

Africa and the Middle East

In addition to U.S. sabotage of better trade relations, the Soviets are also warning that U.S. policy in the Middle East and Africa must be sharply turned from its current course toward superpower confrontation.

In an authoritative commentary in *Pravda's* Oct. 22 weekly *Review of International Events*, Yuri Zhukov zeroed in on the transparent inconsistency between Vance's recent statement that SALT was "95 percent ready" on the one hand, and what, in reality, amounts to U.S. sabotage of the negotiations. In particular, Zhukov cited Carter's neutron bomb decision and the discussions at the NATO Nuclear Planning Group meeting in Brussels last week, attended by U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown, on the need to modernize NATO's theater nuclear forces.

Zhukov then went on to blast current U.S. policy in the Middle East, particularly U.S. support for the Israeli-backed Lebanese Falange, "who are going under the false flag of Lebanese Christians," as well as U.S. policy in southern Africa. Zhukov correctly terms Rhodesian Prime Minister's Ian Smith's trip to the U.S., fully backed by Henry Kissinger, as a violation of stated United Nations policy. The *Pravda* commentator also accused the U.S. of working in complicity with Britain and Canada to foist "illegal elections" on Namibia.

While joint efforts of the Arabs, Soviets and Western Europeans have temporarily succeeded in cooling down the volatile Middle East situation, Africa is on the verge of a continent-wide explosion, thanks to U.S. refusal to back a real peace plan for southern Africa.

The U.S. attitude is exemplified by its permissive reaction to the vicious military raids into the front-line states of Mozambique and Zambia launched by Smith on his way home from Washington meetings with Vance and UN Ambassador Andrew Young last weekend. Fifteen hundred men, women and children were killed by the Rhodesian raiders in the brutal attacks. Instead of condemning this slaughter outright, the Administration gave its de facto endorsement, saying only that the raids' "timing" was "objectionable."

The U.S. response drew immediate, angry rebukes from African leaders. In a press conference Oct. 23, Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda stated that "I stand amazed at the lukewarm condemnation of this wanton and dastardly attack on Zambia, a sovereign state, by the U.S. government and the British government." And the Organization of African Unity issued a similarly strong attack in a statement expressing its dismay over the weakening of Western resolve to get a just accord on the Namibia question.

— *Barbara Dreyfuss*

Europe revolts against U.S. confrontationism

"NATO is so fragile now that it would not survive two of these publicly fought confrontations," said Christian Potyka, military correspondent of the West German daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, last week. His published attack summarizes Western Europe's de facto state of revolt against the military policy being pursued by NATO Secretary General Luns and former Kissinger adjutant, Supreme NATO Commander Alexander Haig. No fewer than four NATO member countries have announced their opposition to the anti-Soviet, confrontationist drift of NATO policy: West Germany, Norway, Greece, and Turkey. They are receiving strong support from non-member France.

Potyka's remarks were prompted by West German Defense Minister Hans Apel's latest criticism of the conduct of this year's NATO "Autumn Reforger" maneuvers, which left 14 people dead and \$10 million in property damages. In an Oct. 21 interview in the *Frankfurter Rundschau*, Apel as good as warned that unless NATO policy is brought into line in short order with West Germany's policy of detente and expanded economic trade and development with the Soviet Union, the alliance may lose its strongest, most valued European partner.

Apel's remarks are news only to those American and British newspapers that have consistently blocked out West European protests since the beginning of the Reforger maneuvers in early September. Then, and since, the West German government with strong support from French President Giscard d'Estaing, has made absolutely clear that it will not tolerate a NATO military policy that is inconsistent with the thinking behind the May economic accords signed by Chancellor Schmidt and Soviet President Brezhnev and renewed in the Bremen Summit of European Community heads of state.

Christian Potyka summarized the sentiment behind the German protests in his column today, writing that "the real issue is the relation of the sovereign state of the Federal Republic of Germany to the inner core of NATO: Brussels headquarters."

Does Germany have an alternative?

Apel's Oct. 21 interview laid the matter squarely on the line, asking "whether there had ever been an alternative to the Federal Republic's membership in the Western Alliance." In the four days since that article appeared, the defense minister, who is fully supported by his long-time political confidante Chancellor Schmidt, has not let up one iota in his pressure on Secretary General Luns and Commander Haig.

On Oct. 23, Luns flew to Bonn to mollify Apel and possibly, to get Schmidt to repudiate his defense minister. Within 24 hours, Apel had informed Luns in blunt German slang that "Bonn will not give a blank check to the military," referring to Luns's complaints that German-imposed restrictions are making it difficult for NATO to adopt the neutron bomb as an operational tactical nuclear weapon. Earlier, at the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, Apel had cut short Luns's attempts to monopolize discussion of NATO's nuclear arsenal, telling him "that as a minister with governmental responsibility, I will not allow anyone here to censor me."

According to today's daily *Die Welt*, Apel has let it be known that West Germany will veto "the Anglo-American proposal for the successor to Luns, British NATO Ambassador Lord Killick." Apel's statements have the clear backing of the Social Democratic Party's parliamentary leader, Herbert Wehner, who insisted in a recent *Morgenpost* newspaper article that "disarmament is a primary national task" for Germany and that resolution of the SALT and MBFR talks "is of historical importance."

Coinciding with these German warnings, Turkey reduced NATO troops on its Soviet border in the interests of detente, and Greece decided not to reintegrate into full NATO membership.

Apel on NATO and detente

The following excerpts are from the article, published in the Oct. 21 edition of the West German daily Frankfurter Rundschau, in which West German Defense Minister Hans Apel publicly questioned West Germany's membership in NATO.

...Twenty-five years is a very short period of time in the history of a nation. And what is all the more astounding for me is just how little we people today either want to remember or can remember about the early 1950s. Our country then still lay in ashes and rubble, reconstruction had just begun. All the prisoners of war had not yet returned home. The partition of Germany was an open wound, and we all believed in more partitions in the period coming into view.

On the one hand, some people wanted to stop the menace against

us that came from the communists after they had seized power in Warsaw, Prague, or elsewhere through a Western defense alliance. They did not succeed in doing this. And their conviction, that Germany's reunification would be made possible through this, nevertheless proved itself to be false. The opposite occurred. Germany's partition was cemented, the Cold War became the determining element of the following decade.

Others considered this way to be dangerous. They wanted to preserve Germany's unity and avoid everything that would dry the ink on the division of our country and Europe and that would also threaten to create at the same time new sources for violent confrontations. Whether there was indeed a conceivable alternative to the BRD's membership in the Western alliance, could not be tested at any point in time. Our hindsight about political data, and about the

French Defense Minister Yvon Bourges has underscored Europe's refusal to be dragged into a war with the Soviet Union. Commenting on President Jimmy Carter's decision to build neutron bomb components, Bourges stated in an Oct. 22 *Le Monde* article that France's deterrent strategy is a war-avoidance policy based on massive strategic firepower in which the tactical nuclear weapon, the neutron bomb, has no part. "The neutron bomb is a peculiar weapon," Bourges said. "The studies which we are pursuing allow us to acquire knowledge related to this type of weapon, but we do not envisage making any in our armaments program because the French policy of deterrence is a strategic one."

Two days later, Norwegian Defense Minister Hansen followed Apel's example in directing his sharply worded protests at British Gen. Whitley, who recently criticized the Norwegian parliament's refusal to increase the nation's defense budget by the 3-percent figure agreed to among the NATO partners. Hansen publicly rebuked Whitley "for intervening into affairs that he doesn't understand anyway, and for intervening into relations between the government and parliament in Norway."

— James Cleary

general climate at that time, lets it appear to us today as certain that there never were paths for our country to take out of the polarization of the postwar period....No one can ignore these lessons from the past. He who wants to change something, must want detente policy...even the expansion of East-West trade belongs in with this connection...East-West trade is economically interesting, but its political dimension is much more decisive.

It is much more difficult to have the military sector open itself up to effective detente. The original causes for this are readily available: what exists due to soldiers and weapons is the expression of political mistrust. Reducing this step by step is the actual content of detente policy...the capability for defense and detente policy are still two sides of the same coin called "security policy." This policy cannot generally succeed when one nation tries to go it alone.