

## West Germany criticizes NATO

A long-simmering dispute over the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's military-strategic perspective erupted into the open last week when a respected, retired German Army General, Christian Krause, criticized NATO's massive ongoing "Autumn Reforger 78" maneuvers in Europe as based on "outmoded war scenarios." Further, Krause declared in a radio interview, the exaggerated size of the maneuvers and their timing are "unfortunate."

On the same program, Andreas von Bülow, State Secretary in the West German Defense Ministry, concurred that the maneuvers are so closely clustered within the same time period that they could easily be taken by the Warsaw Pact as an excuse to intensify their own maneuvers. This, he added, "would certainly not serve the interests of detente" at the present time.

Sources close to the West German Defense Ministry confirmed that General Krause's thinking, which amounts to a repudiation of NATO strategy as presently defined by London and NATO Supreme Commander General Alexander Haig, the architect of "Autumn Reforger," is shared by broader military and political circles. Even the government's official spokesman, Klaus Bölling, "denied" the criticisms of

Haig by admitting that an existing "quarrel has been settled. There are no more problems between the government and Haig."

The Milan daily *Il Giornale* reported Sept. 9 that high-level Italian military officials have also expressed their dismay at Haig's maneuvers. France, which in recent years has participated in NATO exercises though not itself an alliance member, declined to participate in the Reforger maneuvers.

The West German criticisms of the maneuvers also contain an implicit threat to NATO's string-pullers in London. In the event that London succeeds in bringing the United States onto a full confrontation course with the Soviet Union, West Germany may declare its neutrality — the only means of saving the country from complete obliteration in the first hours of warfare. By attacking Autumn Reforger, the West Germans are in effect telegraphing that "Haig's war is not our war."

### *Haig Under Fire*

Although the public criticism of NATO by West Germany is unprecedented, West German military officials' public concern over NATO's strategic policies dates from 1975, when Haig was installed in

### What is 'Autumn Reforger'?

Provocatively timed to coincide with the Camp David summit between President Carter, Prime Minister Begin, and President Sadat, NATO's "Autumn Reforger 78" maneuvers are the largest ever held, consisting of 30 separate exercises, each involving 250,000 troops. The maneuvers overlap as well NATO's biggest ever "Hilex" staff exercises, which will be underway from Sept. 12 to Oct. 19.

A French Defense Ministry official privately confided recently that "these are not normal maneuvers . . . They are a strictly political matter." Autumn Reforger is an aspect of London's plan to use a war in the Middle East in order to deal a "geopolitical" defeat to the Soviet Union. In recent weeks, circles around the London Institute for International and Strategic Studies and U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski have been insisting that an Israeli invasion of Syria would not result in direct Soviet military

intervention, since the Soviet Union is tied down with the European theater. In the insane thinking of Brzezinski, Haig, et al., a sufficient conventional military threat in Western Europe would ensure Soviet acquiescence to the destruction of its friends in the Middle East.

In fact, Haig's top assistant, General Schultz told the West German Armed Forces Television station Sept. 9 that "these maneuvers are not what they used to be. We now have the capability to use these maneuvers as 'crisis management'."

West German government circles are fully aware that such strategic thinking is the recipe for full-scale thermonuclear confrontation. Sources within the West German Foreign Ministry correctly estimate that the Soviet Union is fully committed to military support of Syria if it is attacked by Israeli armed forces.

Brussels following his and his patron Henry Kissinger's successful watergating of Richard M. Nixon. In October of that year, a leading West German military official disclosed that NATO strategy was undergoing a radical transformation under the guidance of Haig, Kissinger, and then-Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, tantamount to replacing the then-current MC 14-3 strategy with a revised MC 14-4. In that official's view, NATO's war-preventing capability was being seriously undermined by the effort to gear NATO up for "step-wise" warfare, gradually escalating from conventional fighting to the maximum limit of full-scale thermonuclear deployment (see box next page).

In the West German perception, not only does this MC 14-4 doctrine defy the reality of the Soviets' war-fighting strategy, which preceeds from a nuclear bombardment as the first order of battle in a conflict between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, but, based on NATO's doctrine of "forward defense," it also ensures that West Germany will be the battlefield on which the nuclear-armed adversaries meet. "Forward defense," in line with the concept of "step-wise" escalation, postulates that an initial attack by Warsaw Pact conventional forces will be with conventional arms only, and could thus be repulsed by NATO forces stationed along West German borders with East Germany and Czechoslovakia. This doctrine is embedded in the Haig strategy, despite strong assurances from the Warsaw Pact that no such purely conventional war would ever take place.

Thus, not only is the NATO-Haig strategy a formula for virtually certain defeat, but it is also a formula for certain destruction of West Germany, something the German commanders who lived through the devastation of World War II, are determined, short of national humiliation, to avoid.

Since 1975, therefore, West German military thinkers in the influential grouping around the "Wehrkunde" military science academy in Munich have, with varying results, undertaken a thorough reexamination of the "forward defense" posture, around which "Autumn Reforger" is based. In a recent series of Wehrkunde meetings, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* reports West German participants raised doubts about the continued viability of the NATO concept of the Soviet Union as an "aggressor," to the consternation of their British counterparts. Along the same lines, General Krause wrote in a letter to the same paper recently that relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union must be on the basis of "agreed-upon non-violence."

#### *Bremen Accords Key To West German Posture*

The West German determination to find a positive alternative to another war with the Soviet Union has been an important factor shaping recent West German economic and foreign policy reflected in the economic treaty signed in May between Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and Soviet President Leonid

Brezhnev, and also in the intent behind the European Monetary Fund agreed upon at the Bremen summit in July. At last week's meeting in Bonn of the International Parliamentary Union, Schmidt defined this alternative as a "worldwide security partnership," in the context of which "regional alliances," such as the one between West Germany and France, would play an increasingly stabilizing role.

This alternative to NATO's long-tolerated, but imbecilic strategy is also the motivation behind this week's visit to Moscow by Greece's Foreign Minister George Rallis — the first such visit of a Greek government leader to the Soviet Union since 1924. The economic relationship sealed there will help redefine overall Western military posture, as will the Turkish government's negotiations with Moscow to develop eastern Turkey and thereby relieve the political chaos there.

West European leaders also see nothing to be gained by a further expansion of NATO membership. Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti was asked during his recent visit to Spain whether Spain's entrance into the European Community should be complemented by its acceptance into NATO. He replied that this is not necessary, since this would "increase tensions" and would not be in the interest of Spain or any other nation.

— John Sigerson

## Die Zeit details German split with Haig

*The West German weekly Die Zeit, detailed the Autumn Reforger maneuvers and, from an alarmed oligarchist standpoint, the West German opposition to them, in its Sept. 16 issue, in an article titled "A Super Leap Over the Atlantic," by Lothar Ruehl.*

Tank columns, full mobilization at American supply depots, landings of large transport carriers from North America at the Ramstein and Frankfurt air bases, make up the outward picture of the large NATO maneuver currently underway in the Federal Republic of Germany. More than 200,000 men are participating in the maneuvers over a period of weeks. The Commander of NATO-Central Europe, Gen. Franz-Josef Schulze, says that "Even in the era of Kaiser Wilhelm II, maneuvers on this scale were not put into motion in the great German Reich." . . .

Reforger 1978 and the included build-up of air forces, named Crested Cap, will serve this year to test a far-reaching goal: the total number of American combat troops in Central Europe is to be doubled within ten days, as if in a period of tension, and the number of fighter planes tripled within three days....

# NATO's war-losing strategy

## Warsaw Pact vs. NATO orders of battle

### The war Haig, Kissinger, and Schlesinger are prepared to fight

1. Warsaw Pact conventional offensive in Central Europe, relying on numerical preponderance in armor and manpower.
2. NATO forces respond using tactical nuclear weapons in European theater to offset Warsaw Pact manpower advantage. U.S. forces mobilized to arrive in Europe on a 3-week timetable.
3. At this point, NATO manuals envision an essentially infinite series of escalations and counterescalations converging on, but never attaining, full nuclear war-fighting.
4. Soviets launch "counterforce" application of nuclear weapons against NATO forces.
5. U.S. launches "counterforce" nuclear attack on Soviet Union, to wipe out Soviet ICBM's and forestall nuclear holocaust.

### The war the Soviets are prepared to fight

1. Soviet Union launches full thermonuclear attack against NATO industrial and population centers in North America and Britain to destroy NATO's in-depth war-fighting capacity.
2. Simultaneous Warsaw Pact atomic-biological-chemical ABC warfare saturation of NATO positions in Europe.
3. With NATO war-fighting capacity crippled, Warsaw Pact ABC-trained ground forces occupy Western Europe.

It is in this context that the recent dispute between the West German Defense Ministry and the NATO Supreme Commander Gen. Haig over the magnitude of the maneuver in West Germany and northwestern Europe takes on its political significance. This comprehensive maneuver of the individual national armed forces and certain regional NATO command groups, called Autumn Forge, has, in addition to its demonstration value, a practical military result as well: cooperation of individual national troop units over a large area and over a long period, in order to maneuver under planning conditions approximating those of actual war. One example: On a single day, over 1,000 fighter planes will be deployed over West Germany. Regional air traffic regulations only permit 300 such deployments in one day. Therefore, the air forces could not realistically maneuver with the army without the centralized coordination of the maneuvers in Gen. Haig's Autumn Forge.

The West German Defense Ministry's reservations are that Autumn Forge essentially involves a

"publicity stunt" for Haig and NATO's European command, and that it involves a burdening of West Germany's political relations with Eastern Europe. This has temporarily made relations between Haig and the German alliance partner very sensitive. The expression "publicity stunt" as a characterization of the maneuver stems from a memorandum by the Bundeswehr's Leadership Staff under the guidance of Inspector General Harald Wust, addressed to the political leadership of the Defense Ministry. Haig and other high military officials were especially struck by the fact that the Germans' critical reservations, which came on the occasion of the welcoming of American Reforger units at Ramstein Aug. 6, were then released to the press by the Parliamentary State Secretary in the Defense Ministry, von Bülow . . . . The gravest aspect of this, in the eye of the NATO command, is that Bülow spoke as a representative of the Federal Defense Ministry in this fashion, just after the publication of the East German armed forces, Nationale Volksarmee, labeled the maneuvers provocative and a signal of aggression . . . .