

Soviet Union replies to Camp David

Two top-level Soviet speeches made following the Camp David summit emphatically rejected as "illusory" the agreements reached there, offering Soviet participation in a system of international security guarantees for all Mideast states, to be worked out in the framework of the Geneva Conference.

The speech by Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev at Baku Sept. 22 and that by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at the United Nations General Assembly Sept. 26, excerpted here, demonstrate that the Soviet leadership is not reacting to Camp David according to the profile projected by U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski. Brzezinski hopes to evoke a paranoid "hardline" retrenchment in the Kremlin — a reaction which would block further Soviet political and economic cooperation with Western Europe and pro-detente American political layers.

The calm but firm tenor of discussion of the international situation in these speeches also demonstrates the stupidity of the opposite "profile" — circulated in testimony to a House subcommittee Sept. 27 by State Department Advisor on Soviet Affairs Marshall Shulman — that it is too soon to say how Moscow will react to Camp David, and that it may be possible to gain Soviet support for the summit accords. This line received wide publicity in press coverage of Gromyko's speech in the major U.S. dailies.

In fact, in the speech Gromyko surveyed the improvement of Soviet relations with Western Europe, including virtually every country except Great Britain. Gromyko and Brezhnev both stressed their concern that the NATO policy of arms build-up, inaugurated at the May session of the NATO Council in Washington, D.C., represents a serious threat to world peace. Excerpts from the two speeches follow.

Brezhnev: "Hardheads endanger peace"

...(The international) situation, as you know, is now complex. Its aggravation stems from the refusal by the more hardheaded imperialist circles to soberly assess the correlation of forces that has formed in the world, and the absolutely unrealistic and peace-endangering plans of achieving military superiority over socialist countries and dictating their will to them.

The Washington session of the NATO Council proclaimed the course at a new upsurge of the arms race intended to span decades to come. This totally bares the true aims of the organizers of the clamor about the mythical "military danger" presented to the West by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty. These inventions were needed to justify NATO's desire to acquire a longer and sharper sword and to attempt a return to the "from positions of strength" policy.

Is this not the cause also of the failure so far to complete the drafting of a mutually acceptable agreement with the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive arms? It must be said that the distance between the positions of the sides on this question, as stated at the talks, is not all that great and is quite surmountable given good will and state wisdom. But it seems that the solution of this question does not suit those in the United States who want not a lasting peace and mutually advantageous cooperation but a new edition of the cold war.

Serving the same aims is the loud propaganda campaign started around the measures taken by the Soviet courts in respect of the unlawful activities of some persons hostile to the Soviet system, including paid agents of Western special services.

The opponents of detente are trying to expand the front of the offensive against it. Using artificial, hypocritical pretexts, the United States has started applying brakes to the development of business ties. Matters have already gone so far as the cancellation of concluded deals and the rupture of signed contracts. A pointed scaling down of ties in the scientific-technical and other fields has also begun. Washington has begun impudently, though rather unsuccessfully, to pressure its allies into following suit.

It appears that some influential circles in the United States are deliberately provoking the Soviet Union, wishing to aggravate the situation still further. This, comrades, is a serious matter. We will resolutely resist sallies against the rights and interests of the Soviet States, and we will not give in to provocations.

Our policy in respect of countries of the capitalist world, including, of course, the United States as well, was and remains a policy of peace, peaceful coexistence and peaceful cooperation. That is the reason why we categorically reject the practice of outside interference into the internal affairs of states and violations of their sovereign rights....

The attainment of a just peaceful settlement in the Middle East belongs, of course, to the most important tasks that must be solved if we are to achieve lasting peace and international stability. The situation there remains complex and potentially dangerous. . . .

This is caused by the stubborn refusal of Israel and the forces on which it relies to take into consideration the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab peoples, by Israel's striving by force of arms or by way of diplomacy, but in any case from positions of strength, to impose its will on the Arabs.

The main emphasis in the attainment of this aim is being made lately on the method of behind-the-scenes separate deals with those who are ready to trade in Arab interests. The intention is absolutely clear: to split the Arabs, set them at loggerheads and to impose separately on the Arab countries the terms of settlement that suit the aggressor.

But all attempts to ignore the cardinal preconditions of a true settlement of the Middle East problem, to exclude or sidestep some lawful participants in the settlement, to sacrifice their interests, to dictate terms to them can produce nothing but illusions of a settlement. No matter what "framework" is used for a separate collusion that covers up the surrender of one side and consolidates the fruits of aggression of the other side — the aggression of Israel, it can only make the situation in the Middle East even more explosive.

Precisely this is demonstrated by the experience of the recent American-Israeli-Egyptian talks in Camp David. We are witnesses of a new anti-Arab deal between Israel and Egypt that was worked out with Washington's active participation.

The experience of many years irrefutably proves that there is only one road to a true settlement of the Middle East conflict, and that is the road of the full liberation of all Arab lands occupied by Israel in 1967, of full and unambiguous respect for the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to create its own independent state, of ensuring reliably guaranteed security of all countries of the region including, naturally, Israel as well. Such an all-embracing settlement is possible only with the participation of all interested sides, including the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

Gromyko: "Radical breakthrough" needed in Mideast

...The results of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe have been a fresh and considerable impetus. It is no secret that from time to time attempts are made to put the durability of those results to a test. Nevertheless detente has been, and

continues to be, the dominant trend in European international life. And surely this is demonstrated by the development of relations between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, on the one hand, and France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Finland, Scandinavian and many other States, on the other....

There is an area situated at the crossroads of three continents which can be described as a "powder keg" just as the Balkans once used to be called. This area is the Middle East. There is hardly anyone who would dare to say that the situation there is not fraught with the risk of another explosion.

What is the root cause of such a situation? It lies in the fact that ten years after the aggression its consequences have still not been eliminated while the aggression itself goes unpunished. Israel continues to hold sway over the territories it has seized. Unfortunately, even in the Arab world there are some politicians who display no concern for Arab lands and who are inclined to neglect the legitimate rights of the Arabs, notably the Palestinian Arabs, and to cringe and surrender to the demands of the aggressor and his patrons.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated its willingness to take part in ensuring peace in the Middle East and to participate in the most stringent international security guarantees for all States of that area. Israeli spokesmen contend that they have no use for international guarantees. This is no more than empty polemical bravado. If Israel genuinely cared for its security, real not illusory security, it would seek a political solution. For the fact is that with the existing means of warfare the distance from the borders to which a neighboring State has withdrawn its guns is of little consequence. What is required here is a radical breakthrough towards a situation where the guns would be silent altogether. .

Separate deals at the expense of the Arabs have only sidetracked the solution of the problem.

And such precisely is the nature of the understandings reached at the recent three-sided meetings at Camp David. If a realistic look is taken at things, no grounds can be found to believe that they, as claimed, bring closer the Middle East settlement. On the contrary, what this is all about is a new anti-Arab step making it difficult to achieve a just solution of this pressing problem. That is why a campaign of artificial and affected optimism can mislead no one.

There is a machinery specifically established to achieve peace in the Middle East, and it is the Geneva Peace Conference. And the sooner an end is put to attempts to keep it in a state of paralysis, the nearer will be the moment when the solution of the Middle East problem can be tackled with a chance of success....