



General Assembly      Security Council

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/38/129  
S/15663  
30 March 1983  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
Thirty-eighth session  
Item 66 of the preliminary list\*  
REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING  
OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

SECURITY COUNCIL  
Thirty-eighth year

Letter dated 29 March 1983 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the  
Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to  
the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you the text of the replies by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Y. V. Andropov, to questions from the correspondent of Pravda, published on 27 March 1983.

I should be grateful if you would circulate the text of the replies by Y. V. Andropov to the questions of the Pravda correspondent as an official document of the General Assembly, under item 66 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) R. OVINNIKOV  
Acting Permanent Representative  
of the USSR to the United Nations

\* A/38/50.

83-07465 0404r (E)

/...

ANNEX

REPLIES BY Y. V. ANDROPOV TO QUESTIONS FROM THE PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT

Question: On 23 March, President Reagan made a lengthy speech on questions of United States military policy. How do you evaluate this speech?

Answer: Quite a spate of speeches devoted to one and the same topic - military preparations, military programmes, and the development of new types of weapons - has been coming out of Washington of late. This is what the President spoke of again on this occasion.

The speech of the President was apparently conceived in order to try to influence the frame of mind in the United States, to calm the growing alarm there at the bellicose course of the Administration. Of course, it is up to the Americans how they will evaluate the President's address.

However, what the President spoke of concerns not only the Americans. For the message of the speech is that America should urgently arm itself and become the world's dominating military Power. At the same time, in a bid to justify these hegemonistic claims, such impudent distortions of Soviet Union policy are made and such questionable stratagems are used that, frankly speaking, one asks oneself - what is the President's idea of the standards for conducting relations with other States?

To hear the President, it would seem that the United States is inferior to the Soviet Union here, there and even in its immediate neighbourhood. And all this because supposedly over the past two decades the USSR has been rapidly building up its armed forces, while the United States, allegedly, has been sitting cross-handed as its armed forces declined.

True, the Soviet Union did strengthen its defence capability. Faced with a feverish United States effort to establish military bases near Soviet territory, to develop ever new types of nuclear and other weapons, the USSR was compelled to do so in order to eliminate the United States military superiority for which Washington is now pining so much. The military-strategic parity attained has deprived the United States of the possibility of blackmailing us with the nuclear threat. This parity is a reliable guarantee of peace, and we shall do everything to preserve it.

As to the allegations that the United States has done nothing in the past 20 years, only naive people can believe that. For confirmation let us turn to some most important facts.

It is known that a strong qualitative breakthrough was achieved in United States strategic forces precisely during that period. Suffice it to say that the United States installed multiple warheads on its ballistic missiles. And it did so despite our repeated calls to renounce this move in order to avoid a new spiral of the race in missile weapons. If the President had taken the trouble of looking into the dossier on the talks, he would have seen for himself that it was really so.

/...

What happened as a result will be convincingly shown by the example that, after such re-equipment, each missile on a United States submarine acquired the capability of hitting 14 targets at a time. And every submarine carries 16 such missiles. Their total yield is equivalent to that of almost 500 nuclear bombs similar to the one dropped on Hiroshima.

On the whole, in the period of ostensible inactivity of the United States, which the President is talking about, the number of nuclear warheads on United States strategic armaments grew from 4,000 to some 10,000. Can an increase in nuclear arsenal by a factor of 2.5 be referred to as inactivity? No, it can by no means be called inactivity.

And now about Europe where, according to the head of the White House, the position of the United States and of NATO in general is rather hard. And if one again turns to the facts, one can easily see that the aggregate number of United States nuclear munitions there has trebled over the period and is now more than 7,000 units. Is this also a result of inactivity?

The President pretends that almost a thousand medium-range nuclear systems of the United States and of its NATO allies do not exist in the zone of Europe, and that he is unaware that, judging by the aggregate amount of nuclear warheads on those systems, NATO has a 1.5-to-1 advantage over the USSR.

The President not only keeps silent about all that. He tells a deliberate lie, asserting that the Soviet Union does not observe its own unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles.

He also passes over in silence the fact that United States medium-range armaments are not somewhere but are literally on our doorstep. Meanwhile, from this point of view, to us there is no difference between them and strategic weapons stationed in United States territory. And this concerns not only Europe. Many hundreds of United States delivery vehicles capable of delivering a nuclear strike at our territory are stationed along the entire perimeter of the USSR. And, according to officially announced plans of the Pentagon, their number is to grow many times over. More than 12,000 long-range cruise missiles alone are to be deployed.

The President produced a photograph showing a civil airport in a Latin American country, and managed to portray it as a threat to the United States. But he did not produce photographs showing hundreds of runways thousands of miles away from the United States, on which United States aircraft with nuclear weapons on board are stationed ready to take off at any moment.

And all this, it turns out, is not enough for the present United States Administration. Trillions of dollars are being sought in order to have still more land-, sea-, air- and space-based weapons. It is planned sharply to build up all types of nuclear armaments. The President has also announced large-scale measures to create qualitatively new systems of conventional weapons. Another direction in the arms race is thus opening up.

/...

However much they repeat the importune talk that all this is being done in reply to a "Soviet military threat", it should not delude anyone. Everything that the Soviet Union did and does gives no evidence of its seeking military superiority. Treaties and agreements which we concluded and are ready to conclude with the United States are aimed at lowering the level of nuclear confrontation without upsetting parity, i.e. without detriment to the security of both the USSR and the United States.

And it ill becomes those who derailed the SALT-2 Treaty, which clearly set precisely this goal, to try to pose as peacemakers now again. While rejecting our proposals that the Soviet Union and NATO should have in Europe an equal number of missiles and an equal number of aircraft, or that there should be no nuclear weapons there at all, neither medium-range nor tactical ones, they still speak of the USSR striving for superiority. The stratagems which the present Washington leaders resort to in order to denigrate USSR policy are inadmissible in relations between States.

Question: President Reagan declared that he had devised a new, defensive concept. What does this mean in practice?

Answer: This is something that needs special mention. After discoursing to his heart's content on the "Soviet military threat", President Reagan said that it was time a different approach was adopted to ensuring United States strategic interests, and announced in this connection the commencement of a large-scale effort to develop highly effective anti-ballistic missile defences.

On the face of it, laymen may even find this attractive, as the President speaks about what seem to be defensive measures. But this is only on the face of it and only to those who are not conversant with these matters. In fact, the strategic offensive forces of the United States will continue to be developed and upgraded at full tilt and in a quite definite direction - towards the acquisition of a first nuclear strike capability. Under these conditions, the plan to acquire the possibility of destroying with the help of the ABM defences the corresponding strategic systems of the other side, that is of rendering it unable to deal a retaliatory strike, is a bid to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the United States nuclear threat. One must see this clearly in order to appraise correctly the true purport of this "new concept".

When the USSR and the United States began discussing the problem of strategic arms, they agreed that there is an inseverable interrelationship between strategic offensive and defensive weapons. And it was not by chance that the Treaty on limiting ABM systems and the first Agreement on limiting strategic offensive arms were signed simultaneously between our countries in 1972.

In other words, the sides recognized the fact, and recorded it in the above-mentioned documents, that it is only mutual restraint in the field of ABM defences that will allow progress in limiting and reducing offensive weapons, that is in checking and reversing the strategic arms race as a whole. Today, however, the United States intends to sever this interrelationship. Should this concept be converted into reality, this would actually open the floodgates of an unbridled

/...

race of all types of strategic arms, both offensive and defensive. Such is the real purport, the seamy side, so to speak, of Washington's "defensive concept".

Question: What general conclusion should be drawn from the United States President's speech?

Answer: My answer will be short and forthright: the current United States Administration continues to tread an extremely perilous path. The issues of war and peace must not be treated so flippantly. All attempts at achieving military superiority over the USSR are futile. The Soviet Union will never allow them to succeed. It will never be caught defenceless by any threat. Let there be no mistake about this in Washington. It is time they stopped devising one option after another in the search for the best ways of unleashing nuclear war in the hope of winning it. To engage in this is not just irresponsible, it is insane.

Although the President spoke above all about the Soviet Union, this speech affects the interests of all States and peoples. One must realize that the United States leaders are trying today to turn the European countries into their nuclear hostages. Washington's actions are putting in jeopardy the entire world.

Today all efforts must be directed towards one goal, that of averting nuclear catastrophe. We call vigorously on the United States to take this path.

-----