

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10294

1 February 1982

West Europe Report

(FOUO 5/82)

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10294

1 February 1982

WEST EUROPE REPORT

(FOUO 5/82)

CONTENTS

THEATER FORCES

FRANCE

General Gallois Interviewed, Says Nuclear War Possible
(Gallois Interview; LATITUDE AUJOURD'HUI, Nov 81)..... 1

ECONOMIC

BELGIUM

Troubles Continue for Cockerill-Sambre Steel Firm
(Paul Colson; POURQUOI PAS?, 10 Dec 81)..... 9

POLITICAL

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ERRATUM: Soviet Peace Movement Ties; Disinformation
Activities
(Philippe Krasnopolski; VALEURS ACTUELLES, 13-25 Oct 81).... 13

- a -

[III - WE - 150 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

THEATER FORCES

FRANCE

GENERAL GALLOIS INTERVIEWED, SAYS NUCLEAR WAR POSSIBLE

Paris LATITUDE AUJOURD'HUI in French Nov 81 pp 19-22

[Interview with General Gallois, by Patrice Galand; date and place not given]

[Text] We wanted to have a talk with a world-famous specialist on the development of the nuclear era techniques and strategies. We reached the conclusion that today a nuclear war is within the realm of possibility. General Gallois, disputed at times, expounds in the most prestigious hemicycles. Author of about ten works, of several hundred articles translated into a number of languages, including Russian, he gave us the results of 30 years of reflection.

[Question] What great changes have taken place during this century?

[Answer] At least two in the field of my professional branch. The first one is political and social: the 1917 Revolution.

The second revolution is the advent of weapons of massive destruction.

[Question] Before discussing the strategic aspects, can you explain to us what weapons of massive destruction are, in fact?

[Answer] It is a question of weapons that have a great destruction power per "unit of fire." Possibilities that they do not always have been attributed to them and the dividends that they may bring in are often overlooked. There can be no thought of having recourse to them except in extreme situations. They have significance only for protecting the territory of the country holding them and if that country were as if held by the throat.

On the other hand, it has not been sufficiently realized that the atom could turn war into an absurd act, at least between countries equipped with them, even in unequal amounts.

[Question] That idea is based on the principle that the final objective of war for an aggressor is to profit from it. If everything is destroyed, there is no longer any advantage in waging war. How have we reached this status quo of forced nonwar?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Answer] Over the ages, men have confronted each other under different conditions. In a first phase, combat took place hand-to-hand, usually at some distance from cities and, when one party won over the other, he took possession of the human and material goods remaining intact. A second period was entered with bombardments at first and then heavy artillery. The combatants not only exterminated each other, but they also partially destroyed their respective property. During World War II, we entered a third period with the combination of the bombing plane and the atom bomb. At that time, they sought not only to destroy the combatant, but they also razed material property in the interior. Thus, a period was reached in which war had become so absurd (because what was supposed to be conquered was destroyed) that the status quo of forced nonwar became imperative.

[Question] Does not the development of techniques throw that status quo open to question?

[Answer] Unfortunately, it seems that it does. For several years now, we have been in a fourth period characterized by the accuracy of long-range missiles. These weapons can destroy traditional armed forces at their stations without having the civilian population and the material goods of the attacked country suffer from them. We have returned to a period in which nuclear war is again becoming conceivable, because the coveted goods would be spared.

[Question] You present the Soviet Union as an expanding social system. What material means has that country given itself?

[Answer] The Soviets have realized what the political and military implications of the two revolutionary changes were. They were the instigators of the first one. They were going to strive to master the second one rapidly. In 1949, they tested their first nuclear explosive. From 1949 to 1960, they modernized the vehicles. During the decade of the 1960's, they deployed those weapons, and, starting in 1965, contrary to what is said everywhere, "parity" was achieved between Russia and America, because, with nuclear weapons, "parity" is not numerical. The Soviets had "parity" as soon as they were potentially capable of making the territory of the United States undergo intolerable devastation; that is to say, capable of wiping a number of cities from the map and of causing human losses that would be counted by the millions. Starting at that time, with regard to America, the USSR knew that it was unattackable on its territory and this resulted in a great freedom of action for it.

[Question] How does Soviet expansion occur?

[Answer] It is the result of two processes: by means of territorial contiguity and by means of discontinuity. When the Soviets expand by means of territorial contiguity, the Red Army usually goes into action after a political preparation adapted to local circumstances. Thus, that was the case in Eastern Europe between 1939 and 1947. That was the case in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in Afghanistan in 1980. It was a 12-year cycle. Political preparation enables the Red Army to intervene without encountering organized military forces in opposition. The Hungarian Army stayed in its barracks. The Czech Army did likewise and the Afghan Army was on the side of the invader.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

At the time of the dispute between Vietnam--allied with Moscow--and China, the Red Army, which occupies a 6,000-kilometer border with China in the north, could have created a diversion to alleviate pressure by the Chinese on the Vietnamese. The Red Army did not move, because it would have had to go as far as Peiping. This was not conceivable. Therefore, there was no diversion.

[Question] Why such precautions?

[Answer] Because the Soviets cannot allow a defeat of their Red Army. It has a reputation of invincibility. It is the guarantor of the regime and if it should suffer a serious setback, it is not sure that the system would hold out. The large number of non-Russian ethnic groups peopling that immense empire might make it break up. Some seven centuries of patient imperialist buildup would disappear. The Soviet leaders are very aware of the value of the heritage given to them and also what they have done themselves to expand still more the space under Russian control. They will not engage the Red Army, if they are not sure of winning.

[Question] Do you think that as soon as the Soviets invade a country by means of contiguity they no longer abandon it that is why they do not take that risk before being certain of winning?

[Answer] The irreversible nature of the operations engaged in by the Russians by means of territorial contiguity is not understood by many Western leaders. In Europe, for example, it is not conceivable that the Soviets will bring their gigantic armament into action and that, in the face of a miraculous resistance, they will do an about-face. Consequently, strategies consisting in resisting with purely traditional means in the belief that, in the face of that resistance, Moscow would not use its weapons of massive destruction, seem to me illusory and dangerous.

[Question] Is not the asymmetry of initiative of the conflict a determining factor in case of a conflict?

[Answer] The East has the initiative. The corollary of initiative is surprise. If the accuracy of the long-range missiles that it has is added to this, the USSR has the means of disarming Western countries, provided only with traditional weapons, at a distance by means of a preventive attack. For the Soviets, war initiative is in itself sufficient to create a total situation asymmetry, because, with today's weapons, the one who strikes first wins. Therefore, let us not talk of numerical "balance." That makes no sense.

[Question] What means do the Westerners have to prevent all their armament from being destroyed by a surprise attack?

[Answer] In order to avoid the crushing effects of surprise aggression, there is hardly anything but constant mobility of the counterattack armament. But the geographical situation asymmetry, added to the preceding ones, comes into play here. If the Soviets can deploy SS-20 missiles on their territory whose population density is, at times, from two to three inhabitants per square kilometer, the same is not true for the Dutch and their 404 inhabitants per square kilometer. If the Soviets can deploy nuclear weapons with their warheads installed in the empty spaces east of Moscow, where there can be no protesters, the same does not apply to the urban or rural complex in Western Europe.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Question] Are not strategic nuclear submarines the last deterrence factor for the Westerners?

[Answer] As a matter of fact, one of the means of avoiding destruction of the West's defense weapons is to put them in constant mobility. But, when there is not much territorial space, when the urban complex is very dense and also when it is a question of democracies in which each one expresses his opinions and in which each one puts up with protest, the sea offers a large-sized sure refuge without protesters. In the West, this solution is not generally agreed to. It is true that it is not practicable for countries that have only traditional forces. They can merely deplore the vulnerability of their military apparatus to the opposing accurate weapons.

It is true that, since 1959, France has succeeded in building five nuclear submarines (the Soviets launch as many every year) and the Defense budget has not favored the nuclear forces, with expenditures on the order of 15 percent of the total military appropriations.

[Question] Are you not defeatist? President Carter wanted to meet the Soviet SS-20 missiles with Pershing missiles or "cruise missiles."

[Answer] When President Carter tried to meet the SS-20 missiles with Pershing missiles and "cruise missiles," he did not take into account the situation asymmetry existing between the two opposing blocs. This asymmetry is political, social, military, strategic, geographic. Until the West realizes all the implications of this asymmetry, it will put itself in a situation of inferiority and will pay tribute to expressions like "detente," "balance of forces," "parity," and so on, which have little significance in the end of the 20th century, if they had any 30 years ago.

Carter, by proposing his new weapons, and European politicians by accepting them, did not realize the political risks that they were running. To take an extreme example, they forgot that it is not easy to shift cruise missiles on Dutch territory with their warheads installed.

[Question] What is the advantage for the Soviets to have SS-20 missiles?

[Answer] Those SS-20 missiles will, perhaps one day, be combat weapons, but they are already formidable political weapons. They work to the benefit of the Soviets owing to the divisions that they are creating within the Alliance. The deployment of SS-20 missiles led Carter to propose "cruise missiles" and Pershing missiles to the European allies. This is already mobilizing Dutch and German public opinion against installation of the American missiles in Europe. Why would the Soviets abandon an armament that gives them that great a political advantage? Militarily speaking, the SS-20 is said to have, at present, an accuracy on the order of 250 meters at a range of 4,400 kilometers. Therefore, it might carry only extremely small explosive charges.

[Question] Can the neutron weapon be effective against those weapons?

[Answer] There is no obvious connection between enhanced radiation warheads and missiles of the SS-20, 21 and 22 series. Of course, if we had had the neutron

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

weapon against Hitler's Panzers, it might have worked wonders. Hitler invaded Europe with tanks. That was 40 years ago. Today, according to the doctrine that it flaunts, the Red Army still thinks of the tank more as an occupation weapon than as a front-breaking weapon, as was true of it 40 years ago. It might be possible that, in our age, the breaking weapon is also and even more so the ballistic missile used with the benefit of surprise. Once the enemy has been disarmed, the tanks intervene to occupy the terrain.

[Question] Are our politicians aware of the evolution of these techniques?

[Answer] Not all. The error--normal, moreover--is to proceed by analogy with the past. For centuries, war was the opposition of chests to chests, cannons to cannons, tanks to tanks, aircraft to aircraft, ships to ships. Today, and all the more so tomorrow, technology is making other instruments available to staffs and those new weapons are fashioning new strategies.

When we talk of establishing a strategic balance between the East and the West, in Europe, which is something current, we disregard the present-day strategic situation. Because the West can only be on the defensive, it must have weapons capable of being kept out of reach of an initial attack by the enemy. Those weapons may be very different from the opposing weapons. That is why there can be no numerical or even qualitative equivalence between the two bodies of opposing forces.

[Question] Does your whole theory reject a traditional war in Europe?

[Answer] A traditional war implies a large number of personnel. In assembling them, the Soviets would lose the surprise effect. A salvo of SS-20 missiles can be fired without any indication of aggression. The Soviets know what the effect of surprise is. They were victims of it in 1941. And then, they would be engaged in a war of attrition, prolonged in time, that would enable NATO's mechanism to operate. This is not to their advantage. Finally, if some 15,000 Russian tanks were to face 7,000 or 8,000 NATO tanks with their corresponding artillery in the Central European sector, in 48 hours no stone of the German habitat would be left standing. The conqueror would reign over a desert and over traumatized and rebellious populations. They are too shrewd in the East not to take such prospects into account.

[Question] What weapons can they use against Europe?

[Answer] You can best be answered by a quotation from Soviet works on strategy:

"The principle of simultaneous action on the entire depth of the enemy's disposition and on the most distant targets in the rear is now, owing to nuclear weapons, established on realistic, solid bases." ("Tactical and Operational Art").

In a book entitled "The Offensive," the following is read:

"...Because nuclear weapons are the principal means of destruction, they should be used in every case to annihilate the most important targets. These targets are, primarily, the enemy's means for nuclear attack, his troop concentrations and especially his armored vehicles, his reserves, particularly tank reserves and depots, artillery on firing position, bridges, points of passage, communication

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

centers, control and command posts, in short every target in the rear zone, defensive structures and still other targets."

[Question] In your assumption, you seem to forget our American allies.

[Answer] In view of the fact that the American defense forces in Europe are deployed in very specific area in Germany, the Soviets could destroy the critical military facilities of the other NATO countries without heavy losses suffered by the American forces in Europe.

[Question] If such a selective nuclear attack were conceivable, how do you view negotiation?

[Answer] It is conceivable, if not politically capable of being carried out. If negotiation took place, which is hardly likely, the Soviets would negotiate directly on the preventive disarmament of the European NATO countries. And by evoking selectivity of an action that would probably spare the United States contingents.

[Question] With what means have the Soviets provided themselves for their expansion by means of discontinuity?

[Answer] That form of intervention required the addition of two new components to their imposing armed forces. They were left a powerful land army by the 1945 war. It supported the change of political regimes in Central Europe. Then, at the end of the decade of the 1950's, Admiral Gorshchikov was made responsible for setting up a high seas fleet. A quarter of a century later, Admiral Gorshchikov finished his work, because he is still in service today. He was able to design and implement an imposing, modern fleet. The second component was an air transport armada. It consists itself of two components: military transport and commercial transport, Aeroflot, which is the largest airline in the world with some 500,000 agents. This civilian fleet uses a large number of the same aircraft as the military air transport. Moreover, it is commanded by an air marshal.

[Question] Is there not a basic difference in strategy between expansion by means of contiguity and expansion by means of discontinuity?

[Answer] When the Soviet Union expands by means of territorial discontinuity, the Red Army never intervenes in combat with its component units. The ground is prepared by a political action. The "sister" parties are mobilized. Organized revolt or rebellion movements create internal agitation and, if it is necessary to support those movements by force, Czech, Cuban or other volunteers are the ones who intervene. Depending on the circumstances, "Soviet advisers," or even small staffs are contributed, but no Soviet division, brigade or air squadron goes into action. Why?

Undoubtedly, because the success of those distant operations cannot be guaranteed. The Soviet leaders know that those undertakings are risky, that they may win, but that they may also lose. They lost in Sudan, in Egypt. They have withdrawn from Somalia. Well before the Indonesia affair turned out badly. On the other hand, for the present, they have the upper hand in Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique and even indirectly in Libya, Rhodesia and still elsewhere in Africa.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Question] In view of what you have just told us, is not the defense of the West maladjusted to the circumstances?

[Answer] Not entirely adjusted, it seems. For over 30 years now, within the framework of NATO, the European countries have been invited to stand guard with traditional armed forces, especially vulnerable, on the places where they are stationed, to the new ballistic weapons deployed by the Soviet Army. The NATO countries allocate considerable amounts of money to this form of traditional defense, very similar to what it was a quarter of a century ago. At the same time, these Western European countries, which depend on the outside world in matters of energy and raw materials, are politically, economically and militarily absent from those regions of the world in which, however, their destiny is at stake every day. Moreover, it is likely that if the Soviet Union had not taken on, since 1917, the imposing stature recognized in it today, the Western countries that depend on Middle East oil would not have accepted so easily the increase in the price of oil. It is true that they now know that, if they rose up against the behavior of the oil-producing countries, the Soviet Union would immediately reap the benefit of that way of acting and the producing countries would turn toward the Soviet Union to ask it for protection.

[Question] What do you advise for the defense of France?

[Answer] It has already adopted, since 1959, a more sensible military policy than the military policies of most of its neighbors. First of all, it has to immunize itself against war, turn its territory into a sanctuary, in order to have, moreover, a certain degree of freedom of action. That was General de Gaulle's idea. Then it would have to mobilize its friends, its allies--with similar interests--in the practice of a policy of presence outside Europe, in order to contend there politically, financially, technically and, in the last resort, nuclearly with the countries of Asia and Africa that have not yet aligned themselves in the Soviet camp. Or even, in the manner of what has been done by the East, "destabilize" the political and social systems that prove to be hostile.

[Question] Are you opposed to military service as it is at present?

[Answer] The country seems to be attached to it--if not the young persons who perform it--and, therefore, it is a holdover in a military world in which the number of personnel no longer plays the same part as formerly. Of course, it justifies a structure to which the Command is attached. I note that Great Britain, which has more inhabitants than France, has given it up and that, instead of maintaining 550,000 men, it now keeps less than 350,000 men. The new weapons, without which there can be no territorial immunity, do not need large battalions. With regard to operations abroad, which can be carried out only with traditional forces, the draftees cannot participate in them. Those operations can be conducted only by career men.

It is agreed that a professional army costs less than a conscript army. This would be true with an equal number of personnel. It is certainly less true with, like Great Britain, a smaller total personnel force. Neither nuclear protection, nor possible distant operations require more than half a million men under the colors.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Question] Can France's nuclear power rival with the nuclear power of the two great powers.

[Answer] The term rival is not appropriate. What is involved is the amount of damage that we would be capable of inflicting in case of a total threat against us. What is needed is for this "amount of damage" to be consistent with the value of France's stake. At least, as estimated by an aggressor. It is true that, differently from what is often stated by politicians, France's reprisal weapons do not apply only to their threat to large Soviet cities, but also to a number of military and economic targets. That is true of the Kola Peninsula, a USSR critical military bastion, and also of a number of industrial zones, like, naturally, force transportation networks and energy irrigation [sic; possibly should read distribution] networks (oil and natural gas). In comparison with an intact America, it is obvious that loss of those facilities would be a severe punishment, a punishment to which a medium-sized power like France is, undoubtedly, not "entitled."

[Question] We have a credible nuclear force that must, of course, be modernized constantly. Did we not demonstrate our capability of operating at a distance with the Kolwezi operation?

[Answer] It is true that the desire to intervene was evident. But, in spite of our sizable personnel force, and without doubt because of it, it was necessary to "borrow" American and Zairian transport aircraft (the Zairian aircraft of American origin) and that operation was successful only owing to the spirit of initiative, to the courage and to the training of our men. But it is a question of a very small number of personnel, with no common measurement with the forces that we maintain for similar operations. Actually, we lacked, and still lack, the technical means: long-range transport and support aircraft.

[Question] In conclusion, what future do you see for the West?

[Answer] It is rather gloomy, for lack of a great plan and the common will to carry it out. That is necessarily true of a political body with a large number of decision-making centers and with a number of internal rivalries and opposition kept alive by divergent interests. That is not the case confronting us, where a lasting government authority, a complete independence from a public opinion that has no expression, enable the leaders to move their pawns on the world chessboard without being hindered by the contingencies making up the normal activity of truly democratic countries. We need an overall reflection, if an analysis of Soviet behavior, especially since the end of World War II, shows that, on the contrary, Moscow is devoting its activity abroad to the implementation of a great political and social plan. And not without considerable success, it seems.

COPYRIGHT: LATITUDE SARL, DEPOT LEGAL, 4^e trimestre 1981

10,042
CSO: 3100/204

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

ECONOMIC

BELGIUM

TROUBLES CONTINUE FOR COCKERILL-SAMBRE STEEL FIRM

Brussels POURQUOI PAS? in French 10 Dec 81 pp 19-20

[Article by Paul Colson: "Headed for Bankruptcy?"]

[Text] As a case of decomposition, Cockerill-Sambre is arousing a great deal of anxiety these days. Some of it is justified, some less so. A not very encouraging example of what awaits a Wallonia given over to its demons and its own forces. Long live public management and the politicization of the economic dossiers!

Catastrophe! A few months following the marriage of convenience between Liege and Charleroi, there is a running battle going on. Catastrophe! Under pressure of one or the other of our partners of the Ten, the European Community is frowning upon it more. And what if it were to cut off our resources? Catastrophe! The Cockerill-Sambre mammoth is losing 1 billion francs a month, which means that an uncontrollable outflow is being added to the permanent deficiency of the enterprise. And, lacking any settlement, time presses.

Package of Billions

And yet, everything in the dossier is not equally black. At the beginning of the week, the Department of Finance authorized the Steel Industry Financing Company and Belfin to borrow sums which should provide several breaths of fresh air to Cockerill-Sambre. Thus, it is not only a question of covering the losses of the company's accounts department, but also of meeting the needs for investments or the repayment of advances for the first 3 months of 1982. This is good news inasmuch as, alas, the Walloon steel men are living from reprieve to reprieve, but it cannot under any circumstances feed longer term hopes.

This week, Willy Claes, who deals with day to day matters at the Square de Meeus in Brussels (Ministry of Economic Affairs), was to convey the Belgian government's response to the questions from the Commission of the European Communities. The granting of a package of billions of francs, of which the Walloon steel industry has the most vital need, depends on it. Citizen Claes has sometimes been accused of a certain slowness in hurrying, and this has led to all kinds of suppositions of a political nature. It is true that community distrust has poisoned the simplest relationships in Belgium between the people in the North and the people in the South.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Whatever the case, the European mortgage could be temporarily lifted. But nothing would be settled for all that. It is from the inside that the dossier is most sure to rot. In the two just merged basins, there are rumors of "unmerging," a neologism in the form of a euphemism which saves the partners from openly talking about divorce. But, isn't that what it is all about?

Cordial Disagreement

Between Liege and Charleroi, distrust has taken a firm hold at all the levels of responsibility and management. Nothing works any longer, not even around the union table, and the most recent figures do not help matters.

As a matter of fact, the October results show much heavier losses in Liege than in Charleroi: 465 million francs, before depreciation and financial costs, for Cockerill and only 8 million francs for the people of Charleroi. For November, the Triangle triumphantly showed a profit of about 10 million francs while the monthly balance sheet for the people of Liege dragged in the red. Liege has taken advantage of this to accuse the people of Charleroi of being too numerous in management positions, which would explain why the Triangle comes out ahead in the confrontation. Because henceforth it is a question of confrontation, and no longer simply one of cordial disagreement.

Once the idea of a possible unmerging has been launched, there will be no lack of fuel for the fire. They are sure to recall in Charleroi that even the experts of Nippon Steel expressed the strongest reservations about the very short term chances of an operation like the one being considered between Cockerill and the Triangle.

"In our country, a merger takes years," they are supposed to have stated.

And to add immediately that, in addition, the matter had been handled contrary to all good sense, as the legal act of merging preceded the clarification of the arrangements in the technical area.

Henceforth, some people stated aloud what had only been whispered in the fall: that the act of merging was first and foremost a political operation intended to drain money more easily from the treasury to enterprises where the social (and electoral) argument carries weight. And Andre Cools -- wasn't he one of the "god-fathers" of the merger? -- will not contradict us.

Political Creature

Another remark from those who advocate divorce is directed at the administration and management of the business. It is no longer a secret that Jacques Vandebosch, the president of the new entity, is being challenged within the Liege clan itself. And by the representatives of the rank and file, which is the last straw for a man of whom it is said straight out that he is first of all a political creature in charge of implementing "the socialist peace" at Cockerill-Sambre. Isn't it true that last Monday he had to cancel a meeting between the executive committee and union representatives from Liege and Charleroi, because the latter had, without further ado, refused to accept the invitation?

It is also true that the merged enterprise still does not have a full time managing director and could in the near future no longer even have an acting managing director.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

As a matter of fact, last week Thursday, during a meeting of the Socialist Party, Albert Frere, who has been filling this position until the appointment of a permanent replacement, announced that he would like to resign as soon as possible. Nobody is unaware of the fact that the former boss of the Triangle and President Vandebosch are not on the best of terms, that the latter has on occasion encroached upon the prerogatives of the acting managing director, and that the incompatibility of temperament between the two men is not simply superficial, or even ideological. In short, they are not two of a kind.

Why is it taking so long to appoint a permanent incumbent to the position which Albert Frere agreed to hold on a temporary basis? The question has been asked and could get a rapid response. Apparently Willy Claes has three candidates up his sleeve, but cannot make up his mind to make a decision. Which once again seems to prove that, through an excess of caution, the little socialist man is delaying the final solution to the difficulties of the Walloon steel industry. From there, it only takes one step to see it as a political-community maneuver, a step which was quickly taken.

All of this tends to prove that the state of decomposition of the dossier is much more advanced than is sometimes imagined. It is likely that the idea of unmerging, or of divorce if one prefers, will make more headway in the days ahead.

Management in Public

Getting back to the overall conditions of the operation, certain people do not hesitate to criticize one or more provisions of the merger. Was it reasonable, for example, to include the mechanical engineering division in the overall package? Was it worthwhile to include "Cockerill Engineering" in the merger? Wouldn't it have been better to hold aside the cold-roll sector as a unit separate from the group, as was done for Phoenix Works, or as Carlam and the Ruau rolling mills were left in Charleroi? On the other hand, there should be no question of turning Seraing and Chertal into subsidiaries.

As the situation has deteriorated over the last few months, it is no longer far from being admitted that the politicization of the dossier has devilishly complicated matters to the point of making certain solutions difficult, if not impossible.

Well placed accusers have challenged "the management in public" from which the whole business is suffering. There is not a single decision which can remain secret long enough to be implemented, but is passed on to the party headquarters where it becomes integrated into a tactic. For which the survival of the unit, with its tens of thousands of workers, is not the main objective.

Collapse

These days, the word "bankruptcy" has been used, and it is true that the climate between the two Walloon basins has become more difficult. If, ultimately, this bankruptcy does take place, it will not be for several months, maybe a year, or a year and a half, enough time so that the responsibility for the collapse cannot be attributed to politics. Wouldn't it be better if only the management were to blame?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The fact remains that a collapse of the steel industry would be a tragedy for Wallonia, a tragedy the scope of which would exceed the figure of job losses above. And yet, an additional 30,000 people unemployed, that is quite something!

Before the irreparable happens in Liege and in Charleroi, shouldn't those responsible -- as they should be called by name -- meditate on Nietzsche's words: "Do not accuse the other, the defeat is in you." Evidently, the father of "Zarathustra" is certainly not well read by our steelworkers ...

COPYRIGHT: 1981 POURQUOI PAS?

8463
CSO: 3100/187

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

POLITICAL

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ERRATUM: The following is a corrected version of an article originally published in JPRS L/10158 of 3 December 1981, (FOUO 63/81) pp 7-9 of this series.

SOVIET PEACE MOVEMENT TIES; DISINFORMATION ACTIVITIES

Paris VALEURS ACTUELLES in French 19-25 Oct 81 pp 54-55

[Article by Philippe Krasnopolski: "The KGB's Doves. How the Soviets Are Operating in Disguise in Europe. By Manipulating the Respectable Peace Movements Animated by Christian or Youth Organizations"]

[Text] "The pacifist movement...is regaining strength and spreading especially in the countries of Western Europe. What are the reasons for this? On one hand, people are greatly preoccupied with American policy; on the other hand, the pacifist initiatives of the socialist countries have had their effect. Diverse political forces have joined the pacifist movement: communist parties, major sectors of social democracy and of the ecology movement."

Mr Boris Ponomarev, member of the Soviet Communist Party Politburo and head of the "international relations" section, makes this observation in the October issue of the "New International Review," one of the communist movement's theoretical publications. It is also a balance sheet. A year ago, on 28 September 1980, the World Peace Council decided to organize a widespread campaign against rearmament of NATO members and against the emplacement of the American Pershing 2 missiles in Europe.

This World Council has its headquarters in Sofia, Bulgaria. It is an organization of obedience to the Soviet Union. In France, it is represented by the Movement for Peace, whose secretary general, Mr Michel Langignon, is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr Ponomarev can appreciate the work it has accomplished: Three hundred thousand demonstrators "for peace and disarmament" in Bonn on 10 October. Last April, there had been only 25,000 protesting against the NATO sessions in the capital of the Federal Republic.

Other demonstrations are planned: in London on 24 October; in Brussels and Paris on the 25th; a month later at the Hague.

"The struggles waged by the pacifist forces of Western Europe are converging," affirms the daily L'HUMANITE.

The culmination of the campaign will be a great international demonstration in Brussels on 6 December, the eve of the NATO council meeting.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In Germany, the agents of the Soviet Union are moving forward in disguise. At the origin of the rally are two pacifist organizations with Christian tendencies: the "Action for Expiation" and the "Movement for Action in the Service of Peace." In reality, the idea for this demonstration belongs to a Dutch organization, "End the N Bomb," created in 1977 at the Netherlands CP's initiative and directed by the International Relations office of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee.

The decision for this was, nevertheless, made in Hamburg on 20 June during the Church Conference, the synod of the German Evangelical Church, after an initial demonstration had brought together 80,000 people in the city streets.

On 24 August, the plan received the blessing of the central committee of the World Council of Churches, which met in Dresden in the GDR, and that of Mr Erich Honecker, East Germany's head of state.

The small communist party [DKP] of the Federal Republic of Germany thus placed its men.

One of the organizers of the 10 October demonstration is a certain Fritz Teppich. He had already been at the forefront of the disturbances against General Haig's visit to Berlin on 13 September. In the sixties, Mr Teppich was a militant within the APO, extra-parliamentary opposition, the German leftist movement.

Previously, he lived in East Berlin, where he was working for the western section of the central committee of the SED, the Communist Party of East Germany, before becoming correspondent for ADN, the GDR's news agency, in the city's western sector. There he joined SEW, the SED's western branch. But he soon left this movement (after a falling out with its head) to join the pacifists.

Another communist infiltrator is Mr Achim Maske, presently the secretary general of the Committee for Peace, Disarmament and Detente. He is a former leader of the communist group, Spartakus.

A report of the Bundesverfassungsschutz, the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution (the FRG DST [Directorate of Territorial Surveillance]), was forwarded to Mr Schmidt. It reveals this communist infiltration of the pacifist movements. According to this report, the European communists are supposed to have drawn up a 3-year plan of action against NATO rearmament, with 1981 being the first phase.

For the first 6 months of 1982, this plan is said to provide for direct action against military installations in the NATO countries, such as taking over barracks. On 5 August 1982 (the eve of the anniversary of Hiroshima), demonstrations are to take place in all of Western Europe, accompanied by hunger strikes. At Christmas, the churches are to be occupied.

In January 1983, the pacifists are to call for civil disobedience (refusal to pay taxes, etc.); strikes against industry are to be launched. Finally, again in August, on the 6th, there are to be new mass demonstrations. The Pershing missiles are due to be installed in Europe in 1983.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The report likewise sheds new light on last February's publication in the weekly STERN of a map showing the site of American nuclear missile installations in the Federal Republic of Germany. This document had been furnished to the journal by the BBU (Citizen Initiative for Environmental Protection Federal Association), an ecology movement, which in turn obtained it from the Communist Party of the FRG.

These documents were furnished by Section A of the KGB, the famous "disinformation" department. Thus, in June 1980, a "Pentagon document" began circulating in Great Britain, showing the American atomic weapon targets in the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries. But it also included the ones in the neutral countries and even NATO members (in the case of Russian occupation). This document arrived in the Netherlands the following December. Today it is being circulated among the Scandinavian countries. A "pacifist" majority was elected to the Hague last May.

PHOTO CAPTIONS

1. p 54. Mr Egon Bahr. One of the only German political figures, along with Mr Willy Brandt, to receive praise from PRAVDA.
2. p 55. The arguments of German pacifism are summarized in the text of this poster: "Bill for the FRG. Items delivered: packages of food, Marshall Plan, Starfighters. Paid to date: loyalty to the alliance, military bases. Balance due: battlefield."

COPYRIGHT: 1981 "Valeurs actuelles"

9475

CSO: 3100/67

END

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY