

Soviet Union's Answer To The Wake Forest Speech

TASS, Moscow (March 17) — President James Carter of the United States in an address spoke about “a major reassessment” by the current Administration of the United States's military strategy.

In his speech he repeated some past remarks to the effect that the U.S. seeks to avert nuclear war, strives for cooperation with the Soviet Union and other countries in the matter of reducing tensions. At the same time, Jimmy Carter's speech contained a number of elements which cause apprehension for they are obviously incompatible with those remarks.

From the essence of the President's speech it follows that the speech actually means a shift of emphasis in American foreign policy from the earlier proclaimed course towards ensuring the national security of the United States through negotiations, through limiting the arms race and deepening detente, to a course of threats and a buildup of tension.

President Carter spoke of deploying a whole number of the latest systems of strategic and conventional armaments. We have under construction, the President said, new trident submarines equipped with ballistic missiles. He stated that he had ordered rapid development and deployment of cruise missiles to reinforce the strategic value of American bombers. At the same time work is underway on the intercontinental ballistic missile and the Trident 2 submarine-launched ballistic missile. “I shall not hesitate to take actions for full scale development and deployment of these systems,” Carter stated.

To justify this course the President resorted to the

worn out thesis about a “Soviet military threat” and alleged also that the USSR interferes in local conflicts. Grossly distorting the Soviet Union's policy James Carter said that the USSR shows “an inclination to interfere in African countries.”

It is well known that the Soviet Union does not seek unilateral advantages. In its policy it does not seek any benefits for itself anywhere either in Africa or in the Middle East where Israel with U.S. encouragement has occupied part of the territory of still another sovereign Arab state.

The USSR upholds the sovereignty, national independence and freedom of the peoples, strives for the hotbeds of tensions to be quenched by peaceful means on the basis of observing the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries and the renunciation of the recarving of already existing borders.

Attempts are being made to distort this principled position of the Soviet Union in order to cover up imperialist interference in these and other parts of the world.

The maturity of a political course is determined by how much it corresponds to the real interests of the countries and peoples, to the needs of ensuring security and peace. These interests demand an end to the arms race and the elimination of hotbeds of tension and deepening of the detente process, the creation of peaceful conditions for the life of the people.

Unfortunately James Carter's speech is testimony to a departure from the solution of these real and vital problems.

Soviets On Salt: Our Patience Is Limited

The Soviet statement on the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks reprinted here — an authoritative unsigned March 17 piece in Pravda titled “A Rejoinder” — was blacked out of most major U.S. newspapers:

As the Soviet press has already reported, a rapprochement of the positions of the USSR and USA on questions of strategic offensive weapons limitation was known to have been achieved at the end of last year.

However, during the recent period, statements have been made by official persons in the United States, and a great many commentaries have appeared in the press, which definitely indicate that there are some who would like to complicate — if not wreck outright — the conclusion of a corresponding Soviet-American agreement. Whatever reasons and distracting maneuvers may be used, it is evident that all this plays into the hands of the opponents of an agreement, who seek only one thing — to

begin a new spiral in the arms race — and who care nothing about the prospects of peace, the fate of the peoples, including their own people.

Under these conditions the question lawfully arises: do they not want to repeat in this way what was done after the Vladivostok meeting? (1975 summit meeting between President Ford and Soviet leader Brezhnev during which a basic SALT II agreement was reached — ed.) It has long been a generally-known fact that it was precisely the obstructionist position of the USA that blocked at that time the process of practical realization of the clear and concrete agreement reached in Vladivostok on the conclusion of a new longterm strategic arms limitation agreement, on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security of the sides. It is also known what great efforts were required to bring the agreement back onto a practical track.

Such a question — is it not raised again by events of the

recent past — naturally suggests itself if one thinks of the florid and contradictory statements recently issuing from Washington, including from the White House.

On the one hand, the American and the world's public says that the strategic arms limitation talks are making good progress, that, they say, only some strictly technical questions remain to be solved; hopes are expressed for the possible conclusion of an agreement in the very near future.

On the other hand, some sort of link is continually suggested between the prospects for reaching an agreement and other unrelated questions, for example the events in the Horn of Africa. Can it already be forgotten how a couple of years ago the USA tried to resort to the exact same tactic, to make a strategic arms limitation agreement into change in a political bargain, and how negatively this affected the negotiations?

Some American officials have been forced to recognize the untenability of such a line, reasonably stating that the working out of an agreement is not some kind of "reward" to the Soviet Union, but a means for insuring the USA's own interests. However, judging from everything, such admissions are not determining the present mood in Washington.

This is also shown by the way questions of the content of an agreement are being treated. Characterizing the remaining problems as purely technical, representatives of the Administration at the same time assert that supposedly their resolution demands some sort of act of

"political will" on the part of the Soviet Union, while the United States, they say, has no need to make the slightest concessions. Not coincidentally, even the American press has not been ready to swallow that. As various observers have remarked, the indicated statements show that rather than defending an agreement extremely important for the USA itself, representatives of the Administration are playing into the hands of the opponents of an accord with the USSR. It could hardly be put any more clearly.

If, behind such lines from American officials, there stands a desire to acquire one-sided advantages for the USA to the detriment of the interests of the USSR, then it is high time they realized that this is simply a waste of time. If they are simply making it seem that the USA is for an agreement, while in reality it is for something quite different, then such a position cannot long be maintained — the truth will come to light in any case.

There must be no place for falsehood here. The Soviet side has always patiently conducted the negotiations so as to keep the essence of the strategic arms limitation problem free of any extraneous features and to find mutually acceptable solutions; it has the patience for this. However such patience is not at all unlimited. It is time that the questions arising in connection with strategic arms limitation be pondered more seriously in Washington, and that it be genuinely realized how much is at stake.

Campaign For Exports Underway In And Out Of White House

With Special Trade Negotiator Robert Strauss in the lead, a core grouping in the Carter Administration is about to embark on a major trade-and-export expansion strategy. This puts them in direct defiance of plans by Treasury Secretary W. Michael Blumenthal, Council of Economic Advisor chieftain Charlie Schulze, and energy czar James Schlesinger to put the U.S. economy through a deflationary wringer under the guise of "fighting inflation."

ADMINISTRATION

News of Strauss's intentions first surfaced in a March 22 article by *Washington Post* columnist Hobart Rowen describing the full-fledged battle now underway in the White House over the direction of U.S. economic policy. Placing the fight in the context of the declining value of the U.S. dollar, Rowen reported that, counterposed to those presidential advisers who favored a strong "anti-inflation" approach (i.e., wage-price controls, restrictions on oil imports, etc.), was the Strauss faction, which sees beefed-up U.S. exports as the key to getting the U.S. dollar and economy back on its feet. In an interview with Rowen, Strauss said bluntly: "The

answer to this nation's problems is not in restricting imports, and making the buying public pay more money when they're already choked by inflation, but the answer is a tremendous thrust from an export program." (For the full text of Rowen's article, see below.)

According to various sources, Strauss has already succeeded in setting up an interdepartmental task force, with representatives of the State Department, Commerce, the Export-Import Bank, et al., to plan a strategy for boosting American export trade. An aide to Frank Weill, head of the Commerce Department's International Business Section and a collaborator of Strauss, told a reporter that the task force is intended to be part of "a major new international economic thrust which will be announced in the next few days."

A major feature of that thrust, the aide indicated, will be a move to judo British protectionist perspectives for the GATT agreement by pushing for an early consolidation of that agreement based on the expanded trade policy. Furthermore, he reported, Strauss will move to set the stage for the GATT offensive in talks scheduled to open in Geneva in April, aiming for agreement on political perspective no later than July.

The Strauss initiative is receiving important backup from other forces, both within and outside the Administration. In an address to a Houston seminar on trade,