

lists every maneuver scheduled to take place over the next year. The official stated that he should be aware of the maneuver if it is going on, explaining that the State Department and Department of Defense consult and jointly work out details of maneuvers because "we don't want to land troops on some beach where some president is being inaugurated." When briefed on the political tensions building in the area, the official expressed

concern over the potential for CARIBOPS to be used as a provocation against Cuba. Several Pentagon officials were equally baffled by their inability to locate any listing of announcement of CARIBOPS in their records. CARIBOPS was first announced in the Brazilian newspaper, *Jornal do Brazil*, printed several days before the Second Fleet release was issued.

## World Press on the Issue of War

*Within the last week, the press in the Federal German Republic has been filled with a debate on the question of war centered on the financing of a NATO proposed AWACS air control system and on the leaked report in the New York Times Dec. 26 that the U.S. intelligence agencies had been won over to "outsiders" views that the Soviet Union is seeking immediate military superiority.*

*Die Welt Dec. 20*—"Brandt Statements on MBFR Weaken The West," by Wolfgang von Raven. "Does Bonn want the West to alter its previous position on the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) talks? Brandt's statements (i.e., his call for a token small conventional force reduction on both sides—ed.) indicate this. . . Is there a contradiction between Brandt and Schmidt on the one hand, and Genscher and Leber on the other? . . . These questions must be answered quickly, because otherwise the Allies will get the impression that the FRG, which awaits Brezhnev's visit, wants to avoid necessary agreements in the alliance, and that they plan to go it alone. . . . A dangerous matter, which would have the effect of weakening the unity of the West. . . . Symbolic reduction. . . could give the Warsaw Pact a form of co-determination within the NATO formation. . . . Bonn must avoid this, since they would not want to opt for the neutralization of Central Europe, nor does it want to harden the East's position toward the West."

*Der Spiegel Dec. 20*—"Expensive Ten Minutes." "The Americans want to protect the West from a surprise attack from the East by using their airborne early warning system AWACS. But the question of how the project, running into the millions, will be financed is still disputed. . . . How high the final bill will be is, moreover, a completely unanswered question. . . . Under these conditions, Bonn's generals and the top military men think it will be impossible for the NATO partners' financial experts to agree on a formula in January as planned. The decision will be made, if at all, only in April during the (European) defense ministers' meeting. . . . What's more, Defense Minister Leber will only agree if "as many NATO countries as possible" participate in its production and operation. A two- or four-nation program is out of the question for financial and political reasons."

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung Dec. 21*—"Numbers Are Not Supreme—Soviet Military Superiority and Western

Strategy," by Adalbert Weinstein. "Western Germany is prepared neither for its own destruction, nor for the damage which the enemy could incur. We have no anti-air raid organization, no bunkers, no energy reserves. This is not a reproach. The core of our strategic conception is deterrence. There is certainly talk about the next step, the transition to a military confrontation. But we cannot accept this in our minds. . . . The core of our weakness is the strategic conception. Formulated simply, the West is prepared for a total non-war. . . . We don't dare think beyond the boundary where the unthinkable begins. The Communists take the unthinkable into account, and are ready for a total war. United States thinking. . . offers us an alternative: the limited war. . . . A limited war in Europe today would be the same as collective suicide."

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung Dec. 23*—"Leber Demands Fair Sharing of Cost of NATO Early Warning System," an interview of the West German Defense Minister with Adalbert Weinstein. "'AWACS must not turn into a matter which only the Americans and the Germans handle amongst themselves. . . . First, our sources of funds are not unlimited. And second, every financial contribution is immanently a political contribution as well. The dollar is not merely a means of payment; it is also a demonstration of solidarity.' . . . 'I would rather be publicly rebuked by my partners than to enter into a commitment which has not been gone over centimeter by centimeter for its workability.'"

*Bayernkurier Dec. 23*—"Targetted Detente Policy," by Eric Morton, reviewing a recent study by Brian Crozier of the London Institute for Strategic Studies, entitled "Security and the Myth of Peace." "Cutting off the seaways and therefore raw materials, however, is not the only Soviet threat to Western economies and security. Along with infiltration, subversion and terrorism supported by the East, there is psychological warfare, as well as political and diplomatic pressure supported by military superiority, in pursuit of the immediate goal of transforming the European nations according to the Finland model. . . . If the new President of the United States does not want to lead his country into a strategic isolation and political defeat, then he must decide to drop the policy of placation and take up the forward policy." Carter must call a special NATO

conference where "all aspects of the Eastern threat are analyzed, forward policy is coordinated, and joint defense measures against terrorism and subversion are agreed upon.

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung Dec. 28*—In reporting the competing Central Intelligence Agency evaluations of Soviet strategy, Jan Reifenberg writes that "Just as in 1960, when the fight over the 'missile gap' introduced a basic change in U.S. strategy, so these days Carter's judgment of the background of Soviet rearmament can decisively shift the essence of U.S. defense policy. The burned children of 1960—who following Kennedy's takeover found out that the 'missile gap' was a fantasy—will be in power again in January." A "powerful group of hawks," including Schlesinger, Nitze, and Jackson, are trying to influence Carter. Since people like Nitze doubt whether it is possible to reach a new SALT agreement, the question is coming up whether the U.S. President alone should make the final decision on the launching of nuclear weapons.

### London Times Questions Times' Motives

In a Dec. 29 article, London Times Washington correspondent Fred Emery questioned the motivation behind a report "leaked" in the New York Times on Sunday, Dec. 26 that the U.S. intelligence had been won over by "outsiders" to the view that the Soviet Union is seeking immediate military superiority. "The fact that the top secret so-called 'national estimate' of Soviet objectives has reached the New York Times in such a timely fashion," writes Emery, "has raised suggestions here today that the defence hardliners wanted deliberately to ensure as much exposure as possible before the new man took office." This switch in thinking is likely to "precipitate political controversy" and is obviously "the stuff of fierce debate," notes Emery. He sees the key item of contention as the report's conclusion that the Soviets are bent on disrupting fuel and raw materials supplies and on developing first strike capabilities. The newspaper quotes Carter's designated Secretary of Defense Harold Brown as saying in an interview with the Los Angeles Times that "the belief on either side that you can survive a strategic thermonuclear war as a going society—when you cannot—is the worst possible situation for the world to be in."

### London Times Scoffs At Carter's Summitry Attempt

Carter's announcement that he will meet with Brezhnev next year should be greeted with "mixed

feelings" writes the London Times in a lead editorial Dec. 29. Mutual distrust between the Soviet Union and the United States "is not going to be removed by handshakes and reassuring words" and even agreement on strategic weapons such as SALT should not be seen as the "end all" of relations between the superpowers, says the editorial. "Their military significance is strictly limited and they become politically significant only if they fit into other arrangements that lower the level of confrontation or lessen the danger of conflict." Carter of course "can make progress. . . but there is something a little dispiriting about his way of starting." A man-to-man summit is a "familiar routine" which can not really resolve any fundamental differences. Carter "would probably have been wiser to say cautiously that he would be happy to meet Mr. Brezhnev as soon as he was convinced that serious business required the personal attention of both men.

### *Venezuela's El Nacional:*

### Jimmy Carter: Portrait of a Robot

. . . This Mr. Carter has a marked vocation for order, discipline and method. . . .

However, being a formidable organizer may help win elections, but I am afraid it does very little for running the United States. We are in the presence of a great executive. . . . But he is not a statesman.

. . . His total lack of humanist education is frightening. He is a reader of briefs and memoranda. . . .

What would this technocrat do when confronted with international crises of the calibre of those of Berlin (1948), the Suez (1956), the Bay of Pigs (1961), or the Missile Crisis (1962)? I suspect that Jimmy Carter, given his psychological makeup, would get along better with the hawks than with the doves. The language of military officers must be more familiar to him than that of politicians.

He will surround himself with technicians, with specialists incapable of thinking in abstractions, with men who have quick answers for extremely complex problems. If this hypothesis is correct, I believe that Mr. Carter's finger will be closer to the trigger than that of Mr. Ford. . . .

Then, supposedly, there is the religious theme. Carter is a believer, but that doesn't change anything. Truman was perhaps the most religious of all American presidents and he did not hesitate to inaugurate nuclear war. Mr. Carter is no monk. . . . His Christianity will be no obstacle in adopting aggressive attitudes.