

Brown and Muskie put the screws on Europe

by Susan Welsh

At the Brussels meeting of NATO defense and foreign ministers this week, U.S. Secretary of State Edmund Muskie and Secretary of Defense Harold Brown sought to pressure Western Europe to go along with Washington's policy of confronting the Soviet Union with a "paper tiger" Chinese-style military strategy. They determined to force Europe to break off what remains of detente, and to extend NATO outside its treaty-mandated boundaries to the Third World, encircling the Soviet Union with hostile states.

While the U.S. did not officially propose such an extension of NATO due to stubborn opposition from particularly West Germany, this was the subject of intensive behind-the-scenes armtwisting (known as "bilateral consultation"). Before the Brussels meetings convened, Secretary Brown visited Rome to line up support for NATO deployments into the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf from Italian Prime Minister Cossiga. Brown admitted in an interview to the daily *Il Tempo*, which has been blacked out in the U.S. press, that the United States has secretly requested such deployments of each of its major allies, and insists that the allies "show the flag" in the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Sea.

Following the NATO meetings, Brown expressed satisfaction that his program would yet be implemented. "We have had the rhetoric, and it has been good. We've had the beginning of the concrete steps, and the signs are that the longer term steps will also be forthcoming."

Edmund Muskie, in his first diplomatic mission as Secretary of State, made it clear to Europe and to the Soviet Union that the Carter administration is as fully

committed to confrontationist policies as it was before the cabinet crisis. Scheduled to meet with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko May 16, he announced that the talks will merely be a "fencing exercise... I'm here to find out if Moscow is prepared to meet minimum requirements in resuming detente." Muskie dismissed a proposal made May 14 by the Afghan government for withdrawal of Soviet troops in return for American promises not to finance rebel activities there.

The Secretary of State, in his discussions with NATO foreign ministers, demanded that they fully implement economic and political sanctions against Iran by May 17. The European pledge was made before President Carter's abortive Iran raid, and was seen by many European leaders as the only way to prevent U.S. military action. When Carter launched the raid, many in Western Europe concluded that the terms of the deal had been broken, and began to look for ways to water down the sanctions. Muskie also demanded that Western Europe stop its efforts to build an independent Mideast peace initiative, since this would "endanger the Camp David agreements.... I think it would be a very poor time to in any way divert attention from that process."

Europe stalls

The Europeans' reaction to Brown and Muskie was to stall, agreeing to a strongly worded condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, accepting certain short-term military measures to bolster U.S. capabilities, but deferring longer-term decisions until the December meeting of the Allied Ministerial Council.

West German Defense Minister Hans Apel has repeatedly rejected any deployment of the West German army outside Europe, and sources in his ministry said this week that the Federal Republic of Germany will send no ships into the Mediterranean. The three ships it has presently en route to the Indian Ocean are on a "routine training mission," will not participate in any maneuvers with other units, and in case of crisis have orders to return immediately to their positions in the Atlantic. West Germany will refuse to provide logistical support to the United States for transport of troops anywhere outside Europe, since "this would violate existing political agreements," the sources said.

But Europe is finding itself with less and less maneuvering room. Although fearful that the Carter administration's "incalculability" will lead to World War III, the leaders of West Germany and France have held back from any intervention which would radically reorient American policy towards global economic development and away from military bluff. The most active "intervention" into U.S. politics has come from Great Britain, seeking to fill the "vacuum" created by Carter.

The stalling tactics of continental Europe drew sharp criticism from the Soviet Union this week, which fears the consolidation of a Washington-Europe-Tel Aviv-Peking axis. As the Warsaw Pact met May 14, Commander Marshal V. Kulikov announced new measures for tight centralization and combat-readiness to make possible a permanent mobilization capability. Radio Moscow commented on the NATO meetings: "It is hard to recall a NATO meeting which took place in such an alarming atmosphere ... There is a psychological attack by the United States on its allies. ... It is trying to intimidate them with the consequences of what would happen if the allies departed from solidarity ... Western Europe follows reluctantly and with reservations. But the fact remains that they follow. However, they may find the price is too high for them. U.S. policy might lead to the brink of a big war in which entire countries would burn up."

NATO's "military buildup"

The measures adopted at the NATO sessions, while significant politically, are a joke from the standpoint of war-fighting ability versus the Soviet Union. The ministers agreed to increase stocks of ammunition and transport aircraft in Europe and to speed up deployment of new weapons, so that Europe can shoulder more of its own defense in case U.S. troops are sent to the Middle East. But European leaders in Brussels privately questioned whether the United States could live up to its own part of the arrangements in view of the depletion of American reserves under the All-Volunteer Army. Whereas the NATO meeting reaffirmed the pledge of each country to increase its defense budget 3 percent

The final communique

The communiqué issued by the NATO Defense Planning Committee May 14 declared in reference to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan that "the stability of regions outside NATO boundaries" was of "crucial importance" to the member countries, although not an area of Alliance responsibility. This is the first time that a NATO communiqué has described an event occurring so far from the NATO region as having such a serious effect on the security of the alliance. The communiqué reads, in part:

"Ministers expressed their concern that for the first time in the postwar era the Soviet Union had used military force to impose its will on a non-aligned country of the Third World and in a way which affected the overall strategic situation.

"Ministers denounced this use of force, which jeopardizes international peace and stability and strikes at the principles of the United Nations Charter, and called for the total and immediate withdrawal of all Soviet forces from Afghanistan.

"The people of Afghanistan must be free to shape their future without outside interference."

Following the NATO session, U.S. Defense Secretary Brown compared the Soviet Union to Nazi Germany. "I would offer for your consideration the analogy of the 1930s," he told a press conference, "Those were also dangerous times. They went from danger into war through a lack of resolve and a lack of willingness to face up to the threat."

annually (at U.S. insistence), the United States has had to resort to fraudulent accounting techniques to achieve such an increase. The Carter administration knocked a few million dollars off the FY 1980 defense budget so that the new FY 1981 could register a 3 percent rise!

More serious, however, is the U.S. Defense Department's "Chinese" approach to military technology. Secretary Brown recently issued a confidential memorandum citing the disastrous condition of the U.S. Air Force, according to the London *Guardian* May 12. Air force planes spend between one-third and two-thirds of their lives out of order; the F-111D can only stay in the air for 12 minutes before a breakdown!

Brown's solution? An abandonment of technology which is "too complex" to be operated by low-skill operators, in favor of "more practical weapons that we can buy in greater quantity." Bows and arrows, anyone?

Brown, Luns say Europe will back U.S. adventures

NATO is going to have to make plans to replace American troops in Western Europe in case the United States decides to commit additional forces to the Persian Gulf, said NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns in a May 6 Washington, D.C., speech. A special NATO committee will probably be formed to draw up contingency plans "in case the Soviets grab the Gulf oil."

"The countries in Europe might well have to shoulder a heavier share ... to take up the slack. ... If the Soviet Union really would not shrink from world war, we will get that world war one day," Luns said, adding that he believed the Soviets would not risk the "unacceptable losses."

The Italian daily Il Tempo published an interview with U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown May 12, in which Brown admits to secret discussions with the leaders of NATO countries on the deployment of NATO forces outside their treaty regions of Europe and the North Atlantic.

But West Germans say they will not

The following wire from the West German DPA press agency May 7 was monitored by FBIS:

As far as the Federal Government knows, the United States does not plan to withdraw troops from the Federal Republic. Speaking at a press conference in Bonn today in connection with statements by NATO Secretary General Luns about a possible movement of U.S. troops from Europe to crisis areas in the Middle East, State Secretary Boelling said that, according to the impression in Bonn, this could "by no means be the case." Boelling conceded, however, that he cannot "enter into discussion of the overall subject . . ."

Boelling added that there has been little time to examine Luns' statement "very precisely." It is his "reliable impression" that maybe as a result of the reports the "mistaken impression" has arisen that the United States is considering the transfer of units stationed in the Federal Republic. Some thoughts on this subject matter had "of course" engaged the Federal Government's attention some time ago and "have been the subject of information as well as of talks within Germany's Federal Security

Il Tempo explained that the purpose of Brown's visit to Europe is to convince the allies that the United States must shift forces from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean, which means that Europe and particularly Italy must be prepared to intervene in the Indian Ocean too. Brown will tell the allies at the NATO meeting in Brussels, according to Il Tempo, that a part of the U.S. military budget will be designated for military expenses in the Southwest Asian theater, and that consequently Europe and Japan will have to accept an increasing role.

Brown: This request has been made confidentially to all the European allies in secret communications between the European governments and the U.S. But now the U.S. is officially placing the question on the table with the urgency which is dictated by the continuing global confrontation.

Il Tempo: It is significant that Brown wanted to inform the Italian government first on such plans.

Brown: The aim of my visit to Rome is to convey to the Prime Minister and the Defense Minister the deep appreciation of the U.S. government and people for the many recent initiatives of the Italian government and people in this moment of serious difficulties. Italy has shown itself

Council" whose deliberations "were not a matter for public knowledge."

Informed military quarters in Bonn confessed themselves "extremely astonished" by the statement attributed to Luns. Hitherto nobody in NATO knew anything of this, it was stated. What Luns is reported to have said "cannot be correct."

"There is no reason for Luns to say this," it was argued in Bonn. It can only cause confusion in the Western alliance. There can be no substitute for U.S. divisions. It is conceded that a situation might arise "in which one is subjected to increased demands."

The remark attributed to Luns that the German Navy might assist the United States in strengthening its military potential in the Indian Ocean is also strongly denied. "Nobody has authorized Luns to make such statements," it was said in Bonn. There will be no German presence in the Indian Ocean.

West German Defense Minister Hans Apel gave an interview to Deutsche Welle radio May 7, monitored by FBIS:

Q: Mr. Minister ... you said in one of your last speeches: There is no national security without international security. Does that not mean that in the future NATO will have to defend the security of its members beyond the

to be among our most solid allies and we will not forget this. Italy showed courage in joining in the decision to modernize NATO's nuclear forces so that the disadvantage due to the increasing number of Soviet medium-range weapons aimed against Europe could be overcome. Italy, although it faces a difficult economic situation, is determined to reach the goal of 3 percent increase in defense expenditures in real terms. . . .

A large portion of the increased expenditures planned in the U.S. military budget for the next five years is to be used in Southwest Asia. In Brussels we will discuss how to implement this new division of expenditures.

Il Tempo: In plain English, Brown said not only Southwest Asia but also adjacent areas, meaning an extension of the NATO countries and Japan outside their areas of competence. This means NATO must not limit its activity to a strictly defined geographical area.

Brown: The military contribution must also include an increase in naval forces, meaning that the allies must show the flag in the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Sea . . . The U.S. will undertake the largest part of this military increase, and this could make it necessary to move part of our forces from other theaters toward that region, for example to periodically move our aircraft carriers from the Mediterranean to the Arabian Sea.

treaty area in other parts of the world?

A: Let us view the current situation quite soberly. What are the reasons for our concern? We are concerned about Soviet expansion, about the improvement of the Soviet Union's strategic positions. By the way, it cannot be shaken out militarily: Afghanistan is topographically in such a location that nobody can go into action there even if he wanted to. Second, there is the concern of endangering our oil supply. Third, the hostages must be freed alive. . . .

NATO would totally overstrain itself if it wanted to solve the problems. At best, NATO can contribute if the Americans say: we are more deeply involved somewhere else, you must relieve us in Central Europe.

Q: In addition, the Army will face a special situation if and when NATO is called upon to share in worldwide responsibility, namely, the situation resulting from the partition of Germany.

A: The point at issue is not just Germany's partition. What matters is that our basic law says in no uncertain terms and without any contradictions: The Federal Republic has, and is allowed to have troops for defensive purposes, for home defense. And this makes it absolutely clear in legal terms that a Bundeswehr mission outside of Europe just cannot take place.

West Germany

A vote in the Ruhr for Schmidt and peace

by Ranier Apel

West German Chancellor Schmidt's Social Democratic Party (SPD) won a major victory in May 11 elections in the state of North Rhine Westfalia, where more than one-third of Germany's electorate lives and works. The returns are considered an important setback to the ambitions of Bavarian Franz Josef Strauss, who is scheduled to be the joint chancellor candidate of the opposition Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union parties in this October's national elections.

The victory of SPD candidates in this Ruhr industrial area represents a clear mandate for Schmidt's war-avoidance, detente-oriented foreign policy, and his government's continuing refusal to collaborate with the Carter administration's military posturing in the international arena.

Overall, the SPD gained 3.3 percentage points in the vote, raising its seats in North Rhine Westfalia's parliament to 49 percent. The Christian Democrats lost 3.9 percentage points, while the Free Democratic Party, Schmidt's coalition partner at the national level, suffered a 1.8 percent decline, failing to qualify for "major party status." Now below the minimum five percent level, the FDP must leave the state's parliament. Analysts agree that some of the SPD gains came directly at the expense of "migrant voters" formerly committed to the Christian Democrats.

Significantly, the so-called Green Party—the environmentalists and radicals—also failed to gain the minimum five percent to qualify for seats in the state parliament. A significant Green vote had been counted on by Chancellor Schmidt's enemies, including Christian Democrat leader Kurt Beidenkopf and Strauss, to weaken the chancellor's governing coalition. But the SPD suffered no net loss of votes to the greenies, whose minimal gains at the expense of the Christian Democrats and Free Democrats still left them at only three percent.

In at least this key state, therefore, the policy of Strauss and Beidenkopf to build the Green Party has floundered. This policy was actually worked out for the two opposition leaders in the United States in February, when Strauss visited America for one week of top-level meetings with Carter administration officials and geopolitical specialists at the Jesuit Georgetown University.