Congressional Probers Seek Tapes Of Aborted Hostage Rescue Bid

Pentagon May Seek Executive Privilege

By John J. Fialka
Washington Star Staff Writer

Congressional investigators have asked the Pentagon for copies of the tapes of communications that went on between Washington and the ground force during the aborted mission to free the hostages in Tehran.

A Pentagon spokesman said that the request had been received and was "being addressed" by Defense officials. He would not say who had made the request.

Other Pentagon sources said that because the tape contain sensitive information about the raid, the tapes are privileged that they are covered by executive privilege.

Such a defense, which can only be raised by the president, may have already been blunted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreeing to turn over evidence concerning the raid to another investigating group, one appointed by the Joint Chiefs that includes three former senior officers.

A response that the tapes are covered by executive privilege should also lead to an embarrassing parallel with the Watergate era, during which the Nixon administration fought long and hard to prevent the public release of tapes of conversations between President Nixon and key aides.

Investigators familiar with the raid say that the communications tapes exist and that they should be the best evidence of what went on during the crucial moments before and after the decision to abort the raid.

The tapes should be able to settle two persistent rumors still circulating in Washington about the April 24 raid. The Army Times has quoted Pentagon sources who have heard the tapes as saying that the complex command structure of the raiding party resulted in a "logjam" of communications and that the raid ended in organizational chaos after a helicopter crashed into a C-130 transport.

There have also been rumors that the raid was terminated after the movement of Soviet aircraft to Tehran and a Soviet communication about a raid with the White House. Brown and other Defense officials have said that communications was "outstanding" during the raid, and they have scoffed at assertions that the Soviets may have played a role in the handlers' withdrawal of the raid.

Soviet is accused of adding to arms aimed at Europe

Bodo Air Force Base, Norway (Reuters)—The top defense officials from the United States and Britain said yesterday that the Soviet Union has increased the number of nuclear missiles aimed at Western Europe.

The U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown said the Soviet Union now has nuclear cruise missiles on its submarines in the Baltic.

British Defense Secretary Francis Pym told reporters that Soviet three-headed, SS-20 missiles were coming out at the rate of one every five days, instead of one a week six months ago.

Two-thirds of them were aimed at Western Europe and one-third at China, according to Western military sources.

The two men spoke after a two-day meeting of the defense officials of 12 countries taking part in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's nuclear planning group.

Mr. Pym said the Soviet Union has slowed down phaseing out its older SS-4 and SS-5 missiles, which the SS-20s are due to replace.

The defense officials of the 12 countries taking part in the nuclear planning group expressed concern in their final communiqué over the retention of SS-4s and SS-5.

"This, coupled with the continuing deployment of the SS-20 missiles, might lead to an even larger Soviet superiority in long-range theater nuclear forces in the mid-80s than previously anticipated," they said.

The officials called on the Soviet Union to respond positively to NATO's offer in December to negotiate controls on this type of weapon.

They said they felt the Soviet Union "was instead advancing unacceptable preconditions, which would perpetuate inequality, to any negotiations or even preliminary arms control exchanges."

The West's proposal to negotiate was made at the same time that NATO decided in Brussels in December to deploy almost 600 Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe to counter the Soviet SS-20 and Topolv-26 backfire bombers.

The offer was conveyed twice to the Soviet Union by the United States and was rejected both times.

Soviet officials have denounced the plan as an attempt by NATO to gain military superiority in Europe and alter the military balance between the power blocs.

Sen. Helms Refuses To Back Off Claim

Gen. Jones Denies Deal

To Resign

By Lisa Myers
Washington Star Staff Writer

Gen. David Jones, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, denied yesterday that he privately agreed to resign if Ronald Reagan is elected president in order to avert a protracted struggle over his renomination.

But Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., refused to back down on his claim that Jones had contributed to the head-off a potentially bloody political fight over his appointment to a second two-year term as the nation's premier military officer. "There's no question that it was set up," Helms said. "I don't know what the game is."

Two other senators, one a Democrat and one a Republican, said they had been told that Jones had agreed to tender his resignation in January if President Carter isn't re-elected. Both said their information did not come from Helms.

Jones, in his own statement, said he had made "no agreements or commitments whatsoever with any member of Congress about submitting a resignation in the event of a change of administration. Such an arrangement would be "inconsistent" with the law, which states that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs "serves at the pleasure of the president," the General said. The Air Force general maintained.

The middleman in the dispute, Sen. John Warner, R-Va., refused to comment pending Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on Jones' confirmation. "In the interest of national defense, Sen. Warner will not join in public debate of this matter," his office said.

It was Warner who initially broached the possibility of such an arrangement to Helms on the Senate floor Monday and who told Helms (See GEN. JONES, Pg 3)
General David C. Jones, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, flatly denied today the report in this morning's Washington Star about a "deal" with some members of Congress to resign if Governor Ronald Reagan is elected President.

General Jones stated that he has made no agreements or commitments whatsoever with any member of Congress about submitting a resignation in the event of a change of administration.

Public Law states that the Chairman of the JCS "serves at the pleasure of the President." General Jones said that, "Any arrangements with members of Congress to resign in the future would be inconsistent with this statute."

He went on to say, "The integrity of the Chairman's office is an overriding consideration and I consider it totally inappropriate for senior military officers to adopt the tradition of political appointees of offering resignations whenever an Administration changes."
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WASHINGTON (UPI) - GEN. DAVID JONES, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, TODAY DENIED A PUBLISHED REPORT THAT HE HAD MADE A DEAL WITH SOME LEGISLATORS TO RESIGN IF RONALD REAGAN IS ELECTED PRESIDENT.

IN A WRITTEN STATEMENT, JONES SAID HE HAD MADE NO AGREEMENTS OR COMMITMENTS WITH ANY MEMBER OF CONGRESS ABOUT SUBMITTING A RESIGNATION IN THE EVENT OF A CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION.

HE NOTED THAT BY LAW THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF "SERVES AT THE PLEASURE OF THE PRESIDENT."

"ANY ARRANGEMENTS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO RESIGN IN THE FUTURE WOULD BE INCONSISTENT WITH THIS STATUTE," JONES SAID.

HE ADDED: "THE INTEGRITY OF THE CHAIRMAN'S OFFICE IS AN OVERRIDING CONSIDERATION AND I CONSIDER IT TOTALLY INAPPROPRIATE FOR SENIOR MILITARY OFFICERS TO ADOPT THE TRADITION OF POLITICAL APPOINTEES OF OFFERING RESIGNATIONS HOWEVER AN ADMINISTRATION CHANGES."

EARLIER TODAY, THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT TODAY CALLED THE NEWS ACCOUNT "TOTALLY INCORRECT.

QUOTING CONGRESSIONAL SOURCES, WASHINGTON STAR PENTAGON REPORTER LISA MYERS SAID JONES AGREED TO RESIGN IN EVENT OF A REAGAN VICTORY "IN RETURN FOR A PLEDGE FROM KEY CONSERVATIVES NOT TO WAGE A PROTRACTED FIGHT AGAINST HIS RENOMINATION."

UPI 06-04 12:22 PED.
Registration Foes Launch Effort To Talk Carter Proposal to Death

By Lisa Myers
Washington Star Staff Writer

Senate opponents of President Carter's draft registration plan yesterday launched a last-gasp effort to talk the bill to death, and the Senate's only woman vowed to try to expand the debate to include women as well as men.

Senate Democratic and Republican leaders said it is only a matter of time before the Senate gives final approval to a million House-passed measure to begin registering 19- and 20-year-old men at post offices this summer. Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker said that, despite a filibuster, passage could come as early as mid-September.

In opening debate, Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd said reinstatement of registration, abandoned in 1971, would be a signal to the Soviet Union and U.S. allies of our determination to place our armed forces in a state of preparedness in the event of a military emergency. He argued that it also "will demonstrate our resolve to back up our foreign policy pronouncements with military strength."

But Sen. Nancy Kassebaum, R-Kan., claimed that registration is largely symbolic and "only has substance as a symbol if it is universal." Its primary value, she said, is "as a tool of education for young people in reminding them of their commitment and the burden of such a commitment." She vowed to fight against its passage.

"That benefit will be neutralized in the divisive debate that will ensue if we mandate a discriminatory and unfair registration scheme," Kassebaum said.

The House and the Senate Armed Services Committee have overwhelmingly rejected registering women. Sen. Robert Dole, R-Kan., predicted that the full Senate will follow suit.

"She's very persuasive, but I doubt she's that persuasive," he said of Kassebaum.

Although some proponents of registration have sought to avoid the issue of including women on the ground that it would delay implementation of a plan, Kassebaum noted that there are strong constitutional arguments for including women. A number of legal scholars maintain that a men-only registration plan would be ruled unconstitutional by the courts when opponents mount a promised legal challenge.

Claiming to have a solid base of 30 votes, Kassebaum said her amendment has "a fair chance provided we can get over some of the paralyzing problems."

Byrd said he expects to file a petition to close off the filibuster by the end of the week. Although senators aren't likely to muster the required 60 votes in the first attempt to invoke cloture but that the votes will materialize on the second or third try.

Sen. Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., leader of the filibuster, said registration would have "a very divisive impact" on the country and wouldn't solve military manpower problems.

He noted that it is opposed by all presidential candidates, other than Carter.
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U.S. Navy chief visits Turks

ANKARA — Adm. Thomas Hayden, U.S. chief of naval operations, arrived yesterday on a four-day official visit. He will hold talks with the Turkish armed forces chief of staff, Gen. Kenan Evren, and other defense officials.

The visit is expected to strengthen military ties between the two nations.
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Brown Cites Soviet Cruise Missiles
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Brown, a former defense secretary, has expressed concern about the deployment of cruise missiles in the Western Hemisphere.

"We're not going to allow the Soviets to have more capability than we have," he said. "I hope it's just a matter of time before they bring it to a halt."
Hussle Over Head of Joint Chiefs May Be at an End

WASHINGTON—Backstage negotiations appeared Tuesday to have ended a Senate challenge to the nomination of Gen. David C. Jones to a second two-year term as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), who declared last week that he would filibuster against the nomination, said he has agreed to drop his opposition in return for a promise by Jones to resign in January if President Carter is not re-elected.

Jones promptly denied through a spokesman that he had made any such promise.

Sen. John Tower (R-Tex.) and John W. Warner (R-Va.), who have been negotiating with Jones, said the general did not say flatly he would resign but rather that he would step aside if whoever is President next January wanted someone else in the job.

"Under the law, the chairman of the JCS serves at the pleasure of the President and Jones realizes that," Tower said. "He would gracefully step aside if the President wanted someone else."

Tower said further that it is now his opinion "that there will not be substantial opposition" to the Jones nomination.

Helms, asked about the Jones denial and the comments of Tower and Warner, said he will seek clarification from the two senators but added that he thought it is a matter of "semantical hair-splitting."

"I know what I mean, and now I've got to find out what Sen. Tower and Sen. Warner mean, but I think we mean the same thing," he said. "I think they're trying to save face for the guy."

Helms had said last week that he would filibuster against Jones' nomination part on grounds the general is a "White House puppet" who has failed to stand up for the military.

Asked Tuesday if he would now oppose Jones, Helms indicated he will not fight further.

"I think it will work out all right," he said.

UP-022

THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT TODAY DENIED AS "TOTALLY INCORRECT" A PUBLISHED REPORT THAT AIR FORCE GEN. DAVID JONES, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, PRIVATELY HAS AGREED TO RESIGN IF RONALD REAGAN IS ELECTED PRESIDENT.

QUOTING CONGRESSIONAL SOURCES, WASHINGTON STAR PENTAGON REPORTER LISA MYERS SAID JONES AGREED TO RESIGN IN EVENT OF A REAGAN VICTORY "IN RETURN FOR A PLEDGE FROM KEY CONSERVATIVES NOT TO WAGE A PROTRACTED FIGHT AGAINST HIS RENOMINATION."

JONES RENOMINATION AS JCS CHAIRMAN IS PRESENTLY HUNG UP IN THE SENATE WHERE SOME CRITICS HAVE LABELED HIM "A PATSY FOR JIMMY CARTER."

A PENTAGON SPOKESMAN SAID THE STAR STORY WAS "TOTALLY INCORRECT."

"GENERAL JONES HAS NOT OFFERED TO RESIGN," HE SAID.

THE STAR STORY SAID: "UNDER AN EXTRAORDINARY DEAL BROKEDER BY SEN. JOHN WARNER; R-VA.; JONES WOULD BE CONFIRMED, BUT HE WOULD SERVE ONLY SIX MONTHS OF HIS TWO-YEAR TERM UNLESS CARTER IS RE-ELECTED."

IT QUOTED SEN. JESSE HELMS; R-N.C.; CHARACTERIZED AS A "LEADER OF THE DUMP-JONES MOVEMENT," AS SAYING: "GENERAL JONES HAS AGREED TO TENDER HIS RESIGNATION IN JANUARY IF GOVERNOR REAGAN IS ELECTED, WITH THAT, I'M NOT GOING TO RAISE ANY RUCKUS ABOUT THE NOMINATION."

JONES HAS RECENTLY RENOMINATED BY CARTER FOR A SECOND TWO-YEAR TERM AS THE NATION'S TOP MILITARY OFFICIAL.
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U.S., Saudi Concern Increasing
At Soviet Arms Aid to N. Yemen

By Edward Cody
Washington Post Foreign Service

HODEIDA, North Yemen—the presence of Soviet advisors and military
division in North Yemen is increasing steadily, and the government says it
has no intention of stopping the flow
despite concern in Saudi Arabia and the
United States.

The influx grows from determination
within President Ali Abdullah Sa-\nlah's government and officer corps
to strengthen their own forces from
whatever sources are available to
a country with Yemen's limited finan-
cial resources.

It refutes a history of military aid
from the Soviet Union combined
with North Yemen's resolve to remain
independent of its wealthy Saudi neigh-
bors, whose attempts to steer Sanaa
away from Moscow have often been
heavy-handed.

Against this background, President
Carter's decision in March 1979 to
dispatch under covert procedures 15
Northrop F-5 fighters and 64 M-60 battle
tanks, a gesture urged by the wor-
sed Soviets, appears now to have been
too little, too late and too closely tied
to Saudi Arabia to make a difference
in North Yemen.

Instead, the size of the direct Soviet
effort has largely eclipsed the U.S.
arms and their value as a symbol of
Western alliance with the Yemenis.

If North Yemen is weaned away
from Saudi Arabia and the West, it
would represent a major setback for
American efforts to contain Soviet in-
fluence in the Middle East, right in
the backyard of the world's leading
oil exporter. Outright alignment
with the Soviet Union by North Yemen
would be seen everywhere in the Arab
world as another loss of face and
influence by the United States on top
developments in Iran and Afghan-
istan.

In addition, North Yemen is strat-
gically placed to provide a possible
site for military control of the mouth
of the Red Sea.

Soviet ships are regularly unloading
Mig 21 and SU-22 warplanes along
with T-55 tanks and other military
equipment at this humid Red Sea port
—even as Yemeni pilots learning from
two American instructors make prac-
tice landings in the F-5Es at Sanaa.

Migs and Sukhois, painted in camo-
battle, line up at the main airport
here. Nearby on the coast, a Soviet-
supplied radar and antiaircraft bat-
tery rises beside the road stretching
along a 12-mile spit protecting
Hodeida's deep-water harbor where
the Soviets land their arms.

Analysts in the capital estimate
that North Yemen has received 15 SU-22
ground-attack fighters, 21 Mig 21 fight-
ners since February in a deal in which
Moscow has promised 40 Mig 21s and
20 SU-22s.

In addition, soon after the Ameri-
can tanks began arriving, Soviet T-55
 tanks started showing up. First came
200 Polish-made T-55s, military ana-
lysts say, and since then at least 300
more from the Soviet Union's own
stocks.

Also recently arrived from the So-
viets, they say, are 65 multiple
rocket launchers and 18 self-propelled
antiaircraft guns, with four 34 mm can-
non that spits out 900 rounds a minute.

Moreover, 70 armored personnel
vcrs sent by Carter have been joined
by Soviet armored cars.

Along with the weapons have come
Soviet military experts to train the
Yemenis in their use. About 230 Soviet
military advisers are reported to be
working in North Yemen. The sche-
dule of future arms deliveries has led
to predictions that the number will
rise.

Up to 70 U.S. military personnel
were in North Yemen last year to
train Yemeni pilots with American wea-
on. But that number has dropped
to eight, including the two instructor pil-
lots, U.S. sources say, in addition to
U.S. teams that come and go.

It was because Saudi Arabia urged
and financed the deal for American
aircraft to strengthen North Yemen's
to the Soviets South Yemen that
Saudi Arabia's role became particularly
upset when the Soviets started com-
ing. Their worries were heightened
talks that for the first time, talks did
as signed of improving relations between
the Soviets in Aden and the Sanaa
government.

Since then, North Yemen has of-
tered repeated assurances to Saudi
Arabia that the flow of Soviet arms
and advisers does not mean a change
in the Sanaa's traditional policy of non-
alignment, and that the arms do not
mean a drift toward a Soviet-orien-
ted alliance with the south.

But Prime Minister Abdul Aziz Ab-
dul Ghani and Foreign Minister
Mohammad al-Makki said in separate
interviews this week that the North Yemeni
assurances have not included a specific
promise to send the advisers home as
reported last March in Saudi Arabia.

"Everybody got angry, but...we
thought they wouldn't," said Abdul
Ghani. "We have got arms from the
Soviet Union since the 1950s...As
long as there is a job to do, there will
be advisors to do it..."

Echoing this theme, Makki said:
"We have our own interests. They
have their own interests. They are our
neighbors. They have their own inter-
est. They are our neighbors. Our
interests may not always be the same.
I will never say to them the
Soviets not to come because some-
bodies is not happy that they are
here. I think America should tell us
how to deal with other countries."

At the same time, both officials
emphasized that Sanaa's government
is assured the vigorously anti-Soviet
Saudi that the Soviet advisers are in
North Yemen only for weapons train-
ing and maintenance, and that their
departure will be considered when
their job is finished.

"We gave all these assurances that

(See N. YEMEN, Pg 6)
ANGOLA -- CONTINUED

system that favors neither East nor West; the third and largest group, which includes Dos Santos, flows with the currents of the moment and appears to be generally befuddled by the problems facing Angola.

For the Soviet Union, Angola represents an important springboard for trying to influence events in southern Africa. Many diplomats here said Moscow is putting pressure on Angola to divorce itself from the Western proposal for a settlement in Namibia and to return to a policy of confrontation.

Angola supported the West's plan to end the civil war in Zimbabwe and also has backed the West's proposal on Namibia, long known as Southwest Africa.

Despite substantial Soviet military investment here, Angola's economy is falling badly. The cities are turning into slums, medical care is lacking, some of the schools are closed because of the shortage of books, agricultural production has fallen 75 percent since independence from Portugal in 1975. Meat is rationed and long food lines form for even essential commodities.

The Soviet bloc has not been very successful in solving those problems. Czechoslovakia recently sold Angola 1,500 cars but no spare parts. The Cubans have taken over programs in which they have little experience—such as petroleum distribution—and have been forced to turn them over to Western experts.

Angola also pays for the bloc's services. It provides the rent and utilities for the Soviets' housing, pays $5,000 a month for every Cuban school teacher and allows the Soviet Union to keep 75 percent of the fish caught off the Angolan coast and repays its debt for weapons with most of its income from oil and coffee. For each dollar earned, a European economist said, Angola spends 60 cents on military or on meeting its financial com-

mitments to Moscow.

Largely out of economic necessity, Angola has been gradually reestablishing its contacts with the West during the past two years. It recently spent $7 million on a new embassy in Paris. Businessmen and technicians are arriving in substantial numbers; the Portuguese who fled at the time of independence are starting to trickle back: the national airline's jet fleet consists of six U.S.-made Boeings, and its charter company, Trans-International Airlines of Oakland, has the aviation contract for Angola's diamond industry.

One of Angola's biggest new trading partners is Brazil, which shares a Portuguese colonial heritage and—common language with Angola. Brazilian exports to Angola have increased from $4 million three years ago to an estimated $200 million this year.

The Angolan government is recognized by all black African governments except Senegal and by most Western governments except the United States. Although the daily newspaper is full of virulent attacks on the United States, talks with Washington continue and Angola is eager to win recognition from the Carter administration.

Abdul Ghan and Makke both said this week that Yemen-Saudi relations satisfied the Saudi government. Several diplomats in San'a have noticed signs of another potential caspian pinch in the government, however, and they say Sultan and Saudi flew home with little of a guarantee than they had sought.

The Saudis traditionally have thought of North Yemen as a close ally and a buffer against South Yemen, ruled by Marxists and closely tied to the Soviet Union. Thus their nervousness remains close to the surface as North Yemen deals directly with the Soviet Union and improves its relations with Aden.

The obligation to deal with Washington through Saudi intermediaries has irritated the independent-minded Yemeni government. A high Yemeni official complained that at one point in the training program every U.S. instructor was accompanied by a Saudi "as if the Americans did not know what they were doing themselves.

So far, the contrast that the Soviet Union has made a point of direct contact and the swift fulfillment of its promises. Yemeni officials said Moscow even diverted its arms at sea on its way to another country to make sure that one shipment arrived in Yemen before deadline.
How Much for Defense?

When President Carter decided last week to urge the House—successfully, as it turned out—to reject the conference committee's compromise budget resolution because it allocated too much to defense, he shifted a layer of the subterranean crust of American politics.

Congressional Budget Office's most recent estimate of the spending implications of the administration's own 1981 defense appropriations request indicated that the compromise resolution exceeded the president's by only $300 million, or four-tenths of 1 percent. Split the difference—say, around $2 billion—and call it close enough for government work. Was this potential difference the real source of the dispute? Various executive-branch officials proclaimed, largely anonymously, to be concerned less about the overall amount of 1981 spending than about too much being spent right now for expensive weapons and not enough for manpower and maintenance.

But such concerns are almost totally irrelevant to the first budget resolution, the one that was being debated. The appropriate vehicles for those fights are the authorization and appropriation bills. There was nothing in this resolution that would have kept the 1981 defense increase from being allocated, for example, entirely to the military. It was the better pay for the career enlisted people who are now leaving the armed services in droves. Carter had said, on board the Nimitz 24 hours before, that he did want to spend more on that problem next year—by implication an extra $2 billion—but apparently he wanted to come from further cats in other defense programs.

Set aside the major issues about policy and programs that are the focus of most of the debate. You support the deficit and don't want to spend more on military pay for first-term enlisted people to attract volunteers under the All-Volunteer Force. Fine, but you still need to keep the career force—you need able sergeants to run an army no matter how you obtain recruits, voluntarily or involuntarily. You don't like the MX? You want to buy small fighter planes or small ships instead of large ones? Fine, but you still have to maintain what you have and let pilots fly enough to stay proficient. You still need defensive communications, radar, and communications that can't be jammed.

These sorts of career pay increases and readiness improvements are beginning to draw strong support not only from the Joint Chiefs of Staff but also from a number of legislators across a broad political spectrum—including, for example, Sens. Tower and Kennedy—thus raising the possibility of reversing Congress' past penchant for cutting readiness funds. And even if you look solely at the military equivalence—sensitivity to drops in the cities streets and paying policemen a living wage, defense needs in these non-controversial areas dwarf the increase Carter opposed and could not begin to be paid for by other defense cuts.

For example, a one-time expenditure merely to bring the casualty rate of the career military people (under half of those in uniform) up to the same level it was when the All-Volunteer Force was introduced in 1972—to make up for their pay having been held 10 percent to 15 percent below the rate for the eight previous years—would cost $2 billion to $3 billion. And bringing ammunition stockpiles, maintenance on existing weapons, fuel for adequate training exercises and communications improvements up to reasonable levels from their currently depressed states would add another $1 billion to $10 billion.

Nice but unaffordable? The administration's proposed defense budget for 1981 would hold spending to 5.3 percent of the gross national product. During the Kennedy administration in the early 1960s, and during the Vietnam War—the nation spent 8.5 percent of its GNP on defense. Defense has no automatic and perpetual claim on the nation's revenues. and given some growth in our economy, we do not need to maintain defense spending at that rate in defense of anything more than our defense in the face of the large Soviet arms surge of recent years.

But the share of GNP is a reasonable measure proposed that we increase defense's share of GNP to 6 or 7 percent. The middle of that range would be only about double of the way back from the level of military spending we have now to the level we supported under President Kennedy—roughly an additional $35 billion annually. Adding that in one year would probably entail some waste, but much more than that would increases that were proposed by the budget conference committees were nowhere. To close this. They would have taken defense's share from 5.3 percent of GNP only up to around 5.4 percent, at most—maybe 1/4th of the way back from today's relative defense burden to that of the Kennedy administration.

Could something else have been afoot? The New York Times reported unnamed administration officials' speculating hopefully that President Carter would, by a small move in the direction of the defense increase, undercut Rep. John Anderson's appeal to similarly minded voters. But whatever his objective, by so protecting his left flank on defense spending (if that is, in fact, the flank Anderson ultimately decides to threaten), Carter now created a future problem for himself that he cannot easily correct, at least not credibly and quickly. Some polls now show over 60 percent of those who respond favoring real increases in defense spending and over 50 percent doing so even if higher taxes are to get the job done—staggering change from the public that backed such steps four or five years ago. Chicago Council on Foreign Relations polls have shown, for example, that for some months the people—especially the people—have been about twice as supportive of increased defense spending as have "opinion leaders" such as professionals and journalists and, apparently, at least some political strategists.

In assessing such increasingly followered opinion leaders, Carter's allies have alienated rather larger number of smaller folk who believe that weakness invites at least being walked on and, at worst, war. In moving over toward the left-hand shoulder, he has abandoned much of the ground that defense issue and has given many traditional Democrats—already unhappy with the economy—an added reason to vote against him. If he gets the nomination in August and if his subsequent attacks on Ronald Reagan for being too far to the right on national security issues fail to bring a number of Democrats back into the fold, he may remember the week after Memorial Day with deep regret.

The Zumwalt- Bagley Report

US Developing New Class of Warships

By ELM R. ZUMWALT, JR. AND WORTH M. BAGLEY

A new class of warships is a key element in the U.S. Navy's program to regain a three-ocean capability to deal with the Soviet navy's new three-ocean fleet. The keel for the first such ship, USS Ticonderoga, was laid Jan. 21 at the automated Ingalls shipyard in Pascagoula, Miss. This first of 21 vessels will be delivered in early 1983. It is a triumphant technology and congressional power.

Ticonderoga's major contribution will be a fleet air defense capability to destroy a high percentage of the Soviet aircraft and missiles which today give Moscow the advantage in a global naval war.

Today's warship radars rotating mechanically can detect a target only at the instant the rotating radar beam sweeps by it. Thus, there are limited detection opportunities for a rotating radar. A separate tracking radar has to "lock on" and engage each target.

On the other hand, Ticonderoga's Aegis computer-controlled weapon system has a radar which transmits in all directions simultaneously. Scanning in all directions, within seconds, detect, track, and engage many aircraft and missiles while continuing to search the skies for others.

Once Aegis detects a target, its range, speed, and direction are computed and processed. A defensive response is selected automatically. A missile can be automatically fired against the target. Or the commanding officer, watching instant, comprehensive displays of the enemy targets, can override and fire when he desires.

After launching, an Aegis missile is guided by radar until close to the target, then the missile switches to receive and follows signals "bounced" off the target by another radar. Destruction of the target is almost certain.

Ticonderoga's Aegis incorporates amazing new electronics today. Many elements can become inoperative, but the system remains effective.

To deal with the occasional target that eludes Aegis, Ticonderoga class warships will have two Phalanx Close-In Weapons Systems which fire a constant stream of pellets, whose axis of fire is constantly corrected by radar to produce hits. The latest detection equipment will locate, and anti-submarine rockets and torpedoes will destroy, enemy submarines.

Two missile launching systems can destroy distant ships with Harpoon cruise missiles.

There is room to add, in 1983, a capability against distant land targets, thus reducing reliance on carrier aircraft. If President Carter backs the Tomahawk long-range cruise missile development.

The latest sophisticated electronic equipment for jamming, anti-jamming, and detection will be on board.
It's Pork Barrel Time on the Hill

The patriotic rhetoric that is accompanying the Pentagon's pending massive budget increase serves to obscure a sordid, political fact of life: The American flag is being wrapped around one of the biggest peace-time pork barrels in history.

Walters Senate and House hawks raise shrill alarms about Soviet military superiority, the private talk in Capitol cloakrooms centers on more practical considerations—how to ensure fat defense contracts for state homes and congressional districts. Here are some examples of the superpower's salami-slicing:

- The powerful Texas delegation—led by Rep. Jim Wright, the House Democratic leader, and Sen. John Tower, ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee—is demonstrating once again that it can bring home the bacon. Without even a vote, Wright succeeded in getting approval of $10 million to study expansion of one of the F11 fighter bombers, which General Dynamics builds in his district. When the White House eliminated $1129 million for ATK attack planes produced by the Vought Corp. in Grand Prairie, Tex., the Texans bullied the administration into restoring the money.

- Fairchild Republic's plant in Hagerstown, Pa. to have closed production of the A10 attack plane this year after delivering a final order of 103 aircraft. But under pressure from the Maryland delegation, the administration agreed to increase the production run to 158 A10s and extend it over four years. Rep. Beverly Byron (D-Md.) even managed to secure a $30 million House authorization to produce a new version of the A10.

- Frank Saltine used to be the House Armed Services Committee counsel. Now he's a lobbyist for Grumman Corp. One of his initiatives is to tell my associate Paul Grant that Saltine is "hurting around constantly" and "calls every day." His efforts apparently paid off. The House granted Grumman $600 million of the Pentagon-budget increase.

- A weapon's performance sometimes runs second in importance to political clout. On the F18 plane, for example, has had problems with landing gear malfunction, leaky fuselage and faulty wing design. But Rep. Charles Wilson (D-Calif.), in whose district Northrup manufactures the F18, had no difficulty getting approval for an increase in this year's plane order from 56 to 72, at an additional cost of about $500 million.

- The House Armed Services Committee staff, noting that the Patriot missile had performed properly in only five of the last six tests, cut back its budget by $60 million. But the missile's builder, Raytheon, is in a district next to House Speaker Tip O'Neill's. After a few words in the right places, the committee reinstated the $60 million. One Capitol Hill veteran remarked wryly: "The Speaker's lobby is appropriately named.

- Iran is the Jewish—When I reported last March that about 100 Iranian Jewish refugees were having trouble getting visas to enter the United States, the State Department denied the story.

Thousands of Iran's minority refu-gees, including Jews, had been allowed into the country in recent months, the department said.

New evidence, however, confirms my original story. One of the nation's oldest Jewish leaders, who dislikes publicity and requested that his name be withheld, wrote me a letter on the subject. The Iranian Jews, who were allowed into the United States, he wrote, were often those who had been to this country before and held valid reentry visas enabling them to return within four years. But he indicated that several first-time applicants were running into bureaucratic red tape at our Paris and London consulates—just as I reported.

In addition, a confidential internal State Department document confirms my report that Foggy Bottom officials can't decide how to handle the Iranian Jewish refugees stranded in Europe. When Immigration authorities tried to give them guidance on the subject, the State Department failed to send a key representative to discuss the situation.

My report brought quick, temporary, results. Less than two weeks after it was published, cables were sent to U.S. consular officials instructing them to show "sympathy and understanding" in processing entry applications from Iranian Jews and other minorities.

But since April 7, when President Carter announced tighter restrictions on Iranians, even those with long-standing visas are having problems getting into the United States.
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World-Wide

CARTER AND KENNEDY AGREE to meet today at the White House.

A Kennedy aide said the meeting will "establish lines of communication." It comes amid signs that Tuesday's voting might aid independent John Anderson. While Carter won a nominating majority, his campaign was jolted by losses in five of eight Democratic primaries, including California and New York.

Strategists for Ronald Reagan said they are rewriting his general campaign plan to tap Anderson's support. Exit polls of California voters showed Reagan would win easily in a three-way race but Anderson would edge Carter.

Carter said he expects Kennedy "will carry his delegates and deep belief in the campaign's cause.

The defeat of Proposition 9 doesn't mean California's tax revolt is dead, analysts said. They suggested that concern about government-service cuts figured in rejection of the plan to tax state income tax. State voters also turned down an oil-company tax and dumped Democratic Rep. Charles Wil-son, who is cited in a House ethics case.

Ayatollah Khomeini accused Carter of trying to cover up U.S. wrongdoing in Iran. Ramsey Clark, attending Iran's anti-America conference in defiance of a Carter travel ban, said he agreed to head an American in-quiry into alleged U.S. crimes. Iran's presi-dent asked the former Attorney General to form the panel.

Swiss trade with Iran should be kept "within normal limits," officials in Bern said. The government said its neutrality and representation of U.S. interests in Tehran bar it from joining U.S. economic sanctions against Iran.

Gunmen in Belfast killed John Turnley, 40, Protestant protests to the Irish Independ-ent Party. Police said they believed the Northern Ireland politician, who favored unity with Ireland, was shot by right-wing Protestants.

Arab merchants in East Jerusalem were detained overnight by Israeli military officials to ensure that they opened their shops. Strikers had been called to protest Monday's car-bomb attacks on two West Bank Arab mayors. Israeli order protected other West Bank mayors.

An Iraqi embassy was attacked by two gunmen in Rome, who killed one employee and planted a time bomb that was defused three minutes before it was set to explode. Embassy guards wounded and captured one gunman, who identified himself as an Iraqi. His accomplice escaped.

Italian Premier Cossiga's government is expected to remain in power through the seven-nation Venice summit, late this month. Cossiga is charged with indirectly helping a suspected terrorist figure. Italian Communists plan to force a parliamentary review, but say the inquiry could take months.

More than 200 South Koreans arrested during the Kwangju uprising were released by the military-dominated government. Last month's insurrection by students in the southern provincial capital left at least 170 people dead. Authorities said 524 people still are being held.

Afghanistan is stepping up a draft to replenish its army, which has been hit by desertions and civil war casualties. Western diplomats said. But they asserted that the conscription drive by the Soviet-backed gov-ernment is meeting resistance.

The shooting of Vernon Jordan was wit-nessed by two persons other than FBI agent said. But a police spokesman said neither witness was able to provide new information. Mrs. Coleman, who drove Jordan to his motel before the shooting, agreed to take a lie detector test, investigators said.

Tornado-ravaged Grand Island, Neb., was patrolled by National Guard units in the search for bodies continued. At least three persons were killed and more than 150 others injured when as many as seven twisters roared through the city.

A stay of execution was granted for con demned killer Jack Potts by a federal judge in Atlanta. Potts had reversed an earlier deci-sion not to appeal his conviction.

Key West, Fla., was deluged with seafair boats carrying Cuban refugees. One captain, who returned to Florida from Cuba with an empty ship, said Cuban officials told him they wouldn't allow any more foreign-regis-tered vessels to participate in the seafair.
pilots about haboobs. And when a photograph of Iran taken by the NOAA 6 weather satellite just two minutes before the mission began showed no storms within 50 miles of the flight plan, the experts concluded that weather would not be a problem. The pilots, totally unprepared for the experience of flying through a haboob, thus began their mission in a state of much confusion and consternation.

Disoriented: In the midst of the haboob, the No. 5 chopper lost its gyro when a blower that cooled the gyro's power source burned out. Unable to see the ground through the dust, the chopper's pilots became so disoriented that they nearly crashed. Rather than try to negotiate a 9,000-foot ridge that lay between them and Desert One, they decided to turn back— even though they didn't have enough fuel to reach the Nimitz. Breaking radio silence, they told Seiffert of their decision. He relayed it to Vaught, who relayed it to the carrier, which reversed course and began speeding toward the Iranian coast to cut the distance the stricken chopper had to cover. They barely made it. One of the choppers ran out of fuel moments after setting down on the Nimitz's deck.

The gyro failure wasn't the No. 5 chopper's only problem. There was also a burn-out of its tactical navigation system. What's more, its omni-directional radio receiver failed to pick up the signal transmitted by the Iranian navigational station at Darabond, which is where the helicopters were to cross the 9,000-foot ridge. Had the receiver worked properly, the No. 5 chopper would have been able to negotiate the ridge even without its gyro.

The Pentagon still isn't sure why so much of chopper 5's equipment failed. Investigators thought they had discovered the reason for the gyro burn-out when they found a flak jacket and duffel bag blocking an air duct inside the helicopter. But the crewman who used the gear insisted he had stored it properly—and that it may have been tossed in front of the duct in the frantic final moments as the crew scrambled about the cabin for life jackets. Pentagon experts also dismissed the idea that the helicopter had been damaged on the Nimitz the morning of the mission when a marine—ironically, one of the eight who later died at Desert One—accidentally set off a firefighting system that doused the craft in a foam and salt-water solution.

The six remaining helicopters were supposed to meet the C-130s at Desert One by 11:30 p.m. But because of the haboob, it was 1:10 a.m. before all had landed. At that point, Kyle discovered that the No. 2 chopper had lost its second-stage hydraulics pump and was unable to take off again. The malfunction had actually occurred two hours earlier. If radio communication had been permitted, the pilot of the stricken helicopter might have been able to inform Kyle of his problem long before any of the choppers got to Desert One. Kyle could have aborted the rescue at that point and started sending the five functioning choppers back to the Nimitz as soon as they had been refueled. That would have eliminated much of the congestion and confusion at the desert staging area that later led to tragedy.

No Spare: Normally, the faulty pump could have been replaced in 45 minutes. But even though the same pump had broken down before in practice, no one had brought along a spare. The Sea Stallions were carrying 5,000 pounds more than their recommended maximum payload—and there simply wasn't room to take along a backup for every part that could possibly fail. Based on an actuarial study of which parts were most likely to break down again, mission planners concluded that the need for a spare...
NATIONAL AFFAIRS

The C-130, which weighed 13 pounds, was a fly-by-wire system. With yet another helicopter out of action, Vaught asked Kyle and commando leader Col. Charlie Beckwith to consider continuing the mission with just five choppers. There were two ways of doing that: they could leave behind some 6,000 pounds of men and matériel, or they could try to load everything onto the already overloaded remaining choppers. Neither alternative was acceptable, and Kyle and Beckwith decided the mission should be scrubbed. Their recommendation was accepted by President Carter. But the team hadn't rehearsed an abort—and the lack of training may have contributed to the final tragedy. "We had never practiced to abort and get on the C-130s," Beckwith said later.

Two of the six C-130s had already taken off when disaster struck. But before the third could taxi to its takeoff position, a helicopter directly behind it had to be moved. The chopper's pilot, Maj. James Shafer, was ordered to bank left and away from the C-130 and fly to a refueling position behind another of the transport planes. Shafer acknowledged the order and started to bank left. Then he apparently became disoriented. He reversed his course, banked right and crashed into the ground that if any Iranians near the site—such as the passengers of the bus that had been stopped—were killed in the process, the militants in Teheran might take reprisals against the hostages. It was the only time since planning for the mission had begun that Washington had overruled a military recommendation.

In hindsight, it is easy to say that the mission planners should have sent ten helicopters instead of eight, that they should have known about the duration of haboobs and briefed the pilots accordingly, that they should have trained for an abort, that they should have taken an extra hydraulic pump to Desert One. But with the exception of the lack of planning for an abort, each of those decisions represented a reasonable trade-off between the need for maximum flexibility on the one hand and speed and secrecy on the other. "There had to have been some mistakes made," conceded Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Thomas Hayward. But in the end, the mission was done in at least as much by an incredible streak of bad luck.

A broader and more troubling question is whether the mission should have been undertaken in the first place. Pentagon planners were never certain how many militants the commandos were likely to encounter at the embassy. The attack force had no secret weapons: the operation would almost certainly have involved a fierce shoot-out. The Pentagon estimated that even if the commandos had made it to the embassy compound undetected, as many as fifteen of the hostages—and up to 30 of the commandos—would have been killed or injured in the getaway. Thus, there was a chance that only 38 hostages would have been rescued safely—at a cost of 45 casualties. In a mission that involved a series of uneasy compromises, that might have been the most disturbing trade-off of all.

Chopper pilot Schaefer arrives home for burn treatment: No evacuation plan

Endangered

Republicans have their best chance in years of capturing the U.S. Senate. A net shift of only ten seats in November could give them control—and more than a dozen Democratic senators face tough re-election campaigns. Conservatives have chosen five liberals as special targets: Birch Bayh of Indiana, Frank Church of Idaho, Alan Cranston of California, John Culver of Iowa and George McGovern of South Dakota. Newsweek's John J. Lindsay toured Idaho to assess the odds against Church, and Pamela Ellis Simons visited Iowa to scout the campaign against Culver. Their reports:

Frank Church and his Republican opponent, U.S. Rep. Steven Symms, came face to face at a rain-soaked fishermen's breakfast near St. Anthony, Idaho—and the soggy amiability of their encounter belied the spiraling acrimony of this year's Senate campaign. To Symms and his sympathizers on the right, Church is an apostle of "appeasement," a "dangerous man" and a "liar." To Church, the New Right itself is increasingly the issue—particularly the campaign being waged against him by the ABC (Anybody But Church) committee and its Washington parent group, the National Conservative Political Action Committee (NCPAC). "Symms and the ABC and NCPAC have been linked to one common objective—to attack Frank Church," he complains. Slightly ahead in the polls but on the defensive nonetheless, Church, 55, must hope that ABC's attacks will boomerang; his fifth Senate term—anchormanship of the Foreign Relations Committee—may depend on it.

ABC and NCPAC resolutely deny connection with the Symms camp.
New Light on the Rescue Mission

What caused the failure of the disastrous American attempt to rescue the hostages in Iran? Newsweek’s David C. Martin has unearthed previously unpublished details of the aborted mission. His report:

The placid waters of the Gulf of Oman were fading into twilight as the eight RH-53D Sea Stallion helicopters lifted off the deck of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier U.S.S. Nimitz last April 24. The helicopters hovered briefly at 400 feet, grouping themselves into a loose, diamond-shaped formation, then swung north at 120 knots toward the Iranian coastline 50 miles away. On the Nimitz’s bridge, an officer picked up a scrambler phone. In a instant, he was connected to an Egyptian air base about 300 miles south of Cairo where the task force’s commander, Maj. Gen. James Vaught, was standing by. Operation Eagle Claw, he told Vaught, was under way as scheduled at five minutes past 7, local time.

The helicopters’ initial destination was the staging area called Desert One—an abandoned salt flat in Iran’s Dasht-e-Kavir desert about 600 miles north of the coast and 250 miles from Teheran. At Desert One, they would rendezvous with six C-130 transport planes that had left Egypt two hours earlier carrying men, equipment and the fuel for the next leg of their journey—a 270-mile dash under cover of darkness to a mountain hide-out code-named “Figbar” just 50 miles southeast of Teheran. They were supposed to arrive at Figbar before dawn and hunker down there for the day, waiting until nighttime to attempt the actual rescue. The mission had been in the works for more than six months. Early on, the planners had considered sending in the commandos by truck from Turkey. They also thought about launching the raid from a carrier task force in the eastern Mediterranean. But the back desert route was considered the best option.

The Odds: Planners figured the mission required a minimum of six Sea Stallions. According to their calculations, there was a 96.5 per cent probability that if eight choppers were dispatched from the Nimitz, at least six would make it to Figbar. Sending ten Sea Stallions would have raised the probability to 99.2 per cent. But that would have required an additional C-130 to refuel them, raising the risk of detection. In the end, the planners decided that the extra 2.7 per cent edge simply wasn’t worth it.

The copters were twelve minutes behind schedule when they crossed the Iranian coast in a gap between two radar stations, at Jask and Chah Bahar. That was because the Nimitz had to steam further away from the coast than planned in order to keep at least 200 miles away from a Soviet spy ship stationed near the Strait of Hormuz.

The first sign of trouble came about an hour into the mission, when the pilot of the No. 6 helicopter flashed a light indicating he was setting down. Operating under a prearranged buddy system, the No. 8 chopper landed with him. In the No. 1 helicopter, flight leader Lt. Col. Edward Seiffert had no way of telling what had happened. The only means of in-flight communication between the helicopters was a nonsecure high-frequency radio that was supposed to be used only in the direst of emergencies. Since no one broke radio silence, all Seiffert could do was to report over his secure scrambler phone to Vaught and deputy task-force commander Col. James Kyle, who was riding in the lead C-130, that two of his helicopters were down. The No. 8 chopper’s tail had been damaged on the Nimitz—and it had spent so much time in the shop that it was known as the “hangar queen.” But it was the No. 6 chopper that had been disabled by a loss of pressure in one of its rotor blades. Its crew and classified material were transferred to the No. 8 chopper, which took off and soon caught up with the formation.

The mission’s planners had expected at least one chopper to break down. From the beginning, the Sea Stallion was something of a compromise choice for the rescue mission. The Army’s CH-47 helicopter might have been better suited for the long, arduous overland journey to Desert One and beyond. But preparing the CH-47 might have raised suspicions: were eight Army choppers being transferred to an aircraft carrier?

As the remaining seven choppers were nearing “Turnpoint Four,” a navigational point near the town of Bam, they ran into a strange floating fog of dust. Normally, dust storms are swept across the area accompanied by strong winds. But this dust storm was different. “There was no blowing sand, no wind, no significant turbulence or any other indications of a sandstorm,” reported a later Pentagon paper. “The phenomenon was suspended dust.” A fine talcum-like powder, it sifted into the cockpits, coating the pilots’ lips and raising the temperature from an already uncomfortable 88 degrees to a nearly intolerable 93 degrees.

As soon as they hit the dust, Seiffert’s lead chopper and its buddy landed. The other five helicopters didn’t see them. Instead, they flew on. Realizing he had left behind, Seiffert took off again. Logically, the mission could have been aborted at that point, since the dust cloud had reduced visibility so badly. But because the dust cloud resembled no sandstorm the pilots had ever experienced—and because the C-130s ahead of them had radioed back no warnings—they pressed on, convinced they would emerge from it at any moment.

Haboobs: What they had encountered was a haboo, a rare though hardly unknown meteorological phenomenon in which dust is generated by thunderstorms kick up great masses of dust miles away. Haboobs occur in the southwestern United States, where the dust usually settles back to earth within ten minutes. But in Iran, where the dust is much finer, a haboo can linger in the air for hours. The 1970 CIA intelligence summary that the mission’s weather forecasters used mentioned haboobs only briefly and said nothing about their duration. Had the planners searched through the archives of weather satellite photos at the University of Wisconsin, they might have turned up evidence of long-lasting Iranian haboobs. But the mission’s urgency—as well as security requirements that kept personnel to a minimum—did not permit such in-depth research. Security concerns also nixed an idea to set up a clandestine weather station in the desert that might have detected the haboobs. (As many as 1,000 people knew enough about the mission to compromise it—and one loose-lipped sailor on emergency leave almost did.)

In any case, the Pentagon anticipated that the mission might have to be called off. But the rescue team never practiced executing an order to abort—and that may have contributed to the final tragedy.
At the Colosseum: These days politicians, not Christians, get thrown to the lions

by Steven Strasser

The West German Chancellor insisted that Bonn would stand behind its decision to deploy the cruise missiles. Only hours before Carter’s letter arrived, Schmidt sarcastically told visiting U.S. Sen. Joseph Biden that the U.S. “can depend on the bloody Germans.” Last week, he told The Washington Post that his proposal on missiles was “in the mainstream of Western thinking.” He said he “found it difficult to understand” why his suggestion “should have created such fuss in Western circles.”

At their meeting in Venice, Carter and Schmidt conducted a “cordial and very intense” airing of their differences, according to one source. Afterward, Carter told reporters: “We have absolutely no doubt that he and the Federal Republic of Germany are completely committed to carry out the agreement” to deploy the new missiles. Furthermore, said Carter, “we both agree completely that the Soviets must withdraw all their troops from Afghanistan.” Schmidt expressed unqualified agreement with everything Carter had said. “I never thought that we did not agree,” said the Chancellor. But if the two men had managed to smooth over their latest dispute, it also was widely assumed that what one German official called their “serious chemistry problem” remained as bad as ever.

The trouble in the Western Alliance, however, goes deeper than mere bad blood between leaders. As the West’s strategic stakes expand beyond Europe to the Mid- east oil fields and the markets of the developing world, some Europeans are questioning whether NATO itself, with its narrow focus on the defense of the North Atlantic, works well enough anymore. In Venice, French and British leaders planned to float the idea of a new NATO mechanism: a panel of American, British, French and German ambassadors charged with coordinating Western military and diplomatic activities beyond Europe. To many friends of the United States, the papering-over of political differences in Venice and the unresolved doubts about Jimmy Carter’s leadership only increased the need for some better way to conduct the business of the West.

Steven Strasser with Thomas M. DeFrank and Rich Thomas in Carter’s party, Scott Sullivan in Venice and bureau reports