

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
27th February, 1979

ISD/196(Revised)

To: Members of the Political Committee

From: Acting Chairman

DRAFT STUDY ON CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES

Attached is a revised version of the study on Confidence Building Measures, ISD/196.

(Signed) L. HEICHLER

This document includes: 4 Annexes

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES

I. PURPOSE AND PHILOSOPHY OF CBMs

1. In the broadest sense, a CBM could be defined as any measure which builds confidence and reduces misunderstanding and tension between states, whether by dispelling misapprehension by greater openness about armed forces or about the purposes of military activity, or by placing constraints on such activity. In the context of the CSCE, which was mandated to produce politically, rather than legally-binding measures, the Allies deliberately chose to exclude from their approach to the conference measures which would limit or otherwise restrict military activity. Other states have in the CSCE proposed measures which would involve constraints on military activity. However, certain categories of CBMs entailing legally-binding obligations and restrictions on military activity are being pursued by some Allies in other arms control and disarmament fora.

2. The concept of CBMs emerged in international debate early in the 1950s. It was further developed in the 1960s, when attention focussed, in particular, upon measures to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, a failure of communications, or surprise attack. Such measures included the 1955 US "open skies" proposal for the exchange of data on military forces between the US and USSR and reciprocal aerial reconnaissance of US and Soviet territory(1); notification of manoeuvres; fixed observation posts and mobile observation teams; and exchange of military missions(2). In the 1970s, CBMs have been developed within both the CSCE and the MBFR talks (where they are designed to increase confidence but are advanced within a framework of an agreement on the reduction of forces and form a part of the "associated measures"), and most recently, at the United Nations and within the French proposal for a European Disarmament Conference, of which they would constitute the first phase.

3. When preparations began for the CSCE in 1972, the Allies decided that it was essential to focus attention on the major sources of instability in Europe - the Soviet tendency to exert military pressure on other European states and ambiguity about Soviet military activities, - by inserting into the final document of the Conference concrete measures to build confidence. It was intended, that such measures should give weight to and insert concrete contact in the "security" section of the Agenda, which was otherwise purely political and declaratory, that they would underline the link between the military and political aspects of security and that they would provide an antidote to Soviet propaganda. The Allies hoped that Confidence Building Measures would strengthen the independence of East European and certain neutral countries and enhance

(1) US Research Project No. 451 dated 1960, page 114
(2) US paper dated 30th November, 1962

ISD/196(Revised)

-3-

their rôle at the Conference. Specific military objectives were thus subordinate to the overall purpose of the Allies in pursuing CBMs at the CSCE. Nonetheless it was hoped that CBMs might encourage greater openness on the part of the traditionally secretive East, thereby removing ambiguities about military activity and increasing stability and security in Europe(1).

4. When selecting proposals to submit at the CSCE, care was taken to ensure that such proposals were consistent with the principle of undiminished security for all the Allies. The Allies participating in the integrated military structure of NATO saw to it that these proposals would not inhibit NATO's reinforcement plans and exercises. The Allies also sought to ensure that these measures were of such a nature that compliance with them could be effectively ascertained without onerous requirement for verification.

Furthermore, Allies participating in the MBFR negotiations took care to avoid proposals which might prejudice the negotiation of other measures on collateral constraints or verification.

5. In general, the Allies have viewed CBMs as being essentially political and to some extent psychological in character. Nonetheless, being related to military activity, they have also been evaluated in terms of their contribution to military security.

Thus one nation commented at an early stage in the CSCE process "Confidence Building Measures do not comprise any reduction measures; they do not prejudice the legitimate interests for participating states nor do they effect any loss of sovereignty. They complement, however, the political efforts of the CSCE because they are particularly designed to strengthen stability and confidence among all participating states and can thus help to eliminate risks of military confrontation"(2).

6. The limited scope and purpose of CSCE CBMs has led Allies to distinguish between these CBMs and arms control measures proper. Thus the Allies participating in the MBFR negotiations have always distinguished between the "stabilising measures" envisaged by these Allies in those negotiations and CSCE CBMs although there are certain similarities between them. It should be noted however, that the distinction made by Allies between CSCE CBMs and other measures of a limiting or restrictive nature has never been accepted by the Warsaw Pact states and only in a half-hearted fashion by some of the neutral and non-aligned states.

(1) Among the documents to be consulted in this regard are:

C-M(72)24, Volume I(Revised), 16th May, 1972

C-M(72)54, 19th October, 1972

C-M(72)82, Annex I, 24th November, 1972

C-M(73)79(Final), 15th October, 1973

POLADS(73)14, 17th May, 1973

C-M(74)57, 6th September, 1974

(2) German Delegation 20-12-9/74 VS-NFD

II. ASSESSMENT OF CBMs IMPLEMENTATION

A. Description of Western/Eastern and NNA Implementation

7. Document C-M(77)61 produced by the Political Committee in preparation for the Belgrade Meeting outlines the implementation of CBMs by the Allies, the East and neutral and non-aligned countries. The part dealing with East European implementation was updated by Reports on Implementation of the Final Act of the CSCE submitted to Ministers in December 1977, May 1978 and December 1978 (C-M(77)92(Final), C-M(78)42(Final) and C-M(78)88). Subsequently Annexes III and IV of C-M(77)61 have been updated to take account of developments since October 1977 and are attached to the present document as Annexes II and III.

B. Assessment of Implementation of CBMs and their Contribution to security and confidence in Europe

8. Being part of the Final Act the CBMs entail a political commitment undertaken at the highest level but impose no legal obligations.

Within this overall political undertaking, at one extreme the participating states undertook that they "will" notify other states of their major military manoeuvres exceeding 25,000 troops, but with the qualification that the measure "deriving from political decision rests upon a voluntary basis", at the other extreme, participating states stated merely that they "may at their own discretion" notify their major military movements. Bearing in mind this variation, the following paragraphs attempt to evaluate the implementation of CBMs since the signing of the Final Act.

9. Of the CBMs in the Final Act the essential elements of the provision on the notification of major military manoeuvres exceeding a total of 25,000 troops have been implemented in the case of all such manoeuvres held by participating states.

There has, however, been some variation in the liberality with which certain parts of that measure have been implemented. Variations in the extent to which participating states have implemented CBMs have been particularly evident in the following area notification of smaller scale military manoeuvres, the number and geographical distribution of states invited to send observers to attend military manoeuvres and the degree to which observers have been allowed to carry out their task effectively.

So far no major military movement has been notified although NATO countries have included in some of their notification texts information on troop movements related to manoeuvres being notified.

ISD/196(Revised)

-5-

CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES

Draft text (revision 2) paragraphs 10-21

10. Other Confidence Building Measures have so far mainly been concerned with military exchanges, a confidence building measure with a long tradition, which found its confirmation in the Final Act. In 1975 there was a sharp increase in the frequency of bilateral military exchanges of various Western and Eastern countries. This involved visits by military personnel of all ranks, including the most senior, as well as exchanges of military units, such as naval vessels and squadrons of aircraft.

A slight, but continuous decrease however has been noted since then. France is the most active Allied country in this field, while of the East European countries the USSR and Romania have the highest number of military exchanges with Allied countries. So far Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg and Iceland on the Western side and Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia on the Eastern side have not participated in any military exchanges between East and West.

(a) Allied Implementation

11. Since the adoption of the Final Act Allies concerned have implemented its CBM provisions in a liberal fashion; with the exception noted above - of the provision on major military movements. Thus during the years after the signing of the document, Allies notified all of their thirteen major military manoeuvres exceeding 25,000 troops in Europe in which ground forces were engaged.

12. In a number of cases advance notice of manoeuvres was given in advance of the 21-day minimum timeframe provided for in the Final Act (e.g. 24-34 days). As regards the content of notification, Allied countries provided an ample amount of information such as the designation and general purpose of manoeuvres, the countries involved, the types and numerical strength of the forces involved, including supporting air and naval components, the period of involvement of the troops, and, as appropriate, any link with other Allied manoeuvres.

13. In addition to notifying their major military manoeuvres, Allies notified thirteen smaller scale manoeuvres involving between 10,000 and 25,000 troops. Furthermore, one Ally notified two manoeuvres involving approximately 8,000 troops.

For these notifications they applied the provisions of notification of major manoeuvres, albeit that the information given was sometimes less detailed.

Thus Allies have demonstrated a clear willingness to be seen to be taking part in the implementation of these CBMs.

14. Invitations have been extended to observers to attend nine of the thirteen Allied major military manoeuvres notified and six of the fifteen smaller scale manoeuvres notified(1).

(1) It should be noted that in the Final Act no link is made between the notification of military manoeuvres and the invitation of observers.

In most cases these invitations have been addressed to all CSCE states or to a large proportion of them, including Warsaw Pact states. Apart from the necessity, sometimes, to limit the number of observers for practical reasons, there is one restriction in Allied practice to invite observers: when a manoeuvre takes place in Germany only representatives accredited in Bonn are invited as observers. Observers at Allied manoeuvres were given ample opportunity to carry out their tasks, by providing them with detailed briefings, experienced escorts, fixed and mobile observation posts, and by allowing visits to the manoeuvre area, contacts with commands and troops and the use of binoculars and on a number of occasions, cameras.

(b) Eastern Implementation

15. CBMs is so far one of the few areas where Warsaw Pact countries and in particular the Soviet Union have taken steps to implement the Final Act.

In doing so they strictly follow the letter of its provisions. So far Warsaw Pact countries notified all of their [nine] major military manoeuvres in Europe exceeding 25,000 troops (seven by the Soviet Union, one combined manoeuvre by the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, one by Poland).

It should be noted that the Soviet major military manoeuvre notified in September 1978 took place in the Caucasus, i.e. outside the area where notification is required by the Final Act (area bordering on non-participating state).

16. In notifying these manoeuvres the Warsaw Pact states have held to the parameters set out in the Final Act, including adherence to the minimum timeframe of 21 days. The information contained in the notifications texts has been much scantier than that provided by Allies in their notifications.

17. In April and September 1976 Hungary notified two smaller scale manoeuvres (one of 10,000 and another of 15,000 troops). However these notifications were characterised by shortness of the advance notice (the first one day in advance, the second the same day) and the paucity of information provided.

18. As regards the invitation of observers the Warsaw Pact states have invited observers of five of the nine major military manoeuvres notified(1).

Till the second half of 1977 invitations were in most cases only issued to a smaller number of countries generally those closest to the manoeuvre area. This may have been a reflection of the Soviet position during the CSCE negotiations that only neighbouring countries required reassurances about the purpose of manoeuvres. In general observers invited to Warsaw Pact manoeuvres

(1) It should be noted that in the Final Act no link is made between the notification of military manoeuvres and the invitation of observers.

ISD/196(Revised)

-7-

were not given facilities to enable them to carry out their task effectively. In many cases total observation time was only a few hours, briefings were poor and observers were not allowed to move freely and were shown demonstrations rather than true exercise activity. These restrictions prevented observers from securing a clear understanding of the purpose of the manoeuvres which they attended. It should also be noted that until the second half of 1977 Warsaw Pact states declined invitations to send observers to Allied manoeuvres, when for the first time the Soviet Union accepted an invitation.

This may have reflected a reluctance to do anything which would seem to endorse Allied manoeuvre activity which has traditionally been a target for Warsaw Pact propaganda.

19. Since the second half of 1977 a certain change in implementation of the provisions dealing with observers is to be noted. However its effects so far are limited to the Soviet Union only. A greater number of countries were invited to send observers to Soviet manoeuvres and several Allied countries were invited to send observers for the first time. The facilities given showed some improvement.

It should be noted that the Soviet Union did not invite observers to a major manoeuvre held in the GDR in July 1978 nor to the Soviet-Czech major manoeuvre held in Czechoslovakia in February 1979. However, invitation of observers to manoeuvres is not required and the Soviet Union so far has avoided inviting observers to Soviet manoeuvres held on the territory of other states.

(c) Neutral and non-aligned implementation

20. In general the neutral and non-aligned countries have implemented this section of the Final Act with evident good will. A number of manoeuvres were notified: one major manoeuvre (by Switzerland) and seven smaller scale exercises ranging from 8,000 to 24,000 troops (2 by Yugoslavia, 2 by Sweden, 1 by Spain and 2 by Austria). It should be noted that the last manoeuvre notified by Austria included a command post exercise, an element strongly propagated by Austria at the Belgrade Meeting. At most of the manoeuvres a substantial number of observers were invited and they were granted satisfactory opportunities for observation.

Of the major NNA states so far Finland did not notify any military manoeuvres. Switzerland is on record that it will not notify smaller scale manoeuvres because of security reasons.

C. ASSESSMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION MADE BY CBMs TO EUROPEAN SECURITY AND CONFIDENCE SINCE HELSINKI

21. Any assessment of CBMs must start by recognizing that Warsaw Pact agreement at Helsinki to the CBM provisions of the Final Act was in itself an important advance, given the conservative and secretive nature of the Warsaw Pact military. At Helsinki the

Warsaw Pact states agreed to implement the Final Act and accepted the principle of advance notification of their major military manoeuvres and the invitation, voluntarily and on a bilateral basis, of observers to attend military manoeuvres. It should also be noted that the inclusion of CBMs in the Final Act constitutes clear recognition by the Soviet Union and its allies that the political and military aspects of security cannot be separated. Since the signing of the Final Act the Warsaw Pact states, in implementing activities, thereby meeting however partially, one of the original Allied objectives at the CSCE. It may, however, be too early to give a definitive judgement as to whether CBMs have really increased confidence and stability in Europe. Since Helsinki, the process of détente has not been consolidated to the extent that had been hoped for. Furthermore, less than four years have elapsed since the signing of the Final Act and Warsaw Pact experience with CBMs is only beginning. It may be that greater military contacts between East and West will, in the long run, increase confidence between states but this process will be slow and unspectacular. Whether CBMs will eventually serve to prevent tension or avert periods of crisis cannot now be foreseen. But, given the modest nature of the CBMs in the Final Act their potential to contribute directly to crisis-resolution is probably limited.

[For the future CSCE CBMs, whatever their deficiencies, have set an important precedent on which it may be possible to build both within the CSCE and in other fora.]

or [The introduction of measures for the notification of manoeuvres and the exchange of observers and their implementation since 1975 has established an important precedent for such practical efforts to build confidence.]

III. CBMs AT THE BELGRADE MEETING

A. General

22. Co-ordination among Western countries in Belgrade was excellent. Common views and tactics were developed and this enabled the Western delegations to take the lead in the CBM discussion and to structure the debate. Despite their efforts however, it proved impossible to engage the Eastern delegations in a real dialogue. On the contrary, the discussion on Confidence Building Measures gave the impression of two separate conferences taking place in the same room, one of the East Europeans, speaking about détente, disarmament, the right to love and the Soviet proposal for a platform of action (BM5), and one of the other delegations discussing CBMs.

CBMs nevertheless, continued to play a central rôle in the negotiations until the last days of the Belgrade Meeting.

B. Review of implementation

23. The review of implementation occupied eight sessions and was almost exclusively a Western performance. The Western delegations addressed each measure in turn, basing their interventions on Document C-M(77)61.

ISD/196 (Revised)

-9-

24. NNA Delegations contributed little to this discussion. The Swedish and Yugoslav Delegations emphasized the importance of notifying smaller scale manoeuvres, whereas the Swiss Delegate claimed that it was impossible for Switzerland to notify smaller scale manoeuvres for reasons of territorial security. The Yugoslav Delegation expressed regret about the failure of the participating states to notify amphibious manoeuvres.

NNA Delegations, in particular the Swiss, echoed Western criticism about the treatment of observers at Warsaw Pact manoeuvres. Under the heading "other CBMs" the Swedish Delegation spoke at some length on the issue of greater openness with regard to military matters, in particular, budgets. This subject was also mentioned by Allied Delegations.

25. In general East European Delegations refrained from entering into the debate on implementation, the only exception being when the Soviet Delegation gave a detailed description of the treatment of observers at the manoeuvre "Carpathia". The East German and the Polish Delegation criticised the Allied practice of restricting invitations for observers at manoeuvres to representatives accredited to the country on whose territory the manoeuvre was being held, arguing that the invited state should have the opportunity to send a military representative, whether or not it had a military attaché in the country in which the manoeuvre took place.

C. Proposals to improve implementation

26. Throughout the discussion of the proposals Western, NNA and the Romanian Delegations maintained that the last paragraph of the CBM section of the Final Act - "They also recognize that the experience gained by the implementation of the provisions set forth above, together with further efforts, could lead to developing and enlarging measures aimed at strengthening confidence" - constituted a mandate to the Belgrade Meeting to make some advance on the measures in the Final Act.

27. The reaction of the East European Delegations (with the exception of Romania) was rather vague and hesitant during the first reading of the proposals. After the Christmas recess their attitude was determined by the general Soviet policy that no new proposals should be accepted and that therefore any attempt to start real negotiations should be blocked. In the discussion on CBMs they defended this position by arguing consistently that insufficient experience has been gained in the two years since Helsinki to justify any extension of CBMs, that such an extension would constitute an amendment of the Final Act and that any development of CBMs would necessarily depend upon progress in détente.

They also stressed the vital importance of the issue dealt with in the Soviet proposal on the Platform of Action (BM5) (e.g. by quoting it at length), compared to the Western preoccupation with minor technical matters such as the provision of binoculars to observers. The Romanian attitude was quite different. The Romanian Delegation contributed much to the discussion of the proposals and defended fervently the need for further development of CBMs.

28. The NNA Delegations took a very active part in discussion of the proposals. At the Belgrade Meeting for the first time in CSCE history the NNA Delegations (Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, Yugoslavia, Liechtenstein San Marino, Cyprus and Malta) formed a formal group adopting common positions and presenting proposals that reflected the common denominator between them. This commitment to a common position, often reached after very difficult negotiations, impaired the flexibility of the individual members of the group (e.g. on the issue of smaller scale manoeuvres, or notification of manoeuvres and movements near territorial waters) and led to an increased clinging to their positions.

This could have had a negative influence on the possibilities to reach an agreement. However the Western and the NNA proposal on CBMs contained a number of similar elements and given enough time probably a compromise could have been reached on the main issue of the two proposals.

29. Three proposals on CBMs were introduced: the proposal presented by Western Delegations (BM 11), the NNA proposal (BM 6) and the Romanian proposal (BM/S 1) (Annex IV). Although they could not prevent a discussion of these proposals the East European Delegations (with the exception of Romania) blocked any real negotiation by asserting that only the Soviet proposal for a "platform of action" (BM5) as it stood, was acceptable.

30. Western proposal (BM 11) (Annex IVA)

The following summarises comments on individual elements of this proposal. (East European comment is only mentioned if it differs from the arguments described in paragraph 27.)

(a) Notification of smaller scale manoeuvres

The Swedish and Austrian Delegations indicated that they could have accepted (or even would have preferred) the Western text. However they were committed to the unspecific NNA proposal, which reflected the Swiss position, that for security reasons notification of manoeuvres involving fewer than 18,000 troops was unacceptable.

(b) The "time" parameter for notification

Delegations showed little interest in this measure.

(c) The "content" of notification

East European Delegations suggested that this part of the proposal was designed to obtain information for intelligence purposes. They questioned the distinction made between the "specification" and "designation" of the forces engaged and indicated considerable dislike for the reference to "amphibious, airborne, missile and tank formations", asking how these were

ISD/196(Revised)

-11-

to be defined. As the NNA proposal was in many ways similar to the Western text an informal Western proposal, combining both texts was tabled.

(d) Invitation and treatment of observers

East European Delegations described this text as an infraction of the right of the host country, given by the Final Act, to determine the number and distribution of invitations and the procedures for the reception of observers. The NNA text was very similar to the Western proposal and an informal Western proposal including some NNA elements was tabled.

(e) Notification of major military movements

Although also this part of the proposal was rejected by the East European Delegations there were some, albeit very slight, hints that they might have been more flexible on this issue, than on any of the other measures.

Reservation was expressed by the NNA Delegations and by the Romanian Representative, about the detailed provisions in the Allied text such as the 200 km for the minimum distance threshold and the caveat formula arguing that it would be simpler to apply the Final Act provisions for the notification of major military manoeuvres mutatis mutandis, as was suggested in their proposals.

31. NNA proposal (BM 6) (Annex IVB)

Throughout the negotiation, NNA Delegations maintained the integrity of their own proposal and did not attempt to present it as a middle way between the Western and Eastern positions. They insisted, in particular, on the importance to them of the text on concurrent smaller scale manoeuvres.

The proposal received the same negative reaction by the East Europeans as the Western proposal, although at an early stage they indicated that the NNA proposal contained several positive elements. However they refused to indicate which these elements were. The Western reaction on those elements that were not also reflected in the Western proposal was as follows.

(a) Notification of concurrent smaller scale manoeuvres

Western Delegations expressed major reservations about this text, citing the difficulties which its implementation would present, given the imprecision of the terms "close to each other in time and space" and "under the same command". These reservations were reinforced when it became apparent that such a text, if accepted, might be used to justify the application of any limitation on manoeuvre activity (as suggested by the Soviet Union) to several concurrent manoeuvres rather than to single manoeuvres only.

(b) Notification of other military manoeuvres

Western Delegates criticised the paragraph on smaller scale manoeuvres as unnecessarily weak. They rejected the paragraph on naval manoeuvres as being impractical. The Yugoslav Representative, the chief proponent of this measure, suggested that the following parameters might be adopted for the notification of naval manoeuvres: 10,000 "naval men" or above, a flotilla of 3 to 5 large ships with a total tonnage to be determined, and an area near the coast of other states which should not be defined too precisely.

(c) Notification of other military manoeuvres

The main proponent of this text was the Yugoslav Delegation. Western Delegates emphasized the impracticability of notifying naval movements.

(d) Openness regarding military matters

Western Delegations supported this text and proposed the following addition which was accepted by NNA Delegations: "they recognise the relevance and value, in this regard, of the work of a series of UN experts groups to develop a satisfactory instrument for the consistent and comprehensive measurement and reporting of military expenditures by states". The proposal and its Western amendments were both rejected by East European Delegations, including the Romanian, on the grounds that greater openness about military expenditures must be preceded by agreement to freeze and reduce budgets. A Romanian proposal on the freeze of military budgets was rejected by Western Delegations as unrealistic, given the absence of agreed methods for the measurement and comparison of military expenditures.

32. Romanian proposal (BM/S1) (Annex IVC)

Of the four elements in the CBMs section of the Romanian proposal - notification of major movements, notification of air and naval manoeuvres near frontiers, and a ban on the establishment of military bases and on the deployment of troops on the territory of other states - only the first was in any way acceptable to Western Delegations, although they argued that the text was insufficiently precise and that the phrase referring to the weapons and mode of combat of the force engaged, would require further definition. On the other elements they commented that the notification of air and naval manoeuvres was impractical, and that the suggested limitations on multi-national manoeuvres near frontiers and on the establishment of new bases and the deployment of troops would be discriminatory and took no account of political and military realities in Europe. The Yugoslav Representative suggested that air manoeuvres including more than 50 aircraft might be notified.

33. Soviet proposal (BM 5) "Programme of Action with a view to the consolidation of military détente in Europe"
(Annex IVD)

- (i) This "programme of action" contained a proposal to convene - in parallel with the continuation of the Vienna negotiations - special joint consultations by all the CSCE participating states in order to discuss the following questions: a treaty on the non-first use of nuclear weapons, an agreement on the non-enlargement of Alliances, a ceiling on manoeuvres and the extension of the CBMs to the southern part of the Mediterranean region.
- (ii) Western Delegations declined to discuss the proposed "special consultations" in any detail, arguing that it was for the Belgrade Meeting to take decisions on developing and enlarging CBMs and that creation of new fora would contribute nothing to increasing mutual confidence in Europe. Of the questions to be discussed at those consultations, the first two had been mooted already at the Bucharest Meeting of the Warsaw Pact in November 1976, and were rejected by the North Atlantic Council in Ministerial Session in December 1976. Western Delegations held firmly to this position. The Western Delegate did not address the suggestion that CBMs might be extended to the Mediterranean at any length, except by expressing doubts as to the practicability of the idea.
- (iii) The idea of a limitation on manoeuvres presented a more serious problem. During their consultations about this proposal considerable differences emerged between the Western Delegations. It was generally felt that the proposed measure was not a CBM as defined in the Final Act and some Western Delegations consistently said that they were not prepared to consider the Soviet proposal in any form. Others felt that the proposal could best be pursued at Vienna, while still others were prepared to consider the acceptance of a limitation at Belgrade, if this secured in return substantial concessions from the Warsaw Pact on CBMs. NATO military advice was that a limitation would only be acceptable if it applied to single manoeuvres involving 60,000 troops or above and if a number of other conditions were met.
- (iv) The response of the NNA Delegations to the Soviet proposal as a whole was extremely reserved. However in an informal proposal for an expert working group they included the idea of manoeuvre limitations.

34. After the Christmas recess Western Delegations circulated an informal "non-paper" setting out of the basic elements of a possible compromise, including elements from the NNA and the Romanian proposal and a bald reference to the question of a manoeuvre ceiling (Annex IVE). Negotiations on this paper however never got off the ground.

35. CBM Experts meeting

In the final stage of the Meeting the negotiations concentrated on the issue of a CBM experts meeting. This idea was pushed in particular and with great persistence by the Romanian and Yugoslav Delegations with the support of most of the NNA Delegations, in particular the Swedish and the Swiss. The Austrian Delegate was rather lukewarm about it.

Anxious to salvage something from the proposals the Romanian Delegate went so far to meet the Soviet wishes that in the end his informal oral compromise formula hardly differed from the special consultations proposal of the Soviets. Nevertheless, the Soviet Delegation did not accept the idea. Western Delegations, much to the disappointment of a number of NNA Delegations, did not enter into the debate, sticking to their position that a meeting of experts would only be useful if progress was made on CBMs at Belgrade. Such an experts meeting moreover should have a very limited well-defined mandate.

Internally in the Western caucus however the discussion on the advantages or disadvantages of a CBM expert meeting was left open-ended. The general conclusion was that in the light of the development at the Belgrade Meeting the idea of an expert meeting would need careful study before the Madrid meeting.

D. Analysis of Eastern and NNA Attitudes to CBMs
(Paragraphs 29-33)

36. The record of implementation and of the discussions in Belgrade make it possible to draw some conclusions about the attitude of neutral and non-aligned and Eastern countries to CBMs.

37. Despite the heterogeneity of the NNA countries, reflecting differences in political perception and geographical location, they have shown great interest in CBMs from the beginning of the CSCE process. This shared interest in CBMs stems inter alia from their non-membership of alliances, relative military weakness, and their exclusion from certain arms control negotiations between members of the two major alliances. However, some NNA countries have pursued the elaboration of CSCE CBMs more actively than others. The lead at Geneva and Belgrade was taken by the Yugoslavs, Swiss, Austrians and Swedes. The Finns, and to a lesser extent the Maltese and Cypriots, supported the efforts of other NNAs but did not attempt to make the running. Spain, who can be considered with the NNA states in this context, although it does not participate in the NNA group, displayed considerable, if intermittent, interest in

ISD/196(Revised)

-15-

CBMs both at Geneva and subsequently. NNA countries appear to consider that CBMs provide concrete security benefits, which they hope to enhance by further developing the measures. Continued Allied interest in CBMs might influence positively co-operation with NNA countries at Madrid.

38. With the exception of Romania, Warsaw Pact states have adopted and continue to adopt an attitude of great reserve towards the elaboration of CSCE CBMs. This attitude is unlikely to change markedly in the near future, though it cannot be excluded that they might adopt a more flexible position in the context of a negotiation containing other elements of interest to them or that they will present as CBM measures which, from the point of view of the Allies, go beyond the measures mentioned in the Final Act. [There may be differences in attitude between the Soviet Union and some of its Allies (e.g. relative Polish and Hungarian interest in, and GDR dislike of, CBMs) but these differences have rarely emerged openly.] The Romanian position is substantially different from that of other members of the Warsaw Pact. At Geneva and Belgrade, Romania put forward a battery of proposals, some of which were close to those advanced by NNA states. But, despite its vocal advocacy of CBMs at CSCE meetings, Romania has neither notified a manoeuvre nor accepted invitations to send observers to manoeuvres. Romania has, however, been active in military exchanges. In only one instance has the Soviet Union displayed interest in a measure in any way akin to the measures defined in the Final Act, namely their proposal for a ceiling on manoeuvres involving 50 or 60 thousand men. Their interest in this proposal [presumably stems from the fact that only the Western countries conduct manoeuvres on this scale, so that such a ceiling would place restrictions on one side but not on the other.] At the same time of the Belgrade Meeting, the Allies considered that this Soviet proposal went beyond the measures defined in the Final Act. It was nevertheless regarded by the Allies as being more closely related to them than other Soviet proposals such as those on the non-first use of nuclear weapons and a ban on the expansion of alliances.

Whether, given their current attitude towards the CBMs, the Soviet Union and its allies can be brought to agree to proposals to further improve the implementation of the CBMs in the Final Act remains to be seen.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

TEXT ON CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES

The participating States,

Desirous of eliminating the causes of tension that may exist among them and thus of contributing to the strengthening of peace and security in the world;

Determined to strengthen confidence among them and thus to contribute to increasing stability and security in Europe;

Determined further to refrain in their mutual relations, as well as in their international relations in general, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations and with the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States as adopted in this Final Act;

Recognizing the need to contribute to reducing the dangers of armed conflict and of misunderstanding or miscalculation of military activities which could give rise to apprehension, particularly in a situation where the participating States lack clear and timely information about the nature of such activities;

Taking into account considerations relevant to efforts aimed at lessening tension and promoting disarmament;

84

Recognizing that the exchange of observers by invitation at military manoeuvres will help to promote contacts and mutual understanding;

Having studied the question of prior notification of major military movements in the context of confidence-building;

Recognizing that there are other ways in which individual States can contribute further to their common objectives;

Convinced of the political importance of prior notification of major military manoeuvres for the promotion of mutual understanding and the strengthening of confidence, stability and security;

Accepting the responsibility of each of them to promote these objectives and to implement this measure, in accordance with the accepted criteria and modalities, as essentials for the realization of these objectives;

Recognizing that this measure deriving from political decision rests upon a voluntary basis;

Have adopted the following:

I

Prior notification of major military manoeuvres

They will notify their major military manoeuvres to all other participating States through usual diplomatic channels in accordance with the following provisions:

Notification will be given of major military manoeuvres exceeding a total of 25,000 troops, independently or combined with any possible air or naval components (in this context the word "troops" includes amphibious and airborne troops). In the case of independent manoeuvres of amphibious or airborne troops, or of combined manoeuvres involving them, these troops will be included in this total. Furthermore, in the case of combined manoeuvres which do not reach the above total but which involve land forces together with significant numbers of either amphibious or airborne troops, or both, notification can also be given.

Notification will be given of major military manoeuvres which take place on the territory, in Europe, of any participating State as well as, if applicable, in the adjoining sea area and air space.

In the case of a participating State whose territory extends beyond Europe, prior notification need be given only of manoeuvres which take place in an area within 250 kilometres from its frontier facing or shared with any other European participating State, the participating State need not, however, give notification in cases in which that area is also contiguous to the participating State's frontier facing or shared with a non-European non-participating State.

Notification will be given 21 days or more in advance of the start of the manoeuvre or in the case of a manoeuvre arranged at shorter notice at the earliest possible opportunity prior to its starting date.

85

Notification will contain information of the designation, if any, the general purpose of and the States involved in the manoeuvre, the type or types and numerical strength of the forces engaged, the area and estimated time-frame of its conduct. The participating States will also, if possible, provide additional relevant information, particularly that related to the components of the forces engaged and the period of involvement of these forces.

Prior notification of other military manoeuvres

The participating States recognize that they can contribute further to strengthening confidence and increasing security and stability, and to this end may also notify smaller-scale military manoeuvres to other participating States, with special regard for those near the area of such manoeuvres.

To the same end, the participating States also recognize that they may notify other military manoeuvres conducted by them.

Exchange of observers

The participating States will invite other participating States, voluntarily and on a bilateral basis, in a spirit of reciprocity and goodwill towards all participating States, to send observers to attend military manoeuvres.

The inviting State will determine in each case the number of observers, the procedures and conditions of their participation, and give other information which it may consider useful. It will provide appropriate facilities and hospitality.

The invitation will be given as far ahead as is conveniently possible through usual diplomatic channels.

Prior notification of major military movements

In accordance with the Final Recommendations of the Helsinki Consultations the participating States studied the question of prior notification of major military movements as a measure to strengthen confidence.

Accordingly, the participating States recognize that they may, at their own discretion and with a view to contributing to confidence-building, notify their major military movements.

In the same spirit, further consideration will be given by the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to the question of prior notification of major military movements, bearing in mind, in particular, the experience gained by the implementation of the measures which are set forth in this document.

Other confidence-building measures

The participating States recognize that there are other means by which their common objectives can be promoted.

In particular, they will, with due regard to reciprocity and with a view to better mutual understanding, promote exchanges by invitation among their military personnel, including visits by military delegations.

* * *

In order to make a fuller contribution to their common objective of confidence-building, the participating States, when conducting their military activities in the area covered by the provisions for the prior notification of major military manœuvres, will duly take into account and respect this objective.

They also recognize that the experience gained by the implementation of the provisions set forth above, together with further efforts, could lead to developing and enlarging measures aimed at strengthening confidence.

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L
EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS AT MILITARY MANOEUVRES

ANNEX II to
 ISD/196(Revised)

D. INVITATIONS EXTENDED IN 1975-1976-1977-1978-1979 BY ALLIED COUNTRIES TO OTHER CSCE PARTICIPANTS

INVITING COUNTRY AND NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	COUNTRIES INVITED	ATTENDANCE OF W.P. OBSERVERS	DURATION OF THE OBSERV. (No. of hours)	FACILITIES GRANTED(1)					OBSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES						
				Tr.	Es.	Tel.	B & L	Misc.	Brief	Observ. Posts	Cameras & Binoculars	Visits to Ex. Area	Contacts with Commands	Questions	Parts of the Man. Shown
<u>1975</u> Fed. Rep. of Germany CERTAIN TROOP 14th-23rd Oct	All CSCE Participants	-	8 hours	+	+	+	+	n s	Sufficient	Mobile	+	+	+	+	Satisfactory
<u>1976</u> Fed. Rep. of Germany GROSSER BEAR 6th-10th Sept	All CSCE Participants	-	10 hours	+	+	+	+	n s	Good	Mobile	+	+	+	+	Satisfactory
Fed. Rep. of Germany LARES TEAM 13th-17th Sept	All CSCE Participants	-	12 hours	+	+	+	+	g/m n s	Good	Mobile	+	+	+	+	Satisfactory
Norway TEAMFOR 76 10th-24th Sept	CA-DE-GR- ITE-UK-US- AUS-FIN-ENT- POL-USSR	-	8 hours	+	+	+	+	g s ms ne	Good	Fixed and Mobile	Bin. avail. on demand	+	+	+	Satisfactory
United Kingdom SPEARPOINT	USSR-CZ-GDR- ROM-YUG-SWE- SMT-FIN-AUS- POL-NE-CA-IRE	-	10 hours	+	+	+	+	Tel ms ne	Comprehensive	Fixed and Mobile	Not Allowed	+	+	+	Satisfactory

(1) Tr = Transportation means; Es = Escorts provided; Tel = Telephone Liaison with Embassies; B&L = Board and Lodging; Miscellaneous = n (newspapers); (g/m) gifts or medals; (s) sightseeing; (ms) medical service; (ne) no expenses incurred to guests

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
ISD/196(revised)

INVITING COUNTRY AND NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	COUNTRIES INVITED	ATTENDANCE OF W.F. OBSERVERS	DURATION OF THE OBSERV. (No. of hours)	FACILITIES GRANTED(1)					OBSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES						
				Tr.	Es.	Tel.	B & L	Misc.	Brief	Observ. Posts	Cameras & Binoculars	Visits to Ex. Area	Contacts with Commands	Questions	Parts of the Man. Shown
<u>1977</u> Fed. Rep. of Germany STANDHAFT CHATTEN 12th-15th Sept	All CSCE	Soviet	48 hours	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	
United States CARBON EDGE 13th-23rd Sept	All CSCE	-													
Denmark ARROW EXPRESS 19th-23rd Sept	AUS-GE-NO-POL-RO-SWE-US-USSR-YU	Soviet													
Netherlands INTERACTION 24th Sept-1st Oct	BE-HUN-NO-POL-SWE-SWI-UK-USSR-YUG	Soviet													
Turkey TAYFUN 77 13th-14th Oct	Military Attachés in Ankara														
<u>1978</u> Norway ARCTIC EXPRESS 1st-6th March	CA-DE-GE-FIN-FR-HUN-IT-NE-POL-SWE-UK-US-USSR-YUG		9-10 hours	+	+	+	+	g/s ms ne	Good	Mobile	Camera gen. allowed Binoc. avail.	+	+	+	Satisfactory

(1) Tr = Transportation means; ES = Escorts provided; Tel = Telephone Liaison with Embassies; B&L = Board and Lodging; Miscellaneous = (n) newsprint; (g/m) gifts or medals; (s) sightseeing; (ms) medical service; (ne) no expense incurred to guests

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
ISD/196(Revised)

INVITING COUNTRY AND NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	COUNTRIES INVITED	ATTENDANCE OF W.P. OBSERVERS	DURATION OF THE OBSERV. (No. of hours)	FACILITIES GRANTED(1)					OBSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES					
				Tr.	Es.	Tel.	B & L	Misc.	Brief	Observ. Posts	Cameras & Binoculars	Visits to Ex. Area	Contacts with Commands	Questions
Germany BLAUE DONAU 17th-21st Sept	All CSCE Participants	Soviet	48 hours	+	+	+	+	+	Fixed and Mobile	+	+	+	+	
United States CERTAIN SHIELD 18th-28th Sept	All CSCE Participants													
Netherlands SAYON DRIVE 18th-29th Sept	All CSCE Participants													
1979 Fed. Rep. of Germany CERTAIN SENTINEL 30th Jan-6th Feb	All CSCE Participants													
				+	+	+	+	ny by ne	Fixed	+		+	+	

(1) Tr = Transportation means; ES = Escorts provided; Tel = Telephone Liaison with Embassies; B&L = Board and Lodging; Miscellaneous = (n) newsprint; (g/m) gifts or medals; (s) sightseeing; (ms) medical service; (ne) no expense incurred to guests

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
IGD/196(Revised)

EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS AT MILITARY MANOEUVRES

F. INVITATIONS EXTENDED IN 1975-1976-1977-1978-1979 BY WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES TO OTHER CSCE PARTICIPANTS

INVITING COUNTRY AND NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	COUNTRIES INVITED	DURATION OF THE OBSERV. (No. of hours)	FACILITIES GRANTED(1)					OBSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES							
			Tr.	Es.	Tel	B & L	Misc	Brief	Observ. posts	Cameras Binoc.	Visits to Ex. Area	Contacts with Comands	Questions	Parts of the man. shown	
1975 NONE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1976 Soviet Union CAUCASUS 26th Jan-6th Feb	BUL-GR-ROM-TU-YUG	2 1/2 hours	+	+	+	+	n g/m s ms ne	Poor	Inadequate	Not Allowed	Not Allowed	Not Allowed	Not encouraged	Very Poor	
Soviet Union SEVER 14th-18th June	NO-SWE-FIN-PO-GDR	4 1/2 hours	+	+		+	s ne	None	Fixed	Not Allowed	Not Allowed	Not Allowed	Not encouraged	Very Poor	
Poland SHIELD 76 (TARCZA 76) 9th-16th Sept	DE-AUS-FIN-SWE	5 hours	+	+		+	s ne	Poor	Fixed	Allowed	Not Allowed	Not Allowed	Not possible	Prepared demonstration	
1977 Soviet Union CARPATHIA 11th-16th July	AUS-BU-CZ-GDR-GE-GR-FR-IT-HU-POL-RO-YUG-SWE							Poor		Binoc. Allowed				Poor	

(1) Tr = Transportation means; ES = Escorts provided; Tel = Telephone Liaison with Embassies; B&L = Board and Lodging; Miscellaneous = (n) newsprint; (g/m) gifts or media; (s) sight-seeing; (ms) medical services; (ne) no expense incurred to guests

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
ISD/196(Revised)

INVITING COUNTRY AND NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	COUNTRIES INVITED	DURATION OF THE OBSERV. (No. of hours)	FACILITIES GRANTED(1)				OBSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES								
			Tr.	Es.	Tel	B & L	Misc	Brief	Observ. posts	Cameras Binoc.	Visits to Ex. Area	Contacts with Commands	Questions	Parts of the man. shown	
1278 Soviet Union BPFEZIMA 6th-10th Feb	BE-FR-FRG LU-NR-UK US-AUS- SWI-CDR- POL-CZ	+ 6 hours	+	+	-	+		ns ne	Poor	Fixed	Binoc. Allowed	Not Allowed	Allowed on spe- cific request	+	Poor

(1) Tr = Transportation means; Es = Escorts provided; Tel = Telephone Liaison with Embassies; P&L = Board and Lodging; Miscellaneous = (n) newspaper; (G/m) Gifts or media; (s) sight-seeing; (ms) medical services; (ne) no expense incurred to Guests

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
ICD/196(Revised)

EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS AT MILITARY MANOEUVRES
 F. INVITATIONS EXTENDED IN 1975-1976-1977-1978-1979 BY
NEUTRAL AND NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES TO OTHER CSCE PARTICIPANTS

INVITING COUNTRY AND NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	COUNTRIES INVITED	ATTENDANCE OF W.F. OBSERVERS	DURATION OF THE OBSERV. (No. of hours)	FACILITIES GRANTED (1)					OBSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES						
				Tr.	Es.	Tel.	B & L	Misc.	Brief	Observ. Posts	Cameras & Binoculars	Visits to Ex. Area	Contacts with Commands	Questions	Parts of the Man. Shown
<u>1975</u> Switzerland 10th-18th November	Military Attachés in Berne		5 hours	+	+	+	+	-	Poor	Mobile	+	+	+	+	Satisfactory
<u>1976</u> Yugoslavia GOLICA 76 20th-23rd September	22 CSCE countries		4½ hours	+	+	+	+	-	Good	Mobile	-	+	-	+	Satisfactory
<u>1977</u> Sweden VORN 77 4th-9th March	AUST-GE-GDR- DE-FI-NOR- POL-SWI-SU- YUG-UK-US	GDR/PO.SU		+	+				Good					+	Forthcoming
<u>1978</u> Spain POBENCO 8th-15th October	Military Attachés in Madrid														
<u>1978</u> NONE															

(1) Tr = Transportation means; Es = Escorts provided; Tel = Telephone Liaison with Embassies; B&L = Board and Lodging; Miscellaneous = (n) newspapers; (g/m) = gifts or medals; (s) sightseeing; (ms) medical service; (ne) no expenses incurred to guests

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
ISD/196(Revised)

INVITING COUNTRY AND NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	COUNTRIES INVITED	ATTENDANCE OF W.P. OBSERVERS	DURATION OF THE OBSERV. (No. of hours)	FACILITIES GRANTED (1)					OBSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES						
				(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e) Misc.	Brief	Observ. Posts	Cameras & Binoculars	Visits to Ex. Area	Contacts with Commands	Questions	Parts of the Man. Shown
1979 Switzerland KNACKRUSZ 5th-9th March	Military Attachés in Berne														

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

MILITARY MANOEUVRES NOTIFIED IN 1975-1976-1977-1978-1979
UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT

A. ALLIED MANOEUVRES

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS (1)
<u>1975</u>								
<u>A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>								
Fed. Rep. of Germany	GROSS ROCHADE	Ground/Air	Bavaria	68,000	GE-CA-FR-US	15th-19th September	23 days	-
United States	CERTAIN TREK	Ground/Air	NW Bavaria	57,000	GE-CA-FR-US	14th-23rd October	34 days	Yes
United States	REFORGER 75	Ground/Air	Fed. Rep. Germany	53,000	US-CA-GE	Early October-late November	32 days	-
<u>B. SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u>								
Turkey	DEEP EXPRESS	Joint	Aegean Sea & Turkish Thrace	18,000	TU-US-UK-GE-BE-IT-NE	12th-28th September	21 days	-
Norway	BATTEN BOLT 75	Joint	Oestfold (NO)	8,000	NO-UK-DE-NE	3rd-7th October	24 days	-

(1) For details see Annex IID

CLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

-8-

10

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
ISD/196(Revised)

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
Netherlands	PANTSER-SPRONG	Ground/Air	Western Germany	10,000	NE	28th Oct - 6th Nov	14 days	-
<u>1976</u>								
A. <u>MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>								
Fed. Rep. of Germany	GROSSER BAER	Ground/Air	North-West Germany	50,000	GE-NE-UK-US	6th-10th September	21 days	Yes
United States	GORDIAN SHIELD	Ground/Air	Hesse (GE)	30,000	US-GE	7th-11th September	21 days	-
United States	LARES TEAM	Ground/Air	Southern Germany	44,000	US-CA-GE	13th-17th September	21 days	Yes
B. <u>SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u>								
Norway	ATLAS EXPRESS	Joint	South West Troms	17,000	CA-GE-IT-NE-NO-UK-US	24th Feb- 23rd Mar	21 days	-
Norway	TEAMWORK 76	Joint	Trøndelag (NO)	13,500	NO-NE-UK-US	10th-24th September	21 days	Yes
Denmark/GE	BONDED ITEM	Joint	Jutland & Schleswig-Holstein	11,000	DE-GE-US	11th-21st October	21 days	-
United Kingdom	SPEARPOINT	Ground	North-West Germany	18,000	UK-DK-US	2nd-11th November	23 days	Yes

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
<u>1977</u>								
<u>A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>								
United States	CARBON EDGE	Ground/Air	Germany	58,700	US-BE-CA-GE-NE-UK	13th-23rd September	21 days	Yes
Fed. Rep. of Germany	STANDHAFTE CHATTEN	Ground/Air	Germany	38,000	GE-US	12th-15th September	21 days	Yes
<u>B. SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u>								
United States	CERTAIN FIGHTER	Ground/Air	Germany	24,000	US	1st-8th May	21 days	-
Denmark	ARROW EXPRESS	Ground/Air	Denmark	16,000	BE-CA-DE-GE-IT-LU-NE-UK-US	19th-23rd September	21 days	Yes
Belgium	BLUE FOX	Ground	Germany	24,000	BE-GE-US	12th-23rd September	21 days	-
Netherlands	INTER-ACTION	Ground/Air	Germany	12,000	NE	24th Sept-1st Oct	21 days	Yes
Turkey	TAYFUN 77	Ground/Air/Naval	Turkey	15,000	TU	13th-14th October	30 days	Yes

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
<u>1978</u>								
<u>A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>								
Fed. Rep. of Germany	BLAUE DONAU	Ground/air	Nurnberg-Regensburg-Augsburg-Ulm	46,000	CA-GE-US	17th-21st September	24 days	Yes
United States	CERTAIN SHIELD	Ground/Air	Bad Hessfeld-Schweinfurt-Darmstadt-Monburg-Limburg	56,000	BE-GE-LU-UK-US	18th-28th September	24 days	Yes
Netherlands	SAXON DRIVE	Ground/Air	Luneburg-Wafsburg-Hannover-Bremen	32,500	GE-NE-US	18th-29th September	24 days	Yes
Fed. Rep. of Germany	BOLD GUARD	Ground/Air	Schleswig Holstein-COMBALTAP, Karup	65,000	DE-GE-UK-US	19th-22nd September	30 days	-
<u>B. SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u>								
Norway	ARCTIC EXPRESS	Ground/Air	Troms	15,300	CA-GE-IT-NE-NO-UK-US	1st-6th March	30 days	Yes

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
Norway	BLACK BEAR	Ground/Air	East Agder	8,200	NE-NO-UK-US	22nd-26th September	30 days	-
<u>1979</u> A. <u>MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>								
United States	CERTAIN SENTINEL	Ground	N. Baden - Wurtenburg W. Bavaria	66,000	CA-GE-LU-NE- UK-US	30th Jan- 6th Feb	25 days	Yes
B. <u>SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u>								
Norway	COLD WINTER 79	Ground/Air	County of Troms	10,000	CA-NE-NO- UK-US	17th-22nd March	30 days	-

CLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

MILITARY MANOEUVRES NOTIFIED IN 1975-1976-1977-1978-1979 UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT

B. WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES' MANOEUVRES

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS (3)
1975									
NONE									
1976									
<u>A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>									
USSR	CAUCASUS	Ground/Air	Kutaisi-Tbilisi Yerevan	About 25,000	Soviet	25th Jan- 6th Feb	21 days	Poor	Yes
USSR	SEVER	Ground/Air	Leningrad Military District	About 25,000	Soviet	14th-18th June	21 days	Poor	Yes
Poland	SHIELD 76	Ground/Air	Bydgoszcz Szczecin Wroclaw	35,000	POL-USSR- CZ-GDR	9th-16th September	21 days	Poor	Yes
<u>B. SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u>									
Hungary	-	Alert/Tactical Exercise	Denafolovar (Central Hungary)	About 10,000	Hungarian	6th April	1 day(2)	Poor	-
Hungary	-	Ground/Air	Tisza/ Danube and Danatul	15,000 (1)	Hungarian, Soviet	18th-23rd October	0 days	Poor	-

- 1) Including certain staffs and units of the Soviet troops stationed in Hungary
- 2) To Western military attaches in Budapest only.
- 3) For details see Annex IIE

CLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

CLASSIFIED - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
1977									
A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES									
USSR	-	Ground/Air	Kiohinev, Odessa, Nikolayev	25,000	Soviet	31st Mar-5th April	21 days	Poor	-
USSR	CARPATHIA	Ground/Air	Lutsk, Lvov Rovno	27,000	Soviet	11th-16th July	21 days	Poor	Yes
1978									
A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES									
USSR	BEREZINA	Ground/Air	Minsk-Orsha-Polotsk	25,000	Soviet	6th-10th February	21 days	Poor	Yes
USSR	TARCZA 78	Ground/Air	GDR	30,000	Soviet	3rd-8th July	21 days	Poor	-
USSR	KAVKAZ II	Ground/Air	Kutaisi, Bakumi and Kirovabad (Trans Caucasus)	25,000	Soviet	5th-20th September (notified 5th-12th September)	21 days	Poor	-

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ANNEX II to
ISD/196(Revised)

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
1979 A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES USSR/ Czechoslovakia	DRUZHBA	Ground/Air	Western Czechoslovakia	26,000	Soviet/ Czechoslovak	2nd-7th February	21 days	Poor	-

MILITARY MANOEUVRES NOTIFIED IN 1975-1976-1977-1978-1979 UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT

C. NEUTRAL AND NON-ALIGNED MANOEUVRES

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS (1)
<u>1975</u>									
A. <u>MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>									
Switzerland	-	Ground/Air	Schaffhausen	40,000	Swiss	10th-18th November	31 days	Detailed	Yes
B. <u>SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u>									
Yugoslavia	-	Ground	SW Macedonia	18,000	Yugoslav	21st-25th October	25 days	Adequate	-
<u>1976</u>									
A. <u>MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u>									
Yugoslavia	GOLIJA 76	Ground/Air	SW Serbia	24,000	Yugoslav	20th-23rd September	34 days	Adequate	Yes

(1) For details see Annex IIF

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
<p><u>B. SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u></p>									
Sweden	POSEIDON	Joint	Eastern Military District (Gettland) and adjacent air and sea areas	12,000	Swedish	2nd-6th October	30 days	Adequate	-
<p><u>1977</u></p>									
<p><u>A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES</u></p>									
<p>NONE</p>									
<p><u>B. SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES</u></p>									
Sweden	VONN 77	Ground/Air	North West Province of Jaentland	10,000	Swedish	4th-9th March	21 days	Adequate	Yes
Spain	PODENCO	Ground/Air	La Mancha (Ciudad Real)	8,000	Spanish	8th-15th October	53 days	Poor	Yes

CLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

CLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PPN(2012)0003 - DECLASSIFIED - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

SPONSORING COUNTRY	NAME OF THE MANOEUVRE	TYPE OF THE MANOEUVRE	AREA	SIZE	PARTICIPATING FORCES	PERIOD OF THE MANOEUVRE	NOTIFICATION GIVEN (No. of days)	CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION	INVITATION TO OBSERVERS
Austria 1978 A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES NONE B. SMALLER SCALE MANOEUVRES	HERBSTUEBUNG 77	Ground/Air	Ried Im Innkreis-Mattighofenv	12,000	Austrian	11th-19th November	37 days	Detailed	-
Austria 1979 A. MAJOR MANOEUVRES	-	Command/Post/Communication Exercise	Weinviertel Lower Austria	5,000	Austrian	13th-17th November	20 days	Detailed	-
Switzerland	KNACKNUS	Ground, co-operation military/civilian	N.E. Switzerland Bodensee-Rhine-Lake Zürich	34,000	Swiss	5th-9th March	28 days	Detailed	Yes

MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN ALLIED AND WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES:

1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 AND 1978

(Listed alphabetically by Visiting Country)

A. DEFENCE MINISTERS AND SENIOR DEFENCE OFFICIALS

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
<u>1974</u>			
France	Romania	10th-29th December	Mr. Bourges, Minister of National Defence
Greece	Romania	2nd-5th December	Mr. Averoff, Minister of Defence
Romania	France	November	General Ionita, Minister of National Defence
<u>1975</u>			
Italy	Romania	1st-3rd October	Mr. Forlani, Minister of Defence
Poland	Norway	September	Mr. Jaruzelski, Minister of Defence
Romania	Italy	15th-20th October	General Sterian Tirca, Commander of Infantry and Tanks and Deputy Minister of Defence
United Kingdom	Romania	-	Secretary of State for Defence, Mr. Mason, accompanied by Director of Combat Development
<u>1976</u>			
Romania	United Kingdom	22nd-26th June	Col.Gen. Coman, Minister of Defence
<u>1977</u>			
France	USSR	November	Mr. Yvon Bourges, Minister of Defence
Romania	France	2nd-12th June	Gen. Ion Coman, Minister of Defence
<u>1978</u>			
Norway	USSR	July/August	Under Secretary of State for Defence, Dr. Holst accompanied by army officers and a civilian
Romania	Greece	18th-22nd April	Gen. Ion Coman, Minister of Defence

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

ANNEX III to
ISD/196(Revised)

B. CHIEFS OF STAFF

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
<u>1974</u>			
France	USSR	27th May - 2nd June	Gen. Maurin, Army Chief of Staff
France	USSR	2nd-8th October	Admiral Joire Moulens, Navy Chief of Staff
Italy	Romania	29th Sept- ember - 4th October	Chief of Staff of the Army
Romania	Italy	June	Lt.Gen. Constrantin Popa, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces
USSR	Denmark	June	Admiral of the Fleet Gorschkov, Commander-in- Chief of the Soviet Navy
<u>1975</u>			
France	USSR	19th-25th May	Gen. Grigaut, Air Force Chief of Staff
Italy	Romania	13th-20th April	Deputy Chief of Defence Staff
Romania	USA	11th-19th March	General Coman, Chief of Staff
Turkey	Romania	16th-18th August	Rear-Admiral Orhan Marabulut, Chief of Staff of the Fleet
USA	Romania	15th September	Gen. Weyand, Army Chief of Staff
USSR	France	19th-21st October	Admiral of the Fleet Gorschkov, Commander-in- Chief of the Soviet Navy
USSR	France	8th-14th December	Marshal Koutskhov, Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Air Force
<u>1976</u>			
France	USSR	23rd-29th May	Gen. Lagarde, Army Chief of Staff
Poland	France	21st-25th June	Gen. Siwicki, Chief of Staff
Turkey	USSR	26th May- 2nd June	Gen. Kenan Evren, Deputy Chief of General Staff accompanied by a military delegation
USSR	France	10th-16th	General Pavlovski, Commander of the Soviet Army

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
<u>1977</u>			
France	USSR	14th-20th June	Gen. Mery, Chief of the French Defence Staff
Turkey	Romania	20th-27th June	Gen. Vecilzi Akin, Deputy Chief of Staff
<u>1978</u>			
France	Poland	September	Gen. Mery, Chief of the French Defence Staff
Hungary	France	June	Gen. Olad, Chief of Staff of the Hungarian Peoples Army
Romania	France	September	Gen. Ion Hortopas, Chief of Staff, Vice Minister of Defence
USSR	Turkey	24th-18th April	Marshal A.V. Ogarkov
<u>C. OTHER VISITS</u>			
<u>1974</u>			
Canada	Romania	12th-16th June	National Defence College
Denmark	Poland	June	Visit to Gdynia by the frigate <u>Peder Skram</u> , one minelayer and four torpedo boats
Denmark	USSR	October	Chief of the Danish Army Academy
France	Poland	July	Visit to Gdynia by the schooners <u>Etoile</u> and <u>Belle Poule</u>
France	USSR	7th December	Courtesy visit to Sebastopol by two French ships
FRG	Poland	18th-22nd July	Visit to Gdynia by sailing/training vessel <u>Gorch Foch</u>
Italy	USSR	15th-22nd September	Delegation of Italian Air Force Military School
Netherlands	Poland	18th-22nd June	Visit to Gdynia by the sailing training vessel HNLMS <u>Urania</u>
Norway	USSR	September	Naval visit to Leningrad
Portugal	USSR	-	Visit by a training vessel
Romania	United Kingdom	May	Visit to Cranwell by six personnel of Air Academy

ANNEX III to
ISD/196(Revised)

VISITING COUNTRY

HOST COUNTRY

DATE

PARTICULARS

USSR	France	21st-26th June	Courtesy visit to Cherbourg by two ships of the Soviet Navy
USSR	France	15th-22nd September	Gen. Govorov, Commander of the Moscow military region
USSR	Italy	24th November- 1st December	Delegation from the Leningrad Military School
USSR	Netherlands	7th-12th March	Visit to Rotterdam by two research vessels
USSR	Norway	November	Naval visit to Oslo
1975 Denmark	USSR	May	Visit to Leningrad by the frigate <u>Peder Skram</u> accompanying the Royal yacht Dannerbrog on the occasion of visit of the Queen
Denmark	USSR	October	Visit to the Naval Academy in Leningrad by the Chief of the Danish Naval Academy
France	Poland	15th-22nd November	Centre des Hautes Etudes de l'Armement
France	Romania	1st-10th September	National Defence and Armed Forces Commission of the National Assembly
France	USSR	20th-25th May	Delegation of senior officers from staff colleges led by Gen. Couderc
France	USSR	21st May- 1st June	Chief of the historical services of the Army, Gen. Christienne
France	USSR	26th-30th May	Courtesy visit to Leningrad by two ships of the French Navy
France	USSR	21st-27th July	Commander of the Paris military region, Gen. Favreau
Italy	USSR	22nd-29th September	Delegation from Moderna Military School
Poland	Netherlands	August	Visit by a sailing/training vessel for "Sail Amsterdam 700"

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
Poland	United Kingdom	May	Visit to Portsmouth by three naval vessels, one SAM kotlin class destroyer <u>Warsawa</u> and two Krogulec class mine-sweepers
Portugal	USSR	-	Visit by a training vessel
Romania	Netherlands	August	Visit by sailing training vessel for "Sail Amsterdam 700"
Turkey	Romania	25th-26th August	Visit to Constanta by naval training ship Savarona
United Kingdom	Romania	-	Contingent of Royal Air Force cadets, as guests of Romanian Air Force Academy
United Kingdom	USSR	-	Visit by a Ministry of Defence technical officer to attend a conference on international standards
United Kingdom	USSR	-	Visit by a civilian technical officer to attend the annual conference on semi-conductors
USA	Romania	20th-24th June	Visit to Constanta by USS <u>Wainwright</u>
USA	USSR	12th-16th May	Visit to Leningrad by Rear-Admiral J.E. Langille, III, as Senior USN representative during a naval visit
USA	USSR	12th-16th May	Visit to Leningrad by USS <u>Leahy</u> and USS <u>Tattnal</u>
USSR	Denmark	September-October	Admiral A. Rassokho, Chief of the Department for Navigation and Oceanography at the Ministry of Defence, with companions
USSR	Denmark	October	Delegation from the Army Academy led by Maj.Gen. A.I. Magonov
USSR	France	3rd-7th July	Courtesy visit to Toulon by two ships of the Soviet Navy

ANNEX III to
ISD/196(Revised)

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
USSR	Italy	19th-26th October	Delegation from the Kiev Superior Technical School (corresponding to engineering section, Italian Air Force Military School)
USSR	Netherlands	August	Visit by sailing training vessel for "Sail Amsterdam 700"
USSR	USA	12th-17th May	Visit to Boston by Rear-Admiral A.M. Kalinin as senior naval Soviet representative during a ship visit
USSR	USA	12th-17th May	Visit to Boston by ships USSR <u>Boysky</u> and USSR <u>Zhgouchiy</u>
<u>1976</u>			
Canada	USSR	4th-9th October	Visit to Leningrad by three destroyers
Denmark	USSR	mid-October 5-6 days	Chief of Air Force Academy with companions (5-6 persons)
France	Poland	May	L'Ecole Militaire supérieure scientifique et technique (35th class)
France	Romania	May	Visit to Constanta by the anti-submarine destroyer <u>Guepratte</u> and the destroyer <u>Agenais</u>
France	USSR	12th-18th May	Delegation of instructors from Saint-Cyr-Coëtquidan led by the Commandant of the Ecole
France	USSR	21st-26th June	Courtesy visit to Odessa by two ships of the French Navy
France	USSR	1st-10th October	Delegation from the French Military Museums led by Gen. Lissarague
Poland	France	June	Visit to Rouen by the training ship <u>Edward Dombrowski</u>
Poland	France	July	Visit to Cherbourg by the training ship <u>Wodnik</u>
Portugal	Romania	-	Army delegation
Romania	USA	3rd-23rd July	Visit to New York City, Baltimore and Philadelphia by naval training ship <u>Mircea</u>

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
United Kingdom	Poland	4th-8th June	Visit to Gdynia by HMS <u>Intrepid</u>
United Kingdom	Romania	2nd-5th June	Visit to Constanta by HMS <u>Devonshire</u>
United Kingdom	USSR	28th May-1st June	Visit to Odessa by HMS <u>Devonshire</u>
United Kingdom	USSR	October	Delegation from Camberley Staff College to Frunze Academy
USA	Romania	28th April - 2nd May	US National War College
USA	Romania	13th September	Visit to Constanta by USS <u>Yarnel</u>
USA	USSR	9th-20th May	Visit by Brig.Gen. J.L. Collins, Jr., US Army in order to improve relations between military historians
USSR	Canada	25th-30th August	Visit to Vancouver by two destroyers and one naval tanker
USSR	Denmark	10th-15th August	Visit by two frigates
USSR	Denmark	End August-beginning September (5 days)	Chief of the Naval Academy in Leningrad (Frunze) with companions
USSR	France	4th-8th April	Gen. Gribkov, Commander of the Leningrad military region
USSR	France	9th-18th May	Delegation from the Soviet Military Museums led by Gen. Anikovitch
USSR	France	20th-25th May	Courtesy visit to Bordeaux by two ships of the Soviet Navy
USSR	United Kingdom	28th May-1st June	Visit to Portsmouth by Soviet Kasha class destroyer <u>Obratsovy</u>
<u>1977</u>			
Denmark	USSR	-	Director of the Navigation and Hydrography Administration with companions and the ship <u>Argus</u>

ANNEX III to
ISD/196(Revised)

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
France	Poland	December	Gen. du Barry, Military Governor of Paris, Commandant of the 1st Military Region
France	Poland	13th-16th June	Escales des escorteurs rapide le Normand et le Picard à Gdnya
France	USSR	June	Gen. Etcheverry, Governor of Metz and Commandant of the 1st CA and the 6th Military Region
France	USSR	19th May-2nd June	Vice Admiral Banuls, Chief of the Naval Military Personnel Department
France	USSR	1st-6th June	Visite escale à Mourmansk de l'escorteur d'escadre Duperre et de la fregate lance-engins Duguesne
France	USSR	25th-29th July	Squadron 2/30 Normandie Niemen, 6 mirages F1 at Kabinka
Italy	USSR	July	Military delegation led by the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army
Italy	USSR	September	Military delegation from the Italian Naval Academy
Netherlands	USSR	June	Visit by two ships of the Netherlands Royal Navy to Leningrad
Norway	USSR	10th-14th October	Visit by 2 Norwegian frigates to Leningrad
Poland	United Kingdom	19th-22nd August	3 Polish vessels to London
Turkey	Romania	30th April-7th May	Lt.Gen. Beshettin Demizel (to participate in the symposium held on the 100th interdependence anniversary)
USA	Romania	1st-6th May	Visit to Bucharest by National Defence University/ICAF Delegation
USA	USSR	11th-18th May	Delegation of Military Representatives from National Defence University

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
USSR	France	24th-29th May	Visite escale à Cherbourg de l'escorteur d'escadre Zeughiyet et la bâtiment Ecole Smolnii
USSR	Italy	October	Military delegation led by the Soviet Deputy Chief of Staff
USSR	Italy	November	Military delegation from Soviet Naval Academies
USSR	Norway	10th-15th October	Visit by 2 Soviet destroyers to Oslo
USSR	United Kingdom	March	Delegation from Frunze Academy to Camberley Staff
USSR	USA	5th-6th May	Visit by military attachés in Washington to selected US military units
USSR	USA	19th-20th July	Visit by Commander-in-Chief of Soviet forces in Germany and members of his staff to US Army Europe Headquarters as a US Army training area
<u>1978</u>			
France	Romania	June	Visit escale à Constanta de la frégate Suffren
France	USSR	19th-25th June	Visite escale à Sebastopol du croiseur anti-aérien Colbert et du bâtiment de soutien logistique Rhin
Greece	USSR	13th-18th September	Visit to Odessa of two destroyers
Romania	United Kingdom	1st-4th March	Delegation from Nicolai Balescu Infantry School to Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst
Turkey	USSR	5th-8th December	Visit to Odessa by two destroyers
United Kingdom	Poland	28th Sept- ember-20th October	Visit to Gdynia by HMS <u>London</u> .
United Kingdom	Romania	27th June- 1st July	Delegation from the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst to Bucharest

ANNEX III to
ISD/196(Revised)

<u>VISITING COUNTRY</u>	<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>
USA	Hungary	Spring	Students from senior service schools
USA	Romania	Spring	Students from senior service schools
USA	Romania	22nd-27th November	Visit to Constanta by US warship
USSR	Denmark	1st-6th October	Visit to Copenhagen by Soviet Naval vessel
USSR	France	10th-14th May	Visite escale à Bordeaux du croiseur Mohrmansk et de l'escorteur d'escadre Smyshleny
USSR	France	4th-8th September	Visit of 6 Mig 23x to Reims
USSR	Greece	23rd-28th October	Visit to Piraeus of USSR cruiser Dzerzinsky and a destroyer under the flag of Admiral Jobrin Commander Soviet Black Sea Fleet
USSR	Turkey	16th-20th November	Visit to Istanbul by USSR cruiser Dzerzinsky and USSR destroyer Reshitelny
USSR	USA	18th-30th April	Lt.Gen. Pavel Zhihn, Director of the Soviet Ministry of Defense's Institute of Military History

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

BELGRADE MEETING 1977

OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES
OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION
IN EUROPE HELD ON THE BASIS OF THE PROVISIONS
OF THE FINAL ACT RELATING TO THE FOLLOW-UP TO
THE CONFERENCE

CSCE/MB/11
Belgrade, 2nd November, 1977

Original: ENGLISH

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATIONS
OF CANADA, GREAT BRITAIN, THE NETHERLANDS
AND NORWAY

CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

The above-mentioned delegations propose that the following text should be inserted in the concluding document of the Belgrade Meeting:

"(1)

The participating States, in implementing the provisions of the Final Act on Confidence-Building Measures,

(Manoeuvres)

- will notify, in the same manner as major manoeuvres, those smaller-scale manoeuvres involving fewer than 25,000 troops and more than 10,000 troops and corresponding in other respects to the parameters contained in the provision on prior notification of major military manoeuvres;
- will, in keeping with the relevant provisions of the Final Act, give notification at least 21 days, but preferably not less than 30 days in advance of the start of the manoeuvre, or, in the case of a manoeuvre arranged at shorter notice, as soon as possible prior to its beginning;
- will include in the contents of the notification additional relevant information related to the components of the manoeuvre, such as the specification and designation of forces engaged at the brigade/regiment level and above and including amphibious, airborne, missile and tank formations;

(1) Preambular language, if any, is for later consideration

ANNEX IVA to
ISD/196(Revised)

(Observers)

- are prepared to invite and send observers more frequently to military manoeuvres and to extend invitations to a greater number of participating States;
- will endeavour to offer observers the best possible opportunity to observe adequately the development of the manoeuvre; to this end, reasonable freedom of movement in the manoeuvre area, under escort, and adequate briefings on the purpose, characteristics, and development of the manoeuvre will be provided, and appropriate facilities, such as maps, means of transportation, and use of binoculars will be granted;

(Movements)

- will notify their major military movements to all other participating States through usual diplomatic channels in accordance with the following provisions:
 - notification will be given of the movement into or within the applicable area, as defined in the Final Act, of 25,000 or more ground troops (in this context the word "troops" includes amphibious and airborne troops), if such troops are moving for a co-ordinated purpose; are moving in units or, if not in units, are moving during a period of 30 consecutive days; and are moving over a straight-line distance of more than 200 kilometres from the point of origin;
 - notification will be given 21 days or more in advance of the start of the movement. Should a State be apprehensive for reasons arising from lack of a clear, timely or adequate understanding of the reasons for military activities of other States, that State may give shorter notification, fully explaining its apprehension to the other participating States;
 - notification will contain information on the designation, if any, and the general purpose of the movement, the type or types and numerical strength of the forces engaged, the estimated timeframe of the conduct of the movement, its place or places of origin and destination (if located within the applicable area), and identification of units involved in the movement at the regimental level or above."

BELGRADE MEETING 1977

OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES
OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION
IN EUROPE HELD ON THE BASIS OF THE PROVISIONS
OF THE FINAL ACT RELATING TO THE FOLLOW-UP TO
THE CONFERENCE

CSCE/BM/6

Belgrade, 25th October, 1977

Original: ENGLISH

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATIONS OF
AUSTRIA, CYPRUS, FINLAND, LIECHTENSTEIN,
SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, AND YUGOSLAVIA

CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

The participating States,

Determined to continue the development and strengthening
of confidence among them and thus further to contribute to
increasing stability and security in Europe;

Mindful of the complementary nature of the political and
military aspects of European security;

Recognizing that the practice of prior notification of
military manoeuvres has proved to be of value in promoting mutual
understanding and in strengthening confidence, stability and
security;

Recognizing further that the exchange of observers by
invitation at military manoeuvres has contributed to promoting
contacts and mutual understanding;

Recalling previous decisions that further consideration
would be given to the question of prior notification of major
military movements;

Taking into account the provisions of the Final Act stating
that the experience gained could lead to developing and enlarging
measures aimed at strengthening confidence;

have adopted the following:

Prior notification of major military manoeuvres

They understand that the term "major military manoeuvres"
is applicable also to smaller-scale military manoeuvres which are
carried out close to each other in time and space under the same
command and which, together, exceed a total of 25,000 troops.

ANNEX IVB to
ISD/196(Revised)

Additional relevant information as referred to in the Final Act will include notification of the types and numbers of the participating major units, the estimated starting and finishing dates of the movements of the forces involved, as well as the period of absence from their regular duty stations.

Prior notification of other military manoeuvres

The participating States recognize that prior notification of smaller-scale manoeuvres has made a valuable contribution towards promoting their common objective of confidence-building. To this end they will give positive consideration to, and further develop, the practice of notifying such manoeuvres.

They will give further consideration to the question of prior notification of military manoeuvres near the territorial waters of other participating States, with special regard to the States in question, bearing in mind, in particular, the experience gained by the implementation of the measures which are set forth in the Final Act and in this document.

Exchange of observers

The participating States, while reaffirming that the invitation of observers rests on a voluntary and bilateral basis, have, for the further development of this confidence-building measure, adopted the following guidelines regarding general procedures and conditions for the participation of observers at military manoeuvres:

- observers will be given ample and continuous information as well as the opportunity of acquiring a good overall picture of the purpose and progress of the manoeuvre;
- observers will be allowed to follow the exercises of forces taking part in the manoeuvre, including, if feasible, the activities of both command staffs and field units, thus permitting personal contacts with troops;
- observers from different participating States invited to attend the same military manoeuvre will be given equal treatment.

Prior notification of major military movements

Bearing in mind the positive experience gained by the implementation of prior notification of major military manoeuvres, the participating States, having further considered the question of prior notification of major military movements, will notify such movements with particular regard to movements involving a change in military strength patterns. They will apply the same provisions as adopted for major military manoeuvres with the additional information of the direction of the movement and the place of destination.

They understand that the term "major military movements" is also applicable when the movement takes place in parts, divided in time and/or space, which in the aggregate exceed a total of 25,000 troops.

Prior notification of other military movements

The participating States recognize that they can contribute further to strengthening confidence and increasing security and stability also by notifying smaller-scale military movements to other participating States, with special regard for those near the area of such movements.

They will give further consideration to the question of prior notification of military movements near the territorial waters of other participating States, with special regard to the States in question, bearing in mind, in particular, the experience gained by the implementation of the measures which are set forth in the Final Act and in this document.

Other confidence-building measures

The participating States recognize that appropriate, increased openness regarding military matters will generally contribute to strengthening confidence among them. In this spirit, and with a view to reducing and eliminating causes of misunderstanding and over-reaction, they will promote openness with regard to their military budgets.

The participating States recognize that there are still additional means by which their common objectives as described in the Final Act can be promoted.

BELGRADE MEETING 1977

OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES
OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION
IN EUROPE HELD ON THE BASIS OF THE PROVISIONS
OF THE FINAL ACT RELATING TO THE FOLLOW-UP TO
THE CONFERENCE

CSCE/BM/S/1
Belgrade, 24th October, 1977

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

PROPOSAL BY THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF ROMANIA
CONCERNING CERTAIN MILITARY ASPECTS OF SECURITY IN EUROPE

I. The participating States, after a thorough exchange of views on the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act and of the tasks defined by the Conference, as well as on the deepening of their mutual relations, the strengthening of security and the development of co-operation in Europe and the development of the process of détente in the future, have noted that the greatest concentration of armed forces and armaments, including nuclear weapons, is to be found on the European continent; that the arms race continues and that exorbitant sums are being spent for this purpose by the States signatories of the Final Act, sums which represent more than 80% of world military expenditure.

They have expressed their profound concern at the evolution of the military situation on the continent and the lack of progress in the negotiations that are taking place on disarmament and military disengagement.

The participating States have stressed the indissoluble link between the efforts undertaken at the political level and the evolution of the military situation on the continent, in the achievement of their objectives as established by the Final Act, namely, to strengthen security and to promote détente in Europe.

Reaffirming their interest in the efforts to reduce military confrontation and to promote disarmament, as an integral part of the strengthening of security on the continent, the participating States consider that it is necessary to undertake more sustained efforts to reduce the dangers of military confrontation on the continent, to halt the arms race and reduce troops and armaments, and to adopt effective measures of disarmament, and, in the first place, of nuclear disarmament. They express their decision to work constantly to that end.

The participating States, conscious of the necessity that general and complete disarmament measures should be adopted, in the interests of mankind, are determined to make an active contribution

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

ANNEX IVC to
ISD/196(Revised)

-2-

to the work of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament questions, to be held in 1978, in order that it may lead to positive results and constitute the beginning of a genuine process of disarmament.

II. The participating States,

Determined to act in order to strengthen confidence among them and thus to contribute to increasing stability and security in Europe;

Bearing in mind the indissoluble link between the political and the military aspects of security;

Recognizing that some positive results have been achieved in the implementation of the confidence-building measures provided for in the Final Act;

Emphasizing the need to contribute further to reducing the dangers of armed conflict and of misunderstandings or miscalculation of military activities which could give rise to apprehension;

Taking into account considerations relevant to the lessening of tension and of the dangers of military confrontation and to the promotion of disarmament;

have adopted the following:

1. Prior notification of major military movements.

The participating States will each notify every other participating State of major military movements which take place on their territory, in Europe.

The prior notification of major military movements will be given in conformity with the provisions of the Final Act concerning the prior notification of major military manoeuvres, and, in particular, in accordance with the following criteria:

- notification will be given of military movements exceeding a total of 25,000 troops, independently or combined with any air or naval components;
- notification will be given 21 days or more in advance of the start of the movements;
- notification will contain information on the purpose of the movement, the type and numerical strength of the forces engaged, the weapons and the mode of combat, the areas of deployment, the itinerary of the movement and means of transport used, the duration of the movement, as well as all other useful information.

2. Prior notification of air and naval manoeuvres

The participating States will each notify every other participating State of air and naval manoeuvres, independent or combined, which take place on their territory in Europe, as well as in the sea or air space adjacent to Europe:

- notification will be given 21 days or more in advance of the start of the manoeuvre;
- notification will contain information similar to that provided for in the Final Act for the prior notification of major military manoeuvres.

3. Refraining from carrying out multinational manoeuvres near the frontiers of other States

In order to remove any source of apprehension and to increase confidence in their mutual relations, the participating States will not carry out multinational manoeuvres near the frontiers of other participating States.

4. Undertaking not to establish new military bases, including nuclear weapon sites, and not to deploy additional troops on the territory of other European States

The participating States will not establish new military bases on the continent, including nuclear weapon sites, and will not increase the number of their troops on the territory of other States in Europe.

BELGRADE MEETING 1977

OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES
OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION
IN EUROPE HELD ON THE BASIS OF THE PROVISIONS
OF THE FINAL ACT RELATING TO THE FOLLOW-UP TO
THE CONFERENCE

CSCE/BM/5
Belgrade, 24th October, 1977

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

PROPOSAL OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
PRESENTED BY THE USSR DELEGATION

PROGRAMME OF ACTION
WITH A VIEW TO THE CONSOLIDATION OF MILITARY DETENTE IN EUROPE

- To conclude among the participants in the all-European Conference a treaty on the non-first-use of nuclear weapons against one another. The draft of such a treaty has already been put forward by the Warsaw Treaty countries. Clearly, if all parties to such an agreement observe it, this will altogether exclude the unleashing of nuclear war in Europe, and also between European countries and the United States of America and Canada;

- To agree that the Military and Political groupings and Alliances confronting one another in Europe should at least not be enlarged by the addition of new members;

- To implement consistently such measures already provided for by the Helsinki Final Act as notification of major military manoeuvres, the invitation of observers to some manoeuvres and the exchange of military delegations.

The experience of two years shows that these measures do in fact contribute to a certain extent to confidence-building and to military détente. In view of this, we consider that it might be desirable to agree not to carry out manoeuvres above a certain level - say 50,000-60,000 men - inasmuch as mass manoeuvres give rise to special apprehension and resemble military demonstrations.

If the countries of the southern part of the Mediterranean basin would also like the military confidence-building measures envisaged by the Final Act to embrace that region, which is adjacent to Europe, our approach to this would be sympathetic.

All these questions could be discussed in detail in the near future - in parallel with the continuation of the Vienna negotiations - at special joint consultations by all the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

THE PARTICIPATING STATES

- BM 5 - will implement fully and consistently all confidence-building measures in the Final Act

PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANOEUVRES/PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF OTHER MILITARY MANOEUVRES

- BM 11 - will notify preferably 30 days in advance
- BM 6, BM 11 - will include in notifications additional relevant information:
- BM 6, BM 11 ... types and numbers of participating major units at brigade/regimental level and above
- BM 11 ... amphibious, airborne, missile and tank formations
- BM 6 ... estimated starting and finishing dates of movements of the forces involved as well as period of absence from their garrisons
- BM 6, BM 11 - will notify smaller-scale manoeuvres
- BM 11 ... 10,000-25,000 troops
- BM 11 ... corresponding in other respects to parameters contained in provision on prior notification of major military manoeuvres

EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS

- BM 11 - will invite observers more frequently
- BM 11 - will extend invitations to greater number of states
- will provide observers:
- BM 6, BM 11 ... opportunity to acquire good overall picture of purpose of manoeuvre
- BM 6, BM 11 ... ample/continuous information on development of manoeuvre
- BM 11 ... reasonable freedom of movement in manoeuvre area, under escort
- BM 6 ... opportunity to follow activities of field units, contact with troops/command staffs
- BM 6, BM 11 ... appropriate facilities (maps/binoculars/transportation)
- BM 6 ... equal treatment

ANNEX IVE to
ISD/196(Revised)

PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS

- BM/S/1, BM 6, BM 11 - will notify their major military movements
- ... parameters:
- BM/S/1, BM 6, BM 11 ... 25,000 or more ground troops
- BM/S/1, BM 6, BM 11 ... "troops" include airborne and amphibious troops
- BM 11 ... moving into or within the applicable area, as defined in the Final Act provision on notification of major military manoeuvres
- BM 11 ... moving in units or
- BM 11 ... if not moving in units, moving during a period of 30 consecutive days
- BM 6, BM 11 ... moving for a co-ordinated purpose, even if movement takes place in parts, divided in time and/or space
- BM 11 ... moving over a straight-line distance of more than 200 km from point of origin
- BM/S/1, BM 6, BM 11 ... notification 21 days or more in advance
- BM 11 ... shorter notification, with full explanation of apprehension, should state be apprehensive for reasons arising from lack of a clear, timely or adequate understanding of the reasons for military activity of other states
- ... notification will contain following information:
- BM 6, BM 11 ... designation, if any, of movement
- BM/S/1, BM 6, BM 11 ... purpose
- BM/S/1, BM 6, BM 11 ... type or types and numerical strength of troops engaged
- BM/S/1, BM 6, BM 11 ... estimated timeframe

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

