

Brezhnev Answers Carter Provocations

In the week following the May 24 plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, which removed President Nikolai Podgorny from the Politburo, General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev charged the Carter Administration with obstructing détente and creating "new difficulties and problems." On a French television broadcast May 29 and in welcoming Bulgarian leader Todor Zhivkov to Moscow the next day, Brezhnev threw his weight behind Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko's denunciation of the U.S. for preventing "any serious forward movement" at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). Brezhnev indicated that in Moscow's view, any progress on SALT at the recent Cyrus Vance - Gromyko discussions in Geneva could be seen only by comparison with Vance's earlier mission to Moscow when the provocative package of "deep cuts" was first unveiled by Carter and vehemently rejected by the Soviets.

The predominating feature of Soviet foreign policy since Podgorny's ouster — indicated in Brezhnev's statements, the Soviet press and from diplomatic sources — has been increasingly visible war prepared-

ness, as the Soviets are faced with one gross provocation after another from the Carter Administration. Sources present at a recent Warsaw meeting of "Peace Builders" report that Czechoslovak and Rumanian delegates there were privately warning the Western politicians in attendance that the war danger was reaching a point of no return.

Brezhnev's remarks appeared on the background of censorious coverage of Carter in the Soviet press and mounting concern that developments in the Middle East, in particular, are leading straight to a war confrontation. Commenting that the Israeli Likud bloc's invitation to Gen. Moshe Dayan to join the new government points to "an open rejection of the possibility of a Middle East settlement," the party daily *Pravda* also emphasized Carter's press conference declaration that he has "no policy for a Middle East settlement."

Even more direct in its attack on Carter — and more telling on just how serious a provocation the Soviets will perceive in Carter's planned disruption of the June 15 Belgrade conference — was the military daily *Red Star*

Brezhnev: U.S. Still Trying To Chisel SALT Advantage

The following are excerpts from the May 29 speech of Soviet Communist Party chief Leonid Brezhnev. Brezhnev's speech was carried on both French and Soviet television:

...Everyone understands how important it is in our day to strengthen trust among nations. This is especially important when it comes to a delicate sphere of relations such as ensuring security of each people and all peoples. The fundamental task here is to prevent the spiral of the arms race from being wound up further.

Perhaps someone will say that much has already been said on this theme. But truth is not a coin which is worn down from frequent use. And a spiral is not just repeating what happened before. Not only is the planet already saturated with means of mass destruction, but there exists a real and annually growing danger that there will be created new types and new systems of weapons, many times more destructive. You might say, the farther you go the worse it gets. This is the point: It's time to stop!

I am convinced that no national or public leader and no thinking person can back off from his portion of responsibility in the struggle against the war danger. After all, this is responsibility for the very future of humanity.

I will not hide the fact that our concern over the continuing arms race, including strategic arms, has grown due to the line taken on these questions by the new American administration. It is clearly aimed at obtaining unilateral advantages for the U.S. This line, of course, does nothing to help the preparations and conclusion of a new long-term

agreement between the USSR and the U.S. on strategic arms limitation, which has been delayed even before this.

True, the recent meeting in Geneva between the USSR Foreign Minister and the U.S. Secretary of State saw a certain rapprochement of positions — in comparison with the March talks in Moscow — on several questions which had previously been disputed. But it must be said outright: because of the unconstructive U.S. line there has been no serious forward movement. Obviously great efforts are still required in this. The important thing is for the American administration to take fully realistic positions and proceed from the principle of parity and equal security.

As for the Soviet Union, I have said recently and I repeat: We will spare no effort in the struggle not only to limit the arms race — quantitatively and qualitatively — but also for disarmament under mutually acceptable fair conditions. If it is impossible to move the whole block of these problems at once...we are prepared for partial measures. After all, they only have this modest name — in fact the realization of any one of these "partial" measures would push back the war danger to some extent and lessen the burden of the arms race which is so heavy on the working masses....

Brezhnev then listed the following points:

- non-proliferation of nuclear weapons
- agreements banning new types and systems of mass destruction weapons
- a vow of signatories of the Helsinki European Security agreement not to make first use of nuclear weapons

May 30, which covered the U.S. president's human rights crusade as part of an all-out psychological warfare campaign aimed by Western intelligence agencies against the socialist sector. Lieutenant General Shevchenko laid the blame on Carter personally, citing his decision to increase funding for Radio Free Europe.

Equivocation

The question has not been satisfactorily answered of whether the Soviet "hard line" indicated by Brezhnev and the press portends more than war preparedness on Moscow's part. Since the plenum, the Soviet Union has made a visible diplomatic push to organize forces in Japan against the opening of a "Second Front" against the USSR in the form of a Peking-Tokyo-Washington axis (see *Asia Section*). Major trade-related negotiations have occurred with Britain and West Germany. Notably absent, however, has been a shift in Soviet posture vis-à-vis political forces in the United States — other than the more and more furious responses to Carter.

On the contrary, Moscow exhibited on the pages of *Pravda* that certain fundamental lessons have *not* been learned. Thus the same issue of *Pravda* which criticized Carter's press conference idiotically displayed, under the headline "A. Harriman's Opinion," remarks by aging "Russian handler" Averell Harriman in praise of Brezhnev's détente policy — the very policy which has proved so bankrupt in the context of the Carter Administration. Brezhnev's French television speech itself, following his criticisms of Carter's SALT stance, called on Jimmy Carter to take a "realistic position" and get on with détente. Brezhnev pleaded that in lieu of comprehensive disarmament, "partial steps" were desirable, since any agreement on arms limitation would "push the war danger back a little."

On May 30, *Pravda* called General John Singlaub, the officer whose opposition to Carter's Korean troops withdrawal in reality places him and like-thinking American

conservatives in de facto collaboration with Moscow against the "Second Front" strategy, a "hero of the hawks" and representative of the mythical "military-industrial complex." The insidious disinformation on U.S. politics, fed the Kremlin for years by the CPUSA-Georgii Arbatov channels, has not yet stopped.

Denounce Carter SALT Position

The following is excerpted from L.I. Brezhnev's speech at a May 30 dinner welcoming Bulgarian leader Todor Zhivkov to Moscow:

Our enemies should have no illusions. The solidarity of the socialist community is unbreakable. Everything that the enemies of socialism have done to date to break our ranks and set us at cross purposes has had the opposite result...

The road to peace has never been easy, nor is it now. I will say openly that we would like to see the leaders of certain Western countries more ready to consolidate and deepen détente and, as a minimum, refrain from steps which create new difficulties and problems. But what, for instance, did the recent NATO Council session show? ... In essence it boiled down to the NATO leaders agreeing to increase military spending and step up the offensive strength of the bloc, and planning the arms race for years to come.... Or take the question of West Berlin. It would seem that the well-known Four-Power Agreement created the conditions for this problem to be rid of its previous acuteness. But certain circles in the Federal Republic of Germany repeatedly try de facto to amend that agreement ... and heat up the situation around that city. We, on the other hand, want West Berlin to be an area of détente and an active participant in détente....

'The Maneuvers Of The Ideological Diversionaries'

The following article by Lt. General A. Shevchenko is excerpted from May 28 issue of the Soviet military paper Red Star.

Today even the most inveterate enemies of détente are forced to somehow accommodate themselves to the situation that has developed. Bourgeois propagandists are seeking new forms and methods of subversive activities, and are masking lie and slander beneath a facade of democratic and high-sounding slogans. Of course, they have not changed their goals and tasks one iota, although they are striving to make it seem as though they were not acting against the countries of the socialist community as such, but just want to help to somehow "liberalize" the social order in these countries.

The theoreticians and practitioners of ideological

diversion consider the notorious theories of "de-ideologization" and "bridge-building" to be among the foundations of their subversive activities. The essence of these theories states that under conditions of détente and expansion of contacts between states with differing social systems, conditions supposedly are created for bringing peaceful coexistence to the ideological sphere. The proponents of these theories allege that for the further deepening of détente it is necessary to "bring down the ideological barriers," which in fact means striving to open up the socialist countries for bourgeois ideas.

According to a lying theory that has become extremely fashionable in the West, a certain leveling occurs during the scientific-technological revolution, not only the domain of technical achievements such as the equipping