

Soviets: Halt Damage To Detente

Pravda replies to President Carter's Annapolis Speech

Under the headline "On the Current Policy of the U.S. Government," the Soviet daily *Pravda* has carried a 5,000-word unsigned commentary on President Carter's speech at Annapolis earlier this month and on developments in his Administration's policy. The June 17 article appeared after a week of sharp Soviet criticism of the speech for its "impermissible attacks" on Soviet policy, which were accompanied in *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and other Soviet papers by a rising tide of condemnation of National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski in particular.

As the *Pravda* analysis confirms, Brzezinski's efforts to "play the China card" and his reckless confrontationalism regarding Africa have Moscow worried that Carter, under his influence, will cause irreparable damage to U.S.-Soviet relations and endanger world peace.

Pravda's strong language leaves no doubt that this concern is growing more acute. Yet *Pravda's* reference to "positive" elements in Carter's speech shows a concerted effort by Moscow to fathom the factional alignments in United States politics, particularly within the Administration.

Moscow has not closed the door on détente and, as *Pravda* stressed, does not intend to as long as Washington refrains from slamming it. Soviet proposals for large-scale Soviet-American and multilateral coordination for nuclear power development, industrial growth through trade, and stabilization of hot spots were alluded to by *Pravda* once again and remain on the table.

* * *

Recent facts indicate that changes dangerous for the cause of peace are occurring in U.S. policy. For some years, an acute struggle has been going on in that country's ruling circles regarding détente and relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. And as time passes, signs are accumulating that those groupings which would like to subvert détente and return the world to the cold war, new confrontations, and unrestrained military rivalry are gaining the upper hand in this struggle. This is indicated not only by statements of the President and several other high-ranking U.S. officials, but also by Washington's concrete actions....

The talks with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation (SALT) are being deliberately slowed down.

The U.S. government has also taken actions whose goal cannot without difficulty be evaluated as anything other than the deliberate deterioration of bilateral relations with the USSR. Attempts at interference in the internal affairs of our country are not ceasing. The U.S. is limiting, by unilateral actions, ties and contacts between the two countries. The opponents of good relations between the U.S. and USSR are seeking a common language with the aggressive anti-Sovietism of the Chinese leaders, who openly proclaim détente and peace a sham and war the only realistic prospect....

Implementation of a policy turn across such a wide front is of course no simple matter....The authors of Washington's "new" policy are trying to give it a "theoretical" basis by overemphasizing the elements of rivalry in U.S.-USSR relations and belittling the significance of cooperation. Some Administration representatives, presidential assistant Z. Brzezinski, for instance, have done this so crudely and awkwardly that they have caused a good deal of confusion in the minds of U.S. allies as well as their own fellow citizens.

President J. Carter's recent speech in Annapolis, it was announced, was supposed to clear away this confusion. But the U.S. president did not succeed in introducing clarity into American policy, above all policy towards relations with the USSR. He failed for the simple reason that the speech contained an attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable: assurance of fidelity to the ideas of détente and improvement of Soviet-American relations, with open attacks on the Soviet Union....

The President of the U.S. and his advisors may rest assured that this speech was read attentively and objectively evaluated in the Soviet Union. The positive statements in it...did not go unnoticed.

But viewed as a "programmatic" speech, as it was announced beforehand, it not only failed to disperse, but in fact deepened doubts regarding the course adopted by the U.S. It is sufficient to cite President J. Carter's statement that the Soviet Union should "choose between confrontation and cooperation" and that the U.S. is prepared to go either way. This way of posing the question is addressed to the wrong party — the Soviet Union long ago and absolutely chose peace and cooperation....It is the U.S., or more precisely, the current American Administration has still not made its final choice, or rather is trying to depart from the principles of relations previously worked out with the USSR....

Pravda proceeds to refute arguments that the USSR is seeking "military superiority" as a goal in itself, and charges that it is the U.S., fearing parity, not Soviet superiority, that is pursuing escalated arms spending. On disarmament, which the article calls the "touchstone" of détente, Pravda details NATO's rebuff of June 8 proposals by the Warsaw Pact at the Central Europe force reduction talks and U.S. stalling on SALT, in which "on the overwhelming majority of questions agreement has already been achieved." Despite lip service to the need for SALT, the Carter Administration has recently "shown no readiness to discuss concretely the unresolved questions," remarks Pravda and adds that the administration is not moving to counter expected congressional opposition to the treaty:

Together with the intensification of military preparations, the changes in U.S. policy also show up in the transition to an openly interventionist, neocolonialist

policy regarding African countries....(including) plans to include some African countries in NATO's sphere of activity....Moscow, on the other hand, learned of the events in Zaire from Western wire reports. There are absolutely no Soviet or Cuban people in Shaba in any capacity whatsoever. Just as there are no copper, cobalt or uranium mines there belonging to the USSR....

Meanwhile, there are real problems, aside from fabricated ones like "Soviet-Cuban interference." They are difficult problems, concerning the liquidation of the consequence of colonial rule, strengthening the sovereignty of young states, accelerating their economic and social development....

Pravda regrets that under the pretext of a "human rights" campaign in the U.S., the development of bilateral cultural and scientific exchange has been delayed.

Another development which does nothing to strengthen trust is Washington's recent intrigues, or rather "little games," around China. In itself, the aim to play the "China card" in the global game is nothing new for American politicians. But hitherto, it seemed, American leaders took into account that this card cannot be played without creating dangers for the cause of peace, and for themselves — for the national interests of the United States itself.

Some people occupying major posts in Washington, however, apparently now are so caught up in anti-Soviet emotions that they discount these dangers. Such people close their eyes to the fact that blocking with China on an anti-Soviet basis would close off possibilities of cooperation with the Soviet Union in reducing the threat of nuclear war and, of course, the arms race. They also forget that the Chinese leaders are playing their own game here. While the U.S. and NATO countries are not averse to using in their own interest the difficulties in Soviet-Chinese relations, the Peking leaders have something else on their mind: to irritate relations between the USSR and U.S. to the maximum and use this aggravation not for American, but for their own interests. Soviet-American confrontation — or, even better, war — is Peking's great longing. Perhaps this theme will be thought about less hurriedly and more sanguinely in Washington.

Following an analysis of some factors behind the U.S. policy shift, which Pravda attributes to "the enemies of

détente," the Soviet statement replies to the perceived need in the U.S. for a "hard line":

...It seems that "hardness" and a "tough line" have become very popular words in America....We see today that the "tough line" has every chance of turning from a tactic into a dangerous and uncontrollable policy with a force of momentum not easy to overcome, and of causing the corresponding counter-action in the world....

Of course, firmness and courage are useful qualities for any politician. But only if they are aimed at good goals and are combined with political wisdom, the ability to be guided by higher interests and to differentiate them from petty, immediate gains; the ability and desire to look ahead to tomorrow and evaluate in advance the consequences of one's actions today. And political courage is not bravado, or the readiness to resort to strong terms and wave the stick. Political courage is rather the ability to chart out and consistently implement a principled political course and to control one's emotions and exercise restraint, without fearing the squawks of political opportunists nor giving in to the advice of adventurers.

The changes in Washington's policy are beginning to cause concern in America itself and on the part of its allies....

The world public also wants to know: how will the Soviet Union answer the toughening of American policy? This question takes on great urgency, as the insufficiently thought-through and sometimes openly provocative nature of many U.S. actions becomes apparent....

The Soviet Union is not going to help the authors of (intentions to return to the cold war). Our people has seen too much and lived through too much...to back down before sabre rattling. It has chosen the road of peace and will not permit itself to be driven from it. We do not accept invitations to the funeral of détente and the hopes of millions of people for a peaceful future....

In a situation made more difficult by U.S. policy, the Soviet Union again affirms its policy of international détente and the development of good relations with the United States, if the U.S. wants this....

The present policy of the U.S. is fraught with serious dangers. Dangers for the U.S. itself, for all countries with an interest in peace, for the entire course of international developments. It would be desirable if this truth were understood soon in Washington.