

terms in our level of effort within the alliance....

I won't go into the details of what has been taking place from the standpoint of the Soviet Union. I think you are all aware of them. Their defense spending has been steadily increasing in real terms. The level of their effort, the size of their military establishment, the modernization of their strategic forces, the substantial modernization of their general purpose forces, the addition of some nearly 2,000 tactical aircraft since the early 1960's, the increase in divisions from 141 to 168 and the obvious, during that period, increase in the sophistication of those weapons as well as the institutional capability of the Soviet Union to produce additional weapons of increasing capability and sophistication.

The only other thing I might say is that it seems to me that, having looked at this alliance over a period of time, and hearing about its imminent demise from time to time, it is encouraging to me to see a very high level of cooperation within the alliance, indeed higher in terms of the smoothness of the cooperation than at any time during my experience. I think the alliance is healthy...I am, frankly, reassured by the fact that there is an Atlantic Alliance and that it is on watch and doing its job.

*Q.* What assurance were you able to give the other defense ministers that the assessment you make is going to be the assessment made by the succeeding administration in Washington?

*A.* ...What we discussed in there was not Rumsfeld's opinion, but *facts, facts don't change*. The military committee presented facts, the SACEUR presented facts, the various nations including the United States presented facts, and the facts are what they are. Those facts drive reasonable people, I think to certain conclusions. It certainly wasn't my role during this particular period to in any way suggest that I could speak for the new administration. The president-elect is obviously very capable of doing that...

*Q.* Mr. Secretary, do you consider what has been decided today on the Air Warning-Air Control System — can it be considered as a decision in principal in favor of the system?

*A.* Well, the question involves how you would characterize what transpired in the DPC from the standpoint of the discussion on AWACS. I would prefer to leave that to the secretary general to discuss. I think that, subject to how he describes it, and I would certainly defer to him since he is the secretary general, it seemed to me that there was general agreement that a capability to provide early warning and control, with respect to particularly low-level air, was generally agreed as a NATO requirement....

*Q.* Mr. Secretary, regarding the factual situation on the Soviet Warsaw Pact buildup, I would like you, if you would, to relate that to the recent history of what is called detente. Do you feel that we have lost ground in following a policy called "detente" and that "detente" may have been partly a hoax that we were on the receiving end of?

*A.* Well, the way I look at it, and I suppose everyone kind of looks at this subject a little bit differently, — but from the standpoint of free people, what we have to do is assure ourselves that we have the kinds of defensive

capabilities that will provide a deterrent so that there is peace and stability in this area of the world. The reality is that the Soviet Union exists; that it doesn't believe in the things that we believe in, by a darn sight; that they have substantial military power; and that their military capability has evolved over the past 20 years in a very substantial way. When one goes back to the post World War II Soviet Union and compares it with today, it is clear that they have moved from an ox cart society to a rather sophisticated military power. Now they are there, and they don't agree with what we agree with in terms of the dignity of individuals, in terms of freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of religion. It seems to me that it is perfectly appropriate, while we are maintaining defense and deterrence at an adequate level to assure peace and stability, that we engage in negotiations with the Soviet Union to test whether at that given point in time we can be successful in finding areas of agreement that, for whatever reason, are in our common interest. We have been doing that in the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT), and I think that is useful to do. We have been doing that is the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) talks in Vienna, and I think that that is useful to do. It, of course, requires that during that period — and everyone I know who has ever dealt with these subjects would agree — that during that period one maintains one's capabilities. So, I think that it goes too far in the context of your question to suggest that some sort of error is involved there. It seems to me that what you must do is you must maintain your defense capabilities, assure that the deterrence is healthy, and simultaneously engage in those discussions and see if it is possible to find some areas of agreement. If it is, wonderful. If it isn't, be patient and keep working and try to achieve them.

*Q.* In that connection, sir, what do you think of the continued granting of loans and credits on easy terms to the Soviet Union and its effect on their industrial capacity, and consequent effect on their military capacity?

*A.* A relationship between two nations is a multi-faceted thing, and to take out one piece of that multi-faceted relationship and try to examine it and say what do you think of that all by itself is really not a very useful exercise. It seems to me that what one must do is look to the entire relationship and judge the whole, and that is the way I prefer to do it. The question you asked, of course, is a question that falls more in the areas of ministers of finance and foreign ministers than secretaries of defense. I have my views on it, but it seems to me that it is very difficult to deal with it in isolation....

### *W. German Press: NATO Reaches No 'Agreements In Principle'*

*The following are selected from West German press coverage of the NATO Defense Planning Committee's annual ministerial meeting earlier this month.*

*Süddeutsche Zeitung, Dec. 9: The West German Ambassador to NATO told the press yesterday that*

although Defense Minister Georg Leber does believe that the Air Warning-Air Control System would be beneficial for NATO, at the same time he does not believe it is realizable. West Germany, the Ambassador explained, therefore cannot commit itself to anything binding in this connection yet; all decisions made at the Nuclear Planning Group meeting are therefore not to be understood as "decisions on principle."

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Dec. 10: In his speech (West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich) Genscher called upon NATO to be especially cognizant of its own basic principles during the disarmament negotiations. The most important of these, he said, are that conventional armed forces parity in central Europe must be the goal of negotiations, and that the reduction of troop strengths on both sides must be agreed upon collectively, without the fixing of any special national prerogatives within the respective alliances. Bonn expects the Soviet Union to start up a large disarmament campaign shortly. Genscher considers it necessary to give the Warsaw Pact an answer which will also explain to the Western public why the declaration of a general renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons (as proposed by the Warsaw Pact - ed.) would negate the Western alliance's deterrence capability as well as Western Europe's security.

#### *French Press:*

### Giscard Opposed To First Strike Ban, Wants NATO Expansion

*Dec. 15 — The following are selected from French press reportage of last week's foreign ministers meeting of the NATO Defense Planning Committee in Brussels.*

*Le Monde*, Dec. 11 — Mr. De Guiringaud (French Foreign Affairs Minister) pointed out that detente was considered by France as a dynamic element in her foreign policy. "We believe," he specified, "that the West has nothing to lose from detente and that the Helsinki declaration constitutes a useful basis for the accentuation of our efforts in this direction." He noted that, already during his conversations with Marshal Tito, French President Giscard had indicated that renouncing the use of nuclear as the East bloc countries have suggested is out of the question: "In the case of attack, we want to preserve all possibilities to reply," Mr. de Guiringaud stressed. Guiringaud by the same token has rejected the idea of freezing the two alliances at their present number of members. "The Atlantic Alliance is a free association of democratic states, and there is no reason for it not to be opened to other countries sharing its convictions," Mr. de Guiringaud asserted. He noted that no one in Bucharest (where the Warsaw Pact convened earlier this month -ed.), had evoked the possibility of a country belonging to one alliance leaving if this was judged necessary.

*L'Humanité*, Dec. 15 — The following communiqué was jointly issued by a Soviet Parliamentary delegation to

France headed by Boris Ponomarev and a delegation from the French National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission led by Baron Couve de Murville, a French Gaullist leader.

The two delegations "call for the use of all possibilities in order to make relations between the USSR and France progress in the fields of political, economic, scientific and technological cooperation...The two delegations are committed to act in favor of detente policy in order for this progress to take a universal and irreversible character...The two delegations call for the intensification of efforts aimed at stopping the armament races and at eliminating the danger of nuclear war...The two delegations call nations to proceed to a total disarmament including nuclear disarmament under strict and effective international control."

### Defense Research Director Currie Stresses Importance Of Fusion And Basic Research

*The following are excerpts from the keynote address, "Pulsed Power, Past and Future," which Malcolm R. Currie, Director of U.S. Defense Department Research and Engineering, delivered at the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineering's International Pulsed Power Conference at Texas Technical University in November.*

*Stressing that "possible revolutionary developments" in science and technology could alter the strategic balance, Currie proposed broad new support for U.S. scientific research and training. In his overview of pulsed power system development and applications, Currie's remarks on "revolutionary developments" focused on the energy conversion problems at the "front end" of pulsed devices, a reference to the "non-linear" energy absorption and condensation processes unilaterally declassified during July by visiting Soviet electron beam fusion scientist Leonid Rudakov.*

...I'd particularly like to welcome our colleagues from the Soviet Union and other nations who are participating in this conference. The Soviets have the largest investment in fundamental research in the world at the present time. Certainly they have an extremely vigorous and well-coordinated pulsed-power program that is being pursued on a national scale, for a variety of important applications. They have stepped out and taken a significant lead in a number of aspects...inductive storage, magnetohydrodynamics and explosive flux compression, to name a few. So we welcome their participation....

#### *Technology Base*

I believe that technological leadership is pivotal to our future...Now the technological leadership which we must have can flow only from a sense of national commitment to this goal and from a strong and constantly renewed base of fundamental science and technology. I have been concerned that, over the last decade, the real investment in research and development both in the private sector and in the military and space sector has declined substantially. This has been due, in part, to the trauma of Viet Nam, to the anti-technology attitude which has