

**Ministry for Foreign Affairs***Säkerhetspolitiska Utredningen*Wahlbäcks papper - some comments

1. Wahlbäck's paper can not be regarded as anything even remotely aspiring to be "a survey and an evaluation of the main points in the debate". On the contrary it turns out to be a thinly veiled political pamphlet pretending to be an academic, objective analysis. And it could hardly be otherwise, since Wahlbäck was both an object for criticism in the report (in his capacity as a close adviser to former PM Carl Bildt) and a subject in the debate (as the producer of several articles criticizing the report).

2. Wahlbäck does not address the main issues of neither the report nor the debate. The assignment of the Special Investigator and the main theme of the report was "to describe and evaluate how the Government, the Armed Forces and other competent authorities dealt with established and apparent underwater violations of Swedish territorial waters since the early 1980s." (Thus he is wrong already in the title where he says "1980-92"). When at the very end mentioning this assignment Wahlbäck only comments upon the tone and the manner in which these issues are discussed, but has nothing to say in substance. This speaks for itself.

3. Right from the very beginning of his paper Wahlbäck is misrepresenting the facts. Disregarding that the task was not to establish nationality, and that this was not a major feature of the report or of the debate he takes this issue as his starting point, stating that "the Investigator puts the two sides on equal footing as potential violators". Although he is an experienced diplomat, Wahlbäck nevertheless totally misses the nuances in the formulations he quotes, where the role of the Soviet Union is clearly stressed. This is even more so in the main text, as must be apparent for any reader. The relevant passage of the summary is as follows:

"It is not unlikely that the Soviet Union, as the largest naval power in the Baltic Sea, may have had reasons for intruding on Swedish territory. The

Stockholm, 16 July 2002

Soviet Union can therefore scarcely be excluded as a possible violating state. Nor can the possibility of intrusions by Western submarines be excluded. Nevertheless, the fact remains that it has not been possible to identify the nationality of any of the submarines."

This language must be understood against the background that in no case since 1981 the Swedish military authorities have been able conclusively to identify the nationality of a possible submarine-intrusion.

4. Wahlbäck makes a major issue of what he calls "A Scenario Suggested", again disregarding the facts. There is in no place in the Report, nor in the summary, any scenario suggested. Having himself severely criticised the 1983 report for not only suggesting scenarios but presenting what it called "the probable course of events" with no basis at all, the Investigator was in no position to suggest any scenarios and carefully refrained from doing so. Nevertheless Wahlbäck makes this a recurrent theme, thus seriously misleading the reader.

5. A survey of the debate must naturally cover what was said not only by critics but also by supporters of the Report. Not least noticeable among the latter were those who publicly strongly distanced themselves from Wahlbäck and Leifland's criticism, and their inexplicable filing of a legal complaint against the Investigator, a complaint that was rejected by the Chancellor of Justice as totally unfounded.

6. When Wahlbäck quotes "critics" this often equals himself, as is shown by his arguments against explanations by the Secretariat that were made directly to him in response to his own queries. An example of this and that the paper essentially reflects Wahlbäck's own views is what he has to say about location of incursions, something not publicly discussed elsewhere.

7. Wahlbäck writes about a chain of evidence underpinning the Investigator's conclusion, again mirror-imaging the technique of the 1983 report and disregarding that the Investigator stayed clear of presenting "chains of evidence" but merely showed the lack of evidence for earlier assumptions of Soviet responsibility.

8. The issue of deliberate damage on military equipment is one that Wahlbäck accuses the Investigator of scant interest in, not mentioning their nature. In

Stockholm, 16 July 2002

fact these are described and discussed in relation to the respective incidents,
and again Wahlbäck is in the wrong.