

ates will continue to
id, also, as the head of
stress, in the sphere of
e Bush, believe a new
promote both coun-
e, the U.S. President
h an agreement would
rties in Congress
ich, in my opinion,

Aleksandrovich,
ed, Corazon Aquino
go unanswered, and
of the fact that
ood of broad circles
the complete evan-
the territory of

ember) there was
st demonstration
nce of the United
0. These protes-
tion association
ment, and we
e country's pop-
United States
retained on
ese protests
Aquino was
aid, they tried

THE WASH-
icles that it
aised the ques-
ilities in the
servicemen are
e validity of
91, and on
ing the scrip-
opine talks
tuled for
Washington
ssion to
e could
the inevitable
roughhold
uld say
is also
press. THE
IC REVIEW
to pin
the Ph
ountries
s. In
AFFAIRS
those be
rests of
s. Women

[Agayants] It would appear then that, judging by every-
thing, in ensuring these interests, Washington intends to
continue to rely on force. Generally speaking, this is
graphically illustrated in the Asia-Pacific region. This
reliance on force is expressed there in the build-up of the
size of the U.S. military presence. It rests on the military
bases and the Pentagon's other facilities. The network, I
shall remind you, extends around the entire perimeter of
the continent of Asia. There are almost 350 such strong-
points in the region. To this one should probably add
that the second largest grouping of U.S. general purpose
forces, making up the unified command in the Pacific
Ocean zone—second only to the West European group-
ing—is stationed in Asia and the waters of the Pacific
Ocean. These forces, it should be pointed out, are
extremely sizable.

[Andrianov] Yes, more than 500,000 men. Moreover, a
considerable part of this contingent is accounted for by the
U.S. Seventh Fleet. Incidentally, I should note that its
forces are concentrated mainly near the Far Eastern bor-
ders of our country. This naval grouping includes up to 200
warships. Among them are 7 multipurpose aircraft car-
riers, 32 nuclear-powered submarines, some 30 ships have
long-range cruise missile launchers on board. In addition
to this naval armada, there are 1,200 combat aircraft. On
top of all this, the United States has concentrated a
considerable part of its strategic offensive weapons in the
Pacific Ocean zone. These include, in particular, nuclear
powered submarines of the Ohio class.

[Vedenyapin] By and large, then, it should be admitted
that the process of militarization in the Asia and Pacific
region is, alas, building up at quite a dangerous speed. At
the same time as stepping up its military presence in this
extensive zone, the United States is trying to ensure that
the Asian states, too, build up their military muscle. It
has to be acknowledged that many of the region's coun-
tries have essentially already been drawn into the arms
race. How can one fail to concur with the conclusion of
the magazine AFRIQUE-ASIE which has written that
beneath the facade of a carefree tropical paradise, the
Pacific Ocean conceals what is one of the most milita-
rized zones of the world? There, for all to see, is a
staggering U.S. military presence.

[Agayants] All of this seems rather strange, to put it
mildly, at a time when the process of disarmament talks
is under way. Incidentally, I should recall that the United
States—as indeed do the other countries of the North
Atlantic Bloc—regard their naval forces as a sort of
sacred cow. Washington stubbornly resists any proposals
to start talks on limiting states' naval activity. Is this
really justified when, in Europe, for instance, a process
that is leading to a strengthening of mutual trust is being
developed, and when the genuine prerequisites for a
reduction in land forces are being created? Can a stable
peace really be secured if the arms race continues on the
waters? I submit that there can be but one answer to that
question.

[Andrianov] Our country believes that the risk of mili-
tary confrontation at sea is just as great as on land. And
it is for this very reason that the Soviet Union is
insistently calling for talks on naval forces to be started.
This is a major, truly global problem, the solution to
which is dictated and stubbornly demanded by our far
from simple times.

[Vedenyapin] I believe it is quite simply imperative that
it be solved. It is on the basis of this that the Soviet
Union has put forward its initiatives. They are widely
known, and were set out by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gor-
bachev in his speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk,
Murmansk, and Belgrade. These proposals are an inte-
gral part of the package program to ensure pan-Asian
security. The way to this is clear: Reduce the level of
military confrontation, extend confidence-building mea-
sures to the region, and develop broad international
cooperation among the countries of the Asia-Pacific
region. Only these routes are able to ensure genuine
peace, stability, and mutually beneficial cooperation
among the states of Asia and the Pacific Ocean.

[Agayants] We are coming to the end of our meeting at
the Roundtable. It's participants, Boris Andrianov and
Gennadiy Vedenyapin, as well as program presenter,
Nikolay Agayants, thank you for your attention,
esteemed comrade listeners. Goodbye and all the very
best.

'New Thinking' on Krasnoyarsk Welcomed
PM0911160189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Nov 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 6

[Stanislav Kondrashov "Political Observer's Opinion":
"Hundreds of Millions: Have They Been Wasted?"]

[Text] At the Supreme Soviet last week describing our
foreign policy, which is imbued with the new thinking,
E.A. Shevardnadze also cited, for comparison's sake as it
were, a few examples of the old, pre-perestroika foreign
policy and old thinking.

Afghanistan is one of them, the most strident which,
though no longer spilling the blood of our soldiers, is still
fresh in our memory and confronts us with the acute
need to realize and master all its lessons. By no means
the whole truth has been told and analyzed as yet. But
people are waiting for it, especially from the Supreme
Soviet and its Committee for International Affairs,
which has received instructions to this effect.

The second example is on a smaller scale, but it is also
strident. It is the affair with the Krasnoyarsk radar
station, built in violation (the minister officially
admitted this for the first time) of the 1972 Soviet-
American ABM Treaty. The "unfinished project" the
size of an Egyptian pyramid will be totally dismantled
and pulled down. However, it might be a good thing to
preserve it in our memory and history as a latter-day
monument, dating partially also from the perestroika
period, of the materially and politically damaging diktat

Approved for Release
Date 11 MAY 1997



of our own military-industrial complex and of the shortsightedness—putting it mildly—of the political leadership. This is a case where accommodating our own military complex made it easier for the other, the U.S. military-industrial complex to step up the arms race. Apart from everything else, it is yet another example of mismanagement and wastefulness. You may say that it is not the biggest such example, involving “only” hundreds of millions of rubles. Not the tens of billions of rubles which, in E.A. Shevardnadze’s estimate, were spent on the creation of the infrastructure of military confrontation on the Soviet-Chinese border which, given a more sensible policy, could have been avoided. However, on the other hand, even hundreds of millions of rubles don’t grow on trees. They should not be wasted where tens of millions of people live below the poverty line. But the fact is that they have been wasted.... And that is why people live as they do....

The official admission that the construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar station was a violation of the ABM Treaty evoked lively comment in the West and among officials and journalists. It was rated as unprecedented, as yet another dramatic step along the road of perestroika which opened up much that is unprecedent for people both in our country and abroad. At the same time Western reactions, naturally, note that the firm stand maintained on this issue by President Reagan, who has now moved out of the White House, and by his administration (as well as the current administration) has been vindicated, since it is now shared by Moscow, too. There is also malicious glee on the part of conservative elements which continue to voice mistrust. Here is the viewpoint of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL: “Unquestionably, something interesting is happening in the Politburo’s corridors of power. Seeking new agreements, new loans, and access to the civilized world, the Soviet Government has admitted the existence of the problem of confidence. This is why, after 70 years, it is admitting patent facts in the hope that it will be trusted on everything else. This is not enough.” The newspaper then goes on to demand that the Soviet Union admit that the outbreak of anthrax in Sverdlovsk in 1979 was caused not by contaminated meat but by an incident in the production of biological weapons in violation of the 1972 Convention banning biological weapons. Incidentally, U.S. scientists, having met Soviet colleagues last year, agreed with the Soviet version of what actually happened. This however fails to convince THE WALL STREET JOURNAL. Its logic is based on the biblical saying: Having lied once, you cannot expect people to believe you....

So, in the West, our minister’s frankness has been appreciated and commented on in different ways. Yet in our country there has been silence on this sensation of the first order. I am writing this both as criticism and self-criticism, and also as an example of the power of the inertia of the past (of the old thinking, if you like) among ourselves, among us writers on international topics. As far as we are concerned the ancient taboos have not lost

their force and the concept of sensitive topics persists, even if these taboos are being removed “from above” and the sensitive topics are touched on in public, at the Supreme Soviet. However, in my opinion they are still only being touched on, sketched in broad terms. They are still not being fully revealed, and no effort is being made to dig deep, down to the spot where the fountain of truth gushes from the earth.

Let us turn to the minister’s words: “We studied the issue of this station for 4 years.... The leadership of the country did not learn the whole truth immediately. In the end we became convinced that this station was built where it should not have been.”

It is true that this affair dragged on for a long time. The current admission was reached in stages, as it were. From 1984-85 onward I myself was present more than once during specialists’ disputes, when Americans were claiming that the Krasnoyarsk radar station was a violation of the treaty since it could be used as a missile attack early warning facility, which would make it part of a missile defense system of the country’s territory banned under the treaty; while our specialists, rejecting the U.S. interpretation, claimed that the station’s sole purpose was to track artificial earth satellites and other space objects. Our specialists among themselves, and in discussions with people on “our side,” sometimes doubted the cogency of this argument, but they acted in accordance with one of the unshakable bastions of the old thinking and misconceived patriotism: In the interests of one’s country it is possible to deny the truth... even if it can be seen plainly (after all, this truth, as I said earlier, is the size of an Egyptian pyramid) by U.S. spy satellites. It was thought possible and necessary to deny this truth even if this denial played into the hands of the U.S., champions of the arms race and “star wars.”

Allow me to recall that the construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar station always served as President Reagan’s trump card when, with reference to Soviet violations of the ABM Treaty, he put forward and substantiated his astronomically expensive “strategic defense initiative” projects. This is a perfect example of the fact that, in a cramped, suspicious, totally transparent and moreover mutually interdependent world, the truth is not just sensible but also profitable and any attempts—deliberate or otherwise—to swindle the other side are fraught with introducing tension in political relations and with new ruinous military expenditure.

Stage by stage Moscow has moved toward recognizing that the U.S. concerns were justified: In early September 1987 three U.S. Congressmen were for the first time admitted to the “unfinished project” near Krasnoyarsk, then construction was officially put on ice, and this was followed by the proposal that the radar station should be placed under the aegis of the USSR Academy of Sciences (removing it from under the aegis of the Ministry of Defense) with a view to turning it into an international center for space research.... At the recent Soviet-American meeting in Wyoming in September we

ists,
bove"
at the
e still
y are
made
truth

d the
of the
ly. In
built

The
From
once
were
viola-
ttack
of a
inned
U.S.
rpose
space
iscus-
d the
dance
nking
one's
an be
is the
t was
ven if
pions

asno-
gan's
ns of
d his
itive"
, in a
eover
t just
erate
with
new

nizing
mber
time
arsk,
s was
ld be
ences
ry of
tional
viet-
r we

announced our decision to dismantle the object of dispute and, together with the rephrasing of our stance on the ABM treaty, this seems to have improved the prospects for achieving an agreement on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms. Finally, there was E.A. Shevardnadze's statement to the Supreme Soviet.

Let us, once again, return to the question of whether the hundreds of millions of rubles spent on the gigantic radar station were wasted—a station which, incidentally, will be more difficult and expensive to dismantle than the intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, of which we also had considerably more than the Americans, were to destroy. I will answer this question as follows: They will

have been wasted if we do not take the trouble to get to the bottom of this sad story. What the minister said was not enough, but in a wide-ranging speech it was hardly reasonable to expect more. I do not know whether it would be expedient to set up a new commission. However, it is essential that details are published regarding both the cost of and the responsibility for this project and regarding the way something like this could happen at all. Incidentally, informed people say that the ill-fated construction began in 1979, at the beginning of that year rather than the end, which was when Soviet forces were sent to Afghanistan. What is more, they also claim that the foreign minister has already received a deputies' written question asking for details.