

# KISSINGER TELLS OF HOPE TO WIDEN TIES WITH SOVIET

At Senate Hearing, He Says  
Collaboration Is Feasible  
on Crucial Problems

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 19 —

Secretary of State Kissinger said today that reduced tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union had opened the way for much broader East-West collaboration on such crucial global matters as food, energy and the environment.

Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Kissinger strongly defended the Nixon and Ford Administrations' pursuit of better relations with Moscow.

In his largely philosophical 10,000-word statement of Soviet-American relations, Mr. Kissinger broke no significantly new ground. He described the achievements he said had accrued to both Washington and Moscow from détente, and the outlook for the future in political, economic and arms-control fields.

He coupled his hopes that the Soviet and the United States would pay more attention to "human concerns" with a reaffirmation that American allies would continue to be protected and that the United States would not decide unilaterally to cut back defenses.

## Discord on Chile

The committee, which has been holding desultory hearings for the last month on Soviet-American relations, generally agreed with Mr. Kissinger's approach. But the meeting was marred by discord.

In particular, Mr. Kissinger was questioned sharply by Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, on how the secret American involvement in Chile was justified in light of Mr. Kissinger's stated belief in non-interference in other countries' affairs.

Mr. Church, in turn, pressed an analogy between his search

and the chairman, J. W. Fulbright Democrat of Arkansas, who argued that questions on Chile "were out of order" since the committee had voted Tuesday to undertake a separate study of the Chile affair.

Mr. Kissinger, however, finally replied to Mr. Church's questions. He asserted that the \$8-million authorized to be spent in Chile between 1970 and 1973 was not aimed at "subverting" the Government of President Salvador Allende Gossens, who died in a military coup d'état last year, but rather to keep alive political parties and the press.

He said they were in danger of being swallowed up in a one-party minority government headed by Mr. Allende.

## Case Voices Doubt

Senator Clifford Case, Republican of New Jersey, expressed the most doubt about the value of détente. He told Mr. Kissinger in the two-hour question period that it was his impression that "the gains made in détente have accrued to the Soviet side."

Mr. Kissinger interrupted Mr. Case to say: disagree completely."

Mr. Case retorted that the Soviet Union had been largely responsible for the Middle East war last fall and had spurred the Arabs to embargo oil shipments to the United States. He said that "we're almost too grateful for relatively small concessions" by the Russians.

Mr. Kissinger said, "I believe that on balance, if anything, the gains of détente have been more in our favor than in the opposite direction."

## Tells of Vietnam Help

The Secretary said that the Russians had helped the United States "extricate" itself from Vietnam and had shown restraint in many areas, including Central Europe.

Mr. Kissinger said the Soviet role on the Middle East was "extremely complex." He said the Russians found themselves in the paradoxical position of helping their Arab friends too much to suit many Americans but not enough to please most Arabs, who now have turned closer to the United States.

In his presentation and in answer to questions, Mr. Kissinger made several other points.

He said that he was confident an agreement would be reached soon leading to stepped-up emigration from the Soviet Union in return for Congress-

20 SEP 1974

sional approval of trade concessions to Moscow. It has been reported that at least 60,000 Jews and others may be allowed to leave each year.

On arms control, Mr. Kissinger—who said his report

had been approved by Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger—said the Ford Administration had chosen not to work out a concrete proposal to submit to the Russians at yesterday's resumption of talks on the limitation of strategic arms. Rather, he said, an effort was made to concentrate on well known principles. He said proposals would become concrete by the time he went to Moscow next month.

In the economic field, Mr. Kissinger stressed his view that a link existed between normal trade with the Russians and their acting in a way that did not disturb the United States.

He said that the United States could not be expected to "reward hostile conduct with economic benefits," but when political relations have normalized, "it is difficult to explain why economic relations should not be normalized at all."

On the Middle East, Mr. Kissinger disputed Mr. Fulbright's view that progress had halted. He said that he expected further diplomatic steps to develop soon between the Arabs and Israelis.

As for military help for Israel, he said the Administration would wait until the next

long-term package, said to cost about \$1.5-billion a year for the next five years.

The Israelis have been assured of receiving urgent supplies, said to total about \$1-billion under current appropriations.

Asked whether the Central Intelligence Agency was involved in India, Mr. Kissinger said that the United States had assured Prime Minister Indira Gandhi that no American was authorized to participate in any political action there. He said he had the greatest respect for Daniel P. Moynihan, the United States Ambassador in India, who recently criticized C.I.A. activity in Chile.

## Appearance Long Awaited

Mr. Kissinger's appearance before the committee had been long awaited. The hearings had been initiated at his specific request. He had been scheduled to appear Aug. 8 but this was changed because on that day President Richard M. Nixon resigned.

Committee attention seemed less focused today on détente than on other matters, such as Chile. The hearing room was crowded, with many standees in the back.

Mr. Fulbright, who has been customarily skeptical of the need for increased military ex-

penditures, asked Mr. Kissinger if it was true, as some had alleged, that the Russians had nuclear superiority over the United States.

"No," Mr. Kissinger replied. "It is very difficult to assess what superiority is, but I think there is common agreement that at no time in the postwar period has the Soviet Union had a strategic superiority over the United States in any significant category."

## 'Some People' Concerned

But he added, alluding to the Pentagon, that "some people" were concerned that the trends over 10 years might lead to an imbalance in the Soviet favor.

Mr. Kissinger reiterated his view that with nuclear arsenals now containing thousands of launchers and warheads, it was increasingly difficult to define what superiority meant.

"The prospect of a decisive military advantage, even if theoretically possible, is politically intolerable," he said in his formal statement. "Neither side will passively permit a massive shift in the nuclear balance."

He noted, however, that the very "appearance" of inferiority could fuel an arms race. As a result, he said, "each side has a high incentive to achieve not only the reality but the appearance of equality."

## Questions Benefit of Race

"If we are driven to it, the United States will sustain an arms race," Mr. Kissinger said. "Indeed it is likely that the United States would emerge from such a competition with an edge over the Soviet Union in most significant categories of strategic arms. But the political or military benefit which would flow from such a situation would remain elusive."

He said that the specific American objectives in the arms control talks with the Russians were to break the momentum of ever-increasing levels of armaments, to control qualitative aspects, particularly multiple warheads, to moderate the pace of new deployments and ultimately to achieve reductions in force levels.

Many in the Pentagon and Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, have urged reductions as a first step. But Mr. Kissinger said that reductions were more complicated because there first had to be agreed ceilings from which the reductions would take place.