

selected as the geographic zone for negotiations on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) when these began between NATO and the Warsaw Pact in Vienna in 1973.

Sometimes the Central European zone is extended slightly by the addition of Denmark on the Western side and Hungary on the Eastern side. General Wojciech Jaruzelski, the Polish leader, proposed new talks on force reductions in May 1987 that would have added these two countries to those listed above.

The next waves of reinforcements would be drawn from countries a little further away from the Central Front. Most analysts believe that, to be realistic, studies of the conventional balance need to include not only the Central European zone but also parts of the Western Soviet Union plus comparable areas on the NATO side. Canada's recent White Paper on national defence, entitled *Challenge and Commitment*, includes, on p.21, a map depicting the European balance which shows the Western and North-western areas of the Soviet Union, and Denmark and Norway, in the same shading of colours. Other assessments compare the Western military districts of the Soviet Union on the Eastern side with the United Kingdom on the Western side. Possibly the best geographic zone to use for comparing the balance of conventional forces on the Central Front is this one: on the Western side include the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom and France; on the Eastern side include the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Western parts of the Soviet Union. Spain and Portugal can also be added in on the Western side if it seems likely that they will send reinforcements to Germany in wartime.

Even with such a broadened area there is no nice, easy solution to the geographic issue. The Warsaw Pact has many divisions in Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, the South-western parts of the Soviet Union and the Caucasus, while the NATO allies have forces in Turkey, Greece and Italy. This is generally seen as a separate balance, on the Southern Flank, but some of these forces might also be used on the Central Front in a war. For example, elements of the Soviet and Hungarian armies could attempt to drive up through Austria to join the battle in Southern Germany rather than turning South towards Italy or the Balkans.

There is also a sub-balance around Scandinavia, on the Northern Flank, where Norwegian, Danish and some other allied forces face Soviet divisions stationed between Leningrad and the Arctic Ocean. This would probably be a major scene of action in a war, because the Soviet Union's main naval base is in this area, at Murmansk, and the Northern Flank is very important for the control of shipping in the Atlantic.

A great deal of interest nowadays is focussed on an even wider area than Central Europe and the two

flanks, that is to say the whole of Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals." New negotiations on conventional force reductions now being discussed between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries in Vienna* will use this broad, continent-wide zone, including the whole Western part of the USSR as well as the territories of all the other Warsaw Pact states and all the European NATO allies. The European neutral and non-aligned states such as Switzerland, Sweden, Finland, Austria and Yugoslavia will probably not participate directly in these new talks, but their forces and territories will certainly be taken into account in calculations of the conventional balance.

Finally there is another question about the geographic area. What about Central Asia, Siberia and the other enormous territories of the Soviet Union east of the Urals, and what about Canada, the United States and the Atlantic Ocean? Should the territories and conventional military forces in those areas be included somehow? In fact the territories themselves will not be included in the geographic area of the new conventional force reductions negotiations; but the army divisions and transport capabilities of the two sides will certainly be taken carefully into account when trying to find a new balance. The defence of NATO in wartime is likely to depend heavily on massive reinforcements flown in or convoyed across the Atlantic from Canada and the United States, while Warsaw Pact forces might need a continual flow of supplies from Soviet Asia if a battle continued for some length of time. Both sides are fully aware of this question and will pay a great deal of attention to it in any discussions about the European balance.

TYPES OF FORCES

In discussions about the conventional military balance in Europe, the main focus is on army divisions, including their manpower, tanks, artillery, and all other weapons except nuclear ones. Some NATO armoured divisions have more than 300 main battle tanks, over 16,000 men, and an extensive range of light tanks, artillery pieces, bridging equipment, trucks, anti-tank missiles, and anti-aircraft missiles. Other NATO divisions are designated as mechanized, infantry or specialized divisions, and have various numbers of men and different ranges of equipment depending on the structure of each allied army. Warsaw Pact armies consist mainly of tank divisions and motor rifle

* The current discussions on this issue in Vienna are known as the Mandate Talks. They are intended as a prelude to full-scale negotiations on conventional force reductions and other aspects of conventional stability in Europe which would include all the NATO countries and all the Warsaw Pact states. Once these new negotiations get underway, for example in 1989, the talks on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) will presumably be wound up or merged with the new process.