

THEME OF THE QUARTER

a closer look at . . .



INTRODUCTION

This section consists of three separate, yet related, parts. The first part -- which represents the principal feature of this Newsletter issue -- is an article submitted by the Logistics and Security Assistance Directorate of the Headquarters United States European Command (USEUCOM). Following this initial article, DISAM has developed supplementary articles which highlight "NATO Arms Cooperation and Initiatives" and DISAM's "European, African, and Middle Eastern Studies" program.

* * * * *

U. S. EUROPEAN COMMAND -- AN OVERVIEW OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE (Submitted by USEUCOM)

Headquarters U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) is situated in the town of Vaihingen on the outskirts of Stuttgart in southern Germany. It is at the forefront of most of today's major international security issues whether they center upon NATO's defenses against the Warsaw Pact, instability in the oil-rich Middle East, or the throes of young emerging nations in Africa. USEUCOM's involvement is broad and complex, and is expected to continue being so in future years.

General Bernard W. Rogers, USA, became the new Commander in Chief Europe (CINCEUR) on 27 June 1979 when he replaced General Alexander M. Haig, Jr. Since he is double-hatted as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), and thereby stationed at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) in Mons, Belgium, daily U.S. national responsibilities are shouldered by the Deputy CINCEUR, General James R. Allen, USAF, who is stationed in Vaihingen.

Security Assistance (SA) Responsibility

In addition to the traditional functional responsibilities, CINCEUR, as a Unified Commander, is tasked by the Secretary of Defense to command the various in-country Security Assistance

Organizations (SAOs) (i.e., MAAGs, Missions, Liaison Offices, Offices of Defense/Military Cooperation (ODC/OMC)), and in coordination with the Ambassador, to conduct appropriate activities to ensure effective and efficient management of SA programs within the USEUCOM area of SA responsibility. This area includes all of Western Europe, the Middle East, and all of Africa. For FY 1980, there are 49 countries within this area which have SA programs with which HQ USEUCOM is involved and assisting.

HQ USEUCOM Organization and Functioning

At the headquarters, the Logistics and Security Assistance Directorate (J4/7), headed by a Major General, has staff cognizance over SA. Within the Directorate, daily actions are handled by the Deputy Director for SA, a Colonel, and the SA Division. The Division is staffed with 33 persons, and is sub-divided into a Country Branch which handles materiel programs for each respective country, and an Operations Branch which coordinates overall policy and regional responsibilities plus manages training for all USEUCOM countries. Each branch is headed by a Colonel.

The SA Division operates within several functional areas. First, there is the development and consolidation of data for Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of State (STATE) planning. This includes annual input to the major JCS documents, the Joint Strategic Planning Document Supporting Analysis (JSPDSA) and the Joint Security Assistance Memorandum (JSAM). It also includes review and comment upon the annual embassy submissions to STATE which are the Annual Integrated Assessment of Security Assistance (AIASA) and the Consolidated Data Report (CDR), instrumental in producing the JSAM and the SA Congressional Presentation Document. To assist the in-country SAOs in preparing their input, HQ USEUCOM develops and provides "country guidance packages" complete with U.S. objectives, host country force structure and requirements, and strategic interest and threat information.

Second, there is the monitoring and evaluation of country SA programs, projections, and activities. This is done on both an individual and regional basis, and recommendations are made pertinent to theater-wide planning and coordination. Since HQ USEUCOM is not normally involved in the day-to-day mechanics of grant aid and FMS contract administration, a "management by exception" approach is taken with concentration upon significant problems and areas of confusion. Nonetheless, this requires frequent, almost daily contact with most SAOs.

Third, this Headquarters, through direct communications and in-country visits, works closely with SAOs, Defense Attaches, and Embassy personnel designated to perform SA functions. Examples include: important direct assistance provided in-country by HQ

USEUCOM personnel during the establishment of new OMCs in Cairo, Egypt, Sana, Yemen, and Khartoum, Sudan; an officer provided for three weeks to Muscat, Oman, to advise the Ambassador on SA matters and to initiate the necessary procedures to establish new SA programs; and SA personnel accompanying the HQ USEUCOM Inspector General (IG) teams on all IG inspections of SAOs (15 in 1978, 6 for 1979). Additionally, several one-week Phase IV SA Schools are conducted annually each Fall at HQ USEUCOM for SAO personnel (in 1978, 70 persons attended; in 1979, 99 are scheduled). Separate service training workshops are conducted in Stuttgart each year, and in May/June 1979 special regional SA training workshops were conducted in Nairobi, Kenya and Abidjan, Ivory Coast. A theater-wide SA Conference is hosted each Spring (in April 79 over 50 SAO chiefs, DOD, and STATE personnel, including the Honorable Lucy Benson, Under Secretary of State for SA, Science and Technology, were in attendance). Further, the SA Division provides the USEUCOM representative to the European F-16 Steering Committee. In other areas of direct support, the various Directorates at HQ USEUCOM work closely with the SAOs to assist in personnel assignment/manning, personnel services support (dependent schooling, environmental and morale leave program, awards and decorations, postal, and commissary), administration, communications, budgeting, transportation and other logistics support, legal, and public affairs.

Fourth, HQ USEUCOM functions as the theater focal point for promulgation and resolution of SA policy and management issues. A significant and continual dialogue is maintained with DOD and SAOs regarding policy coordination, interpretation of SA legislation, manpower requirements and allocation, and management of Foreign Military Sales (FMS)/Military Assistance Program (MAP)/International Military Education and Training (IMET).

In-Country SA Organizations

For the 49 USEUCOM countries programmed for SA in FY 1980, the programs are managed by various SAOs ranging in size from a 95-man MAAG to a single civilian point of contact in an embassy. Presently programs are managed by nine of the larger MAAGs/Missions/Liaison Offices, 13 of the smaller 3-6-man ODCs/OMCs/Liaison Offices, 14 DAOs, and 10 embassies. Three countries have programs managed by SAOs/DAOs located in other countries.

The general organizational trend over the past several years, driven by President Carter's Arms Transfer Policy and current legislation, has been toward significantly smaller SAOs with a shift from advisory/training duties to predominantly administrative/management functions. The accompanying USEUCOM manpower trend has been an overall total decrease of almost 60% of in-country SA

personnel since 1974: U.S. military from 791 to 288; U.S. civilians from 97 to 59; and local nationals from 284 to 133. In the face of larger programs, increased numbers of visitors, and greater management complexities, present manning levels are the minimum acceptable for accomplishing the SA mission.

SA Program Values

The dollar value of SA in the USEUCOM theater has increased over \$10 billion between FY 1971 and FY 1978. During this time, foreign military sales increased from \$1.2 to \$11.5 billion and commercial sales from \$235 to \$941 million, while grant aid decreased gradually from \$196 to \$144 million. During FY 1978, USEUCOM countries received 85% of the worldwide FMS, 62% of the worldwide commercial sales, and 57% of the worldwide grant aid.

When the FY 1979 tally is in, it is expected that FMS agreements will decrease, while commercial sales and grant aid are expected to increase slightly. Forecasts for FY 1980 are for a decrease of approximately 14% in all three categories.

Total grant aid in the USEUCOM area for FY 1979 amounted to \$161 million (\$146 million materiel, \$15 million training) for 21 recipient countries, 15 of which were in the Middle East or Africa. The largest recipients were Jordan, Spain, Greece, and Portugal. For FY 1980, despite an overall projected decrease of \$28 million in grant aid funding, the number of recipient countries will increase to 28, with only four receiving materiel and the remainder being grant aid training recipients.

The domestic impact created by introduction of sophisticated weapon systems and equipment is not nearly as severe in the European/NATO countries as it is in the developing countries of the Middle East and Africa. European/NATO countries over the years have developed the capability to absorb and properly use and maintain these assets. Countries in the Middle East and Africa, however, lack this capability and normally experience some adverse impact, for example, upon their economy or manpower. Manpower is perhaps the most constraining factor since in the majority of cases sufficient trainable personnel are not available. SA personnel in USEUCOM are especially watchful regarding SA requests and programs for these countries. Foreign training, of course, directly addresses this problem.

Foreign Training

During FY 1978, 17 USEUCOM countries received \$16.4 million in grant aid training (IMET - International Military Education and Training). Another \$185 million worth of training was purchased through FMS resulting in a combined total of over 8,000 students being trained.

During FY 1979, the African countries of Chad, Mali, and Upper Volta were added to the IMET program, increasing USEUCOM IMET countries to 20. However, IMET funding dropped to \$14.5 million. Additionally, \$190 million of FMS training is expected to be purchased, and approximately 8,000 total students trained for FY 1979.

For FY 1980, IMET will expand to \$17.1 million with the addition of eight countries (seven African), which brings the new USEUCOM total to 28 (18 African). Although there is a total funding increase, the proportionate average per country has decreased, with the largest cuts being absorbed by Jordan, Portugal and Zaire. Portugal, however, remains one of the largest recipients along with Spain and Turkey.

USEUCOM considers IMET to be the most far-reaching, influential, and cost-effective SA program on a per-dollar basis. Attendance at schools in the United States, in addition to providing education and skills, very effectively induces a feeling of rapport and a familiarity with the U.S. and with American values which becomes a prime source for future international relations. In this regard, a recent study has shown that of almost 3,300 foreign officers from 43 USEUCOM countries who have attended U.S. military schools and colleges since 1945, 496 graduates have attained general officer (or equivalent) rank, and 30 graduates have reached head-of-state, ministerial, or ambassadorial positions.

Regional SA Status

Security assistance situations and programs differ vastly from region to region within the USEUCOM area of responsibility. In Europe, the SA situation, particularly for the northern and central European countries, can be characterized as reasonably stable, sophisticated, and mutually understanding and cooperative due largely to the long-wedded NATO Alliance. Assistance is predominantly on an FMS cash-and-carry basis; however, certain southern European countries, such as Portugal and Turkey, experience shortfalls in meeting minimum modern military requirements, due primarily to economic problems, and therefore require sizeable U.S. grant aid. For FY 1980, SA for 19 European countries totals approximately \$86 million MAP, \$8 million IMET, and over \$2.1 billion in forecasted FMS agreements.

The Middle East is characterized by explosive instability and large, costly SA programs designed to fulfill specific U.S. objectives and provide for regional stability. The recent Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty will result in multi-billion dollar programs for both countries. In the remainder of the region, most of the countries except the small oil-rich states are long on desire and