress that Soviet Naval ships have never attacked either the ships, or the coasts of other countries or threatened them. Yet the strategic force of the USSR Navy is in permanent readiness for launching a retaliatory strike.

(Pravda, July 27. In full.)



Wednesday, July 16, 1986

VORIO-860716-508

1

THE SITUATION IS BEING AGGRAVATED

Yuri Vladimirov

Tension is escalating in the Mediterranean: the US Navy is carrying out war games off the shores of Libya. Carrier-based aircraft are feeling out" the anti-aircraft defence of Libya. The Pentagon and the White House are talking about the intention "to continue pressure" on that state which has twice been subjected to US aggression over the past few months.

Such provocative actions and statements were a new reminder of the dangerous situation that has taken shape in the Mediterranean because of the continuing militarist efforts of Washinton in that area. The US has long since been trying to ensure its control over the Mediterranean Sea, and keeping the warships of its Sixth Fleet there. According to a decision passed recently, not one but two US aircraft-carrier groups will be permanently based in the Mediterranean.

Naturally, all this worries the peoples of the coastal states and not only them. They demand that tension in the Mediterranean, caused through the fault of the United States, be relaxed.

It is generally known that the trade routes linking the Soviet Black Sea ports with the World Ocean pass through the Mediterranean. The US Sixth Fleet also threatens our security, thus forming the USSR keep its warships in the area. This is a forced measure. Therefore, our Government, interested in goodneighbourly relations with other states, recently came out with a new initiative which provides for a simultaneous withdrawal of the US and the Soviet naval units from the Mediterranean.

This step was received in the Mediterranean countries of Europe, Africa and Asia with great interest and approval.



Wednesday, July 16, 1986

1

- 2 -

However, the US Administration has not given a positive answer to the Soviet proposal.

(Pravda, July 16. Abridged.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA KURUMU  
TÜSTAV



Wednesday, July 9, 1986

6. File

5

VOVPO-860709-505

MEDITERRANEAN SECURITY

Letter to UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar

Esteemed Mr. Secretary-General,

In the present-day complex and tense international situation it is vital that practical actions be urgently taken to ensure by joint efforts of states a turn for the better, to start movement towards creating a dependable comprehensive system of international security to embrace all regions of the world. All foreign policy actions of the Soviet Union, and its approach to international problems including the matter of ensuring security in the Mediterranean are prompted by a desire to accomplish this task in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

The Soviet Union has on more than one occasion called the attention of the international community, and at the highest political level, to the abnormal situation that is taking shape in that densely-populated region. It has actually been turned into an arena of military confrontation, and is overflowing with armaments, including the most destructive ones - nuclear armaments.

The reasons for this are well-known: they directly proceed from the US policy of neo-globalism, and its imperial ambitions to destabilize 'objectionable' governments and suppress national liberation movements.

The unprecedented escalation in the US military presence, the large-scale militaristic preparations, the endless manoeuvres off the shores of independent countries of that region, the provocative actions against Cyprus, the campaign of blackmail against Syria, the threats of force against other Mediterranean countries, the aggressive actions by Israel, a US strategic partner, and, finally, the reckless anti-Libyan campaign have made the situation in that part of the world



white-hot.

Things deteriorated to a direct US armed attack on Libya - a sovereign state and member of the United Nations Organisation - which constitutes a flagrant violation of the UN Charter and the universally accepted standards of international law. Threats to deal new strikes against Libya do not cease today either. This policy of state terrorism could have grave consequences going far beyond the boundaries of the Mediterranean region.

It is quite apparent that developments in the Mediterranean have a direct bearing on many countries, including the Soviet Union. Vitally interested in the ensurance of the security of the area, the USSR resolutely supports the proposal of the non-aligned countries to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and cooperation and is prepared to make a weighty contribution to the consolidation of peace and cooperation in the Mediterranean for which a resolution of the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly (40/157) calls.

Still valid too are the Soviet proposals for extending agreed upon confidence-building measures to the region, for the reduction of armed forces, withdrawal of nuclear-armed ships from the Mediterranean, renunciation of the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear Mediterranean countries and the adoption by nuclear powers of a pledge not to use such weapons against any Mediterranean country that keeps from deploying such weapons.

The Soviet Union recently advanced a new far-reaching proposal to withdraw the navies of the USA and the USSR from the Mediterranean.

There is in principle no need for our country to keep its naval forces in the Mediterranean on a permanent basis. The Soviet Union has to keep permanently its ships in the area for



the sole reason that the US Sixth Fleet, equipped with nuclear missile weapons and threatening the security of the USSR and its allies and friends is sailing close to our boundaries. If the USA which is situated thousands upon thousands of miles away from the Mediterranean withdraw its fleet from the area, the Soviet Union would simultaneously do the same. We are prepared to enter into talks on this matter without delay.

We believe that further steps to consolidate security in the area could be determined taking into consideration the Soviet proposals contained in the Statement of January 15, 1986, for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear and chemical) by the end of the current century.

Enactment of those practical measures plus reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe would undoubtedly bring improvement to the situation in the Mediterranean and in the world as a whole and contribute to stronger security and to the establishment of normal relations among states.

Urgent steps capable of lessening tension and normalizing the situation in the Mediterranean are needed today more than ever before. All interested parties have to make painstaking efforts to achieve that goal.

The Soviet Union is convinced that the issue of security in the Mediterranean must be resolved through the joint efforts of states and in this context it regards with understanding the initiatives of the non-aligned Mediterranean countries which are going to hold their second conference on Malta this year.

We think that a broader conference, similar to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, could play a useful role. The United States and other interested countries could attend such a conference in addition to the Mediterranean states and other countries adjacent to that



Wednesday, July 9, 1986

5

- 4 -

region. Participating states could agree at such a conference on the elaboration of certain recommendations to build up a regime of peace and security for the Mediterranean.

The issue of the Mediterranean has been under discussion at the United Nations for a number of years and this discussion shows how worried the overwhelming majority of states are by the dangerous developments in that region. Generally useful decisions have been passed on that matter but the present situation demands definite actions to strengthen security in the Mediterranean, and the representative conference on this matter proposed by us could contribute to that goal.

It is the Soviet Union's belief that the United Nations should use all its prestige and every opportunity to contribute in practice to the establishment of a region of lasting peace, security and cooperation for all in the Mediterranean.

E. Shevardnadze,  
Minister of Foreign Affairs  
of the USSR

(Pravda, July 9. In full.)



MEDITERRANEAN TANGLE

N. Kovalsky

The extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions is a major step towards shaping an all-embracing system of international security. This is a tangible gesture of goodwill opening up wide opportunities for creating a climate of confidence and co-operation on a global as well as regional scale. One of the regions concerned is the Mediterranean which is in dire need of a new policy -- of realism, peace and good-neighbourly relations.

The Soviet proposal to call a representative conference on the Mediterranean, similar to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, continues to be discussed abroad. The attempts initially made in the West to hush up this Soviet initiative have aborted. Now, some claim the Soviet proposal either "unrealistic", or "essential only to Moscow". All this brings to mind the events before the Helsinki Conference and, notably, the "arguments" that had been produced to oppose it.

Yet, the Helsinki Conference did take place. The Helsinki process, having stood quite a few tests of strength, endures. The latest case in point has been the success of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in Europe.

Turning to the problem of the Mediterranean, however, one has to note that the international significance of this region has increased since Helsinki. And so has the political weight of many Mediterranean countries in the world community. The spirit of non-alignment and anti-imperialist orientation have been increasingly typical of the foreign policies of a number of the coastal States in this region.

Much has changed in the economic field as well. Industry



Tuesday, September 30, 1986

4

- 2 -

and trade have made notable headway. The increased traffic across the Mediterranean requires a quiet and peaceful situation. There is buzzing activity on trade and passenger routes from Europe to Africa and back, and swelling transit through the Gibraltar, the Suez Canal and the Dardanelles.

However, there is a rather alarming development along with all that: increased military tension through the fault of American imperialism. The sea and coastal areas of a number of countries have been crammed with arms, including nuclear weapons, and dotted with military bases. The US has declared the Mediterranean a zone of its interests, including the whole region in the framework of its neo-globalist strategy.

The damage that is being done here to the cause of peace has been demonstrated by the aggressive US policy towards Libya. It is not difficult to explain why this particular country has been chosen as an object of blackmail to serve as a scare lesson for all who would not bow to the imperialist bidding. In the US, it is an open secret that the whole thing is due, first and foremost, to Libya's anti-imperialist position and its stand against imperialist policies in respect of the Arab world and against the Mediterranean being turned into an area of confrontation. In short, Libya has become one of the obstacles in the way of expansionist plans.

With the doctrine of "neoglobalism" and the reckless logic of power politics behind it, most of the pressure brought to bear on Libya is exercised by military means. Suffice it to say that in the last five years, the US has staged over a score of military exercises off Libyan shores, eight this year alone. Pressure is mounting. The entire US Sixth Fleet, which the President has described as the "spear and shield of American policy", is in action. Yet another batch of F-111 planes was stationed earlier this month in Britain from where the US Air Force had carried out the April raid on Libya.



Tuesday, September 30, 1986

4

- 3 -

Simultaneously the US is extending its network of military bases in the Mediterranean, which have become a destabilising factor in the region and a real source of military danger. According to Western figures, a formidable strike force is concentrated there - 32,000 US servicemen. Seventeen of the bases have nuclear weapons.

The striving of the United States is to turn its numerous bases and installations into a closed, self-contained and autonomous system with a short reaction time, uncontrolled by, and acting contrary to the interests of, states on whose soil they are situated. In Italy, for example, they took note of the use of NATO's Sigonella base by the Americans during the memorable incident involving the m/s Achille Lauro. As the Italian magazine Rinascita noted, "the Americans do not mind violating Italy's national sovereignty, these violations being part and parcel of a policy of involving NATO militarily in Mediterranean developments, in the Middle East crisis, and now in the Libyan crisis."

The US, as it pursues this policy, seeks by every means to consolidate its military bases and installations on the territory of Mediterranean countries. Washington does not conceal that it would not listen to the demands by the Spanish people that American military bases be closed down in Spain.

What is the United States guided by in the buildup of its military presence in the Mediterranean? First of all by its new globalistic plans for world domination, and confrontation with the forces of social progress. In the eyes of the American militarists the Mediterranean is a convenient springboard for possible aggression against the USSR and other countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. A nuclear missile attack is planned to be struck from cruise missile bases in Sicily, surface and submarine missile-carrying ships, and all other forward-based systems.



Tuesday, September 30, 1986

4

- 4 -

The American military presence in the Mediterranean is also a means of pressure not only on the North African states but also on national liberation forces throughout the African continent. It poses a nuclear missile threat to all African peoples. Another aim pursued by the buildup of American military forces in the region is to solve political problems of the Middle East solely in the interests of US imperialism and its strategic ally - Israel, and to support militarily this ally and its aggressive policy against the Arab nations.

The American military presence in the region is further an attempt to influence socio-political life in the Mediterranean states which are US NATO allies. American leading circles have often expressed displeasure when left forces in those countries have made advances.

The military presence of the US in the Mediterranean is also one of the means to put into effect American policy of ousting from the southern part of the region its West European allies which have long had not only political, but also economic, commercial and other interests here. It is no secret that over the past few decades the US has increased the volume of its trade dealings with a number of south Mediterranean countries where American capital has launched a large-scale offensive against its rivals from Western Europe.

In this situation, the peace forces legitimately ask themselves if it is possible to do anything to lower the level of military danger in the Mediterranean and ultimately to eliminate it altogether. Responsible-minded political leaders and statesmen are looking for a constructive answer to that question. It is being discussed at the United Nations. A series of useful initiatives on the Mediterranean issue came from a conference of Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned Mediterranean countries in September 1984. Peace in this area was advocated by the 8th Non-Aligned Summit in Harare.



Tuesday, September 30, 1986

4

- 5 -

Peaceloving public opinion formulated a number of important considerations on ways of converting the Mediterranean into a sea of peace at its conference in Athens in February of this year and in the Delphi Declaration it adopted. Appropriate ideas towards this goal were expressed at various levels in a number of Mediterranean countries directly.

Necessary elements are thus already available for the elaboration of a concept, acceptable to all, of turning the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and cooperation. The solution of this question would eliminate the war danger both in the region itself and emanating from it and would be a step along the road to establishing a comprehensive system of international security which the 27th Congress of the CPSU has spoken for.

The Soviet Union has on many occasions declared that it is interested in converting the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and cooperation. Guided by the firm principles of its foreign policy, our country sincerely wants to see the seats of tension in the Mediterranean eliminated by political means. Together with the other Warsaw Treaty member states the USSR advocates the extension of agreed confidence-building measures to this region, the renunciation of stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of Mediterranean non-nuclear countries and the assumption by nuclear powers of an obligation not to use nuclear weapons against Mediterranean countries that do not allow the stationing of such weapons on their territories. It is known that the Soviet Union has resolutely declared for the withdrawal of nuclear-armed ships from the Mediterranean Sea.

The resolution of these problems would be a contribution to the struggle for the termination of the arms race and the liquidation of nuclear weapons until the end of this century.

In principle, there is no need for the USSR to have its navy permanently stationed in the Mediterranean. If the USA



Tuesday, September 30, 1986

4

- 6 -

withdrew its fleet from here, the Soviet Union also would simultaneously do so, being ready immediately to enter into negotiations on this question. Moreover, no restrictions would be introduced on the naval activity and naval armaments of coastal Mediterranean states at the first stage. Further steps to reinforce security in this area could, in the opinion of the USSR, be determined with regard for the Soviet proposals contained in the Statement of January 15, 1986. As already mentioned, a broad conference on the Mediterranean, similar to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also would play a useful role. The USA and other interested countries, apart from the Mediterranean states and the states adjoining this area, could participate in it.

Voices have recently been ever louder in the Mediterranean states that suggest considering the problem of relaxing tension and lowering military activity in the region also at the forthcoming Vienna meeting of representatives of the states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. A whole series of Mediterranean countries show an obvious interest in a constructive discussion of this question at the forum in Vienna.

The issue of banning chemical weapons has been assuming ever greater urgency of late. As a step in this direction, the idea of establishing a zone free from chemical weapons in Central Europe is being discussed. The Soviet Union is for this idea to be thought out also in regard to the Mediterranean area, and then to the African continent as a whole.

The USSR has worked out a specific programme for eliminating tension that also applies to different parts of the Mediterranean, including proposals on the principles for a Cyprus settlement and the ways of achieving it.

The Mediterranean can and should become a sea of



Tuesday, September 30, 1986

4

- 7 -

international peace and good-neighbourly and mutually  
beneficial cooperation.

(Pravda, September 30. In full.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI  
TÜSTAV



Elim 86

THE MEDITERRANEAN: THEATRE OF COOPERATION,  
NOT OF CONFRONTATION

Since remote antiquity the Mediterranean--cradle of many civilisations and the hub of three continents--has been a theatre of friendly relations and cooperation among peoples. But, time and again, it has also been a theatre of bloody collisions, of armed conflicts. Of late, the situation there, already tense, has been further aggravated. This is understandably troubling peace opinion, of the littoral states in the first instance.

The following is a collective interview given by eminent political and civic personalities from Mediterranean countries on the situation in the region and on what could be done to avert a dangerous escalation of tension and improve the international climate. They are Francis Xavier Caruana, Central Committee member of the Maltese Communist Party, Abdallah Layachi, CC Political Bureau member of the Party of Progress and Socialism of Morocco, Rachid Akhtarini, member of the regional leadership of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party (Syria), and Hassan S. Grew, representative of the Organisation of Progressive and Socialist Parties of Mediterranean Nations.

Source of Danger

The threat to peace in the Mediterranean, it was noted by all the participants in the interview, is created by the militarist course pursued by the most aggressive and adventurist quarters of imperialism, chiefly of the USA. The role of strong-arm tactics is growing visibly in the Mediterranean policy



pursued by Washington, which sees this region mainly as NATO's southern flank and a likely theatre of hostilities. In it the Pentagon has spun a dense network of military bases, including nuclear-missile installations, that serve as bridgeheads for interference in the affairs of littoral states and springboards for acts of aggression. US militarist activity is threatening to turn the Mediterranean basin into a focus of flash-points. Libya has become an object of unending provocations and direct armed aggression. The danger of another attack is materialising, this time against Syria. No end is seen to the bloodshed in Lebanon <sup>fuelled</sup> / by continued Israeli intervention and internecine discord largely provoked from without. Ill-intentioned intrigues are not ceasing against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus.

At the back of all this is imperialism's aspiration to subordinate independent nations to dictation and throttle the struggles of their peoples for true national liberation and social emancipation. The prime motivation of the piratical US raid against Libyan cities, said Abdallah Layachi, was to teach the republic a "lesson" because of its anti-imperialist policy and staunch support for the just cause of the Arab peoples, especially of the people of Palestine.

Equally, the ferocious campaign of threats against Syria started by the USA in collusion with Israel is, said Rachid Akhtarini, a typical bellicose response to the policy of determined opposition to the designs of imperialism and Zionism



pursued under the leadership of Hafez al Assad, General Secretary of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party and President of the Syrian Arab Republic.

True, this time around the pretext for acts of aggression and militarist blackmail is the charge of terrorism or conniving at terrorism. But this is a downright falsehood. Those who resort to the use or threat of force and thereby inflame tension in the region, charged Francis Xavier Caruana, are far from being guided by any desire to eradicate terrorism. In the case of Libya, for example, the true reason for the long-standing animosity of the imperialists against that country is that it compelled the USA and Britain to dismantle their military bases on its territory, nationalised the oil companies, and steadfastly opposes the Camp David line and the attempts to undercut the anti-imperialist tendencies in the Arab world.

In this context Rachid Akhtarini drew attention to an important point. One cannot, he said, bracket terrorists with those who defend their country against invasion. The latter are patriots upholding rights usurped from them and trampled by the enemy. We side with such patriots, with partisans fighting to liberate their lands from Israeli occupation. But Syria has never had nor intends to have anything in common with terrorists. The charges of involvement in their actions are only a cover for the stratagems aimed at destabilising progressive Arab regimes.



The danger of becoming targets of imperialist attacks, declared Abdallah Layachi, hangs not only over countries steering a progressive course. The objective of the orchestrators of the attack on the Libyan <sup>Jamahiriya</sup> / was to escalate tension in the entire Mediterranean basin in order to sow consternation and fear among the peoples, notably the Arab peoples, inhabiting this region, and compel them to resign themselves to imperialist blackmail and dictation, to imperialism's policy of trespassing upon the sovereignty and independence of other countries, of undermining international peace.

This outbreak of imperialist aggressiveness, said Abdallah Layachi, was in no way accidental. Lately, the national-patriotic forces in the Arab world have scored a series of successes, while the USA and its "strategic ally" Israel have had to retreat in some sectors. The Zionist military fell short of their objectives in Lebanon when they invaded that country in the summer of 1982. Their attempt to force upon Lebanon the odious agreement of May 17, 1983 likewise failed. Insurmountable barriers for them were the courage of the Lebanese patriotic resistance and of the Palestinian units, Syria's staunchness, and the unwavering support given for their just cause by the Soviet Union and other socialist states and by democratic world opinion.

Suffering a setback, the USA rushed into a counter-offensive. This was a total reaction, and no Mediterranean country can feel secure whatever the orientation of its regime. There are countries whose ruling circles are submissively following in the



wake of US policy. But even in these countries, as everywhere else, the people are rejecting imperialist domination and supporting the just struggle of other peoples for their inalienable national rights, freedom, and independence. To suppress and crush progressive, patriotic forces and movements, imperialism unhesitatingly strikes out also at countries where its flunkies are in power.

Rachid Akhtarini mentioned the fact that armed terrorism, adopted as state policy by Washington, is complemented and reinforced with economic terrorism--sanctions, embargoes, and trade blockades. One of its most dangerous and destructive features is the debt noose around the necks of developing nations, including Mediterranean countries.

The question of the peace-clouding socio-economic consequences of imperialist policy was expanded upon by Hassan S. Grew. By generating a debt burden, poverty, and instability in the countries of the region, the actions taken by imperialism and the international financial institutions controlled by it, such as the World Bank, are seriously endangering the socio-economic structures of these countries. Some patriotic regimes are succumbing to pressure and beating a retreat. The most grasping and adventurist elements are breaking through to levers of power. Using the cover of slogans of the "open door policy" type, they are virtually yielding to imperialist dictation. There is growing confusion in the popular movement, and this is opening the door to negative forces that are offering no practical solutions to urgent problems, for instance, religious fanatics.



This is unquestionably further shaking stability in the region.

Nor is the atmosphere being improved by factors such as the increasing US interference in the policy of the European Economic Community and the rigid imposition of the US line on the Atlantic alliance. In parallel, the independence of the national policies of some of the biggest Mediterranean countries is being debilitated. This is giving the green light to a further vitalisation of the Pentagon's militarist activities in the Mediterranean and increasing the threat to international peace.

The Moroccan Communists, said Abdallah Layachi, are convinced--and this is, they believe, the view of all the other progressive forces in Morocco and other Arab states--that the USA's aggressive activities in the Mediterranean basin are part and parcel of its global strategy of smashing the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It must be borne in mind that the USA crushed Grenada's sovereignty, is fighting an undeclared war against Nicaragua, and Afghanistan, and conducting subversion against Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and other nations.

And another point: the whipping up of militarist activity and of the arms race in the Mediterranean is linked inseparably to the implementation of the imperialist plans for breaking the present military-strategic parity and attaining superiority over the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community, to material preparations for a war on land, at sea, in the skies, and in outer space. In hitting Libya, the Washington strategists



counted on, among other things, diverting the attention of world opinion from the far-reaching peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and from the Washington administration's reaction to these initiatives. It was felt that the bombing of Libyan cities would muffle the underground nuclear explosions at American test sites and the hum of preparations for militarising outer space, for turning the latter into a "star wars" theatre. These plans harbour a deadly threat not only to any single country or people, region or continent. The entire globe, the whole of humanity is endangered.

#### Joint Action to Repulse a Common Threat

The keynote at the interview was that the overhanging threat of war can be removed and peace and international security sustained only if all the anti-imperialist, peace forces close ranks and are united on the national, regional, and global levels.

Rachid Akhtarini accentuated the point that the solidity of the Syrian domestic front and the people's unity around the nation's party and state leadership are the source and mainstay of the unshakable staunchness displayed by Syria, which is prepared to resist any attack on its independence and sovereignty, any foreign aggression. This unity is embodied by the Progressive National Front, which consists of several parties, including the Communist Party. It acts under the leadership of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party. In parallel, an important role in



mobilising the people against the conspiracies of imperialism and Zionism is played by mass public organisations--workers', peasants', women's, youth, and students'.

The unity of the progressive-patriotic forces in each individual country, stressed Hassan S. Grew, is the condition and foundation for concerted actions regionally and on a wider scale. The Organisation of Socialist and Progressive Parties of Mediterranean Nations is helping to institute such actions. This organisation was formed in the 1960s when progressive-patriotic forces, including some socialist parties, of the region felt the need for harmonising their views and coordinating their efforts in the face of NATO's militarist policy and the expanding imperialist presence in the Mediterranean. The organisation then set up a Standing Secretariat and began conducting periodic conferences and meetings, which are attended by both Socialists and Communists. This interaction is based on a common platform, whose wide-ranging objectives provide for uniting the peoples against the military threat created by imperialism, turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and security, and fostering productive cooperation to promote economic development and social progress.

Much is being done to strengthen the links between the public organisations in Mediterranean countries representing different sections of the population--workers, peasants, women, young people, and so on. There has been a constituent congress of the region's Union of Progressive Journalists and it has been



decided to set up a Mediterranean Information Agency. Relations have been established and are maintained with the World Peace Council, the League of Arab States, the Organisation of African Unity, and the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organisation.

Abdallah Layachi pressed the point that there has to be unity among the Arab peoples, who are being relentlessly attacked by imperialism, Zionism, and local reaction. The masses can repulse the combined assaults of the adversary only if they themselves close ranks under the leadership of progressive-patriotic organisations, notably the communist and workers' parties, which are their revolutionary vanguard.

The Communists devote considerable attention to promoting such unity. The issues arising from this have been considered, in particular, at regional meetings and conferences of representatives of communist and workers' parties of Arab countries and also of countries of the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, and the Red Sea.

In the middle of last May, the journal Al-Nahj, published collectively by Arab Communists, sponsored a scientific-political conference in Damascus on the subject "US aggression against Libya and the threats against Syria, and their impact on the situation in the Middle East and the Mediterranean basin and their adverse consequences to world peace and security". This conference was attended by representatives of 54 parties and political and public organisations of socialist,



capitalist, and developing nations. The final document notes that one of the central tasks of the forces of freedom and progress in the Mediterranean and the Middle East is to work out and develop optimal forms of coordination and united action in order to counter the common threat and the common enemy, and to prevent minor differences from pushing the basic contradiction with imperialism into the background.

The influence and potential of Arab countries are such, noted Hassan S. Grew, that if they were to remove the friction and discord among themselves and achieve effective solidarity this would have a very strong positive impact on the situation in the Mediterranean. As a result, not only would the resistance to the anti-Arab actions of imperialism and Zionism become more effective but the conditions would be created for closer and more constructive relations between the North and South of the Mediterranean basin. There would be a new situation characterised simultaneously by diversity and unity. There would then be not an inkling of confrontation and hostility. The conditions would be on hand for establishing a climate of peace and concord in the region, where today tension and instability are so much in evidence.

The situation in the Mediterranean, said Francis Xavier Caruana, is one of the most acute international problems giving rise not only to local but also to global tension. The search for ways of easing this situation can and must be the business



chiefly of the Mediterranean states and peoples themselves. Such a settlement would gratify people throughout the world, indeed every person who wants to live under a peaceful sky fearing neither for his or her own future nor for the future of coming generations. Francis Xavier Caruana observed that in organising Malta's population for action against US imperialism's strategy in the Mediterranean, the Maltese Communists are focusing special attention on rebuffing the attempts of US propaganda to spread the myth that there is a "Soviet threat" to the region.

Rachid Akhtarini said that the Syrians rely, in the first place, on their own strength and potentialities to repulse aggression by imperialism and Zionism. But, in addition, they rely on their allies and friends in the Arab world and on the international solidarity and consistent support for its just struggle from progressive world opinion and the peace-loving nations, and in particular from the non-aligned movement, which is an immensely influential factor of present-day international life. It attaches special significance to promoting and consolidating cooperation with the socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union, which has by <sup>its</sup> deeds shown that it is a true and dependable supporter of the Syrian and other Arab peoples.

This, noted Abdallah Layachi, is precisely why Arab-Soviet friendship is constantly under violent attack by the enemies of the Arab national liberation movement. They would like to subvert it and weaken the anti-imperialist front. The USSR is making tireless efforts to block imperialism's dangerous



military sallies, prevent a new spiral of the senseless arms race, and restore a climate of detente in international affairs. All this is facilitating the struggle of the region's peoples for a free and peaceful life, for the right to decide their own destiny and to an unhindered advance along the road of national and social progress. The patriots and revolutionaries of the Arab world see their key task in strengthening their militant solidarity with their natural allies--the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Here, too, matters should not be confined to simple exhortation. Practical action and effective support for the multiple peace efforts of the Soviet Union are of undeniable political significance.

#### A Concrete, Realistic Programme

In the interview attention was focused on the Soviet initiatives indicating the ways and means of converting the Mediterranean from a theatre of ominous confrontation into a zone of lasting peace and cooperation.

The USSR, said Francis Xavier Caruana, had earlier proposed spreading agreed confidence-building measures to cover this region, reducing the armed forces stationed there, and pulling nuclear-armed warships out of the Mediterranean. Further, it was proposed that the non-nuclear Mediterranean states should deny permission for the deployment of nuclear weapons on their territory and that the nuclear powers should pledge not to use such weapons against these countries.



As the close of last March the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachov declared that the Soviet Union was prepared to go further--to withdraw all its naval vessels from the Mediterranean if the same step were taken simultaneously by the USA. The people of Malta, said Francis Xavier Caruana, have welcomed this offer of the Soviet leadership and its readiness to enter into negotiations with the USA forthwith on this issue.

In the series of Soviet initiatives Hassan S. Grew drew attention to the point about it being expedient to convene a meeting on the Mediterranean along the pattern of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. It could be attended not only by nations situated in this and adjoining regions but also by the USA and other interested states. The presumption that the establishment of lasting peace in the Mediterranean is closely linked to ensuring European security and vice versa, Hassan S. Grew said, is winning increasingly active support among the nations participating in the Helsinki process. The initiative for convening a representative conference on the Mediterranean, added Francis Xavier Caruana, is in line with this year's second conference of Mediterranean non-aligned nations and with the Luanda Appeal of the Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers Conference. As had been done by these forums, it calls for turning the region into a zone of "peace, security, and universal cooperation".



The view was stated that the practical implementation of this idea, as of the proposal for the simultaneous withdrawal of Soviet and US naval forces from the Mediterranean, depends largely on the overall state of Soviet-US relations, on the level of interaction between them in settling burning international issues.

The postures of the Soviet Union and the USA express in bold relief two diametrically opposite lines in world politics, said Abdallah Layachi. Moscow advances more and more constructive peace initiatives, while Washington rejects or blocks any step aimed at reducing tensions, ending the arms race, and achieving disarmament. The Soviet Union has a shore line along the Black Sea, which is a continuation, as it were, of the Mediterranean. The USA is many thousands of miles away from this region. The Soviet Navy has never been used as a weapon of aggression. The US Navy has time and again invaded or shelled countries of the region. The most recent examples are Lebanon and Libya. Yet it is the Soviet Union that proposes the withdrawal of the naval forces of both powers from the Mediterranean, while the USA responds negatively to this proposal, thereby showing the whole world its imperial ambitions once again.

Washington's attitude to the peace efforts of other nations is likewise negative. Following the American raid on Libya, said Francis Xavier Caruana, the Maltese government instituted steps to defuse the explosive situation. At first it offered to mediate between Libya and the USA, but Washington flatly turned down this offer.



The Maltese government then addressed the governments of Central Mediterranean states--Algeria, Greece, Egypt, Italy, Cyprus, Libya, Tunisia, France, and Yugoslavia--proposing the convocation of a conference at the level of Prime Ministers to consider the situation and coordinate practical steps to reach a settlement. In particular, it was proposed that the countries concerned should pledge to avoid using armed force against each other, disallow the use for such purposes of their respective territories and of the military bases and installations on these territories, and deny assistance of any kind to terrorist acts. This proposal took into account the existence of US military bases in Italy, Greece, and Cyprus over which the governments of these countries have no control, the presence of the US Sixth Fleet in the waters between Malta and Libya, and other circumstances of an analogous nature. The Libyan government accepted this proposal, but the Washington administration rejected even this limited initiative.

Rachid Akhtarini and Hassan S. Grew spoke at length of how Washington is torpedoing all efforts to secure a fair and all-embracing settlement of the Middle East conflict, and providing Israel with diplomatic cover and massive military and economic aid, in fact encouraging its course towards aggression. Here, too, the obstructionist, hegemonistic policy of the USA is countered by the Soviet Union's constructive, purposeful line towards extinguishing this flashpoint in the Eastern Mediterranean. The ways and means for doing this are set out in the Soviet proposals for a Middle East settlement.



In Syria, said Rachid Akhtarini, the people are closely following and solidly supporting the Soviet peace initiatives, for they are aimed at ensuring freedom and peace, which are the most precious and cherished aspirations of all of the world's peoples. The struggle for peace and the struggle for freedom and social progress, Rachid Akhtarini continued, are interrelated and mutually complementary. Those who do not enjoy the blessing of freedom are incapable of making a tangible contribution to safeguarding international peace. In fighting and upholding independence and in striving for progress, the peoples are seeking to have the opportunity to come forward as active subjects of world development, above all of the battle against the threat of war.

Expanding on this, Abdallah Layachi underscored the following. The Moroccan Communists are steadfastly pursuing their course of closely coupling Morocco's national problems with international issues, central to which is today the problem of averting the nuclear threat hanging over humanity. In other words, they regard the fulfilment of their internationalist duty of countering US imperialism's militarist designs and actions and supporting and explaining the Soviet foreign policy of peace as a lofty patriotic task. They are doing everything to get the people of Morocco to understand that their own independent, free existence, that their destiny and that of all Arab peoples depends directly on the destiny of peace in the world. Either peace triumphs and national independence will be assured,



or the threat to international security will inevitably turn into a threat to the freedom of the peoples.

Speaking metaphorically, said Abdallah Layachi, the Moroccan Communists are holding the banner of patriotism in one hand and the banner of internationalism in the other. They are combining what these banners symbolise--the struggle for the country's progress with the struggle for a life free of the fear of humanity's extinction. Patriotism is inseparable from internationalism, and the battle for independence cannot be fought in isolation from the battle for peace.

The interview showed that large sections of public opinion in Mediterranean countries are more distinctly seeing the causes and sources of the war threat and increasingly inclined to unite and conduct concerted actions to eliminate this threat. To a large extent this is fostered by Soviet foreign policy moves that lay bare the antithesis between the Soviet Union's course towards peace and the aggressive hegemonistic strategy to which the Washington administration is clinging tenaciously.

The movement for peace and security in the region, however, has its distinctions due to the modalities of the situation in different Mediterranean countries. Some of these are industrial capitalist states, but most are developing nations. In the former the anti-war protest, based above all on the human instinct for survival in a fragile world, was almost from the outset directed towards delivering humankind from the threat of annihilation in a thermonuclear holocaust. In the latter the struggle against the threat of an all-consuming nuclear con-



flagration is linked more closely with opposition to imperialist encroachments on the freedom and independence of peoples, with the efforts to promote the national and social progress of the developing states. This distinction in accents is by no means a hindrance to joint actions by the peace forces. The manner in which the problem of war and peace is raised in individual countries and regions presupposes an active quest for specific ways of addressing it. There is here a wide field for action by the most consistent protagonists of the cause of peace, freedom, and progress, notably by the Communists.



### HELPING THE AGGRESSOR

Yuri Glukhov

American and Israeli experts in "strategic cooperation" have wound up a round of talks in Israel after discussing Israel's possible status of the U.S. ally with special privileges like the ones enjoyed by U.S. partners in NATO.

Once Israel is awarded this status, it will be in a position to push for consolidating its militaristic alliance with the United States. Radio Tel Aviv has reported that the Israeli military, apart from having outlays from their usual sources, may well get an access to the Pentagon's special fund of 615 million dollars for the development of conventional weapons.

So the aggressive military and strategic alliance between Washington and Tel Aviv is likely to grow even more sinister than it is. American and Israeli political and military experts meet on a regular basis, as do officials of both countries' secret services. Pilots of the U.S. 6th Fleet have training sessions in the Negev Desert in Israeli territory. 6th Fleet ships routinely call at the port of Haifa. In 1985 alone Israel was visited by about 30,000 American navy personnel.

U.S. annual aid to Israel amounts to an average of 4.5 billion dollars. According to the Middle East Times weekly, while increasing direct subsidies to Israel, the United States also funds the Jewish state's military programs indirectly, through all kinds of its agricultural, medical and research departments and institutions whose budgets provide for respective outlays. For example, tractors bought in 1982 on donations from the U.S. Jewish community never reached Israeli farmers, because they were used to level Lebanese villages destroyed during air raids, thus clearing the way for Israeli



tanks.

Israel's involvement in the multibillion-dollar Star Wars program opens up fresh vistas for pumping more money into the Israeli military-industrial complex. Tel Aviv in November 1986 signed its first contract worth more than five million dollars, according to which the Israelis will develop systems for interception and destruction of short-range missiles.

Israel is increasingly seen by Washington as a strategic bridgehead and a potential strike force of American imperialism in the East Mediterranean. One fact mentioned by U.S. Senator Rudy Boschwitz (Minn-R) and certainly taken into account by the Pentagon's strategists is that Israel can put up a 400,000-strong army within 72 hours.

The continuing Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, Tel Aviv's anti-Syrian campaign, U.S. and Israeli attempts to blackmail and intimidate certain other Arab states testify to the growing bellicosity of the aggressive strategic and military alliance between Washington and Tel Aviv, an alliance posing a grave danger to peace and security in the Middle East. Beirut.

(Pravda, December 30. In full.)



AN INSTRUMENT OF BLACKMAIL

Gennady Zafesov

NATO has launched large-scale military manoeuvres code-named Dragon Hammer-87 in the Mediterranean, with units from six member-countries of the bloc: the USA, Great Britain, Italy, Turkey, the Netherlands and France, taking part. France, though it is not a member of the military setup of NATO, is beginning to participate ever more actively in military programmes of the Atlantic bloc.

The military exercises being held in the Mediterranean by the USA and its allies have long gone beyond the framework of war games. They have become some sort of instrument of blackmail and political pressure. The Pentagon and its allies pretend that Marine landing operations, the transfer of mobile naval units and simulated naval and air battles help preserve "stability" in the region. In actual fact, however, the situation in the Mediterranean is very far from tranquil. And as soon as Washington strategists imagine that the smouldering embers of contradictions and confrontation are beginning to go out, they immediately start fanning them either by another show of force or acts of undisguised aggression. Suffice it to recall the history of Washington's power politics against Libya: in the last few years, the USA has staged military manoeuvres off the shores of Libya more than 20 times. Moreover, it did not limit itself to manoeuvres. The cities of Tripoli and Benghazi fell victim to barbarous bombing raids.

Having proclaimed the Mediterranean a zone of its vital interests, Washington continues building up its military potential there. Both US and NATO bases, with American-controlled nuclear weapons deployed at 17 of them, are being used for the same purpose. The US 6th Fleet, which is constantly plying the Mediterranean, has become a permanent



VOVP0-870810DR32

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S ANSWER

The Soviet government has received a statement by the non-aligned Mediterranean participating states of the conference, held in the Brioni Islands, Yugoslavia, over June 3-4, 1987. The statement had been sent to it, on behalf of those states, by Raif Dizdarevic, Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The other day, Eduard Shevardnadze, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, sent Raif Dizdarevic an answer by the Soviet government, which points out that the Soviet Union treats with complete understanding the striving of the non-aligned countries to resolutely promote the relaxation of tension and to make their own contribution to lowering the level of military confrontation and to strengthening security in the Mediterranean. This is consonant with the objectives of Soviet foreign policy, including its Mediterranean aspect. The concrete measures proposed by the non-aligned Mediterranean countries, which are aimed at achieving a military detente in the region of major importance to us, echo the Soviet initiatives in many respects.

Just as the participating states of the Brioni Conference, the Soviet Union is a convinced supporter of spreading as fully as possible the positive processes developing in Europe to the Mediterranean area. It supports the proposal of Malta, Cyprus and Yugoslavia to convene a meeting of the participating states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on questions of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean.

The Soviet Union thinks it important that all the participating states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe should take part in negotiations on



CALLING A HALT TO THE NAVAL ARMS RACE

A. Sitnikov

To replace the obsolete "gunboat diplomacy" with the latest "flattop diplomacy" seems to be one of the aims of Washington at present. This is shown by many facts, and corroborated by reports that continue to come in even now. A new aggression is threatening Libya in the Mediterranean where US 6th fleet ships are on constant patrol. The battleship New Jersey, capable of carrying nuclear Tomahawk missiles, has been sent to the Japanese port of Sasebo. This and other US warships are to hold provocative manoeuvres in the next few days in the Seas of Japan and Okhotsk - in direct proximity to the Soviet Far East coast. In the meantime Washington is considering establishment of a new military command to control special air, ground and naval forces - a sort of mailed fist ready to be brought down against any country whose policy displeases US ruling circles. All this only highlights the topicality of Soviet proposals to curb the arms race on the high seas.

In a recent statement on Soviet television, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev not only announced extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, but also dealt in detail with other aspects of the foreign policy of our country, which has put forward a comprehensive programme for the elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons. Much of this programme is concerned with proposals to call a halt to the naval arms race and to military activities in the seas and oceans.

Among the latest Soviet initiatives is a broad package of measures to ensure security and promote cooperation in the



Asia-Pacific region. With a view to limiting naval activities in that area, the Soviet Union proposes that concrete talks be started on the reduction of the activity of naval fleets in the Pacific, above all nuclear-armed ships. Restriction of the rivalry in the sphere of anti-submarine weapons, specifically an arrangement by the sides to keep from anti-submarine activity in certain zones of the Pacific, would help strengthen strategic stability.

Life itself is insistently putting the limitation of the arms race on the seas to the forefront of struggle against the military threat. The USSR has proposed that the discussion of confidence-building measures and non-use of force in the Asia-Pacific region be switched to practical plane and that start be made from the simpler measures, for instance, measures for security of sea lanes. Besides, the Soviet Union would be ready to reciprocate if the US gave up military presence, say, in the Philippines.

What are the realities of the situation on the high seas?

The armadas under the star and stripe flag are now one of the major components of the US war machine. Hoping to acquire a comprehensive superiority and a possibility of massive use of force in the most remote areas of the planet, Washington has started a new round of the naval arms race.

New ships with the most up-to-date weapons of destruction are being built or launched, and the old ones re-equipped with similar weapons. The US permanent naval presence in different parts of the high seas is being reinforced, and the base infrastructure for it expanded. Over recent years the US Navy's range of large warships has been greatly increased to reach 546. The declared aim is to bring up their number to 600. Special emphasis is being laid on equipping surface combat ships and submarines with long-range cruise missiles. At the start of the '90s the USA plans to deploy no fewer than



4,000 Tomahawk cruise missiles on the sea.

Washington ever more often sends fleets thousands of miles from its shores to put pressure on sovereign states, especially developing nations, to meddle in their domestic affairs and to commit acts of armed aggression and intervention.

The world well remembers how US battle ships "crushed" defenceless Grenada, and shelled peaceful Lebanese towns and villages. Only recently with the employment of US warships brought to the shores of Libya a naked act of aggression was undertaken against this sovereign Arab country, threats regarding which have not ceased to this day. By the canons of political neoglobalism, the US Navy is being used for "shows of force" off the shores of Cuba and Nicaragua...

Our country has been consistently advocating the adoption of concrete measures aimed at limiting and reducing naval armaments and at winding down naval activity. Independently or together with other socialist states, the Soviet Union has offered for discussion a whole series of concrete measures relating to a mutual restriction of the activity of navies, arms limitation and reduction and the taking of confidence-building steps.

The Soviet-proposed programme for the liquidation of weapons of mass destruction till the year 2000 opens up an opportunity radically and for ever to end the nuclear danger threatening nations from the sea and from sea depths. Along with a ban on space attack weapons our country is also ready to agree on a 50 per cent cut in the strategic offensive arms of the sides, a considerable part of which falls to atomic submarines equipped with ballistic missiles. In order to advance the talks in Geneva, the USSR has proposed an interim solution whereby, simultaneously with an agreement on nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty for 15 to 20 years, the



Wednesday, August 27, 1986

8

- 4 -

sides' strategic arms would be reduced by about 30 per cent and limited to equal levels. Moreover, this would comprise cuts both in strategic sea-based delivery vehicles and the charges mounted on them.

The world community expresses serious concern over the continuing saturation of sea expanses with armaments and the growth of military confrontation on the seas. Resolutions adopted by the last few sessions of the UN General Assembly call for a start of negotiations to restrict naval activity, to limit and reduce naval armaments and to extend confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans.

Our country has immediately responded to the UN appeal. Expressing readiness to participate in the negotiations, it has suggested a complex of practical measures covering all major aspects of this matter. As an urgent step, it has proposed reaching agreement on the nonexpansion of naval activity by states in areas of conflict or tension. The USSR thinks it useful to look for ways to eliminate the situation where large powers' navies remain long stationed at a considerable distance from their own shores, as well as to consider such steps as the withdrawal of nuclear weapons-carrying ships from definite areas of the world's oceans and the setting of limits to the presence in them of ships of different classes.

The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. For example, to discuss the possibility of adopting such measures as the limitation of the number of combat ships of the main classes, the introduction of restrictions on anti-submarine forces and systems and measures regarding naval bases on foreign territories. It is for the future consideration of the question of reducing on a balanced basis the number of ships which form the combat part of the navies of large powers, with particular emphasis on such combat ships as



Wednesday, August 27, 1986

8

- 5 -

aircraft carriers which have an especially destabilising character. Agreeing on and implementing confidence-building measures would be of great importance.

The USSR has agreed to conduct negotiations on naval armaments and naval activity under the auspices of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva or at a special forum with participation by all major naval powers and other interested states, in accordance with the principle of not impairing the security of anyone, with due regard for all the factors determining the balance of forces at sea.

In spite of the urgent calls of the United Nations, talks on limiting naval activity and naval armaments still have not begun. The reason for this is the stubborn unwillingness of the USA and its closest NATO allies.

The Soviet Union is eager to take practical steps to resolve the problem in specific regions and seas. It consistently backs the efforts of the non-aligned countries to implement as soon as possible the UN Declaration on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and to hold an international conference on this subject in 1988. At the July session of the UN Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean the Soviet delegation again called the attention of all states to the proposal made by the USSR in 1982 that all countries whose ships use the Indian Ocean should, without waiting for the conference, refrain from any steps liable to complicate the situation in the region. They are expected not to send large naval task forces or hold military exercises there and not to extend or modernise military bases in the non-littoral states having such bases.

Still standing are Soviet proposals on extending agreed confidence-building measures to the Mediterranean, reducing armed forces there, withdrawing nuclear-capable ships from the area, not deploying nuclear weapons on the territories of



Wednesday, August 27, 1986

8

- 6 -

Mediterranean states, and for nuclear powers to pledge themselves not to use such weapons against any Mediterranean country that has not allowed such weapons to be sited on its territory. The USSR thinks it is worthwhile to convene a conference on the Mediterranean to be attended by Mediterranean countries and ones adjoining the area. The US and other states concerned could take part in it. Its purpose would be to agree about recommendations for peace and security in the Mediterranean region. Our country expressed readiness to pull the Soviet fleet out of the Mediterranean provided the American fleet was withdrawn at the same time.

The conditions of the nuclear age urgently dictate the necessity of preventing the replacement of infamous gunboat diplomacy by a diplomacy of strike air carrier groups. This is the imperative of the times.

(Pravda, August 27. In full.)