

# U.S. Says Possibility of Canceling Moscow Trip Is Not 'Live Issue'

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15

The White House, seeking to clear up confusion caused by two senior aides yesterday, affirmed its unhappiness today with the Soviet Union's strong support for India but said that the possibility of canceling President Nixon's trip to Moscow was not "a live issue."

Statements by Ronald L. Ziegler, the White House press secretary, at his regular morning news briefing indicated that Mr. Nixon was irked over the refusal of the Soviet Union to join in Security Council action against India and was worried about any further Indian attacks on West Pakistan, now that East Pakistan seems lost to the Pakistani Government.

**Restraint Sought**  
But Mr. Ziegler, as he did last night, tried to soften the impact of remarks made yesterday afternoon by his White House colleague, Henry A. Kissinger, to a five-man delegation of correspondents aboard the President's plane, the Spirit of '76.

Mr. Kissinger, the adviser on national security, said that less the Russians in the next few days persuaded the Indians to show restraint, "a new look might have to be taken at the President's summit plans." The correspondents, acting as "pool" representatives for the

rest of the White House press corps, were given the briefing on condition that the information be published without attribution.

According to the pool report, which was approved by Mr. Kissinger, he said that "the United States is definitely looking to the Soviets to become a restraining influence in the next few days."

Mr. Ziegler, who was aboard a chartered plane carrying the press corps back from the Azores, arrived at Andrews Air Force Base outside Washington several hours after the President and was stunned when he read news agency dispatches based on Mr. Kissinger's remarks. The reports all stressed the possibility that Mr. Nixon's trip to Moscow might be cancelled.

After consulting with the White House, Mr. Ziegler said that "the United States is not considering canceling the United States-Soviet summit and no official intended to suggest this." He said that Mr. Kissinger's remarks had been interpreted in a "highly speculative way" and had been "taken out of context."

Mr. Kissinger had labeled those parts of his remarks "deep background," meaning that newsmen were not to identify the source in any way. This ground rule was violated by both The Washington Post and The New York Times. The Times decided that be-

cause of the importance of importance of the material it would attribute the remarks to the White House without naming Mr. Kissinger. It did so after informing Mr. Ziegler. The Post, asserting that it had learned through independent sources, the briefing, named him in all its editions. In late editions after the appearance of the early edito of The Post, The Times and other news media identified Mr. Kissinger also.

The sum of the Kissinger and Ziegler statements produced some confusion and drew more correspondents than usual to Mr. Ziegler's news conference this morning.

The statements also caused great discomfiture at the State Department. Officials who have been quietly working on plans for Mr. Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union were especially surprised by Mr. Kissinger's remarks. As reported, they seemed to them to go further than the situation in South Asia warranted.

One official, who asked not to be identified, said the Kissinger and Ziegler statements yesterday were "far from mature statesmanship."

Mr. Ziegler, explaining his statement last night, said that after consultation with the White House he had tried to "put into perspective" the Government's actual position. "The fact of the matter is that if the situation in South

Asia expands into West Pakistan or continues elsewhere in the area, this will very definitely affect the world peace," he said.

Mr. Ziegler said that Mr. Kissinger had been saying that such a development could "very well affect future Soviet-United States relations." But he asserted that the United States did not expect the fighting to spread to West Pakistan and that "there will be a solution."

Thus, he added, the question of canceling Mr. Nixon's trip was "not a live issue."

The White House was unhappy that Mr. Kissinger's name had been mentioned as the source of the comments, in violation of long-standing ground rules. Mr. Ziegler said that the Post's breaking of the rules was "unacceptable to the White House," and called for a meeting with press representatives to draft a new voluntary code of regulations.

At the news conference, David J. Kraslow of The Los Angeles Times, who was one of the pool reporters who met Mr. Kissinger, said that Mr. Kissinger's remarks had not been volunteered but had been elicited under sharp questioning.

Mr. Kraslow said that "the good name of The Washington Post, and that of The New York Times to a certain extent, was sullied."

Other newsmen, however, told Mr. Ziegler that they thought the pool had been wrong to accept Mr. Kissinger's views as "deep background" when they touched such sensitive issues.

### Editor Defends Stand

Mr. Brandlee, in a statement tonight, defended the violation of the ground rules. He said that in practice, background briefings "have been abused and become vehicles for the Government to give the press its version of the news, and its interpretation of the news, and its policy," without accountability.

"We are convinced that we have engaged in this deception and done this disservice to the reader long enough," he went on.

"Therefore it shall be the policy of this newspaper to make every reasonable effort to attribute information to its source."

Specific guidelines would be issued to The Post staff shortly, he said, "to get this newspaper once and for all out of the business of distributing the party line of any official of any government without identifying that official and that government."

When not wanting to be directly quoted, Washington officials usually refer to one of two devices. The remarks are labeled either "on background," in which the official's agency can be mentioned, such as "a State Department official," or "on deep background," in which information cannot be attributed in any way.

### Soviet Ignores Warnings

By HEDRICK SMITH  
Special to The New York Times  
MOSCOW, Dec. 15—The Soviet Union today publicly ignored leaked warnings from the White House that continued Soviet encouragement of Indian military actions in East Pakistan could lead to reconsideration of President Nixon's visit to Moscow next May.

Officials here are known to resent attempts by the Nixon Administration to link Soviet moves in one region to policies and negotiations elsewhere and to picture Moscow as eager to have an American President come here at the sacrifice of established Soviet policies.

But the Foreign Ministry today had no comment on Western Press reports that Henry A. Kissinger, the President's adviser on national security, had linked Soviet backing for the Indian military campaign in East Pakistan with the general state of Soviet-American relations and Mr. Nixon's visit in particular.

Diplomats here saw strong indications that the Soviet Union considered the collapse of Pakistani military resistance, permitting Moscow to be more forthcoming on a cease-fire.

One diplomat suggested that the Kremlin was prepared to weather Mr. Nixon's displeasure on the assumption that once the fighting stopped and the crisis had eased, talk of reconsidering the President's visit would fade.

It was understood that even Mr. Kissinger had his controversial background briefing for reporters, the United States charge d'affaires here, Boris H. Klosson, had conveyed the President's displeasure over the Soviet position on the Indian-Pakistani war, to the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

Soviet recognition of East Pakistan as an independent nation is considered very unlikely among well-informed diplomats here. The Soviet Union was depicted as anxious not to see relations with Pakistan broken out of a country where China's influence is now great.

Soviet recognition of East Pakistan as an independent nation is considered very unlikely among well-informed diplomats here. The Soviet Union was depicted as anxious not to see relations with Pakistan broken out of a country where China's influence is now great.