



Gromyko Warns Of Danger Of General War

Sept. 30 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts of a Sept. 28 speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to the 31st General Assembly of the U.N. The translation is from the Provisional Verbatim Record provided by the U.N.

The very emergence of the United Nations as an international organization on the crest of the great victory over the forces of fascism and aggression was an expression of the will of the peoples of the world to prevent another war. In the name of those who perished and those who survived, its founding States declared their determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war....

Nevertheless, if the role of the United Nations is viewed in terms of the problems which still remain on the political agenda of the world there are at least two questions which arise.

First, is the United Nations potential always fully exploited whenever tension grows or blood is shed in any given part of the world? No. The United Nations does not always measure up to the situation. This was true in the case of Indochina. It is still true in the Middle East. It is true in Cyprus, and it is true in southern Africa....

The second question is this. Has the United Nations really addressed itself to the task of solving the most burning issue facing mankind today — the elimination of the threat of another world war? Unfortunately this question cannot be answered affirmatively either....

It is indeed a fact that today the world spends 60 times more money to teach a soldier the ABC of annihilation than to teach a child the science of creation. And, if one goes through the records of some parliaments, it would appear there is no greater evil than a reduction of military spending. As a result, record-breaking military budgets are being adopted. Those who work at the factory bench and in the fields or who are engaged in scientific and cultural activities are increasingly deprived of funds that could be used for improving nutrition, public health, education, housing and social security.

Science and technology have made tremendous strides forward. Opportunities for raising the material and cultural standards of the people have increased immeasurably. But a huge proportion of the material and intellectual resources of the world are being devoured by the arms race. According to United Nations data, the world today spends on armaments about \$300 billion a year, or more than a million dollars every two minutes. In the three hours of this very plenary meeting we are attending, another \$90 million worth of means of destruction will have been added to the total....

Now, what specifically do we have in mind?

In the first place, the curbing of a further build-up of weapons of mass destruction, to be followed by their complete prohibition and elimination. The conscience of mankind demands that ultimately nuclear weapons be eliminated altogether....

Independently of these negotiations, nuclear weapons testing should be stopped everywhere and by all....

The Soviet Union proposes that all chemical means of warfare be completely prohibited and destroyed, as has been done in respect of bacteriological weapons....

As it always has, the Soviet Union favours the dismantling of all foreign military bases on alien territories. The existence of such bases is one of the main causes of the complications and tensions in the world. This problem is no less urgent today than it was yesterday....

We consider it reasonable that a number of Asian and African States desire to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. In this connexion, the essential point is that there should be no foreign military bases in the area which constitute the main element of a permanent military presence. As for the Soviet Union, it has never had and does not have any intention of building military bases in the Indian Ocean....

Three years ago, the General Assembly approved our proposal that the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council be reduced by 10 per cent while a part of the money thus saved could be used to provide assistance to developing countries. Because of the position taken by some States, the practical solution of this problem has been blocked. Wishing to break the deadlock in this matter, we are prepared to look for mutually acceptable specific figures with which the reduction could be started. As a first step, a figure either greater or smaller than 10 per cent could be agreed upon as soon as for 1977, next year. But it is necessary to begin negotiations on this question....

That is why the Soviet Union has proposed, and continues to propose, that the problem of disarmament be considered in its entirety at the broadest and most authoritative forum — a world disarmament conference. An overwhelming majority of the States of the world have declared themselves in favour of convening such a conference. But the implementation of this proposal continues to meet with the objections of some big Powers....

The principle of the non-use of force has been developed in detail in the Final Act of the all-European Conference. The need to abide strictly by this principle has on more than one occasion been stressed by non-aligned States, and particularly at their highest forums....

The principle of renunciation of the use of force must become an iron law of international affairs. That is the purpose of the proposal made from the rostrum of the twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union concerning the concluding of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations....

There is, of course, a fundamental difference between the launching of hostilities for the purposes of aggression and the legitimate right to repel aggression or eliminate its consequences. Can the Arabs, for instance, resign themselves to the loss of their lands? And do the colonial peoples have no right to fight for their independence till final victory? They do indeed have an inalienable right to that. The substance of the matter is the prevention of aggression....

It is now common knowledge that thousands of people have been killed or crippled in Lebanon in recent months. The tragic events which have occurred in that country are the direct result of imperialist aggression against the Arabs. The events in Lebanon are a direct consequence of the lack of an over-all settlement in the Middle East....

Unfortunately, the international machinery for producing the necessary agreements on the middle East — the Geneva Peace Conference — is still inactive. The Soviet Union is in favour of a resumption of its work, and the sooner the better, for a consideration by it of all the major issues involved in a Middle East settlement — I repeat, all the major issues involved in such a settlement....

It is becoming ever more urgent to spread détente to Asia....

We insist that the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam be admitted to the United Nations without delay....

Friendly co-operation between the Soviet Union and India is an important stabilizing factor in the Asian continent....

The Soviet Union continues, as it has done in the past, to attach great importance to its relations with the People's Republic of China....

Today, as always, the Soviet Union stands firmly by the side of the fighting peoples of southern Africa. We are in favour of the unconditional ending of the policy of apartheid and racism in South Africa, of the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from

Nambibia, of the unreserved transfer of all power to the people of Zimbabwe....

Recently, problems of the restructuring of international economic relations have been assuming increasing importance in world affairs. We support the just demands of the developing countries to do away with discrimination and artificial barriers in international trade, to eliminate all instances of inequality, imposition of will and exploitation in international economic relations. On behalf of the Soviet Union, the Soviet delegation intends to make a special statement on these matters at this session of the General Assembly....

The States of the socialist community have thrown their prestige, their material and foreign policy resources onto the scales of the policy of defending peace. The newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have resolutely favoured the strengthening of international security. This has also been demonstrated by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo....

Red Star Lambasts Concept Of Limited Nuclear War

Sept. 28 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts from a commentary by General Major R. Simonyon, Doctor of Military Sciences, printed in the Sept. 28 Red Star, the Soviet Army daily paper. The article was entitled "Military Thought Abroad: The Conception of 'Target Selection.'

"...Let us recall that before the appearance of the conception of target selection, American military doctrine considered strategic nuclear war the main variation in a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union and other states of the socialist community. During such a war it was proposed (and still is, since preparations for it have not ceased) to use all the Pentagon's deployable nuclear strategic, operative-tactical and tactical nuclear forces. Massive nuclear strikes would be launched against the armed forces and military facilities of the enemy, and also its economic and administrative-political centers. It would be precisely the strikes on cities and administrative-industrial centers which would, according to Pentagon calculations, lead to the 'guaranteed annihilation of the enemy as a viable society...'

"Former Pentagon chief, J. Schlesinger, asserted in 1974 that 'at the present time both sides have and will continue to have an invulnerable second strike capability. As a result, it is inevitable that a situation would arise in which a strike by one side against the other side — in the course of a total attack — would rapidly bring a disastrous second strike on its own cities... For this reason,' Schlesinger concluded, 'there must be alternate variations in the use of strategic force.'

"The alternative variation that appeared was the conception of a 'limited' nuclear war during the course of which, according to the same Schlesinger, strikes 'would not have to be against a large number of targets,' and strategic forces should be used 'so as to limit the damage to both sides' participating in the nuclear conflict.

"Of course it would be naive to suppose that the Pentagon leaders are worried about 'limiting damage' to 'both sides' in this way. Their goal is different: to put the 'potential opponent' in a position that deprives him of the possibility of launching a

shattering second strike against the territory of the USA, or at least to weaken the force of such a strike as much as possible....

"The conception of 'target selection' and its variation, 'limited' nuclear war, are being widely advertised and held up as new, superior achievements of Western military thought, which are supposedly appropriate to the spirit of the time and ostensibly make it possible to reduce losses among the civilian populations to a minimum, averting general nuclear annihilation. The falsity of such hypocritical assertions by the Pentagon 'humanists' has evoked bewilderment and protests even among various military specialists....

"The assertions by the proponents of 'limited' nuclear war that it could be contained within previously delineated boundaries, that it could be 'controlled' are also completely untenable. It is clear to any sensible person that any war unleashed by an aggressor, in the course of which strategic nuclear weapons are used in a limited quantity and against 'selected targets,' carries in it the real threat of expanding and growing over into a strategic nuclear war with all its fatal consequences.

"This is hardly unknown to the foreign strategists. It is not for nothing that, while adopting the conception of 'target selection,' they have not stopped their preparation for strategic nuclear war. They demand the 'limited' nuclear war variation solely in order to try to expand the range of combat applicability of their strategic offensive forces. Thus, according to reports in the Washington Post, 'the program of target selection includes all possible variations of nuclear strikes, beginning with separate strikes against several Soviet targets and ending with the destruction of up to 80 per cent of the military and economic potential of the USSR.

"However under the influence of the strengthening of the defense might of the Soviet Union and the fundamental changes in the relationship of forces in the world, the 'counterforce strategy' fell apart. The present leadership of the Pentagon, in spite of reality, is trying — with the aid of a new cycle of the strategic arms race and 'new' strategic conceptions — to resurrect the risky and unrealizable plans of their predecessors. The essence of the conception of 'target selection' and its basic