

EDITORIAL**The Summit that wasn't**

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwoman, News and Letters Committees

The brief joint U.S.-Russia statement on the summit proved to be as total a void as the summit itself. The Reagan-Gorbachev attempt to cover over this void by referring to it as "the new reality" only further laid bare the nothingness of achievement, which in turn will allow these two nuclear Behemoths to continue their pursuits for single mastery of the world, even if that results in the destruction of civilization. In the face of this reality, can the non-stop smiles of Reagan-Gorbachev hold till that unspecified "nearest future," when the two are supposed to resume their empty dialogue, with Gorbachev landing in Washington in 1986?

Let's first take a look at those one-to-one talks with no one except the translators were present at the Reagan-Gorbachev meetings. It is certainly true that the news blackout kept the world's people from knowing anything about what was occurring. But was it really true that it was an unrecorded event? A seemingly distant column ("Washington Talk" N.Y. Times November 23) reports that they weren't just translators, they were interpreters. Reagan had five of them instead of the usual one. Moreover, these interpreters took notes and made comments, and were checked by security. What is the important truth, is that each of these rulers will do more than rely on their already heavily prejudiced memories to write that history.

Take what happened on the eve of the summit. On the U.S. side there was the Weinberger letter, written to Reagan by that extreme rightist hawk of a Secretary, and very deliberately "leaked" to the press. It asked the President to 1) be ready to reject the 1979 Salt II treaty, signed by Carter and Brezhnev, but unratified, and 2) to have the narrowest of interpretations of the 1972 Nixon-Brezhnev treaty, signed and duly ratified limiting anti-ballistic missiles.

So sure were the aides to Reagan that this "Pentagon leak" was outright "sabotage" of the summit that they got caught in Weinberger's McCarthyite witch-hunt for anyone "soft" in the Reagan entourage.

It turned out that Weinberger's view was precisely Reagan's view. His "Hell, No" answer to any firing of Weinberger showed that it was the man who wasn't there—and not the Secretary of State, the National Security Adviser or the five other key spokesmen for the administration who were present at the summit and got listed in the very first paragraph of the joint summit

statement—who set the line. Reagan's comment defending Weinberger was said despite Reagan's pre-summit vow to the Russians that precisely there would be no retreat from abiding by the Salt II agreement though it was unratified.

On the Russian side, the official newspaper was as virulent against the United States as any Reagan statement about Russia as the evil empire.

**EISENHOWER-KHRUSHCHEV-MAO,
NIXON-BREZHNEV-MAO**

Did other summits which were recorded, and were more or less open, and that did come out with concrete treaties, really determine what the ruling interests of the capitalist countries, private or state, followed?

Take the great Camp David spirit of the 1959 Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting that led to the 1960 meeting that was to prepare for a summit. Eisenhower didn't let that spirit stop him for one single second from the usual imperialistic spy-plane reconnoitering, even on one of those greatest holidays in Russia, May 1. So when Khrushchev stormed out of the 1960 meeting, it wasn't his bad temper that scuttled that summit-to-be. It was the fact that the Russians had succeeded in shooting down that U-2 spy plane.

Thus it was Eisenhower who actually helped Khrushchev to cover up the budding Sino-Soviet conflict by creating an opportunity for Khrushchev to call upon the world's 81 Communist Parties to give a unified rebuff to U.S. imperialism. Thereby, Khrushchev was able to keep Mao from developing his April 1960 critique of Russia, and thus prevent Mao from showing that the great unified Sino-Soviet orbit was about to be sharply divided into the Sino-Soviet conflict.

The games that rulers play—whether they represent private capitalism (statified) or state-capitalism (privatized), both of which are deeply rooted as well as continually expanded as their "national" interests—are best exemplified by the Nixon spectacular to China in 1972, declaring it as important as the recognized global powers.

No one denies that it was a great achievement for U.S. imperialism, and that it took that reactionary Nixon to have broken through the China Lobby and achieve what no Democratic President could have achieved. But did this new spectacular version of "peaceful co-existence" of the "two systems" really change anything in the course of capitalist nationalism?

The point is that U.S. imperialism, for its global ambitions, did think that the Sino-Soviet Conflict meant that Mao would accept an outright alliance with the United States against Russia. It didn't matter whether or not Nixon had been inspired for that spectacular journey because Brezhnev let the cat out of the bag on the question of how sharp was the Sino-Soviet conflict, or because he felt frustrated at not being able to win

the Vietnam War without help from China and Russia. When that U.S.-China alliance proved elusive, the spectacular change of line hardly yielded the results that Mao had expected from this shift in the balance of global politics.

That is precisely what is the issue with the present non-summit. Did it at least then change the "climate"? Can those smiles and change in rhetoric from the level of "evil empire" to a "fresh new approach" mean that we are more secure? Does non-talking, but very continuous actions on so-called research for Star Wars, bespeak a softening of relations between these two nuclear Behemoths?

ABSOLUTE OPPOSITES AT HOME

The question is not one of denying the differences between mere dialogue and statements versus actual agreements, but as we showed in pointing to the "successful" summits, these two terrible powers are national enemies, but not absolute opposites. The absolute opposites are not the United States and Russia, but are the absolute opposites that exist within each country, between the rulers and the masses. That is what is decisive in each case. The two, totally opposite worlds are those which exist in every land. That is what is crucial as against questions of Russia and Afghanistan or the United States and Nicaragua, where it is the national ambitions of the rulers which is the determinant.

There were at Geneva itself signs of the many oppositions to this helter-skelter run for nuclear confrontation. The thousands who marched against both nuclear and any kind of war certainly did not let the rulers forget that the people in every country do not stand idly by. Neither was there any way for either of the superpower rulers or the rulers of their respective ally countries—NATO and the Warsaw Pact—to forget the ongoing, undeclared civil war in South Africa.

And to top it off was what is going on within each country. Here in the United States, the growth of the unemployed army continues; the number of homeless is increasing. The hungry children are not just in Africa; there are serious conditions of undernourishment right here in the U.S., especially among Blacks. The weakening of the economy extends very much to the crisis in agriculture among the American farmers.

What is truly new and decisive is the movement on the part of people in the United States against unemployment, against hunger, against nuclear or any other kind of war, all of whom refuse to consider peace as merely the absence of war. They are determined to oppose the wholesale Reagan retreat on civil rights, Women's Liberation, and the environment and health and safety both in and outside the workplace.

10423