

## Ustinov views global United States posture

*Excerpted from Soviet Defense Minister Dmitri F. Ustinov's article in Pravda, Oct. 25:*

... There are forces who did not like the Soviet initiative. Leading circles, above all in the U.S., the Federal Republic of Germany, and Great Britain, are trying to avoid giving a concrete answer to it, and to belittle both the constructive steps taken and the proposals made by the Soviet Union. ... These circles are essentially trying to convince the international public, and above all the countries of Western Europe, that, no matter what, the NATO bloc should continue its senseless policy of arms buildup in Western Europe and move on to deploy there qualitatively new American missile systems. ...

We face a situation of growing aggressiveness on the part of NATO, with the U.S. calling the shots, and an activation of U.S. military preparations in various regions of the world.

The leaders of the U.S. verbally endorse the development of peaceful cooperation among states. ... But their practical actions often bear witness to the opposite; they heat up an atmosphere of fear, urge on the arms

race, and openly conduct military preparations.

U.S. Defense Secretary H. Brown has openly declared that it is a goal of the U.S. to achieve military superiority of NATO over the Warsaw Treaty members by the mid-1980s. And it is specified that this means nuclear superiority, giving the U.S. "guaranteed annihilation potential."

Recently in the U.S. there have been lively discussions on the feasibility of inflicting a "preventive nuclear strike under certain circumstances," using strategic weapons against military targets in the Soviet Union. It is not very clear, given the present status of strategic nuclear arms ..., how responsible people can entertain the idea of such strikes, since it is completely obvious that a powerful counterstrike would inevitably follow.

How should the Soviet Union react to such statements? How should we take the assertions of highly placed U.S. representatives that "now the entire globe falls within NATO's sphere of interest?" It is clear even to people who are not military specialists, that these are not simply words. Behind them are concrete plans and scenarios for war against the USSR and its allies. ...

(In Europe) we see the forced rearming of all branches of the armed forces and types of troops with new weapons. There are huge stockpiles of arms and technology for U.S. troops being created in the Western European countries, for troops transported to Europe in so-called crisis situations. The combat capabilities of military transport aircraft and paratroops are being improved.

The Oct. 8 London *Guardian* responded by taking aim at West Germany: "After Mr. Brezhnev's latest intervention, the big question is whether Chancellor Schmidt will want to reopen West Germany's agreement to join in the modernization program before exploring the new Soviet proposals. ... But sources close to him suggest that he may be tempted to argue that, at a time of exceptionally weak American leadership, the European members of the NATO alliance must take seriously both Mr. Brezhnev's proposals and his threats. ..."

By last week, Anglo-American rejection of Mr. Brezhnev's proposals had hardened into openly linking treaty ratification and military buildup. From Oct. 22-26:

- Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously voted to adopt a decision that nothing in the SALT II treaty will prevent the United States from continuing to help NATO countries with conventional and nuclear military assistance;

- Senate majority leader Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia endorsed the treaty, issuing a 5,000-word statement on how rejection of the accord would

increase the possible hazards to U.S. security by removing any limitations on Soviet arms development. Byrd also declared that he had obtained a written assurance from President Carter that the United States will proceed with the development of the MX mobile missile.

- Defense Department officials report that the Carter administration is considering a \$20 billion increase in the military budget for fiscal year 1981. Part of the increase would go to development of a 100,000-man "rapid-deployment force" for use in the Middle East or other "hotspot" regions. A final decision on the budget increase is expected to be made early in November.

- *The New York Times* reported that the Carter administration is seeking approval from NATO allies to withdraw up to 1,000 old-generation nuclear weapons from Western Europe, in order to clear the way for NATO's adoption of the U.S.-backed "modernization" program. Officials said that this proposal was discussed by White House deputy assistant for national security David L. Aaron during his recent trip to Europe.

Europe is not an exception. The U.S. military presence in Japan is being stepped up. NATO is considering the possibility of supplying modern weapons to China and is helping the military preparations of Peking which are directed against neighboring states. In the Middle East, there are efforts under the U.S. aegis to put together a new aggressive alliance involving Israel, Egypt and several other countries. The formation of a hundred thousand-strong "rapid response force" is in full swing; it is intended for carrying out "punitive functions". The U.S. is developing a permanent fleet in the Indian Ocean, despite the protests of states in this region. Thus the facts show that NATO and the U.S., covering themselves with a non-existent "Soviet military threat," are unflaggingly building up arms aimed against the Soviet Union.

At the base of the decisions which the U.S. is forcing upon the NATO bloc lies reliance on force as the main means of carrying out an imperialist policy. The result of such a development would be not only the destabilization of relations between the U.S. and the USSR, but also general instability in the world and the absence of a clear perspective for peace.

## NATO 'in the grips of inertia'

*In these excerpts from an Aleksandr Bovin article in Izvestia, Oct. 20, a top Soviet political commentator assesses the "Euromissile" debate.*

The main reasoning of the Americans (with respect to the deployment of 600 Pershing-II and cruise missiles in Europe—ed.) rests on their conception of "limited" war in Europe. Washington supposes that a hypothetical conflict in Europe could be localized through an exchange of nuclear missile strikes in the so-called European theater of military action. In this war, the territory of the U.S. would be spared destruction. The Americans may of course console themselves with such suppositions. But why this should satisfy their European allies, who are deliberately put in the position of a target, is not at all clear to me. Nevertheless, NATO experts recommended to their governments in early October to accept the American plan....

Strategic or, if you will, Eurostrategic equality, which has come to be on the continent some time ago, is a very delicate thing. The armed forces of the two military-political groupings have different structures. One side may have more of one thing and less of another. ... And only consideration of the situation as a whole makes it possible to see the overall equality and balance of forces....

Furthermore, the balance of forces in Europe cannot

be separated from the overall balance of strategic forces. Our medium range rockets cannot strike targets on U.S. territory and therefore they are not taken into account in SALT II. The American missiles slated for stationing in Western Europe are not counted in the established limits either, although they can strike targets on our territory and are intended to do just that....

London is marching in step with Washington. The reaction of the Tory government is the same: give the new rockets!...

In the reaction in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), it seems to me, there are more nuances and more concern about the consequences of the proposed decision. ... (In an interview to the London Economist) the FRG Chancellor rejects the myth of the "Soviet threat". ... True, it seems to him that we have "overdone it" in regard to the firmness of our defense; but each has his own experience and a representative of the FRG should understand this perhaps better than others. ... It would seem that there is a full basis for mutual understanding. And yet the responses to L.I. Brezhnev's speech show that the inertia of traditional NATO representatives keeps the FRG from seeing the world without bias....

Politicians are stressing that the decision on "modernization" will not be isolated ... that simultaneously NATO will call on the East to open talks on reducing the corresponding nuclear missile systems.

But insofar as the natural framework for discussing "Eurostrategic arms" is considered to be SALT III, a curious relationship exists between the ratification of the SALT II treaty and the proposed NATO decision on "modernization." FRG Defense Minister Hans Apel expressed this dependency: "The SALT II treaty should not be defeated. This would cause a political crisis in NATO. ... If SALT II is not adopted, then NATO will not make any resolution." One of course cannot fail to welcome Western Europe's support for SALT II. But at the same time, in the given political context this reference to SALT II and SALT III serves as a sort of shock absorber to soften negative reactions to NATO's dangerous plans.

*In an October 16 radio commentary, the same commentator said:*

(In) another example of what one might call these shock absorbing lines of reasoning, Egon Bahr, the secretary general of the Social Democratic Party of Germany said. ... "At the NATO session the question to be resolved will not be one of deployment, but of the manufacture of medium range weapons. The manufacture of these weapons is not contained in Brezhnev's remarks." ... Such an interpretation of Comrade Brezhnev's words is pure sophistry. ... If the weapons are produced, they are in effect begging to be deployed on site.