

this area”⁸ — contingent on a similar pledge by the Western powers.

All three of the Scandinavian states speedily rejected Kekkonen’s 1963 proposal on the grounds that it needed to be considered in the general context of the disarmament negotiations then going on in Geneva and, in particular, required the prior negotiation of a comprehensive test ban (CTB).⁹ Arguments that there was no need to improve upon the existing nuclear-free status of the area; that a Nordic NWFZ could in any case not be pursued independently of broader European (if not global) negotiations; and that at least part of Soviet territory would have to be included in the zone in some way, have persisted to this day.

Despite its earlier reservations, Sweden, from the mid-1970s on, began to express greater interest in the Nordic NWFZ as a separable measure. Rather than speaking of the need to include Soviet *territory* in such a zone, Swedish officials acknowledged that little could be done about the concentration of Soviet ballistic missile submarines on the Kola Peninsula, which was, after all, more germane to the global, than to the regional, nuclear balance. They began to focus on more limited and (presumably, therefore) negotiable *ancillary measures* to be required of external powers as part of a NWFZ arrangement. Specifically, it was suggested that “the medium-range ballistic missiles and the tactical nuclear weapons (all except ICBM and SLBM) that are stationed near the zone and that could be directed against targets within the zone” should be withdrawn as part of any agreement, since they would have been rendered “superfluous” by the negative security assurances of the nuclear weapon states.¹⁰ After it became known, in early 1978, that the Soviet Union had for the first time deployed six ballistic missile-carrying submarines in the Baltic Sea, Swedish Foreign Minister Hans Blix stated

8. As broadcast on Moscow Radio, 14 August 1959, in: United States Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Historical Office, *Documents on Disarmament 1945-1959, Volume II: 1957-1959*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 1438.

9. Werner Wiskari, “Nordics Reject Finn’s Plan,” *NYT*, 31 May 1963, p. 2; “Danes Reject Call By Finland,” *Times*, 31 May 1963, p. 10; and “Rejection by Norway,” *Times*, 8 June 1963, p. 8.

10. “Nuclear Weapons and the Nordic Countries Today — A Swedish Commentary,” *Ulkapolitiikka* 1/1975, abstracted in: *Bulletin of Peace Proposals* 6:3 (1975), p. 213.